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北京论坛（2016）
出土文献与中国古代文明（一）

11月4日下午，北京论坛（2016）“出土文献与中国古代文明”分论坛第一场讨论会在钓鱼台国宾馆二号楼四季厅举行。本场讨论的主题是“出土文献研究的国际视野”，共有六位学者发言。

第一位发言人为张光裕教授，发言主题为《从上博竹书<孔子诗论>“猗嗟”谈射礼文化的意义与内涵》。张教授认为上博竹书《孔子诗论·猗嗟》文本文句与今本《诗经·齐风·猗嗟》对应，两者文辞训诂可以互为发明。文章从“四矢”一词之使用，明确显示先秦射礼之严谨。论证射礼文化源远流长，蕴藏之传统文化深意与内涵，有移风易俗的作用。

第二位发言人为夏含夷教授，发言主题为《<郑文公问太伯>与中国古代文献抄写的问题》。《清华大学藏战国竹简（陆）》载有《郑文公问太伯》一文的两个文本，按照清华大学编者认定，因为这两个文本的书法和模型基本一样，所以两个抄本应该都是一个抄手抄写的。然而，夏含夷教授认为两个抄本之间也显现某些重要差别，特别是两个抄本对含有“邑”旁字的写法：一个抄本系统地将“邑”旁置于字的左边，一个抄本系统地将“邑”旁置于字的右边。这暗示抄收利用了两个不同的底本来抄写，一个底本可能出自楚国的书写习惯（即“邑”旁置于左边的抄本），一个抄本可能出自秦国抑或另外一种北方国家的书写习惯（即“邑”旁置于右边的抄本）。这对说明中国古代文本之制作的问题是非常宝贵的新证据。

第三位发言人为小寺敦教授，发言主题为《关于清华简<系年>的女性》。清华简《系年》有关女性的记录不多，但在《左传》等传世文献里出现很多女性。小寺敦教授通过与《左传》、《国语》、《史记》等传世文献的对比，讨论了清华简《系年》中所见的女性形象。小寺敦教授指出《系年》中出现的女性人物，她虽然有在故事中存在意义，但是没有影响到故事推移的力量。这种现象可能代表了《系年》作为一部文献的叙事特点。本报告在把握《系年》里女性人物的记述方式与特点的基础上，希望更深入地挖掘《系年》关于女性记述这一侧面的史料特点。
第四位发言人为单周尧教授，发言主题为《从出土文献看高本汉《左传真伪考》之方言说》。《左传》的作者，一直以来都有争论。瑞典汉学家高本汉在《左传真伪考》一文中尝试用助词的比较研究来证明《左传》不是鲁国人所作，《左传》的语法，与《论语》、《孟子》所代表的鲁语的语法很不同，因此，《左传》不是孔子作的，也不是“鲁君子左丘明”作的。单周尧教授认为近数十年出土的文献显示，传世的典籍都不是先秦的本来面貌，因此，高本汉根据《十三经注疏》本《左传》、《论语》和《孟子》所使用的助词来证明左语不同于鲁语，从而证明《左传》的作者不是鲁国人，是不可靠的。高本汉《左传真伪考》，虽然在中国曾引起一阵哄动，被认为是一种新颖而重要的贡献，其实未能彻底解决《左传》的作者问题，只是提供了一些研究方法和学术观念供学术界参考而已。

第五位发言人为朱凤瀚教授，发言主题为《曾国墓地大墓之墓主人身份与曾侯舆钟铭文》。湖北随州叶家山墓地的发掘是近几年中国考古的大事件，对商周考古和先秦史研究有重要作用。朱先生通过分析墓葬排序、出土铜器器形以及铭文内容等方面对叶家山墓地墓主人的身份进行了细致的考辩，就几座大墓墓主人之间的相互关系提出了三种可能，并详细分析了三种可能的优缺点。进而又分析了曾侯舆编钟铭文所载的史实，并结合其他相关西周铜器铭文资料对西周早中期西周王朝与淮夷的战争进行了系统的分析。

最后一位发言人为李零教授，发言主题为《北大秦简<禹九策>》。李零教授介绍了北京大学藏秦简《禹九策》的内容。《禹九策》共五十一支简，全篇内容可分三部分，第一部分为序说，主要讲吉凶。第二部分为禹九策，是全书的主体。全篇用韵文写成，借助大禹行九州等图像，卜问疾病、出行等内容，大概是一种民间流行的占卜。第三部分包括善、恶等内容。《禹九策》属于数术类文献，内容十分重要。
11月5日上午，北京论坛（2016）“出土文献与中国古代文明”分论坛第二场讨论会在北京大学英杰交流中心星光厅举行。本场讨论的主题是“青铜器与古文字研究”，共有八位学者发言。

第一位发言人为德国慕尼黑大学的夏玉婷教授，发言主题为《青铜器铭文里反映的克商及文、武王的记忆与早期中国的纪念政策》。夏教授从社会学记忆理论的视野，探讨“武王克商”这一重要历史事件作为当时周人集体记忆中的重要事件，如何进行传承与以何种媒介进行传承的问题。武王克商并不是自然形成的文化记忆和历史传统，而是周王室有选择的记忆策略作用的结果。通过分析宜侯夨簋、何尊、大盂鼎等铜器铭文，发现这样一种文化记忆传承的过程以礼仪、格式化的语言等媒介表达，并且保存在青铜器铭文记录中。而且对集体记忆塑造和控制的权力目前看来是掌握在周王手中。

延世大学沈载勋教授做了题为《浅论大河口霸国墓青铜礼乐器所见的“逾制现象”的两面性》的发言。沈教授的发言首先讨论倗、霸的渊源问题，其次对二者政治地位的进行了讨论，在此基础上，沈教授指出对大河口墓地的“逾制”现象需要放在西周丧葬礼仪的框架中进行研讨。而晋侯的作用则在于对霸、倗等小邦进行监视。

韩国成均馆大学李裕杓讲师做了题为《多友鼎铭文所见军事领导关系》的发言。他的发言首先探讨多友鼎铭文所见战争过程，以及其军事领导关系，他认为贵族接受周王之册命，成为周王之臣，贵族家臣以“策名委质”与贵族结成主从关系，周王对贵族，贵族对家臣要求“勿废朕命”之态度，贵族为周王，家臣为贵族坚持“不知二命”的态度。不过，周王与贵族的家臣之间，没有册命关系，因此，周王对贵族家臣不能要求“勿废朕命”的态度，贵族家臣也不必为周王“不知二命”。这种重层性私属关系，从西周战争铜器铭文所见的战争命令、把握战况、战功赏赐、蔑历和对扬等关系中，可以得到验证。周王不能直接控制贵族的私属将领的原因，他认为来源于周王朝发展的历史过程与由此建构的西周国家的结构。

布拉格查理大学远东系的石安瑞讲师，发言题目为《西周金文日名、谥号研究综述——
兼论使用两种称谓的铭文所反映的铭刻行为模式的异同》。他的发言主要对祖先成为众使用日名使用谥号的言语行为进行了分析，认为两种铭文中言语行为以及措辞的用法有大致相同的发展趋势，但是，铭文中日名的使用更着重于祭祖仪式，而用谥号的铭文更多使用于记述赏赐等官方事务。造成这种差别的原因在于称谓的本质不同：日名绝大多数是相对“称谓”适合于记述“私”方面的内容，而谥号本身是绝对一位祖先的绝对标识，适合于适用预设更广泛的观众的铭文中。

清华大学的赵平安教授，发言主题为《谈谈战国文字中用为“野”的“冶”字》。战国时代从土从田，予声，后来土和田粘连在一起写作“野”的字，可以看作冶的异体。从字形字音的结合与纯粹字形的角度来看这个说法都能够成立，目前看这种写法的野字，仅见于晋楚两系的文字中。

法国国家科学院东亚语言研究所的麦里筱教授，发言主题为《中国境内古今文字里“虹”字的构形及其所反映的民间信仰》。她讨论了甲骨文中的虹字将其与纳西的虹字进行比较，探讨天虹这一自然现象在民间的分布非常广泛，覆盖了从中原到今天的西南地区，且从过去一直持续到现在。

美国佛罗里达大学的来国龙教授，发言主题为《通假字与出土战国秦汉简帛的研究》。来国龙教授认为借助近年来新语文学在国际学术界的复兴，可以为简帛研究提供新的突破：一是突破专注于单个字词的本义、本义的研究，转移到对字词的语境以及文本的整体研究。二是突破以传世文献为中心，以考古发现的秦汉文字材料主要用于校读传世古籍的研究方法，而转变为以出土写本为主，以传世文献为辅，综合运用多种材料与手段的“新语文学”，以探究早期中国文本及蕴含的社会思想和历史文化意义。

最后一位发言人为美国加州大学伯克利分校的齐思敏教授，发言主题为《中国早期死而复生者与祭祀礼仪》。齐思敏教授将传世文献中涉及到死后复活的相关话题和这两篇出土文献内容进行比较，并论证这两篇文献的核心关切在于（通过自身经历）验证对于亡者的祭祀行为。死后复活者因为同时有现在现世世界和死后世界生活的经历，因而在这一问题上有独特的认知视角，也因此可以作为见证死后世界并对其有独特理解的解释者。至于死后复活者关于祭祀死者最有方式的证言，这些证言就是用于验证证言自身所埋葬的墓中的祭祀行为。
北京论坛（2016）
出土文献与中国古代文明（三）

11月5日下午，北京论坛（2016）“出土文献与中国古代文明”分论坛第三场讨论会在北京大学英杰交流中心星光厅举行。本场讨论的主题是“战国秦汉简帛研究”，共有八位学者发言。

第一位发言人为复旦大学刘钊教授，发言主题为《从出土文献看<山海经>》。刘教授探讨了山海经的内容、文本形式以及成书年代问题，并结合出土文献材料，如甲骨文资料、战国秦汉简帛资料等，着重探讨山海经所蕴含的重要价值以及纠正了以往一处断句的错误。刘钊教授认为山海经山经部分是战国楚人所作，有重要的语料价值和史料价值，用出土文献注释山海经仍是以后研究的一个重要工作，目前尚缺少一部详尽的用出土文献注释山海经的著作。

牛津大学麦笛教授作了题为《“书”类的传统与文本重构“金縢”与“周武王有疾”之重估》的报告。“周武王有疾”是现藏于北京清华大学的清华简中的一部分。此文辨析和诠释了“周武王有疾”中的施行特征，以进一步了解战国时期文本在社会中的运用。它在古代政事史料汇编《尚书》中的对应内容广为人知，在历史文献《史记》中也有被记载。然而，与其在政事史料中的记载不同，它大量省略了对周公在武王死后角色的清晰评价。细思此处不同，结合那个时代的政治哲学话语，对这些文本的运用进行重构。本文将从动态文化的角度思考“书”的传统：其成分不断演变，不断在环境、形势截然不同的社会中被重新阐释。本文最终得出结论，这些再创的文字，不仅形式、文体有异，其所传达的内容亦有所不同。

理海大学柯鹤立教授的发言主题为《清华简“筮法”与北大简“荆诀”的比较研究——从两种占筮文书看楚国文化》。本研究课题将专注于两种占卜文书，清华简“筮法”（约前4世纪）与北大简“荆诀”（约前1世纪），两种文书尽管相隔几个世纪，但都反映了古代楚国的文化习俗。两种占卜方法都依靠数字计算以产生卦象，但两种占卜的展现方法完全不同，占卜时考虑的外部因素也完全不同。本论文将特别关注这些因素，包括形象、时
间等，这些因素外在于每一卦之计算，但对于占者（或贞人）来说却是非常重要的“数据点”，当占者（或贞人）占卜以决定吉凶时，这些点会包括在占者的等式中。并且，两种文献中的每一卦——这些卦均与周易传统不同——暗示出在多种可能作祟的因素中，某种因素可以影响一个人的生活生命。而本文将在古代楚国文化的背景下进一步探索这些作祟的可能性因素。

香港中文大学沈培教授的发言主题为《从清华简<子仪>看崤之战后秦国的处境》。沈培教授认为清华简《子仪》的主体内容是放归前秦穆公与子仪的对话，对话之前的几条简文则是在秦国在崤之战后所实施的政策的叙述，实为放归子仪的历史背景。由于目前大家对简文的理解不够准确，致使这个历史背景没有很清晰地体现出来。简文所反映的历史背景，是秦穆公在求得国内安定的情况下，重新唤起秦国重新称霸的梦想，放归子仪是为了取得楚国的帮助，也是建立在自己国家有稳定的局面这个资本之上的。

格林内尔学院顾史考教授的发言主题为《上博竹书<鲁邦大旱>探源》。《鲁邦大旱》是上海博物馆藏战国楚竹书（二）的重要文献之一，记录的是孔子与鲁哀公及弟子子贡两场有关鲁国遭遇大旱及鲁君所当采取之对策的对话。整个故事及对话内容与《晏子春秋·内篇·谏上》第十五章的故事极为相似，甚至可谓乃同一故事的两个不同版本。顾史考教授通过仔细辨析二者内容的区别，探讨了其所以不同的源由，深入发掘了文本的思想内涵，并以此来说明了一些思想史上的问题。

宾夕法尼亚大学钱德樑教授的发言主题为《“恒先”的创造力观》。在本次讲演中，钱教授把“恒先”作为早期道教一个典型概念来分析，她认为恒先的要义“自作”是道教“无为”理念的基本内涵。钱教授强调时空的界定有助于定义创造力，并理解这种创造力如何对人类行为产生影响，以及为什么这种创造力是人类最基本和最重要的模式。

第七位发言人为哈佛大学傅希明先生，报告题为《关于北大简老子的真伪性》。2009年，北京大学入藏了一批汉代竹简，对理解早期中国具有重要价值，几近完整的老子早期版本便是其精华之一。然而北大简不是科学发掘出土，导致邢文对其真实性提出质疑。最近我们重新观察和检视了这批竹简，以此为基础，证明北大简的真实性无可置疑。
第八位发言人为北京大学中国古代史研究中心陈侃理研究员，发言主题为《＜史记＞与＜赵正书＞—历史记忆的战争》。北京大学藏西汉竹书《赵正书》的部分记载与《史记·李斯列传》、《蒙恬列传》同源，但另一些记载却与《史记》迥异，最引人注目的是《赵正书》以胡亥继位为秦始皇临终钦定，而非赵高、李斯密谋后矫诏诈立。两者的异同，反映出汉初对秦代历史存在不同的认识。《史记》在胡亥继位问题上，自然地接受了当时占据主流的历史认识。这种认识来自于楚人反秦的政治宣传，为汉朝所继承，并通过《史记》，最终战胜了其他的历史记忆，深刻地影响了后世。
北京论坛（2016）
出土文献与中国古代文明（四）

2016年11月6日上午，北京论坛（2016）“出土文献与中国古代文明”分论坛第四场讨论会在北京大学英杰交流中心星光厅举行。本场讨论的主题是“秦汉魏晋隋唐出土文献研究”，共有五位学者发言。

第一位发言人为武汉大学陈伟教授，发言主题为《秦汉简牍“居县”考》。秦汉简牍中的“居县”一般认为指当事人目前所居之县。陈伟教授亦认为“居县”既可指当事人目前所居之县，也可指其家乡所在之县。通过对相关资料进行分析，陈伟教授发现过去对简牍的断读和对“居县”的认识都有修订的需要，“居县”实为当事人家乡所在之县。在出土文献中，有“居县”与“死所县”相对的文例，可以证明这一点。之前旧说，应当放弃。

日本中央大学阿部幸信教授，发言主题为《长沙吴简所见的“市布”》。入市布简与布簿的关系有三，民入市简与入布简、入调简分开统计但以乡为单位汇总核算；二，存在对吏入市布简有统计整理的二次记录；三，吏“市布”簿籍与为常规税务制作的布簿分别管理。因此长沙简“调布”之“调”本质在于调整物流，而非赋课之意。

罗格斯大学的Sukhee Lee助理教授作了题为《来自死者的故事：出土墓志与观察前现代中国社会史的新视角》的报告。李先生认为利用新出的考古发现，尤其是墓志铭，学者们可以对中国古代的社会精英发展出一个革命性的认识。当下历史学家能够根据前所未知的细节去探究前近代的中国社会精英究竟如何，他们如何结成姻亲网络，他们与当时的国家政府保持一个怎样的关系。

北京大学韩巍副教授的发言主题为《北大藏秦汉简牍物质形态的考察——兼释对汉简＜老子＞真伪的质疑》。简册背划线在简册编连中起着重要的指示作用。北大简整理过程中曾对简册背划线的观测与认识存在一些问题，导致有竹简的背划线被遗漏。但并不能由此推出北大简《老子》为伪或整理者二次作伪的结论。北大简《老子》所出现的背划线的现象，也可见于北大简《赵正书》和《周驯》，以及一些清华简。可见从战国至西汉中期，于竹简上
刻划“螺旋状”划线的做法是一种稳定的工艺传统。不构成证伪的证据。

第五位发言人为韩国成均馆大学的金庆浩教授，发言主题为《出土文献<论语>在古代东亚史中的内容和展开》。韩国和日本的古代目见的使用时期大体在6世纪末至8世纪末，因此通过讨论这个时期从中国流传而来的汉字文化和木简的相关性，使得对古代东亚社会进行实证研究也成为可能。古代东亚国家的中央集权统治，是吸收从中国传入的律令体制而建立的。通过文书行政，中央和地方的有效统治体制确立、以儒家为代表的统治理念的普及等，构成了以上古代国家成立的重要要素。因为诸要素都是以汉字为媒介而传播，因此对官吏而言，熟知《论语》、《孝经》等与国家治理理念密切相关经典成为一项必须。能通过实证材料确认与此相同的古代东亚社会状况的，便是出土文字资料《论语》。
北京论坛（2016）
世界文明中的巨型城市与区域协同发展（一）

11月4日下午，北京论坛（2016）城市分论坛“世界文明中的巨型城市与区域协同发展”在钓鱼台国宾馆八方苑四季厅举行。会议分为主题演讲和对话两个环节，主题演讲环节由北京大学城市与环境学院常务副院长贺灿飞教授主持，四位发言者就巨型城市的演变、公平发展以及城镇化与卫星城建设等进行演讲；对话环节由北京大学林肯中心刘志主任主持，由五位来自相关领域的专家就如何管理巨型城市发展进行了深入探讨。

香港大学叶嘉安院士首先作了题为《从巨型城市到巨型城市区域》的演讲。叶院士认为城市管理和城市研究的视角应当从巨型城市向巨型城市区域转变，并指出影响巨型城市区域发展因素包括传统的城市化和城市扩张因素如高速公路系统、跨城市交通等以及新型的技术因素如高速铁路、智慧城市、区域数据共享技术等。在介绍了基础设施发展、区域规划以及环境规划等方面的区域合作的国际经验后，他指出中国巨型城市区域的发展面临着区域规划的功能高度分散、自上而下的战略规划引发地方利益损失、区域规划引发不平等等挑战。

原住建部副部长、国务院参事仇保兴博士以《超大城市卫星城建设的历史经验与教训》为题分享了国际超大城市卫星城建设的理论和实践。仇部长在介绍了20世纪以来城市发展历史以及经典理论，并深入对比了英国和法国建设卫星城的经验和教训，指出英国、法国在建设卫星城过程中存在目的、中心、选址、基础、功能、布局、建筑等方面的差异。最后，他指出中国建设卫星城必须在某一方面产生足够的反磁力，需要富有特色、与主城互补、展示稀缺性；卫星城应当是功能复合的城市而非功能单一的中心，其基础设施应遵循“微循环”的新理念，并作为生态示范城进行设计和建设。

美国宾夕法尼亚大学Robert D. Yaro 教授演讲主题是《促进巨型城市区域的公平发展》。他以美国为例，指出美国巨型城市区域在集聚大量人口和产业的同时也产生了诸如交通拥堵、失业率高企等区域不平等等发展的问题。他认为应当从巨型城市区域的视角解决不断产生的不平等问题，并提出应当通过建设城市间高速铁路、就业培训、改善教育和医疗等公共服务等措施促进巨型城市区域的发展。
北京大学城市与环境学院院长傅伯杰院士以《城镇化的环境效应及中国新型城镇化》为题进行演讲。傅院士以长三角、珠三角、京津冀等中国六大巨型城市区域为案例地，说明在1980-2000年中国快速城市化过程中出现了水资源污染与短缺、空气污染、城市热岛效应等一系列生态环境问题。他指出，中国城镇化应当走新型城镇化道路，应当通过城市与区域互动、乡村与城市共进的方法，实现可持续的城镇化。

对话环节伊始，加拿大多伦多市执行长官Peter Wallace先生以《多伦多：我们光明的未来》为题对多伦多进行了详细介绍，他指出多伦多是世界上最具竞争力的城市之一，拥有全球领先的企业并在专业服务、时尚设计、教育、娱乐、金融、生命科学等方面具备突出的优势。最后，他指出多伦多也面临着平衡城市增长、解决贫富差距、更新基础设施、保持金融稳定等新型挑战。

随后，对话环节由英国开放大学Allan Cochrane教授、美国林肯土地政策研究院总裁George W. McCarthy、宾夕法尼亚大学Robert D. Yaro 教授、加拿大多伦多市执行长官Peter Wallace以及北京大学杨开忠教授等五位专家就四个问题展开讨论。

对于巨型城市面临的关键挑战，专家们普遍认为巨型城市面临着基础设施的挑战、财务支出的挑战、组织模式的挑战等；而对于城市化是否为好事情，专家们一致认为城市化的关键不在于好坏，其重点在于是否能够对城市化进程进行有效管理。

对于巨型城市应当处理的最重要事项，Allan Cochrane教授认为完善巨型城市的交通、解决工业问题、统筹考虑城市中心和外围的关系最为关键；George W. McCarthy总裁和Robert D. Yaro教授都认为更新基础设施、合理融资十分重要；Peter Wallace先生进一步强调了城市发展的可持续性；杨开忠教授认为中国城市发展应当完善治理结构、变革城市规划、建立城市管理职业经理人制度。

对于巨型城市未来的挑战和重点，Allan Cochrane教授和Peter Wallace先生都认为巨型城市应当面对多样性、包容多样性，George W. McCarthy总裁城市转型所需要的一系列资源最为关键；Robert D. Yaro教授认为政府角色非常重要；杨开忠教授强调城市的宜居性和环境的重要性。
北京论坛（2016）
世界文明中的巨型城市与区域协同发展（二）

11月5日上午，北京论坛(2016)分论坛“世界文明中的巨型城市与区域协同发展”第二场讨论会在北京大学英杰交流中心月光厅举行。讨论会共有十位发言人进行了报告，上下两个半场分别由宾夕法尼亚大学Robert D. Yaro教授和伊利诺伊大学厄巴纳—香槟分校Geoffrey Hewings教授主持。

上半场讨论中，围绕“全球巨型城市”展开讨论。

美国南加州大学Eric Heikkila教授讲述了演变中的中国城市原型，并通过提取中国五年规划中的关键词，对城市样本进行聚类分析，他认为经济文化价值与历史地理背景对城市身份和发展不容忽视。

英国开放大学Allan Cochrane教授分享了伦敦打造全球城市区域的经验及其新定位，强调大伦敦地区与全球网络中其他城市的关联，大伦敦地区发展不平衡的现象突出，急需寻求恰当的治理方法，以及推进有效的政策实施。

日本东京大学松原宏教授深度分析和梳理了东京都市区的内部结构及城市结构转型、文化产业的地理集聚和产业组织，以及工业集聚的全球竞争力，未来应加强大都市区之间各产业之间的联系。

韩国首尔市立大学崔瑾熙教授带从一个问题——“首尔是创意城市吗？”——展开演讲。研究发现首尔具备了后工业化城市的主要特征：经济结构近几年发生了很大的变化，制造业占比大幅度下降；快速的去中心化使城市空间结构发生转变，已经形成了多中心城市；创意产业新兴并充满活力。

巴西伯南布哥州联邦大学Marcos Costa Lima教授指出圣保罗面临的复杂问题：全球化进程中巨型城市的发展、城市发展与政策实施的博弈、城市化的实际驱动力、城市核心区域的变化带来的挑战。之后，举例了理想状态的可持续发展社区标准来畅想未来巨型城市的前景。
下半场的讨论以“巨型城市治理与财政”为主题展开。

美国林肯土地政策研究院主席George W. McCarthy展示了未来二十年城市化发展的框架和目标，展望了如何监测联合国“新的城市议程”（the New Urban Agenda）的实施执行，指出需要资金、法律、政策等全方面的支持。

美国加利福尼亚大学洛杉矶分校Cindy Fan教授的研究解答了“为什么农民工不要城市户口？”的中国户口之谜。通过调研解析不同要素对城市户口与农业户口的影响，发现流动人口借助了户籍改革的红利，农业户口与宅基地、土地、政府补贴密切相关，而城市户口与优质教育医疗条件等相关。

加拿大多伦多大学Enid Slack教授比较了北京、伦敦和多伦多的差异，指出大都市地区的影响不仅仅在行政区划内，大都市地区的财政和治理起到了影响全局的关键作用，并列举了五种不同的政府治理层级模式。

香港大学林初昇教授提出了以“大型事件”为抓手，推动巨型城市的出现和经济的发展。引人注目的城市主义和大型时间的发生，促进了立杆见影的增长，重造了巨型城市，城市化的过程中要关注时空的变化。

英国伦敦大学学院Mike Raco教授以不断变化的房地产市场着手，收集地产公司的细节数据来体现有规制的财政和治理，发现伦敦自我管制的体系化和规划机制受复杂因素影响。最后，提出了进一步研究的方向：探讨制度和文化多重条件下，未来资本主义到底应该如何运作。

前沿深入的研究报告，让与会的专家、学者和学生感受到学术的价值和魅力。
北京论坛（2016）

世界文明中的巨型城市与区域协同发展（三）

11月5日下午，北京论坛（2016）分论坛“世界文明中的巨型城市与区域协同发展”在北京大学英杰交流中心月光厅举行。围绕巨型城市区域及其面临的挑战这两个议题展开讨论，来自威斯康星大学密尔沃基分校的Linda McCarthy教授与来自多伦多大学的Mark Fox教授分别担任两个议题的论坛主席。

会议的上半程首先就“巨型城市区域”这一议题展开讨论。英国伦敦大学学院巴特利特规划学院的教授吴缚龙进行了题为《巨型城市区域的兴起：以京津冀为例》的主题报告。吴教授以京津冀地区为例，梳理了京津冀地区的发展历程，提出了对多种力量整合多个城市形成一个互锁且密集的巨型城市区域的见解。他认为这种空间特征的形成的源泉主要源于城市的规模和治理水平。对于一个巨型城市区域，其将城市间竞争转化为互惠合作的能力至关重要，而在形成功能性城市区域的过程中，会产生一些类似于“城市病”的挑战，比如北京的空气污染和城市拥堵。而要解决巨型城市的这些问题，须在更大的城市区域中去考虑。

清华大学建筑学院城市规划系顾朝林教授主要从事城市与区域规划理论、城市地理学等方面的研究，此次他的报告主题为《京津冀巨型区的空间重建》。顾教授认为中国的巨型城市区域正在兴起。在中国提出区域发展战略中，京津冀地区对未来中国的区域发展十分重要；而燕郊（河北）、昆山（江苏）这类一线城市周边地区新城的迅速发展，体现了中国的巨型城市区域正在形成。顾教授特别强调巨型城市区域内的空间重构，因此京津冀地区，应发展多中心空间结构并构建功能区、构建纵横的发展轴等；而对于目前以北京为核心的京津冀大都市区，控制北京的规模言之过早也不利于这一巨型城市区域下一步的发展。

英国威斯敏斯特大学建筑与建筑环境学院教授Duncan Bowie做了题为《伦敦的住房与规划：社会影响、社会分化、可持续发展和社会公平》的主旨发言。Bowie教授聚焦伦敦大都市区近年在国家政策和区域治理上取得的进展，认为英国目前还没有足够的能力来设计和治理一个大都市区。从英国现有的制度法律和现状出发，简要梳理了现有可负担住房的供给以及新供给的区位和负担能力方面的潜在空间影响。Bowie教授考虑了伦敦市区与大伦敦都
市区之间的治理关系，在此基础上分析了新政府政策和立法是否能够引导和推动伦敦的住房需求与规划和社会公平的目标相一致，并提出了自己相应的建议和对策。

此后，中国科学院科技战略咨询院副院长樊杰就中国巨型城市边缘强势扩张和其对区域不协调的加剧作用这一问题进行了发言。他认为在当前经济全球化的背景下，中国区域经济的中心性愈发增强（向城市、沿海地区城市和巨型城市集聚），中心区域与边缘区域的发展差距不断扩大，巨型城市和都市密集区应运而生。近年来的产业结构调整也促使区域经济布局发生改变，受区域发展规律、中国税收体制、政绩引导、贪污腐败等影响，巨型城市的边缘区等地带发展迅速，却也阻碍了城市核心区域产业空间向边缘扩散的过程。这无疑增加了区域的不协调性，同时也在空间上加重并扩大了当前的资源环境过载的问题，发展方式转型已经刻不容缓。

北京大学建筑与景观设计学院教授John Keith Zacharias则关注了“巨型城市发展的形态和动态”问题。他认为巨型城市将持续增加，尤其是在亚洲以及非洲。传统的规划方法受到城市区域规模和持续增加的流动性方面的挑战。John Keith Zacharias教授通过对于现状的对比和分析，结合北京、东京和深圳的案例，建议采用更加综合的区域发展政策来直面当前巨型城市发展面临。具体地，城市应建立更为垂直化的结构，构建与行动网络更密切的联系，并增加植被覆盖，走更立体化的发展之路。

会议的下半程议题是“巨型城市的挑战”。美国伊利诺伊大学厄巴纳-香槟分校区域经济应用实验室的Geoffrey Hewings首先做了《老龄化和巨型城市的问题与机会》的报告。他认为到2030年，几乎所有的国家的老年（年龄高于65岁）人口占比都将超过20%。在此基础上，Hewings教授对芝加哥地区老龄人口对于劳动力市场、宏观经济总量等方面的影响进行了实验分析。而通过进一步的分析，他发现移民和退休年龄的改变能够潜在地缓和上述影响。

美国加利福尼亚大学洛杉矶分校的地理学教授Eric Sheppard做了题为《发展中国家巨型城市的大众住房问题：雅加达的例子》的主题发言。Sheppard教授认为当前的南部巨型城市中，富裕的中产阶级对于西方城市生活方式的诉求刺激了规模庞大且复杂的房地产开发和基础设施建设。这些基础设施建设和房地产项目将（通过谈判或驱逐的方式）置换低收入
的城市大众长期赖以生存的临时定居点。他以目前第四大的城市区域雅加达为例进行分析和概括，认为这无疑对不久的将来产生巨大的潜在影响：穷人将面临更为严峻的住房短缺，有吸引力的替代居住地选择减少，以及中产阶级对于与他们同居一座城的穷人认同感下降。

多伦多大学的Mark Fox教授就“智慧城市”问题进行了探讨。他认为城市世界上最为复杂的系统，他主要关注巨型城市的信息管理，为此相继抛出了三个主要问题：信息是否是实现对于城市更好的管理和运作的良好工具；信息是否像基础设施一样需要建设和维护；信息是否是一种服务。通过对于以上问题的梳理和解答，Fox教授强调了信息同时作为一种基础设施和服务在未来的巨型城市中发挥的作用。

多伦多大学的David Hulchanski教授常年从事城市研究，他的主旨报告题为《大都市区不公平、社会—空间分化与社区结构改革趋势：以1970-2010年间的芝加哥和多伦多为例》。他提到，社会经济和民族文化的分异，导致主要的大都市区在空间上变得日渐分隔，其邻近地区变成了新的社会隔离和空间隔断的断层区，而这种日益强化的社会—空间秩序是建立在越发突出的不平等和社会极化与歧视之上的。他以1970-2010年间的芝加哥和多伦多为例，分析和讨论了这一问题。

北京大学首都发展研究院院长李国平教授介绍了他基于首都功能定位的北京产业空间布局研究。李教授认为北京正处于转型发展的关键时期，面临着加快经济增长和缓解人口资源环境压力两大艰巨任务。一方面，与国际大都市相比，北京仍需进一步扩大经济规模。另一方面，北京已面临十分严峻的人口资源环境压力，严重制约了经济的持续健康发展。破解制约首都可持续发展重大问题的关键在于，应进一步优化北京城市功能布局，充分发挥郊区及周边地区的发展潜力，促进中心城区过于集中的产业向外疏解。
北京论坛（2016）
世界文明中的巨型城市与区域协同发展（四）

2016年11月6日上午，北京论坛（2016）分论坛“世界文明中的巨型城市与区域协同发展”的第四场讨论会在北京大学英杰交流中心月光厅举行，本次探讨的主题是“巨型城市规划”，由英国伦敦大学学院吴缚龙教授主持。

英国曼彻斯特大学Cecilia Wong教授从空间集聚谈到规划：通过火车、航班、港口数据解析大伦敦和北方工业中心城市在英国的核心地位，同时，英国发展不均衡现象突出，需要从不同的方式来解读这些空间的聚合，并做好区域合作、经验借鉴、长远规划。

美国威斯康星大学密尔沃基分校Linda McCarthy教授以极具代表性的纽约和莱茵—鲁尔区为例，考虑到区域属性和复杂性，探讨多中心巨型城市的区域协作和规划治理。

澳大利亚格里菲斯大学Darryl LOW CHOY教授是一位专业的规划师，列举了多个城市—区域边缘区的协同规划的典型案例，介绍了支撑规划方法的理念框架，提出城市内部的不同价值之间相互作用，丰富了规划系统和内涵。

北京大学杨家文教授从基础设施建设和投资角度，分享了中国城市轨道交通规划的经验，指出轨道交通规划基于密度考量和开发考量，发挥最大作用，满足通勤、开发、长远总体规划的需求。

英国剑桥大学金鹰展示了英国不同出行选择之间的联系和差异和伦敦城市内部交通、就业情况、实体基础设施演变过程，帮助理解巨型城市内部区位联系。通过梳理影响企业、居民城市区位选择的复杂因素，运用SEM模型，回归分析后得出建成区环境与出行行为关系。

北京大学城市发展与土地政策研究中心主任刘志作分论坛总结发言，他完整全面地梳理了三天的发言内容，他指出巨型城市是一个动态发展的现象，既带来了效益，也需要环境经济成本，给政府架构、规划、财政、管理等各方面带来了巨大的挑战，中国发展巨型城市的条件独具特色，中国的巨型城市建设，政府干预发挥很大的作用。过去三天的交流展示了如此丰富值得借鉴的国际经验，并且很多经验与中国目前的发展现状高度相关，未来的巨型城市规划和发展挑战与机遇并存。
北京论坛（2016）
建设世界一流大学：制度的视角（一）

2016年11月4日上午，北大-斯坦福论坛暨北京论坛教育分论坛在北京大学斯坦福中心隆重拉开帷幕。本次论坛以“建设世界一流大学：制度的视角”为主题。在未来的两天中，来自中国、美国、加拿大、英国、澳大利亚、俄罗斯、芬兰、日本、韩国、菲律宾、巴基斯坦、中国香港和澳门等国家和地区及国际组织的四十余位大学校长和学者将汇聚一堂，共同探讨世界一流大学的产生、组织、管理以及发展等问题。

论坛开幕式由北大-斯坦福中心主任戴慕珍（Jean C. Oi）教授主持。戴慕珍教授、斯坦福大学副教务长安·阿尔文（Ann M. Arvin）和中国教育发展战略学会会长闵维方教授在开幕式上致辞，北京大学阎凤桥教授在开幕式上发表题为《从国家精英高校到世界一流大学：制度逻辑思考》的主旨演讲。

北京大学斯坦福中心主任戴慕珍教授首先致开幕辞，对各位学者的到来致以诚挚的感谢和热烈的欢迎。戴慕珍教授介绍，在过去的五年中，在北京大学的大力支持下，北京大学斯坦福中心不仅为斯坦福大学的师生了解中国、研究中国提供了重要支持，同时也为中美两国乃至全球优秀学者提供了进行学术交流的平台。在当今世界，建设世界一流大学成为各国提高国际竞争力、发展高等教育的重要战略，而本次论坛为更加深入地探讨这一问题提供了契机。戴慕珍教授感谢北京大学和闵维方教授对本次论坛的支持，并预祝论坛圆满成功。

在建设世界一流大学成为一个全球趋势的背景下，斯坦福大学副教务长安·阿尔文教授指出，如何在21世纪推动大学继续更好地践行其使命和愿景，这已经成为大学管理者需要考虑的共同议题，而这个问题的回答需要更多优秀的学者进行更加深入的研究和探讨。北大-斯坦福论坛为全球顶尖学者提供了一次交流和讨论的机会。阿尔文教授对北京大学的支持致以感谢，期待未来两天与会者就世界一流大学建设进行探讨。

中国教育发展战略学会会长、北京大学教育学院名誉院长闵维方教授在开幕式上致辞。闵维方教授首先对各位与会的专家学者致以热烈的欢迎，他指出，在科技发展、网络社会和
知识经济崛起的背景下，建设世界一流大学已经成为一种世界性的现象。世界一流大学建设已经成为提高国家硬实力和软实力的战略举措，大学通过聚集优秀学者、寻求真理、推进前沿研究，不仅成为推动经济发展的引擎，同时也是提供文化产品、价值观和信仰的基础。但是，闵维方教授指出，在建设世界一流大学的过程中，浅层次的技术方法和大学自身的资源配置受到广泛重视，而更深层次的制度却被相对忽视。在这一背景下，本次论坛尝试将对高等教育发展的思考从表层的对技术的关注推动到更深层次的对制度的探讨，从而加深对世界一流大学建设的理论认识和实践探索。

以同闵维方教授合作的研究为基础，阎凤桥教授进一步就世界一流大学建设的制度化问题发表了主旨演讲。阎凤桥教授指出，在当前知识经济的背景下，许多国家将建设一流大学作为增强国家竞争力的重要战略。政府采取优先资助国家精英大学而不是推动结构性改革和发展来发展世界一流大学的措施。尽管资金对于一流大学建设是不可或缺的，但是结构和制度性因素会对整个高等教育系统特别是一流大学建设产生重要的影响，因此需要在大学发展的实践和理论思考中强调制度性因素的作用。阎凤桥教授认为，高等教育系统继承学术自由和高校自主等传统价值观和信仰是十分重要的，高等教育系统的适当分化对于提高高等教育质量也是有益的。作为一个抽象的概念，世界一流大学是推动高等教育国际竞争的重要动力，但是对于后发型发展中国家来说，除了财政支持以外同样需要进行制度的改革。由于结构惯性导致某种程度上制度变革的滞后，发展中国家在价值观和信念等深层次的变革要慢于作为正式规则的表层变化，因此，建设世界一流大学还需要从制度的视角进行进一步的探讨。

本次论坛得到了北京论坛、北京大学教育学院、北京大学教育经济研究所、联合国教科文组织亚太高等教育教席（UNESCO Chair in Higher Education for the Asia Pacific）、中国教育发展战略学会（CSEDS）、斯坦福大学沃尔特·索伦斯坦亚太研究中心（Walter H. Shorenstein Asia-Pacific Research Center）和北京大学斯坦福中心的大力支持。与会专家将围绕“不同制度环境下高等教育系统的分化与世界一流大学的产生”、“制度背景与世界一流大学的组织结构”、“制度环境形势下世界一流大学的管理特征”和“世界一流大学与社会、经济和政治发展”四个分议题展开深入讨论。
北京论坛（2016）
建设世界一流大学：制度的视角（二）

北京论坛教育分论坛暨北大-斯坦福论坛于2016年11月4日上午在北京大学斯坦福中心隆重开幕。在第一个分会场的讨论中，来自美国、香港、澳大利亚、俄罗斯和中国的学者围绕“不同制度环境下高等教育系统的分化与世界一流大学的出现”的主题进行了热烈探讨。本会场由斯坦福大学教授、北大-斯坦福中心主任戴慕珍（Jean C. Oi）主持，包括两个主旨演讲和四个评议演讲。

在主旨演讲中，来自宾夕法尼亚州立大学（Pennsylvania State University）的罗杰·盖格（Roger L. Geiger）教授强调了科研创新的重要性，科研创新程度通常用论文发表、引用、研究支出和获奖情况衡量。盖格教授的演讲从大学内部特性入手，从学生、教师和科研的视角，提出了世界一流大学需要具备的特性。

香港科技大学陈繁昌教授基于自身担任校长和过往在美国的学术生涯的经历，分享了他对于高等教育发展中高校治理角色的观点。基于日渐增长的公众关注，他提出人们已经逐渐理解和认识到大学治理的重要性，但是对这一问题的关注度对世界一流研究性大学建设而言还远远不够。

在随后的专家讨论环节中，四位专家学者进行了深入讨论。澳大利亚昆士兰科技大学（Queensland University of Technology）校长彼得·柯德瑞（Peter Coaldrake）教授讨论了新建大学在建设世界一流大学过程中遇到的挑战。在澳大利亚，相比传统大学，新建大学为了得到政府的金融扶持需要承受更大的政策压力并做出更审慎的战略决策。俄罗斯的大学也面临相似的情况。但是，俄罗斯国立科学技术大学（National University of Science and Technology MISiS）副校长蒂莫西·奥康纳（Timothy Edward O'Connor）教授介绍，俄罗斯政府实施了“5-100俄罗斯学术卓越项目”，作为俄罗斯大学进入世界大学100强的战略计划。将俄罗斯国立科学技术大学作为一个案例研究，奥康纳教授指出，制度框架的支持、预算拨款的增加、各层面的动态领导和良好的治理结构对于成功地将国家精英大学转变为世界一流大学来说是必要条件。
在世界一流大学的界定上，清华大学校务委员会副主席谢维和教授指出，在全球时代大学对卓越人才的吸引程度应该成为世界一流大学的衡量标准。此外，因为大学已经成为了高等教育大众化阶段全球竞争的工具，香港大学白杰瑞（Gerard A. Postiglione）教授将研究聚焦在世界一流大学制度化的可行步骤上。他的研究分为三部分，包括国家框架的界定和比较，对亚洲世界一流大学制度化案例的审视以及探索新的全球背景的影响。

在开放性讨论环节中，与会者与六位发言人就大学分化、研究资金和民主治理问题等问题展开了讨论。对于政府来说，建立公平的研究经费竞争机制是非常重要的；同时，大学需要积极与公司合作争取更多研究资金。为了提高民主治理水平，大学也应该鼓励教师和学生参与学校的决策制定过程。
北京论坛（2016）
建设世界一流大学：制度的视角（三）

11月4日下午，北京论坛教育分论坛第二场报告会在北京大学斯坦福中心举行。中国教育发展战略学会会长、北京大学教育学院名誉院长闵维方担任分会场主持。来自英国、美国、日本、韩国和中国的学者就“世界一流大学的制度环境与组织结构”的主题开展了热烈的讨论。

在主旨演讲中，伦敦大学学院（University College London）的西蒙·马金森（Simon Marginson）教授集中讨论了构成多元巨型大学（multiversity）的国家权力、行政权力和学术权力的关系以及三种力量之间的协同和冲突。其中，大学组织内部的行政权力表达和执行了组织外部的力量（来自国家、市场、利益相关者和全球压力），表现出多元巨型大学的特点，并且提供了学术实践和学术生产的必要条件。注意到了英语文化圈、西欧、东欧、拉丁美洲以及东亚（包括中国）大学的不同，他研究了不同国家在这些权力上存在的动力机制、影响和范围方面的差异。最后，马金森教授总结，全球化的知识系统和模式推动了制度性的适应和转化，同时，国家权力继续发挥着重要作用，并对全球化系统产生重要影响。

斯坦福大学医学院院长劳埃德·迈纳（Lloyd B. Minor）教授指出了学术医疗中心（医学院和教学医疗系统）在建设世界一流大学中不可或缺的作用，它们能够帮助大学在生物医学革命中起领导作用，这一革命将使得医疗服务变得更有预测性和预防性。他的演讲进一步印证了在学术医疗中心中，教育、研究和患者护理是密不可分的。对于学术医疗中心，临床事业是非常重要组成成分，对于临床研究、基础研究和临床研究向临床治疗实践的转化以及医疗和生物医药的领军人才的培养训练都具有至关重要的作用。

在接下来的评论环节，清华大学经济与管理学院院长钱颖一教授探讨了大学的本质是什么。基于组织的产生是服务于某种价值的共识，钱颖一教授认为，大学的本质最终在于大学的价值，而大学本质的三大支柱是：为了谁，为了什么，怎么做。钱颖一教授指出，大学主要应该服务于学生的发展，大学的终极目标是追求真理、光明和自由，而这种目标的实现应该是通过解放思想和教会学生如何思考而实现。日本科学、技术和创新委员会（Council
for Science, Technology and Innovation）的上山隆大（Takahiro Ueyama）教授调查了在公共资金的严重缩减和竞争日渐加剧的研究环境下，美国研究型大学在1990年代是如何转变了它们的学术型管理风格的。他以斯坦福大学作为案例，主要探讨了研究型大学的治理和管理策略。

北京师范大学原副校长王英杰教授也关注到了大学治理的问题，他指出了大学的三个主要变化，以及治理改革所面临的三个基本冲突。为了解决这种冲突，他提出共同治理将是一个好的选择。韩国首尔国立大学（Seoul National University）的Jung Cheol Shin教授从韩国大学的立场出发，探索了韩国大学中基层学术组织的制度化是如何在韩国的社会文化背景和学术背景下发生的。他认为，大学里的系所是学术社会关系网络的核心组成部分，是分配经济财富、政治权力和社会声誉的关键因素。与此同时，社会关系网络也在学术生涯中扮演着重要角色。

自由讨论环节中，与会者主要关注了共同治理问题。大学应该成为一个民主的组织，形成民主的决策机制。他们提出了一些具体的实施措施，例如，由教师决定教师的聘任和晋升，通过院系与校方协商谈判的方式决定大学之内的资源分配。
11月5日上午，北大-斯坦福论坛暨北京论坛（2016）教育分论坛的第三场报告会在北京大学斯坦福中心举行。本场报告会的主题为“制度环境形塑下世界一流大学的管理特征”。这场会议包含两个主题演讲，四个评议演讲和一个午餐演讲。主题演讲由斯坦福大学戴慕珍（Jean C. Oi）教授主持，评议演讲由斯坦福大学副教务长安·阿尔文（Ann M. Arvin）教授主持。

在第一个主题演讲中，韩国高丽大学的校长Jaeho Yeom教授从社会的角度着手分析了韩国高校之间以及高校与其他机构之间的复杂关系。通过概述21世纪韩国高等教育在文化、管理制度和其他方面所面临的挑战，Jaeho Yeom教授强调了在韩国高等教育发展的大背景下，高丽大学应对挑战的创新方式。

在第二个主题演讲中，北京大学校长林建华教授以中国大学尤其是北京大学的建设为例，做了题为《创新体制机制，加快世界一流大学建设》的精彩发言。在回顾了中国高等教育的快速发展之后，林建华校长以北京大学为例，介绍了北京大学在本科生教学改革、人事制度改革和综合改革等方面的举措。对于中国大学改革的目标，林校长强调，最主要的目标在于在全球化环境中探索世界一流大学的管理机制。实现这一目标需要一系列配套改革，包括教育体制改革、人事体制改革、资源配置改革、法律法规的变革以及学术管理方式的变革。

在评议演讲环节，澳门大学校长赵伟教授介绍了大学应如何“发现自己”以及如何在这个时代建设创新型的大学。赵伟校长以澳门大学为例，解释了如何建设有特色大学的方法。他强调在学校的建设过程中，需要把“发现自己”作为首要的教育目标，然后根据这个目标有选择地加入自己的想法，而不要全盘接收成功模式。

为了进一步解释大学自身的管理角色，加拿大多伦多大学的教务长Glen A. Jones教授在题为《重点研究型大学和学术自治面临的挑战》的报告中，分析了传统学术自治在当前所面临的挑战。相关研究显示，学术自治仍然在大学决策制定中起到重要的作用，但存在管理
结构内部及其之间的权利分配不平衡的问题。

考虑到环境在很大程度上影响着大学的发展，俄罗斯国立高等经济大学的Isak Froumin教授以卓越计划为例，讨论分析了环境对大学建设的影响以及政府在大学建设方面存在的矛盾性战略所造成的影响。Froumin教授总结道，卓越计划代表了向国家控制的转变，这种转变会使高校的外部环境越来越由国家驱动。

来自日本筑波大学的金子元久（Motohisa Kaneko）教授分享了学生的国际流动快速扩展的情况，分析了日本高等教育机构国际化进展较慢的原因。金子元久教授认为，高等教育研究当前面临的挑战在于如何系统地论证高等教育机构国际化的长期影响。

在讨论环节，专家教授就政府政策对高等教育发展的影响，资金方面的支持、资源的支持以及政府决策等问题展开了激烈的讨论。其中，对于政府在大学建设方面的矛盾性战略问题，闵维方教授根据自己在中国的成长经历，以及中国的发展情况做出了评论。他指出，对于政策的决策，他认为没有答案，政策决策的好与坏取决于具体机构的背景，甚至可能取决于一个具体的国家环境。他明确指出，政府给大学太多的控制是不行的，我们必须得给大学更多的自主权以释放其热情、能力、自主性和创新性，这样才能提升大学自己的水平。在学术自治问题上，林建华校长、安·阿尔文（Ann M. Arvin）教授、赵伟校长和Glen A. Jones教授都分享了自己的看法。基于担任重庆大学、浙江大学和北京大学校长的经历，林建华校长分享了他担任不同学校校长时所做的工作和经验。他指出如何自治取决于大学的真实情况，例如，学校的文化和学校职工的能力等。对于如何将学校的研究成果转变为经济的发展，林校长指出大学可以培养更多的创新型人才，研究更多的技术，从而提高经济的发展。

在午餐时间，来自亚洲开发银行的技术顾问布瑞士·潘（Brajesh Panth）和部门主管Sungsup Ra做了题为《发展中国家建设一流高等教育机构的机遇与挑战》的报告。通过讲述亚洲开发银行在最近几年的自身发展及其对高等教育的支持，他们反思了亚洲开发银行在其成员国（柬埔寨、老挝共和国、蒙古、越南）开展的工作，以及亚行如何对待其他国家（孟加拉国、尼泊尔、斯里兰卡、泰国）对高等教育的新需求。报告主要分析了日益增长的对高质量高等教育的需求，及在发展中国家通过建立地区和国际合作关系建立一流大学的可利用建设方案。
北京论坛（2016）
建设世界一流大学：制度的视角（五）

2016年11月5日下午，北大—斯坦福论坛“建设世界一流大学：制度的视角”第4分会场在北京大学斯坦福中心举行。来自美国、加拿大、巴基斯坦、中国等国的专家学者围绕“世界一流大学与社会发展”这一主题进行了深入的讨论。会议由斯坦福大学Gi-Wook Shin教授主持，包含两个主旨演讲和四个评议演讲。

首位发言人是斯坦福大学的John W. Meyer教授，报告主题为“高校扩张的社会影响”。Meyer教授从社会视角分析高校扩张的因素，指出高等教育的扩张并非仅仅改变了高等教育的产出，而是在“知识社会”中对教育精英所做出的发展贡献赋予更积极的评价。Meyer教授通过跨国分析表明，高校扩张带来了服务业的巨大经济增长，这也是在传统上遭到批评而如今受到重视的。

香港科技大学荣休校长、荣休教授吴家玮（Chia-Wei Woo）指出在定义世界一流大学时必须考虑其内在因素和附加价值。教学型大学、文理学院、社区学院等高等教育机构具有丰富的教学经验，在人才培养中均发挥着重要作用，为来自不同背景、有着不同兴趣的学生提供了宝贵机会。吴家玮教授认为，评价高等教育机构应当根据各自的使命、目标、附加价值作为基准——每种教育机构进行相应的发展，力争成为各自体系中的世界一流。

在随后的讨论环节中，有四位专家参与了讨论。斯坦福大学周雪光教授对大学排名现象进行了社会学分析。周雪光教授认为，制度环境可以帮助解释社会对各种大学排名的认可程度，并能够解释其变化。但是，无论是否有稳定可靠的排序标准，大学排名问题都会仍然存在。

通过对中知识结构的历史渊源研究，加拿大多伦多大学安大略教育研究院的许美德（Ruth Hayhoe）教授关注中国历史文明的贡献，以及中国大学如何呈现和传播中国文明的方式。许美德教授指出中国模式与欧洲模式在学校与国家关系、师生关系两个方面可能具有一定趋同性，这将成为新的思考起点。

巴基斯坦国立科技大学（National University of Sciences & Technology）顾问
Amer Ahmad Hashmi先生从社会经济学的视角讨论了大学在社会经济增长中的作用。他列举阐明了大学促进自身功能转变的不同方式。

最后一位发言人是北京大学的哈巍教授。哈巍教授提出，中国致力于建设世界一流大学的一个主要特点是吸引海外中国人才回国。利用中国第一批和第二批“青年千人计划”人才的个人背景信息和其学术发表成果，哈巍教授将这些青千与留在国外人才的发展情况进行对比，探讨影响“青年千人计划”归国人才发展状况的影响因素。

第四分会场结束后，北大—斯坦福中心主任戴慕珍（Jean C. Oi）教授主持了闭幕式。闭幕式上，中国教育发展学会会长、北京大学教育学院荣誉院长闵维方教授，斯坦福大学副教务长Ann M. Arvin教授对制度环境对大学发展的影响进行了进一步讨论。
北京论坛（2016）
中国与全球治理：国际组织与国际机制的作用（一）

2016年11月4日下午，北京论坛（2016）分论坛“中国与全球治理：国际组织与国际机制的作用”第一场讨论会在钓鱼台国宾馆5号楼百人厅召开。

上半场讨论由北京大学国际关系学院院长贾庆国教授主持。本次分论坛将依次讨论国际合作逻辑、国际法与国际规范、国际组织与国际机制、发展援助和人道主义干预等重要理论问题。首场围绕国际合作的逻辑相关问题展开。

意大利前总理、法国巴黎政治大学国际事务学院院长Enrico Letta谈论了G20 和联合国在应对世界危机中的使命和强化多边体系的当代意义。他指出当今世界，难民问题等全球危机挑战着既有国际秩序，全球化进程中民族主义、保护主义的抬头也已初见端倪。在此情势下，重新塑造以国家为基础的多边治理体系十分必要。他高度评价了中国在G20杭州峰会的角色，同时对新任联合国秘书长在应对全球危机中能够发挥的作用充满了期待。

Laurel McFarland博士和中国人民大学公共管理学院院长杨开峰教授就学历认证相关的国际合作展开了讨论。Laurel McFarland博士认为国际合作应建立健康的竞争关系和有效的合作模式，重视教育质量的提升和人才解决问题能力的培养，而非将重点放在学校排名等问题上。杨开峰教授比较中美两国MPA教育的异同，强调合作对于解决全球性问题的必要性以及互信、交流、分享理念对于实现国际合作的重要性。

康奈尔大学的徐昕教授作了题为《中国的全球治理之道》的发言。他认为中国近年来的外交政策被广泛地认为是具有进取性的。尽管邓小平在冷战之后确立的“韬光养晦”政策依旧发挥作用，但自从习近平执政之后，“有所作为”则被强调的更多。尤其是习政府在全球治理领域中表现出的积极政策与过去的政策有所区别，彰显了中国崛起背景下的改革信念和中国特色。

下半场讨论由加州大学伯克利分校的T. J. Pempel教授主持。
北京大学的张小明教授作了题为《中国与国际规范的变迁》的发言。张教授首先定义了国际社会和国际规范这两个核心概念，随后从中国与国际规范变迁的角度，分析了历史上中国作为后来者在与西方主导的国际社会互动中呈现出的紧张关系。他认为造成紧张关系的原因既有历史记忆和中西差异，也有政策选择的因素。他指出中国作为一个正在崛起的新兴大国，在国际社会的变迁中扮演着积极的角色。

布林茅尔学院的Seung-Youn Oh教授通过对中国在汽车零件和风电等行业的贸易争端案例的研究，分析了中国工业政策如何领先于WTO的制裁，以及WTO在将中国这样巨大的转型经济体整合进既有国际经济体系中的作用。

新加坡国立大学的黄靖教授作了题为《中国的“融入”崛起推动了全球治理的发展》的发言。他认为中国的崛起不仅是从全球治理中获益的结果，也对全球治理作出了重大贡献。目前国际经济一体化和世界多极化这两大趋势是中国和全球治理共同面临的机遇和挑战。

潘成鑫教授分析了“中国挑战：全球视角”的问题，他指出，根据国际政治传统视角以及权力转移理论，中国的崛起被视为另一个新兴权力的崛起，意味着其将重新修改现存的国际规则、挑战美国的全球领导地位，并导致新的修昔底德陷阱。但这种视角是过时的，误导性的。中国的崛起根植于经济全球化的现实以及中国的国内政策。在很大程度上，中国在经济、环境、资源、规则等方面对世界秩序提出的挑战，反映出的是世界秩序自身面临的变革、挑战以及悖论。中国“挑战”不是中国自身的问题。

此外，发言人和其他与会者就全球治理目标、中国角色、去全球化、民粹主义等理论问题展开了深入的讨论。
北京论坛（2016）
中国与全球治理：国际组织与国际机制的作用（二）

2016年11月5日上午，北京论坛主办方“中国与全球治理：国际组织与国际机制的作用”第二场讨论在北京大学英杰交流中心第二会议室召开。与会的中外学者就国际组织与国际机制的性质、作用与挑战等问题展开了深入讨论。

上半场讨论由来自蒙古财经大学的Amarjargal Rinchinnyam教授主持。

加利福尼亚大学伯克利分校的T. J. Pempel 教授做了题为《多边机制与国家间竞争》的发言。第二次世界大战之后，美国主导了一系列的经济、安全组织，如联合国、世界货币基金组织、世界银行等。影响东亚地区发展的还有冷战中建立的安全机制，即美国与该地区国家的联盟、中国与朝鲜的关系等。因此，东亚政治、经济、安全秩序是全球性与地区性安排的结合。一系列的多边经济机制显示出了冷战在东亚经济、金融领域造成的分歧在逐步消失，合作形成共赢，而不是零和游戏。安全机制如东盟地区论坛、东盟国防部长会议以及“休眠的”六方会谈等被建立起来，以应对国家权力变迁以及新的安全挑战。冷战造成的分裂——无论是真实的还是想象的——依旧提醒着不同国家关于构建东亚安全秩序上的分歧，这种分歧深受旧的安全秩序的影响。美国依然在全球和地区有决定性的影响。

北京大学王逸舟教授做了题为《中国与国际机制：若干思考》的演讲。王教授回顾了中国外交的不同阶段，主要分为三个阶段。第一个是毛时期，这是一个与西方对抗的时期，特征是革命外交。第二个阶段是邓小平时代，这是一个合作时期，特征是世界经济发动机。当代中国的全球角色是在全球治理中发挥重大影响。尤其是十八大以后，中国呈现出越来越活跃进取的趋势，担负起全球大国的责任。中国是当代全球体系是参与者建设者，而不是挑战者。中国的实力和利益在拓展，中国需要更多话语权和参与。中国人对于中国海洋强国的发展理想应如此，但是给周边国家造成安全困境，并引起国际社会的担心。但是这是对中国的误解，中国目前依然不会改变邓小平时代的外交路线。中国虽然与周边国家有一些小摩擦，但是应该看到中国更多积极的方面。中国同时应该学会自身实力的发展与世界的适应性等问题。中国未来会更多建设性介入国际事务，在保护自己利益的同时，提供更多全球
公共产品。

丹佛大学赵穗生教授的发言题目是《从规则接受者到规则制定者：中国与变化中的世界秩序》。他指出，中国的迅速崛起引发了对中国是现存世界秩序的接受者还是挑战者的争论。虽然中国不是一个单纯地满意并接受现有秩序的规则接受者，但是它也没有发展成为一个不满现有秩序而力求破坏规则的规则破坏者。这不仅是因为中国实力还远不能取代美国，还因为中国并没有明确的、独特的价值理念去构建世界秩序。作为东亚历史上的帝国，中国的中心等级制体系或称为“天下”体系的观念被中国的众多周边国家所拒绝。接受了威斯特伐利亚体系确立的国家主权原则并逐步适应新兴的国际规则，中国更像是一个改革者，或修订者，它并不是不满现存的世界秩序，而是不满本身在现存世界秩序中的地位。如果中国的需求可以通过与美国以及其他国家进行谈判和对一些规则进行的细微调整得以满足，从而扩大中国在现存制度的话语权和影响力，那么中国就没有必要成为对现有规则的革命者。

下半场讨论由丹佛大学的赵穗生教授主持。

日本同志社大学的Mine Yoichi 教授则提出了一种作为新兴规范的人类安全概念。他认为，人类安全的视角提供了一种新的分析框架，在这个框架中，消极自由与积极自由，公民自由、社会权利以及集体权利被协调一致，并能够通过综合性的分析得到进一步发展。人类安全与人类发展的关系就像是光与影的关系。人类安全首先需要认真倾听那些面临严重威胁或者遭受极度贫困的不安全的人的声音。最后，人类安全可能无法成为解释人类生活方方面面的普遍定理，但是它依旧可以作为一个强大的“灯塔”，阐明不断变化中的人类社会的关键方面。

日本国立新泻大学的张云教授讨论了地区性国际组织与地区治理问题。他提出，东盟国际秩序观和对外关系问题有三个关键点。第一，东盟国内秩序和国际秩序的联动性；第二，东盟对于地区治理的期待的核心在于东盟内部团结；第三，东盟与大国看待国际秩序和地区治理的视角不同。他总结道，东盟作为地区治理的重要行为者，未来能否继续发挥稳定次区域和沟通大国关系平台的作用，关键在于，东盟内部之间以及东盟与中美之间，就国际秩序和地区治理的问题能够达到多大程度上的新的共识和理解。
韩国西江大学的Shang-Eung Ha教授通过考察韩国人对脱北者的态度以及他们对南北韩关系的看法，分析了公民认同和种族认同这两个维度的关联性。调查显示，热衷于种族认同的公民对朝鲜人移居韩国持有更加负面的态度，更加不相信半岛统一是有必要的。这表明，尽管有所谓的“一个民族，两个国家”的普遍认同以及韩国和朝鲜不可辩驳的民族文化相似性，过去六十多年的政治分裂，导致韩国人认为朝鲜以及朝鲜人民就是“外群体”，与其他外族移民并没有明显的区别。

此外，与会学者就美国总统大选以及可能引起的美国外交政策变化、中美外交关系、中国与东南亚国家的关系、中国与现存国际规则关系、文化对于国际关系的影响、非传统安全与国际关系，联合国与国际安全规则等重大问题进行了深入讨论。
北京论坛（2016）
中国与全球治理：国际组织与国际机制的作用（三）

2016年11月5日下午，北京论坛（2016）分论坛“中国与全球治理：国际组织与国际机制的作用”第三场讨论在北京大学英杰交流中心第二会议室召开。与会的中外学者就发展援助问题展开了深入讨论。

上半场讨论由来自北京大学的王逸舟教授主持。中国农业大学的李小云教授介绍了南南合作的新情况，南方国家出现了分化，中国、新加坡等国家迅速发展。南南合作有一个相对独立的发展经验，例如南方国家的贸易、技术等发展等，尤其是在经济领域，南南合作比南北合作的意义更大。中国和印度的决策过程比美国更有优势。南南合作也开始走制度化的道路，所以亚投行和金砖国家银行兴起。这种制度化的南南合作将可能走向一个新的时代。

日本早稻田大学的Yasushi Katsuma教授做了题为《对全球卫生治理的再思考：从西非埃博拉病毒爆发中得到的教训》的报告。他首先回顾了埃博拉病毒在西非的传播扩散以及当地和国际上采取的应对措施，然后解答了世界卫生组织不能在第一时间发布公共卫生事件预警以及联合国针对埃博拉病毒做出紧急反应的原因。最后他就改善全球卫生治理提出了自己的建议。

北京大学亚非研究所所长李安山教授的发言题目为《中非关系中的技术转移：神话与现实》。针对中非关系中技术转移的不同看法，李教授通过对历史的分析，阐述了其不同概念和形式。他指出，技术转移的目的和功能会随着时代而变化，并且目前的技术转移仍有很大的改进空间，可以实现更深层次的互利共赢。现在已经有一些中国企业认识到了技术转移的重要性，未来在非洲工业化进程中应当有更宽领域、更尖端技术的转移。

伦敦大学亚非学院的Niels Hanh 博士做了题为《全球治理与中国、美国和非洲》的发言。主要讨论了中国与非洲的关系与美国的反应。西方国家对中国在非洲的发展非常担忧，认为这是新殖民主义。然而美国在20世纪60-70年代在非洲实施了很多政变和秘密行动，而现在变成了输出民主和人权到非洲，这些公民权、NGO以及非洲的总统选举等都是
被美国支持和操纵的。而中国的不干涉内政原则，促进了中国与非洲国家的友好关系挑战了西方在非洲的利益。如果西方国家不能够正视自身对非洲做法，将越来越不能理解中国在非洲发展。

下半场讨论由美国大学的赵全胜教授主持。北京大学的夏庆杰教授《如何激励非国有企业参与“一带一路”倡议？》通过博弈论模型来分析了国际合作的特征、资本流动和一带一路关系。发展中国家缺乏足够的基础设施，缺乏市场。而中国则是世界上最大体量的市场，不但为这些发展中国家协助了基础设施建设，也为这些国家提供了庞大的消市场。

来自南非开普敦大学的Alison Gillwald教授做了题为《非洲的多方利益相关者参与互联网治理面临的挑战》的讲话。他对非洲很少参与或者难于公平参与互联网治理的原因做出了解释，并指出伴随着全球化与发展不平衡的晚期资本主义是导致这一问题的根源所在。他从政治经济方面鉴定了互联网体系中潜在的权力关系并提出只有以广泛共识为基础的国际管理框架才能促使所有国家都遵循最基本的标准，而这也正是保障互联网蓬勃发展所需要的。

北京大学刘海方教授阐释了中国与亚非团结的问题，指出亚非团结是中国和非洲关系的传统，也是中国人和非洲人的一种情感。很多非洲学者说，我们应该恢复传统的合作方式。从历史上，中国很多学者在做丝绸之路在东非的研究，而很多非洲学者在重写非洲历史，他们在重现殖民地时期之前的历史。中国和非洲的很多文献和书籍都体现了中非的友好传统。这种团结的传统可以进一步促进当代中国与非洲的友好关系。有很多平台都成为促进中国和非洲关系的重要舞台。

此外，与会学者就非洲的政治经济发展、中国在非洲发展中的作用、金砖国家的定位、埃博拉问题、非洲大陆次区域、合作进行了深入讨论。
2016年11月6日上午，北京论坛（2016）“中国与全球治理：国际组织与国际机制的作用”分论坛第四场讨论在北京大学英杰交流中心第二会议室召开。与会的中外学者就国际人道主义干预问题展开了深入讨论。

本次讨论由意大利前总理、巴黎政治大学国际事务学院院长Enrico Letta先生主持。

来自非洲女子大学的Fay King Chung博士作了题为《国际规范中的权利与责任》的报告。Fay King Chung博士指出当今世界是一个分化的世界，区域性冲突、发展差距和意识形态、宗教差异问题突出。这些问题成因复杂，但也存在解决之道。她介绍了《联合国人权宣言》规定的基本权利，其在20世纪的演变及在当今世界面临的挑战。她主张对人权概念的理解需要和各民族国家的历史文化和法律传统联系起来，并强调国际规范在人权保护方面的功能，政府在确立人权保护范畴和优先序列中的关键作用，以及国际组织在为一个政治和司法传统具有高度异质性的国际社会提供统一评估标准的重要价值。

美国大学的赵全胜教授，在其题为《儒家思想与中国外交政策》的发言中首先分析了儒家思想历史遗产的发展变化轨迹及其在当代中国复兴的社会基础。随后他介绍了儒家思想中“天下观”、“朝贡体系”等核心观念与当代中国强调和谐秩序和不干涉内政、在国外建立孔子学院等内政外交政策的关联性，并探讨了当代几位知名学者关于儒家思想与西方主流价值观念的兼容程度的不同观点以及儒家思想对日本、韩国等东亚国家的影响。

北京大学国际关系学院院长贾庆国教授以《“保护的责任”：几点思考》为题，和与会嘉宾分享了他对于国家保护责任和国际人道主义干预相关问题的一些看法。他指出，国家保护责任和国家不能有效履责时国际人道主义干预的合法性、重要性已在当代国际社会取得广泛共识，然而实践中对人道主义干预的具体条件、认定主体、干预责任和必要手段等相关问题尚缺乏统一的认定标准，截至目前人道主义干预记录也不尽如人意。为此，他主张专家、国际组织官员和各国政府应就此密切合作，共同构建一套科学的制度框架，以确保国际人道
主义干预的有效性和合法性。

此外，与会学者就津巴布韦土地所有制度反映出的人权问题、儒家思想与西方民主理念的兼容性、人道主义干预的“亚洲模式”、“保护的责任”的概念和适用标准等问题进行了深入的讨论。
北京论坛（2016）
生态安全与生态城市：国际经验与中国实践（一）

11月4日下午，北京论坛（2016）分论坛“生态安全与生态城市”于博雅酒店中华厅开始了第一场以“生态城市主义的内涵”为主题的主旨报告会。分场主席为北京大学建筑与景观设计学院教授俞孔坚、哈佛大学设计学院副教授Gareth Doherty。

分论坛学术负责人、北京大学建筑与景观学院院长、美国艺术与科学院院士俞孔坚向与会者介绍了主讲嘉宾的学术背景和主要研究并致开幕词，阐释了生态城市主义的主要理念、技术方法以及在世界范围内的实践情况，为本次分论坛的学术主题“生态安全与生态城市”做引言。

国家建设部前部长、第十一届全国人大环境与资源保护委员会主席、国际欧亚科学院院士汪光焘首先发表了题为“城市生态保护与修复——法制保障与技术支持”的主旨报告。他指出，大量的理论研究和实践都表明，城市发展必须完善城市生态系统。他结合自己在建设部多年工作的经验，介绍了生态城试点工作对城市转型发展的推动作用。其中，以新疆吐鲁番示范区为例，介绍了建筑节能和绿色建设工作。同时，从建设要求出发，开展了生态绩效评价研究，并在工作中认真学习理解中国政府对城市发展的要求。汪光焘还介绍了如何用系统论思维研究城市生态保护与修复。他最后指出，要实现对城市生态的保护和修复，必须坚持法制保障，坚持技术支持。

美国哥伦比亚大学教授、美国艺术与科学院院士Barry Bergdoll主旨演讲的题目为“城市设计对气候变化的弹性适应”。作为纽约MoMA博物馆的策展人，Bergdoll的演讲围绕了大量他在该博物馆的策展工作。他首先介绍了2001年举办的一个关于美国城市建设与气候变化关系的工作坊，并由此提及了博物馆如何影响公众并进而影响政策的制定，此后介绍了美国设计师Catherin Bauer的纽约住房改造计划等一系列重要的建筑主题展。由此，他引入了建筑与景观设计如何更加具备“弹性”、如何更加具备气候适应性的问题，并通过芝加哥、纽约等城市应对海平面上升、飓风等气候问题的经验和教训，指出了新型生态城市建设的设计理念和技术方法。
英国AA建筑学院教授、英国普拉斯马公司首席设计师Eva Castro的主旨报告集中介绍“激进自然的本源”。作为当代知名设计师，她谈到了自己对建筑与景观设计的兴趣来源于对几何的痴迷，进而带来了对城市空间如何相互作用、如何影响人的思考。Castro指出，随着自己设计实践的增加，她从对几何及机理的兴趣日益转向了对生态因素的重视。她结合自己的大量设计项目，向与会者介绍了自己的“激进自然”设计理念，包括技术及设计上与地面样貌多样化的结合，“完美街区”概念，“绿手指”与建筑的结合，城市慢行系统设置等，不限制洪水的“地基”策略等，十分富有创新和启发意义。

新加坡国立大学副教授Vladan Babovic用一个直观而富有内涵的公式作为自己的演讲主题：可持续城市=“某公式”，也表明了他的工程师学术背景及学术视角。Babovic长期在新加坡生活和工作，这是一个非常小的国家，也是世界上水资源危机最严重的国家之一。他指出，目前城市化进程超乎想象地迅速，已经有超过一半的人口居住在城市中，但并非所有的城市都是宜居的。他的演讲以新加坡为例，介绍了城市化进程中水问题的严重性，从工程科学的角度，结合水、气候和能源，介绍了如何利用生态技术，解决城市的水问题。Babovic及其在新加坡国立大学的科研团队在实验室中进行了大量新的生态雨水技术的实验，他也对最新的技术成果做了介绍。最后，他指出，软性设计加硬性设计，就不会有让人追悔不及的错误决定。

在分场主席的主持下，本场发言的四位主旨报告进行了深入的讨论，并回答了听众的提问。
11月5日上午，北京论坛（2016）分论坛“生态安全与生态城市”第二场会议在博雅酒店中华厅召开，本场会议因天气原因哈佛大学教授Charles Waldheim缺席，主题进行了调整，与会者共同表达了希望通过生态城市建设推动北京重现蓝天的美好愿望。

哈佛大学设计学院副教授Gareth Doherty首先带来题为“实践中的生态城市”的报告。Doherty介绍了哈佛大学设计学院主编的著作《生态城市主义》，书中提出了建设生态城市的一系列关键词：参与、合作、感觉、策划、合作、互动、移动、尺度、合作、使用、培育。他特别指出“合作”出现了三次，强调了国际合作的重要性。为了推广生态城市主义的理念，哈佛大学将此书中的重要内容印刷成通俗易懂的图片，在科威特、智利、巴西、巴林等世界多个国家举办多场展览，吸引了不同社会阶层人们的共同关注。随后，他介绍了哈佛大学在世界各地进行的一系列田野调查和设计实践，并集中介绍了在巴哈马群岛进行的项目，通过一部名为《埃克斯楚马岛可持续发展的未来》的短片，直观地展现了当地的独特地理和经济情况和项目推动下的变化，并向与会者介绍了从中总结出来的适用于整个巴哈马群岛各岛屿的工具箱。通过这些不同的设计项目，Doherty总结了生态城市主义实践要求决策者和设计师重新思考规划是一个什么样的过程，并将场地调研真正纳入设计过程，最终构建可持续、富有活力的项目。最终，他呼吁学者、设计师和公众，用“广泛参与、多领域工作、共享知识、预景方案”的方式推进生态城市的建设。

宾夕法尼亚大学城市设计学院副教授Stephen Al则为与会者带来了题为“当代城市的可持续性及都市形态”的主旨报告。Al的演讲选择了美国各地一些“高风险社区”为例，如拉斯维加斯，这里是所谓的“赌场资本主义”区，是严重缺水的荒漠城市，建筑历史短暂，城市规模较小，并列举了存在类似情况的澳门、新加坡等地的城市建设问题。针对这些情况，Al通过他所参与的香港“地铁交通与房地产”项目，介绍了当代都市的城市形态发展模式，包括城市密度与人口密度、公共交通及步行区设计、街区布局与日照及采光等一系列问题。最后，他介绍了他正在进行中的研究项目，“面临海平面上升问题的城市”，其中涉及
到了中国的三个重要城市，向与会者抛出了当前城市化进程中一个至关重要的问题，并留待进一步的调查与研究。

美国哈佛大学设计学院教授、西班牙马德里城市生态系统建筑设计事务所创始人Rojas Luis Vallejo的演讲主题为“网络城市主义”，颇具时代性。Vallejo的演讲主要关注城市和景观设计中的一些最新技术工具。他指出，随着城市的高速发展，城市的功能日益复杂，城市中人与人、人与自然的互动也日益复杂，对一系列的城市发展和生态问题也就没有一个固定的方法。他提出，尽管城市在高速发展，但我们应该尽量降低自然的压力和生态系统的复杂性，那么就应该更好地发挥互联网在城市文化发展和人的社会关系发展中的作用，建立良好的社会-环境-技术互动模式。他通过在马德里中心大道上的“一棵树的季节功能”项目，向大家介绍了一些技术难度不高、不增加生态系统复杂性、社会参与度高、可复制的设计实践。他于2010年在上海开展的“空气树”设计项目也正是相同的尝试，也取得了比较理想的效果。

北京大学建筑与景观设计学院副教授王志芳用向与会者发问的方式引出自己主旨发言的主题：“中国正在向生态城市主义方向发展吗？”，发人深思。王志芳首先引用了哈佛大学设计学院教授Charles Waldheim对于“生态城市主义”的定义，作为讨论的重要参照标准。此后，王志芳采用一系列数据对中国和外国城市进行了对比，并指出了中国自上而下的决策模式与西方存在着巨大的不同，政策制定又相当程度地决定了中国城市发展的进程和方向，因此中国的生态城市主义过程必然是独特的。《百花齐放》介绍了当代中国景观史，“景观”作为城市化的副产品，是如何重要影响着中国人的生活方式和经济发展。她指出，中国面临着最为严重的环境问题，生态系统非常脆弱，而城镇化进程又是全世界最为迅速的。人们在这个过程中受到了剧烈的冲击，逐渐丧失自己的文化身份。所以不能浪费过多的时间去分析是否该实践生态城市主义，而是应该在实践中尽快建立生态红线，推广生态城市，并在城镇化的进程中，更多地关注乡村。

在分场主席的主持下，本场发言的四位主旨报告进行了深入的讨论，相互评议、彼此发问，并共同回答了听众的提问。之后，与会嘉宾还在Gareth Doherty及北京大学-哈佛大学生态城市联合实验室研究员Hannes Zander的引导下，前往第二教学楼共同观看了为配合本次分论而举办的“中国城市比较”图片展。
北京论坛（2016）

生态安全与生态城市：国际经验与中国实践（三）

11月5日下午，北京论坛（2016）分论坛“生态安全与生态城市”举行了最后一场主旨报告会，主题为“实践中的生态城市主义”。北京大学建筑与景观设计学院副教授李迪华担任分场学术主席。

世界建筑大会科学委员会委员Alvaro Rojas在开始演讲前先给大家播放了一段哥斯达黎加的音乐，带领大家以轻松的心情开始题为《必要建筑》的主旨报告。他分别介绍了哥斯达黎加的自然环境和首都圣何塞城市建设情况，然后引用了美国著名设计师Michael Sorkin对“可持续建筑”的定义，并表明了自己对于建筑的观点即“批评性的地方主义”。在介绍他的“必要建筑”理念中，他从自己的生活经验和设计实践出发，主要关注热带地区的国家和城市尤其是哥斯达黎加的情况。他有力地指出，哥斯达黎加的建筑设计必须是“热带的”，因为哥斯达黎加就是一个热带国家——也就是说建筑必须与当地自然和文化情况相适宜，而非徒劳地增加很多现代主义的装饰。此后，他介绍了在圣何塞洛代欧（El Rodeo）社区开展的建筑与景观设计项目，强调了适应性、灵活性、成本控制和公众参与因素的重要性。

Philippe Rham建筑师事务所首席设计师Philippe Rham演讲的主题为《气候性项目：可持续发展时代的建筑》，主要围绕其所在的建筑师事务所在丹麦哥本哈根的街区设计和台湾高雄进行的公园设计项目展开。Rham指出，过去我们是在气候条件的基础上进行建筑设计的，设计师根据当地的气候来建造舒适、健康的建筑。而进入20世纪，随着全球变暖等气候变化的加剧和能源的日益枯竭，人们必须在建筑设计方面做出相应的调整，以求通过绿色建筑设计来实现对温室气体排放的控制，这才是可持续发展时代建筑设计的正确选择。

苏黎世联邦理工学院教授、新加坡未来城市实验室（FCL）创始人Stephen Cairns为大家带来了题为《未来亚洲城市的城乡生态》的主题演讲，主要围绕新加坡未来实验室所进行的相关研究项目展开。他首先介绍了FCL研究成员多元的研究背景，然后通过三个重要的曲线图呈现了城镇化问题中不可忽视的要素，即联合国发布的城市化进程曲线、世界粮食产量变化曲线（1960~2001）和世界城镇用地与人口密度变化曲线，他指出城镇化并非一
个完全以城市为中心的问题，而应该同时关注和研究乡村，关注诸如粮食安全等重要的全球问题。未来城市实验室在世界范围内用大数据的研究方法对全球的城市带进行了研究，其中发现在印尼西爪哇地区，农作物生产、城市建设人口密度等与传统的城市和农村的传统定义有很大的不同，因此他们选择在这里开展了“热带城镇”项目，取得了良好的成效，重塑了可持续的，与当地经济、文化及生态环境相适应的新型城乡形态。Cairns指出这一项目也展现了很好的增长性，他希望其中的经验可以在全球得到推广。

宾夕法尼亚大学访问学者Tom Verebes的演讲主题为《城市、自然和适应性城市》。他首先列举了从上世纪三十年代机械化、死板、缺乏适应性的城市模型，到二十一世纪频发飓风、地震、海啸等自然灾害的情况下生态城市等理论应运而生，再到未来主义者对于都市的种种设想城市规划理念发展史，列举了大量相关著作指出城镇化实际上是一个控制与反控制、规划与反规划的过程，然后结合他所在的海洋CN(Ocean CN)设计团队在日本大阪、中国香港及深圳等地开展的设计实践，介绍了具有高度适应性的新型智能生态城市的发展趋势。他还向与会者介绍了自己的专著《总体规划：适应性城市》，其中全面地介绍了在快速城镇化的背景下，如何通过计算机模型为异质化程度很高的各个城市制定总规。

哈佛大学设计学院信息设计系副主任Stephen Ervin做本次论坛的最后一场主旨报告，发言的主题为“城市不是树，可是……”。“城市与树”典出Christopher Alexander的著名城市学著作《城市不是树》。这部著作指出，“本书中所指的树并非长着树叶的树，而是一种抽象的结构。我将用这种结构与另一种更加复杂的结构——半格点结构进行对比。”围绕这两种结构，Ervin梳理了人们对于城市形态理解的一系列变化，其中许多理论正是围绕树状系统和半格点系统展开的。Ervin则引入了更多形象的比喻，用来形容当代城市的新发展，如网状、网络、森林等，通过大量案例阐释了各种复杂的城市形态类型。并最终总结，城市并非树，也不是简单的树状结构，然而景观设计师们仍然可以从“树”身上学到很多关于生态城市设计的哲理。

在李迪华的主持下，本场发言的五位嘉宾还就生态危机、生态城市设计实践等问题进行了深入的讨论。
2016年11月4日下午，北京论坛（2016）经济分论坛“经济全球化中的中国角色”的第一场研讨会在北京钓鱼台国宾馆10号楼四季厅举行。本次研讨会分上下两个半场，分别由北京大学国家发展研究院的余淼杰教授和姚洋教授主持。共有七位学者在讨论会上发表演讲，分别是来自北京大学的姚洋教授、日本一桥大学的Taiji Furusawa教授、北京大学的张维迎教授、南京审计大学的晏维龙教授、北京大学的李玲教授、国立首尔大学的Lee Keun教授、以及北京大学的余淼杰教授。

首先，姚洋教授做了题为《固定汇率制，巴拉萨-萨缪尔森效应和经济增长》的发言，就各国在融入全球经济时汇率制度的选择问题进行了相关的探讨。姚教授通过建模分析与实证分析的方法，论证了当一个经济体有贸易盈余时，实行固定汇率制能够使可贸易部门的就业数和产出有着相对更快的增长。

日本一桥大学的Taiji Furusawa教授的发言题目为《TPP 的经济影响：CGE 模拟的启示》，讨论了跨太平洋伙伴关系协定（TPP）的签订对其成员国与非成员国的影响。Furusawa教授利用CGE模型估计了27个国家的32个产业部门，包括了12个加入TPP的经济体和中韩等尚未加入TPP的经济体。通过相关计算，日本和越南或将成为TPP签订的最大的受益者，中国和韩国的经济则可能会受到小幅负面冲击。同时，Furusawa教授也指出，TPP能否得到落实仍是一个未知数，它在很大程度上取决于美国的总统竞选结果。

北京大学的张维迎教授带来了题为《全球化与企业家精神》的发言。张教授认为在讨论经济全球化的问题时，我们不仅要关注政府的政策，也要关注企业家精神。在全球金融危机之前，中国的增长更多的依靠于企业家的套利，而今后的经济增长则要更多的依靠于企业家的创新。为了充分的激发企业家的创新能力，政府必须要建立完善的法治体系。

南京审计大学的晏维龙教授谈了《中国特色社会主义审计》，着重介绍了中国特色社会主义政府审计的制度背景与治理逻辑。他认为中国特色社会主义政府审计与中国本身的政治
制度是密不可分的，政府审计在管控经济风险，实现政府、市场和社会的良性互动方面发挥了重要的作用。

李玲教授做了题为《中国道路特色和中国作用》的发言，她认为中国道路的特色在于社会革命先于经济革命，社会建设促进经济建设。在新中国建立后，中国政府充分的利用了自身的组织动员能力，发动了“卫生革命”与“教育革命”，使我国在收入水平较低时，就实现了较高的预期寿命与较低的文盲率，积累了宝贵的人力资本，为改革开放后的经济增长打下了良好的基础。中国如果想要走出新型的发展道路，那么有为政府、有效市场和有机市场缺一不可。

国立首尔大学的Lee Keun教授分享了他的论文《中国产业的赶超模型》。Lee教授选了5个经济部门进行研究，同韩国相比，在手机行业中国强势崛起，在汽车行业中国在缓缓地追赶，在半导体产业中国则仍有较大的差距。他发现后发国家在技术更新快的产业部门追赶速度较快，技术更新缓慢的产业部门则往往更难实现赶超。同时，政府的产业政策对各个产业部门的作用是并不相同的。

最后，北京大学的余淼杰教授进行了题为《对外直接投资与国内要素扭曲》的发言。从理论上说，国有企业比民营企业资本更加雄厚，应当对外直接投资的比例更大，但现实数据却得到了相反的结果。余教授认为这在很大程度上是由于国内的要素分配是扭曲的，民营企业同国有企业在国内市场的竞争中处于相对不利的地位，因此更有激励向国际市场发展。相关模型分析与实证分析也证明了上述观点。

在七位教授完成发言后，与会学者与参会人员就经济全球化、汇率制度选择、产业政策等话题展开了热烈讨论。下午的会议在浓厚的学术氛围中圆满落幕。
北京论坛（2016）
经济全球化中的中国角色（二）（A组）

2016年11月5日上午，北京论坛（2016）经济分论坛“经济全球化中的中国角色”A组第二场讨论会在北京大学英杰交流中心第三会议室举行。讨论会分为上下两个半场，分别由北京大学国家发展研究院副院长黄益平教授和Laszlo Halpern教授主持，共有7位学者在讨论会上发表演讲，分别是来自加利福尼亚大学的Kevin Salyer教授、早稻田大学的Yas Todo教授、日内瓦研究院的黄毅教授、黄益平教授、多伦多大学的Peter Morrow教授、北京大学国家发展研究院的王勇教授和匈牙利科学院的Laszlo Halpern教授。

Kevin Salyer教授做了题为《构建风险冲击模型》的发言，通过观察风险的峰度、偏度，可以发现不确定性具有很强的时变特征，在金融加速器模型的框架下，对企业生产率的分布赋予时变的权重，可以构建加权的混合正态模型来刻画这种随时间变化的不确定性，即风险冲击。具体来说，模型中通过对生产力二阶矩的定义，将企业家分为低风险者（生产率的二阶矩相对较小）和高风险者（生产率的二阶矩相对较大）这两种类型，二者所占的比例也会随时间发生变化，每个市场参与者知道每个时刻两类企业家的比例，但是不能确定性的知道具体某一个个体的类型。由于高风险的存在，委托-代理问题就会带来监督成本，从而降低了投资的收益。当高风险者在总人数中的占比从1%变化到2%，给银行贷款的风险溢价会带来很大的量化效应。经济运行过程中的破产率和风险溢价对两种风险类型企业家的占比非常敏感，且具有反周期的特征。

Yas Todo教授发言的题目是《全球化进程下的中国企业跨境交易、资本结构和专利申请：来自规模企业的证据》，在network框架下，将贸易关联、贸易多样性实现可视化，分析中国企业全球化过程中贸易、资本结构等相关问题。通过全球主要企业供应链等分布图，可以发现虽然中国并没有处在全球供应链的中心，供中国链上的企业数目也比较少，但是中国企业与其他周边国家的主要企业建立较为广泛的联系。在供应链的全球化发展过程中，中国政府通过其他企业或机构建立股权关系等联系，始终发挥着非常重要的作用。

黄毅教授在题为《债券发行的实际影响与金融影响：来自中国非金融企业的证据》的发
言中指出，通过考察中国非金融企业的债券发行及企业在本币和外币之间的选择，分析其中的实际影响和金融影响。利用企业资产负债表与债券发行的匹配数据，可以发现高杠杆、低利润率、没有外币现金流的企业以及一些国有企业，更有可能会选择美元计价的债券。这些企业存在套期保值和金融中介的行为，其美元债券的发行与企业价值、投资评级、企业的绩效指标负相关，与表征非金融企业金融中介活跃程度的企业间贷款呈正相关。尤其值得注意的是，企业治理比较弱、没有投资评级、没有外币现金流的企业在发行美元债券时会增加企业间的贷款，这样，货币错配、影子银行活动以及全球美元流动性的溢出效应就会给国内经济带来严重的金融风险。

黄益平教授为大家介绍了中国开创性数字包容型金融的发展。2013年是互联网金融开始蓬勃发展的重要元年，阿里支付、微信支付越来越受到广泛的使用，P2P在线借贷平台也开始发挥越来越重要的作用，中国在全球数字金融中的地位是举足轻重的。中国互联网金融蓬勃发展的原因主要有三个方面，首先是独家金融机构已经越来越不能满足家庭、中小企业、消费借贷、小额借贷的要求；其次，互联网技术快速发展，移动终端的发展带来了极大的便利，再者，监管当局对互联网金融发展的总体态度是很包容性的。与此同时，大数据分析兴起，在一定程度上可以替代尽职调查，降低成本。从数字金融的发展前景来看，普惠金融还不够普惠，可获得性不够高，融资成本也比较高，数字技术还不够完善，数字安全存在明显的隐患，还需要一套覆盖面很广的、效率较高的全国征信系统，真正做到普惠金融普惠大众。

Peter Morrow教授就《中国的关税和贸易安排》主题进行了发言，分析了中国进口关税下降对一般贸易和加工贸易安排的影响，这两种贸易方式主要在关税待遇和企业在国内市场上的销售能力方面存在差别。在企业层面的研究中可以发现，投入品关税的下降会导致一般贸易在总出口中的份额在集约边际和广义边际上显著上升。贸易形式的选择与国内市场的规模关联较小，因为加工型的企业未能进入国内市场。总体来说，由进口关税下降带来的贸易安排的变化往往会使得在工业~省级层面上中国国内制造在总出口中的份额显著提高。

王勇教授发言的题目是《贸易与中等收入国家的非收敛性》，在一个三国的一般均衡模型框架下，引入贸易和技术的扩散，强调“夹持力量”的作用。一方面，追赶效应的存在是
有一定条件的，不能同时在集约边际和广义边际上发挥作用。另一方面，压制效应在集约边际上总是存在的，但在广义边际上只有在特定条件下才会发挥作用。他强调，在经济全球化背景下，应当同时考察一国在国内和国外两方面表现来评价其发展。中等收入国家在开展对外贸易时，应根据其贸易伙伴的行为，将资源在既有欣欣向荣的生产力间优化配置，并加强既有生产力对新产品生产的学习。

最后，Laszlo Halpern教授做了题为《经济全球化背景下的产品、就业和企业行为》的发言。供应链贸易发生了深刻的变化，在产品、劳动力、竞争、生产力四个维度上对参与其中的经济体有着深刻的影响。产品层面的竞争可以分解为价格和非价格两块，当非价格成分可以补偿价格竞争的损失时，说明一国可以应付竞争对手的竞争。出口业绩与价格质量的相关相关，发达国家对奢侈品和品牌产品的出口对新兴经济体的竞争更有抵抗。发达国家的劳动力市场面临严重的工作两极分化问题，这可能是由于近年来的技术变革，发达国家中，中等工资水平的工作在就业市场中的份额越来越低，而高收入和低收入的工作占比提高。一些很容易受到进口竞争影响的工作，比如机器人操作员的劳动力需求比其他就业岗位低得多。市场竞争越激烈，各种产品的价格加成下降，一些表现比较好的产品就会占据较高的市场份额，并带来企业层面业绩和生产率水平的提高。在政策其实层面上，他强调，保护主义政策往往会适得其反，发达国家和新兴经济体需要设计针对性的政策来应对全球化的挑战。
2016年11月5日上午，北京论坛（2016）“经济全球化中的中国角色”B组第二场研讨会在北京大学英杰交流中心第四会议室举行。研讨会分上下两个半场，共有八位学者在研讨会上发表演讲，分别是香港大学Tao Zhigang教授、日本Gakushuin大学Tomohiko Inui教授、美国加州大学欧文分校Antonio Rodriguez-Lopez教授、美国华盛顿大学Kia-yiu Wong教授、东盟与东亚经济研究中心Lili Yan Ing教授、香港大学丘东晓教授和华中科技大学张建华教授。其中丘东晓教授和张建华教授分别担任上下半场的主席。

Tao Zhigang教授的演讲聚焦于中美贸易对美国政治选举的影响。利用中国不同产业适用的美国税率差别，他采用差分法和断点回归设计评估了美国对中国出口产品的关税变化对美国县级选举结果的影响。他发现综合税率变化越大的县在政治选举中，民主党候选人吸引的投票份额会显著更大，最终民主党人在选举中获得该县代表的概率也更高。与这一事实相一致，他还发现民主党人更倾向于支持不利于贸易的和促进经济援助的法规。特别是在2001年以来美国从中国进口大量增加、制造业就业显著下降后，这一倾向变得更加明显。

Tomohiko Inui教授的演讲则主要阐述了日本零售企业外包对于其国内生产企业的影响。他和他的合作者合并了日本制造业企业的财务信息和企业对应的下游零售企业之间匹配的销售网络信息，并比较了零售企业是否是进口企业对其上游供货企业的生产率和成本加成的差别。为了克服潜在的样本选择性问题，他们采用了结合差分的倾向性匹配得分法进行估计。估计结果显示，当对应的零售企业开始从国外进口时，其上游供货企业会出现显著的成本加成、生产率和销售量的下降。但是这些企业的就业和工资水平没有受到显著的影响。

Antonio Rodriguez-Lopez教授的演讲题目是《工作流动和全方位贸易自由化：中国的理论与实证》。基于国际贸易中的Melitz模型，他推导出了异质性企业在税收水平下降后容纳的就业水平变化。高生产率企业在平均的出口关税水平下降后应该有就业上升；低生产率企业则相反。利用中国制造业企业数据，他在实证上验证了这一结论对于各种类型的贸易自由化都是成立的。此外，相比于投入品税率或外部最终品税率，企业的就业对于内部最终
产品税率的变化更为敏感。内部最终产品税率的下降对不同类型企业作用类似；外部税率的下降对于纯加工企业的影……作用于进口企业。

丘东晓教授做了题为《中国的全球影响力：国际贸易视角的考察》的演讲。他用详尽的数据展示了中国在全球贸易中的作用，并综合已有的研究总结了中国的国际贸易对……国。中……国的贸易对于中国的GDP增长做出了重要的贡献，但同时也带来了地区间工资不平等程度和地区内收入不平等程度的上升。研究发现中国的出口造成了美国制造业就业的下降和收入不平等的上升。对于亚洲国家，中国的贸易增长对主要出口消费品的国家呈现整体负面影响，而对主要出口资本品的国家呈现正面影响。中国的贸易还加速了拉丁美洲的产业升级。对于全球整体而言，中国的贸易呈现正面影响。

Kia-yiu Wong的演讲紧扣中国的产能过剩和出口的主题进行阐述。产能过剩已经成为中国经济当前面临的重要问题之一。Wong教授从理论上区分了供给侧的产能过剩和需求侧的产能过剩。作为产能过剩最严重的行业之一，中国的钢铁行业在过去二十多年里经历了显著的扩张。要解决这一问题，中国政府应该做的是促使企业在最优的产能水平上生产。中国的钢铁行业的产能过剩由供给侧和需求侧两方面的因素同时驱动。在供给侧，中国许多企业都存在过度投资的问题。在需求侧，许多国家仍然没能从2008年的全球金融危机中完全恢复，对钢铁的需求仍然维持在一个较低的水平。

Lili Yan Ing教授则报告了她对来自中国企业的质量竞争对印度尼西亚企业生产率的影响的评估结果。结合中国企业的出口数据和印度尼西亚制造业企业的数据，她和她的合作者构建了一个衡量进口产品质量的指标。根据这一指标，她发现从中国进口的产品的质量提升能够显著提升印度尼西亚企业在国内和国外市场面临的竞争，从而显著提升了印度尼西亚企业的生产率。相比于主要面向国内市场的印尼企业，这一来自中国的进口品质量竞争效应对于出口到国外市场的印尼企业作用更为明显。

张建华教授从收入水平、收入差距与自主创新三个概念入手，论述了中国如何跨越“中等收入陷阱”的问题。他构建了一个同时包含需求驱动和技术驱动因素的专利竞赛模型。通
过理论推导，他发现对于不同发展阶段的企业，收入水平和收入差距对于国内和外国直接投资企业的创新行为有着不一样的影响。收入差距、基础投资比例、经济发展水平、人力资本质量、研究投入以及研究者数量都会对国内企业的创新行为有显著的影响。他认为，政府应该同时采用需求驱动和技术驱动的政策来提升企业的创新能力，从而跨越中等收入陷阱。

演讲之后的讨论环节中，学者们就报告中的问题深入交换了意见。本场讨论会在热烈友好的气氛中顺利结束。
北京论坛（2016）
经济全球化中的中国角色（三）（A组）

11月5日下午，北京论坛（2016）经济分论坛A组的七位学者分享了他们关于经济全球化中的中国角色的思考。

奥胡斯大学的Frederic Warzynski首先展示了他的论文：实际生产率与超常出口表现。他与Yao Amber Li、Valerie Smeets合作的论文探究了加工贸易在出口商定价异质性表现中的作用。基于中国国家统计局数据与中国海关数据，他们的研究结果发现：首先，在中国的制鞋与制衣行业中，出口商并不会更缺乏效率，他们定价彼此不同，拥有更低的基于利润的全要素生产率（TFPR）与更高的基于数量的全要素生产率（TFPQ）；其次，加工贸易仅能解释部分出口商定价的异质性；最后，在其他如酒、粮食等其他产业，定价偏离的方向并不相同。

香港科技大学的Edwin Lai主要介绍了全球生产碎片化和本地增值占出口的比例。他的研究发现，首先，出口国家的本地增值比率（DVAR）随着出口国国内生产该产品的中间品份额的增加而上升；其次，对任意一个行业，拥有更高技术水平生产中间品、更低劳动成本、更少机会获得外国中间品的国家，有用更高的国内中间品份额；再次，对任意最终产品，在拥有更高劳动成本的国家，如果替代弹性小于1，那么该国将有更高的增加值份额；最后，对任意最终产品，拥有更高技术生产中间品、更少机会获得国外中间品的国家，拥有更高的本地增值比例（DVAR）。

约翰霍普斯金大学的Fernando Parro展示了关于贸易与劳动市场动态的论文。该论文构建了贸易与劳动市场的模型，捕捉了劳动市场摩擦、产品市场摩擦、中间品-最终品联系、地理因素与国际贸易等因素。同时，该论文提出了一个新的解动态离散选择模型的方法：DEHA（Dynamic Exact Hat Algebra）。进一步，论文利用美国50个州、其余37个国家、覆盖22个部门的数据校准了模型的参数。最后，他们探索了中国的进口竞争对美国劳动市场的影响，研究发现，虽然中国的进口竞争减少了美国的制造业就业，但美国的总体社会福利呈现上升的结果。
一桥大学的Jota Ishikawa展示了关于平行进口与修理服务的论文，平行进口是从来源国经销商购买、但未经原始生产者同意出口到另一目的地的产品，例如代购。厂商通常对平行进口产品实施售后服务歧视，例如仅为授权产品提供售后服务，平行进口产品则不在服务之列。研究结果发现：首先，服务歧视使得原始授权产品与平行进口产品具有垂直差异性；其次，服务歧视产生了更高的企业利润，但是降低了企业提高产品质量的动机；最后，贸易自由化提升了不具有平行进口或服务歧视现象产品的质量，但可能降低平行进口、具有服务歧视产品的质量。该研究的政策建议在于，当允许平行进口时，国家应对企业的服务歧视施加一定限制，而且，管制服务歧视在贸易自由化的背景下显得更为重要。

西澳大学的Yanrui Wu展示了关于中国是否能规避中等收入陷阱的研究。他认为，中国有三个积极的发展迹象：首先，服务业引领经济增长；其次，研发投入正在上升；最后，创新能力持续扩张。他认为，中国的投资仍然有一定空间，如在教育、健康、老年护理等产业；正如日本在上世纪六十年代的经历一样，中国未来对农村劳动力的吸收将引发另一轮的增长。他的观点是，基于未来GDP持续增长6.5%或者4%的假设，中国未来的增长似乎与日本和韩国的增长轨迹相同。接着，他指出了中国目前发展面临的挑战：研发投入结构和质量正在变化，具体表现为基础或应用研究研发投入下降、“发明”专利所占比例较小。最后，他提出，未来中国应深化经济改革，加强包括外企在内的私人部门在服务业与创新领域的参与，同时加强知识产权保护激励创新。

圣地亚哥大学的Alyson Ma展示了全球价值链、组织灵活性与关税规避为主题的论文。该论文将垂直专业化引入Chaney（2008），展示了一些企业通过将生产转移到国外来规避贸易政策冲突。他们以世界银行全球反倾销数据库中对中国的反倾销数据，构建了贸易冲击指标。基于中国海关数据，他们发现，首先，企业设置全球价值链不仅是为了减少生产成本，更是为了创造组织灵活性，进而规避国际层面的贸易冲击。其次，这种组织灵活性使企业全球价值链布局中的制造业部分，对国家层面冲击的反应更加敏感，同时使得价值链中总部服务部分对冲击更加不敏感。

北京师范大学的邱东展示了关于价格测度不确定性的论文，他提到了两种价格测度方式，一种是Volume Price，一种是Quantity Price。他认为两者的分解有很大差异，后者
包括被忽略的质量因素，而前者仅包含原始的价格因素。而且，他认为因为质量的不可测
度性等原因，质量无法很好地从价格中分离。进一步地，他讨论了价格测度不确定性之所
以重要的原因，并介绍了标准产品描述（Standard Product Description）与不可能产生
纯粹定价（pure pricing）的原因。最后，他为未来的价格识别方式提供了三种方向的思
考：一是实际层面识别产品，二是哲学层面识别产品，三是经济层面识别产品。
北京论坛（2016）
经济全球化中的中国角色（三）（B组）

2016年11月5日下午，北京论坛（2016）经济分论坛“经济全球化中的中国角色”B组第三场讨论会在北京大学英杰交流中心第四会议室举行。讨论会分上下两个半场，分别由加利福利亚州立大学的Jack Hou教授和对外经济贸易大学的洪俊杰教授主持，共有7位学者在讨论会上发表演讲，分别是来自联合国的杨文艳女士、爱知大学的李春利教授、新加坡国立大学的Shi Xunpeng和Jack Hou教授、北京大学国家发展研究院的徐晋涛教授、台湾大学的陈恭平和洪俊杰教授。

杨文艳女士做了题为《包容增长对于社会和经济可持续发展的意义》的发言。自第二次世界大战以来，现代世界许多国家的经济迅速增长，数亿人民成功地摆脱了贫困。随着全球死亡率的下降，物质财富不断增加，人们的寿命延长，生活也变得越来越丰富。前所未有的物质幸福和大众不满之间却存在一定的悖论，西方国家政治上的不满情绪上升，全球极端主义不断增加，呼吁包容性发展的需要越来越迫切。然而，繁荣并没有实现共享，并不是所有国家都从全球化中受益。目前观察到不平等现象往往根植于特定的历史渊源，但即使是在结构性变革之后，这种不平等现象仍然存在。不平等问题始终应当引起我们的高度重视，发展也应当始终坚持包容性的原则。如何跨越贫富之间的鸿沟已经越来越成为全球性的共识。一个普适性的社会政策是包容性发展的关键，因为它可以应对排斥和社会不公正的根源。也应当保持之前在全球发展中的定位并发挥相应的作用，积极分享发展经验和参与全球事务。

李春利教授发言的题目是《汽车社会成本中的交通拥堵分析与“东京模式”》。中国在准备不足的情况下匆忙跨入汽车社会，其负面效应日益凸显。近年来，围绕汽车的主流话题编撰了“限行”、“摇号”、“限购”等。汽车社会是有成本的，不仅包括购车、汽油、税负等私人成本，还包括大气污染、交通拥堵、环境破坏等各种社会成本，或者说是汽车社会的外部成本。如果北京模式以限购限行为特征，上海模式以拍卖拍照为特征，那么，无论是北京/上海模式，还是伦敦模式，都属于急拐弯急刹车的类型的。他考察了一种相对温和的渐进式或改良式的治理拥堵的方式——“东京模式”，这种模式重视立体轨道交通，积极建
立“副中心”，引导城市空间布局从单中心结构向多中心机构转变，重视“交通需求管理”的理念。他强调，“治堵如治水”，不能光从下游建坝堵水，必须从交通需求的源头找出原因，只有做到寻源溯流、分流泄洪、因势利导、疏而堵，才能真正实现治标兼治本。

Shi Xunpeng教授在《东南亚国家的一带一路战略：能源投资的案例研究》的发言中指出，尽管中国倡议的“一带一路”（OBOR）可以在合作上实现多方的共赢，但大家对“一带一路”的认识仍然是两极分化的。有人对东南亚在“一带一路”中所扮演角色的重要性存在怀疑。多边利益往往是非常复杂的，因为能源项目上的技术复杂性、政治环境的变化、不规范的投资行为等都会导致这些问题。他认为，所有权意识的建立是解决这个问题的关键，在实施“一带一路”战略的过程中，应当逐步建立这种所有权意识和主人翁意识。

Jack Hou教授发言的主题是《一带一路：远水救不了近火？》，中国目前的问题其实是多方面因素综合作用的结果。在1980s，中国对汇率进行干预，并于20世纪90年代开始鼓励FDI的引进，目前中国已经超越美国成为世界上最大的FDI东道国。2001年时，虽然很多人认为加入WTO存在很多风险，但是入世以来中国的出口贸易迅速增长，对中国经济发展起到了非常重要的作用。近年来，我们经常听到可持续发展、新常态、中等收入陷阱、刘易斯拐点等范畴，其实他们描述的都是一个问题。在这样的背景下，中国倡议“一带一路”的决议，就想当年加入WTO一样，虽然目前来看存在一定的风险和重重困难，但是，如果“一带一路”能够成功建立起来，那么毫无疑问，这可以与工业革命的影响相媲美，这对全人类都具有非常重要和深远的意义。

徐晋涛教授就《交通堵塞对空气质量的影响及其政策意义》这一主题进行了发言，分析了当前大家普遍关注的两个问题：交通拥堵和空气质量。徐教授想要探讨两个问题：交通堵塞对空气质量的影响到底有多大，空气质量是如何随着交通堵塞的严重程度而变化的。只有明确交通拥堵对空气质量的净影响和政策干预的潜在影响有利于对提出更加具有现实意义的政策建议。徐教授指出，道路拥堵对空气质量的破坏程度达到47.6%，晚间交通堵塞对空气质量的影响是白天的2.47倍，因此我们应当限制大型车辆晚间进城。交通拥堵与空气质量之间的关系是非线性的，这就意味着将拥堵指数提高到转折点以上，并不能同比例的提高当地的空气质量。
陈恭平教授为大家介绍了网上竞价的最优策略。由于中国人口众多，近年来互联网上的平台交易发展规模非常大。为了从理论上对不同的竞价策略进行探讨，陈教授分析了三种常见的竞价方式，包括常规拍卖（Regular Auction）、固定价格拍卖（Fixed-Price Auction）、即买拍卖（Buy-It-Now Auction）。他认为网上平台应当允许不同竞价方式的存在，以满足销售商的需求，而且买方的时间偏好与保留价格是负向相关的。陈教授通过一个简单的模型为我们清晰地刻画了不同竞价方式的最优选择问题。

最后，洪俊杰教授做了题为《全球经贸新规则与中国智慧》的发言。开篇他指出，全球经贸规则经历了朝贡贸易-市舶贸易-殖民地贸易的无规则时期、一战到二战之间传统规则酝酿时期、大萧条后传统规则的确定期以及21世纪全球新规则的重构期。在全球价值链发展和跨国公司利益的推动下，全球贸易新规则将环保和劳动利益的范畴考虑进来，以公平贸易为理论基础。洪教授强调，中国风格的国际规则应当坚持五大理念，即补充完善为先的和谐理念，兼顾改革发展的中庸理念，尽量维护多边的大同理念，倡导合作共赢的和合理念和让更多人受益的民本理念。在构建中国风格的国际规则时，应当同时考虑国内、国外两方面的因素，在国外因素方面，应当尽力符合世界潮流和趋势，合理应对外国壁垒和不公平行为，努力获得贸易伙伴国的支持；在国内因素方面，应当致力于提高我国产业的国际竞争力，维护我国的全球地位和利益并满足国内改革和发展的需要。体现全球经贸新规则的中国智慧应当包含以下基本内容：加工贸易规则，跨境基础设施，电子商务新规则，包容性创新理念，强调发展中国家低成本的合理性，反对蓝色壁垒，强调基于贸易利得的碳排放责任，反对绿色壁垒，逐步推进诸边或多边投资体制。在全球产业链不断延长，专业化程度不断提高的背景下，重要中间投入品的贸易自由化对于各国融入全球价值链，充分发挥和利用各自的比较优势具有重要的作用。
北京论坛（2016）
经济全球化中的中国角色（四）（A组）

2016年11月6日上午,北京论坛（2016）经济分论坛“经济全球化中的中国角色”的第四场A组研讨会在北京大学英杰交流中心第三会议室举行。本次研讨会由来自巴黎第一大学的Sandra Poncet教授主持。共有四位学者在讨论会上发表演讲，分别是来自北京大学的林双林教授、英国格拉斯哥大学的Sai Ding教授、来自日本大学(Nihon University)的Naohiko Ijiri教授和主持人Sandra Poncet教授。

首先,林双林教授做了题为《中国财产税改革的影响》的发言,就中国的财产税尤其是房产税的征收问题进行了相关的探讨。林教授比较了各国财产税征收的异同,并通过建模分析的方法研究了中国进行财产税改革将产生的经济影响。林教授认为财产税的引入将起到抑制住房消费,增加私人投资与产出的作用,并改善下一代人的福利水平。

英国格拉斯哥大学的Sai Ding教授的发言题目为《企业在意投资机会吗?来自中国的证据》,讨论了中国企业的投资决策问题。不同于大多数相关文献聚焦于金融因素（比如现金流）,Sai Ding教授从经济基本面的角度进行公司金融方面的研究。她通过模型将投资项目分为基于供给侧与基于需求侧的两个部分,使用面板向量自回归（PVAR）和GMM的方法进行了实证分析。此项研究得出了民营企业对投资机会更加珍惜,而国有企业对供给侧的投资机会响应较强,对需求侧投资机会反应不足的结论。Sai Ding教授希望她的发现能对我国正在进行的企业所有制改革和金融改革有所帮助。

日本大学(Nihon University)的Naohiko Ijiri教授带来了他的论文《非善意的标准检测：日本进口的非关税贸易壁垒研究》。自1995年以来，《世界贸易组织贸易技术壁垒协议》一直在推动各个国家对相关标准进行协调。这样一个统一的标准可以降低贸易成本从而促进国际贸易。如果强制性国家标准与国际标准不统一,这些标准就会成为非关税贸易壁垒。Ijiri教授利用日本的数据通过实证分析的方法检验了标准协调和强制性标准对国际贸易的影响。他的研究结果表明,非善意的标准与强制性法规会阻止新产品进入到国内市场。
巴黎第一大学的Sandra Poncet教授做了题为《中国的贸易政策效率》的发言。她认为相比于世界上其他国家，中国的增值税体系使得中国厂商在产品出口方面处于更不利的地位，然而中国大量的出口退税给予了出口一定的竞争优势。Poncet教授通过实证分析的方法评估了出口税的变化会在多大程度上影响中国的出口表现。她的研究结果表明增值税退税体系确实是一项有效的产业政策并提升了中国在国际市场上的竞争力。

在四位教授完成发言后，与会学者与参会人员就房市泡沫、国有企业改革、贸易壁垒、税收改革等话题展开了热烈讨论。会议在浓厚的学术氛围中圆满落幕。
北京论坛（2016）
经济全球化中的中国角色（四）（B组）

2016年11月6日上午，北京论坛（2016）“经济全球化中的中国角色”分论坛B组第四场研讨会在北京大学英杰交流中心第四会议室举行。共有四位学者在研讨会上发表演讲，分别是日本神户大学Lex Zhao教授，台湾政治大学胡伟民教授，内蒙古大学杜风连教授，上海财经大学鞠建东教授。鞠建东教授担任了本次研讨会的主席。来自美国、蒙古国、印度尼西亚等多个国家的其它学者参加了此次研讨会。

Lex Zhao教授的演讲聚焦于中日关系面临的挑战。他从四个问题入手剖析了中日关系：领土争议、战争历史、国家主义以及意识形态和制度差异。领土争议至多是一个零和博弈，而一旦第三方介入很可能成为负和博弈。但是以保守政党为代表的特殊利益集团利用这一争议来实现自己掌权内政的目的。中日历史战争也使得双方现状关系变得更加复杂。国家主义的问题涉及到谁将成为亚洲第一大国的问题，中日双方也在不同历史时期占据这一位置，并可能在未来各方面竞争这一位置。意识形态和制度上两国也有明显的差异。中日发展离不开双方的合作，而冲突只会给第三方带来收益。中日关系未来的发展可以借鉴英语国家之间的关系。

胡伟民教授的演讲则主要对中国2008-2012年期间抵制日本汽车销售进行了经济分析。在中日钓鱼岛之争事件发生后，日产汽车在中国的销量经历了一个显著并且持久的下降：销售额的下降幅度达到17%到52%；以市场份额作为衡量指标，这一下降过程维持了15个月之多；以销售额的绝对值作为衡量指标，这一下降过程维持了7个月。中国的国产汽车品牌从这次抵制过程中受益最多。分地区来看，那些在抗日战争中未被占领的省份，其对日货的抵制程度要显著低于其它地区。在被占领的省份中，那些小部分地区被占领的省份的抵制程度又要显著低于那些大部分地区被占领的省份的抵制程度。那些大部分地区被占领的省份的抵制程度与东三省的抵制程度相当。分城市来看，那些拥有日本汽车生产基地的城市，其日产汽车销售额在抵制期间的下降幅度要远远大于其它城市。这可能是因为这些城市的生产基地提供了一个更便利的抵制目标。
杜凤莲教授的演讲题目是《角色与关系：中国经济发展对中蒙关系的影响》。中国和蒙古在经济上存在互补性：中国的比较优势体现在服装、鞋子、食品等消费品，蒙古的比较优势体现在非食用原料上。中国经济的快速增长也带来了中蒙贸易的快速增长。特别是1994年以来，中蒙关系发展到了新阶段，中蒙政治关系密切，而中国坚持的睦邻友好外交政策也维持不变。中国经济的崛起不仅使中国超过俄罗斯成为蒙古最大的贸易伙伴，也使得蒙古的经济增长率创造了历史高点。但是这种经济关系对两国外交关系的影响不是单调的，其背后的含义仍需要借助进一步的分析才能得出结论。

鞠建东教授以华夏共同体为主题，探讨了全球贸易新常态与全球治理新框架。以2012年为分割点，全球贸易模式已经从一个“高速增长、美国核心、中国驱动”的旧常态向“增长趋缓、三足鼎立、区块结构”的新新常态演变。未来全球经济治理的发展方向，既不是美国想要恢复的单极世界，也不是美中对抗的双极世界，而是与全球鼎足三立的生产结构相适应的G3体系——北美自由贸易区（NAFTA）、欧盟和华夏共同体。从中国和亚洲未来的发展方向上看，“一带一路”将以横向调整促进布局优化；而华夏共同体的构建则将以纵向调整促进产业升级。两者互补，共同构成我国在全球贸易新常态下的“一体两翼”开放新战略。

演讲之后的讨论环节中，学者们就报告中的问题深入交换了意见。本场讨论会在热烈友好的气氛中顺利结束。
北京论坛（2016）
社会企业概念构建与认证制度发展（一）

2016年11月5日上午，北京论坛（2016）“社会企业概念构建与认证制度发展”分论坛第一场研讨会“社会企业的概念构建与认证制度发展：欧美模式”、第二场“社会企业的概念构建与认证制度发展：东亚模式”在北京大学英杰交流中心第八会议室举行。上午的两场研讨会分别由北京大学公民社会研究中心主任袁瑞军副教授和中国发展研究基金会副秘书长崔昕主持。

第一场研讨会在北京大学政治发展与政府管理研究所学术委员会主任李景鹏教授的致辞中拉开序幕。李教授首先就工作坊的顺利举行表示了祝贺，对参加工作坊的各界人士的热情和努力表示了肯定。接下来，李景鹏教授从“人性”的角度出发，对“社会企业”这一新的企业形式进行了阐述。李景鹏教授指出，社会企业是跨越公益慈善的社会领域和市场领域两个截然不同的领域的，而市场领域中人性的贪婪和公益慈善中人性的善却是矛盾的。因此，为了兼顾这两个领域，必须用社会企业的公益慈善的性质去指导和统帅企业的市场过程。此外，李景鹏教授还高度肯定了社会企业认证标准建立的重要意义。

北京大学政府管理学院院长、北京大学中国政治学研究中心主任俞可平教授以《社会企业的当代价值》为题，就社会创新的意义展开了发言。俞可平教授提出，作为学者可以从社会结构分化的角度，更深刻的评价启动现代化进程以来中国社会的变化。俞教授将当前社会分为了政府系统、市场系统和公民社会系统三个相对独立的部分，并提出随着这一新的社会格局的形成，中国改革的重心将转移到社会政治领域，这也是目前社会创新备受重视的宏观背景。接着，俞可平教授从广义和狭义两个角度对“社会创新”进行了定义，并对社会创新的意义做了简单阐述，认为社会创新对于促进社会公共领域作用的发挥、激发社会活力和推动社会进步等方面作用巨大，而社会企业在推动社会创新方面的作用更是不可忽视。俞可平教授进一步指出，社会企业的发展需要社会各部门的支持，社会企业自身也应该制定长远的目标性规划、自觉担负起推进社会创新和社会进步的责任。

第一场研讨会的最后，日内瓦大学日内瓦经济与管理学院的Thomas Straub教授介绍
了欧洲各国社会企业的概念和认证情况。Thomas Straub教授首先介绍了社会治理的三种模式——股东权益模式、利益相关者模式和三重底线模式，并引入了社会企业作为最后一个范式。之后，Thomas Straub教授具体就欧盟和欧洲各国对于社会企业认定的不同商业标准和社会标准进行了介绍。

第二场研讨会“社会企业的概念构建与认证制度发展：东亚模式”在中国发展研究基金会副秘书长崔昕的主持下开场，来自四个不同的国家和地区的嘉宾分别对日本、韩国、台湾和香港的社会企业的发展和认证进行了介绍。

上海外国语大学国际关系与公共事务学院公共管理系执行主任俞祖成副教授就日本社会企业的内涵和认证动向，分别从日本社会企业兴起的背景、日本社会企业内涵的嬗变和日本社会企业认证的动向三个方面进行了介绍，并指出日本的社会企业。俞祖成副教授认为，日本社会企业的内涵可以概括为“从社会性商业渠道出发解决社会问题和社区问题”，日本社会企业的蓬勃发展充分得益于中央政府和地方政府的积极作为、得益于学者和实践者之间的良性互动，而这正是中国政府相对比较缺失的部分。

韩国社会企业促进会资源匹配团队经理EunSoo Lee女士就韩国社会企业的内涵、作用、现状和促进政策进行了介绍。EunSoo Lee女士以卖面包为例，将社会企业定义为既创造社会价值又创造经济价值的经济体，阐述了社会企业在就业、社区发展和社会公共服务方面可持续的作用，肯定了政府在促进社会企业可持续的自我发展方面的支持作用，并提供了韩国认证社会企业具体数量和创造的就业岗位的数量。

台湾国立中正大学社会福利系官有垣教授介绍了台湾社会企业的内涵和认证模式。他认为对于社会企业至今还没有一个固定的定义，主张对于社会企业做更仔细的分类，以看到不同特质的社会企业的组织的特质。官教授特别强调了政府在社会企业发展中的作用，并介绍了台湾政府在社会企业发展中所提供的支持和援助。官教授建议不要停留在表象上争辩什么是什么企业，什么不是，而要将关注点放在社会公益和社会价值的时间上，他认为能够紧扣社会价值的企业才是真正的社会企业。

最后，香港理工大学第三部门教研室主任陈锦棠博士对香港社会企业的发展做了介绍。陈锦棠博士将香港社会企业的发展分为三个阶段：探索期、政策主导期和多元发展期，并介
绍了不同时期社会企业的发展特点。陈锦棠博士特别指出，虽然过去十年中香港社会企业的发展很快，但在香港这样一个奉行自由主义的社会中，很多“社会企业”都是名不副实的，并着重介绍了香港政府的SROI社会企业评估标准和CEE认证系统，希望能借此对内地社会企业认证的发展起到启示作用。

研讨会的最后，来自中国各家社会企业的听众分别针对日本企业社区型和社会性的区别和社会企业认证的目的和价值发问，并得到了学者们的回答，第一天上午的研讨会圆满完成议程。
北京论坛（2016）

社会企业概念构建与认证制度发展（二）

2016年11月5日下午，北京论坛（2016）“社会企业概念构建与认证制度发展”分论坛第三场研讨会“社会企业的本质属性与认证体制（一）”、第四场“社会企业的本质属性与认证体制（二）”在北京大学英杰交流中心第八会议室举行。下午的两场研讨会分别由北京大学城市治理研究院副院长周红云博士和华北电力大学社会企业研究中心主任朱晓红教授主持。

在第三场研讨会中，在中国人民大学马克思主义学院副教授张晓萌的发言中拉开序幕。她以“社会目的优先：内涵与认证”为题，从公平正义的角度阐述了如何为社会企业提供良好的社会氛围和社会土壤。她首先从如何看待社会企业发展面临的困难出发，认为社会企业既要经济利己、又要道德利他，互助合作促进良性市场的形成。接下来，她通过五个方面对社会企业的发展做出了分析，认为社会企业应该重视自己的文化基因，对自身作出恰当的定位，借助时代的大背景，找到自己的盈利点。

浙江大学公共管理学院苗青教授就社会企业的本质属性做了发言。他认为对社企而言最关键的一点是“双重底线”，即社会企业的经济属性和社会使命，二者剥离掉任何一个社会企业就不在存在，在此基础上，社会企业目前正面临着来自内外部的双重挑战。苗青教授接着提出，基于用户和受众的关系，社会企业至少有两种模式：分离性和整合性。他还提出，在做关于社会企业的研究时，在服务部门的跟踪、社会企业家本身的成长和对社会企业投资回报的跟踪这几个维度上可以做到中国特色；在认证过程中，可以体现出认证的公信力、示范力、自律力和市场力以让认证过程更好。

第三场研讨会的最后，中国发展研究基金会研究一部主任余建拖先生继续就社会企业的概念和认证标准、制度进行了发言。他提出要明确社会企业的外围边界，找出社会企业与其他组织形式的差异。余建拖先生认为，对于社会企业柔性的概念倡导并不难，真正的困难在于确定硬性的标准。然而，社会企业的每一个环节都有社会价值承载的空间和潜力在里面，如果硬性的确立标准实际上会限制社会企业的发展。因此，余建拖先生认为社会企业的认证
实际上社会建设和公共政策的要求，认证应该由社会企业行业主导，而让政府仅掌握一定的
监管和管理权力，并且提倡由试点而渐进推广。

短暂的讨论和休息之后，第四场研讨会“社会企业的本质属性与认证体制（二）”在华北电力大学社会企业研究中心主任朱晓红教授的主持下开场。

北京大学光华管理学院组织管理系助理教授张闫龙以“制度逻辑与社会企业治理”为
题进行了分享。他将社会企业定义为传统的资本主义的商业企业和传统的非营利组织的混合
体，商业企业用市场的方式去解决问题，社会企业则注重社会考量，因此，混合体的内部蕴
含了很多的冲突，“制度逻辑”的提出就是为了分析不同元素之间的矛盾。制度逻辑，是指
社会体系的特别运作方式，大概可以分为商业逻辑、官僚逻辑和民主逻辑三种。不同的制度
逻辑有不同的组织形式，相对应就有正式结构、行为模式和规范命令三个维度。社会企业实
践层面的不同直接由组织形式的不一致引起，但追本溯源却是不同的制度逻辑方面的冲突。
如果制度逻辑的冲突无法解决，社会企业只能陷入发展陷阱。

日内瓦大学日内瓦经济与管理学院的Thomas Straub教授进行了以“欧洲社会合作
社的社会治理”为题的专题报告。Thomas Straub教授首先介绍了合作社的概念和定义，
认为合作社是自愿形成的、满足其成员在社会经济和文化方面需要的协会，并以瑞士的
MIGROS为例详细介绍了合作社的运转模式。在报告的最后，Thomas Straub教授指出还
需要对认证的限度进行讨论，思考如何平衡、协调这两种模式中的矛盾。

SK SUPEX追求协议会社会贡献委员会社会贡献院副院长崔濬博士进行了发言。崔濬
博士认为社会企业家所要做的，就是以互信、合作和共享为原则，尽可能的实现全人类的共
同繁荣。接着，他以SK下属的CSR项目对社会企业的透明度和社会信用体系的建设发展做
了经验分享。

研讨会的最后，在场的各位学者和中国各家社会企业的听众分别针对MIGROS的董事会
代表选择和韩国SK下的CSR项目的评估问题等发问，并得到了学者们的回答，第一天下午的
研讨会圆满完成议程。
2016年11月6日上午，北京论坛（2016）“社会企业概念构建与认证制度发展”分论坛第五场研讨会“中国的社会企业认证：议题与挑战”在北京大学英杰交流中心第八会议室举行。上午的研讨会由南都公益基金会理事长徐永光先生主持。

第一场研讨会在北京大学公民社会研究中心执行主任袁瑞军副教授的发言中拉开序幕。袁教授首先介绍了北京大学公民社会研究中心的社会企业认证研究项目，对中国社会企业与投资联盟的支持表示感谢。袁教授提出，中国的民办非企业单位尽管政策非常严格，但从政策的定义上看这是最典型、最严格的社会企业，对社会企业的研究就是希望能够放松民办非企业的条件。她希望通过对国际上多元、多元的认证模式的研究，能够以一本书的方式在明年五月的年会上呈现研究的结果，以为利益相关的各方提供参考指南和政策建议。目前，社会企业还是一个有待证明的概念，当思考社会企业的概念和制度时，还是必须要紧紧抓住社会需求和社会目标这一核心。

湖南大学中国公益创业（社会创业）研究中心副主任汪忠副教授以“中国社会企业认证发展战略思考”为题展开了发言。汪忠先生首先分享了个人的社会创业经历和感慨，接着提出了关于社会企业的概念和认证的几点思考。一方面，他提出社会企业的基本定义有三点：社会目标优先、创新性和市场导向性，而他个人倾向于相对宽泛的概念。另一方面，他认为社会企业认证的本质就是信号机制效应，认证要强调过程和结果，宜粗不宜细。对于社会企业需要分类分层的研究，不能一个标准衡量所有。对于分成、分红和财产锁定的标准应该具体问题具体分析，由市场自由选择和具体的谈判来决定。

第一场研讨会的最后，深圳大学社会管理创新研究所所长唐娟副教授对慈善超市目前的运转和深圳在推动慈善超市向社区转型的过程中的努力进行了介绍：慈善超市是一种以社会公众自愿无偿捐助为基础，借助超市经营的模式，为困难群众提供物质帮扶和志愿服务的社会服务结构。在中国，慈善超市有着浓厚的官方背景和强烈的行政化推动：它的资源来源主要就是靠政府和公共募捐；主要运营者分为民政局、慈善总会和居委会三类；服务的对象
也很狭隘，仅限于困难群众。对比出现最早的美国好义超市，唐娟女士认为，中国的慈善超市运转、经营模式中行政化色彩特别浓厚，社会参与不足，运营成本比较高且不具有品牌意识，总体上说是不成功的。之后，唐娟女士继续对2015年深圳慈善超市开始实行的社会化的托管运营进行了阐释，并表示了对慈善超市未来发展的展望。她提倡慈善超市的经营方式、资金来源和物质来源多元化、受益对象社会化，用社会企业的运营方式，以公益为目标，提高自己的造血功能，继续进行进一步的尝试。

研讨会的最后，来自中国各大高校的学者和各家社会企业的听众分别针对慈善超市如何浪费公共资源和对深圳慈展会社会企业认证的评价如何等问题进行提问，并一一得到了学者们的回答。最后一场研讨会圆满完成议程。
北京论坛（2016）
大变革时代的全球治理—世界青年的视角和声音（一）

2016年11月4日下午，北京论坛学生分论坛第一场研讨会“文化与文明”在俄文楼201教室举行。此次学生论坛共邀请包括美国、英国、日本、法国、韩国、澳大利亚等国家及地区的50余位学生嘉宾参会，由元培学院的刘毅舟同学担任主持。

上半场会议在北京大学政府管理学院李强教授的开幕致辞中拉开序幕，李强教授热情欢迎了来自世界各地的同学参与到北京论坛中，并就当下全球治理问题的重要性和紧迫性发表了自己的看法。元培学院的孙华副院长和学生论坛组委会主席曾莹也发表了开幕致辞。

首先发言的是来自加州伯克利大学的Samantha Yen,她发言的主题为通过发展与文化输出产生的中国软实力。软实力区别于硬实力，是指一个国家的文化、价值观等影响自身发展潜力和感召力的因素。Samantha指出中国应当抓住发展软实力的历史机遇，这不仅可以帮助中国发展文化产业，转变资源消耗型的发展方式，实现可持续发展，还可以塑造中国和平、可信的国际形象，从而在国际社会中发挥更积极的作用。

来自芝加哥大学的李天娇同学就全球治理下非政府组织的展望与挑战这一主题发表了自己看法，她认为非政府组织将成为新时代全球治理中的重要力量。非政府组织作为自治力量，最好地表达了公民社会的精神。非政府组织内部以协同合作取代了传统的官僚架构，这为全球治理中主权国家如何在公共利益最大化的目标下平等磋商树立了样板。李天娇指出，非政府组织的发展也面临许多障碍，它是否是一条值得探索的路径仍须经受实践的检验。

第三位发言的同学是来自燕京学堂的徐杨。她的发言针对当下欧洲的危机：2015年数以百万计的来自中东国家的难民潮持续涌入欧洲，构成了二战结束以来世界上最大的难民潮，难民危机也在经济和文化等层面成为欧洲国家当下需要面对的社会问题。全球化背景下欧洲基督教和伊斯兰教的宗教冲突与宗教极端分子的恐怖主义问题日益突出。她从欧洲的普遍老龄化问题等角度分析了欧洲伊斯兰化的原因与其导致的欧洲文明危机：经济危机、恐怖
主义危机和难民危机，并在发言的最后提出了应对危机依托宗教对话和共同价值的非虚无主义解决路径。

在三位发言人进行主题报告后，学生嘉宾分为三组针对文化软实力等话题进行了讨论，学生论坛第一场在热烈的氛围中圆满结束。
北京论坛（2016）
大变革时代的全球治理—世界青年的视角与声音（二）

11月5日上午，北京论坛（2016）学生论坛第二场“全球政治”场在俄文楼201举行，三十余位学生嘉宾参加了本次论坛。

首先，来自伦敦国王学院的Florence Cooke发表了题为“21世纪世界秩序中的中国角色：以中欧关系为着眼点，探讨进展、挑战和经济关系在未来国际治理中的重要性”的演讲。她通过对中欧贸易的数据分析，认为中欧合作具有坚实的基础。在经济合作的基础上，双方在全球问题也必将拥有进行更深入对话的可能性。英国脱欧等问题使得中欧合作面临更多的挑战，如何面对这些困难则不仅仅关系到中欧双边的互惠合作，更对于全球政治、经济问题有重要影响。

第二位发表演讲的是来自燕京学堂的Yuliana Dementyeva，她就中国模式的发展问题进行了探讨。她认为中国模式具有实用主义、渐进主义、经验主义的特点，并且具有很强的灵活性与调适能力。在对中国模式特点的分析后，Yuliana也展示了学界对于中国模式是否可持续与可推广这一问题不同角度的思考。

第三位发表演讲的是来自伦敦国王学院的Eric Schimidt。他发言的题目是全球化进程中的权力东移是否真实存在。通过中国与美国硬实力、软实力、经济实力三个维度的对比，Eric提出美国军备费用远远超出其他国家，军事实力上权力的东移并没有真实发生。在软实力领域也是如此，虽然美国与伊拉克和阿富汗的争端损害了美国的国际形象，但美国式的价值观并未从根本上动摇，Eric幽默地指出诺贝尔和平奖甚至在奥巴马尚未入主白宫时就授予了他。在经济实力的对比分析中，他则提出中国作为拥有最多人口的国家经济总量排名第二位不足为怪，国民生产总值也与美国具有较大的差距。从这三方面来看，在目前阶段权力东移还并未真实发生。

最后，所有参会嘉宾进行了以“中国在21世纪的角色”为主题的自由讨论。讨论涉及到了中国与印度两国的发展路径对比、不同国家应对全球化的挑战的方式等等，不同国家、不同专业的学生的观点交锋令参会者都颇有启发。
北京论坛（2016）
大变革时代的全球治理—世界青年的视角与声音（三）

2016年11月6日上午，北京论坛（2016）学生分论坛“全球经济”第三场在北京大学俄文楼举行，来自世界各地的三十多名学生嘉宾参与了本次论坛。

第一位发言者是来自伦敦国王大学的Hannah Niese，她报告的题目是《全球化时代的美元、欧元和人民币》（USD, EUR and CNY in a globalized world）。她考察了在全球化背景下美元、欧元和人民币三种货币的表现，并分析了全球货币体系治理的相关问题。她在报告中指出，近年来中国经济迅猛发展、世界经济重心东移，但中国日渐增强的经济影响力尚未使其货币获得相匹配的重要地位。比之于被广泛使用、对于全球市场举足轻重的美元，无论欧元还是人民币都无法竞争“世界货币”的地位。对于这一现象，她从经济、政治和国际关系的角度进行了探讨。她还分析了欧元和人民币的现状以及官方推广这两种货币的方式，并对未来全球货币体系治理中可能出现的问题进行了探讨。

随后发言的是来自芝加哥大学的任泽宇，他的报告题为《中国在全球治理中的参与——从私募股权和企业并购的视角》（China’s Participation in Global Governance through PE and M&A）。他认为，中国经济的腾飞是世界经济史上的一大奇迹：一个如此幅员辽阔、人口众多的国家能够维持如此高的经济增速，是世所罕见的。在从中央计划经济到社会主义市场经济的转型过程中，私募股权，这一迟到至二十一世纪才为中国人所熟悉的概念，实际上在经济发展中扮演了重要的角色。他的报告着重阐述了私募股权，特别是外资私募股权对于中国的经济发展做出了怎样的贡献，并就在激烈的竞争环境下外资私募股权如何开拓中国市场、扮演更加重要的角色给出了自己的看法。

最后一位报告人是来自北京大学元培学院的任昶宇，他报告的题目是《从“生活成本”看人民币购买力的区际差异》（Disparity of the Purchasing Power of RMB: From the perspective of Cost of Living）。他指出，人民币购买力在全国各地的一致性，是区域经济核算准确性的重要前提。但事实上，中国各地的物价差异客观存在，这反映出人民币购买力的差异。在报告中，他通过调查中国36个城市的物价水平，应用购买力平价计算方法，证
明确了人民币购买力区际差异的存在和时间上的稳定性。进一步，通过引进房价数据，他分析了购房决策对人民币购买力区际差异核算的影响；通过生活成本与GDP、人均GDP、人均收入等指标的相关性分析，发现生活成本与这些因素之间存在明显的正相关性。这在一定程度上证实了“宾大效应”（经济越发达的地区，物价水平越高）的存在。这一研究为区域经济差异的研究提供了新的视角与方法，有利于深入分析区域经济差异的实质。

全场嘉宾对报告中的有关问题进行了热烈的讨论。针对美元的国际地位、人民币的发展潜力、中国企业的海外并购等话题，嘉宾们进行了深入探索并表达了许多精彩见解。
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Unearthed Documents and Ancient Chinese Civilizations (I)

On the afternoon of November 4th, the panel session “Unearthed Documents and Ancient Chinese Civilizations” was inaugurated in the Four Seasons Hall, VILLA 2, Diaoyutai State Guest House. Six speakers gave speeches on the topic “International View of Unearthed Documents Research”.

Professor Cheung Kwong Yue was the first to present his paper, “The Importance and Implications of the Archery Culture in Light of the Expression ‘Yi Jie 猗嗟’ in the ‘Kongzi Shi Lun 孔子诗论’ Bamboo-stripe Manuscript from the Shanghai Museum Collection”. Based on a comparison of the ‘Yi Jie 猗嗟’ section of the ‘Kongzi Shi Lun 孔子诗论’ Bamboo-stripe Manuscript from the Shanghai Museum Collection and the transmitted version of the song Yi Jie from the Qi Feng section of the Book of Songs, Professor Cheung discussed the number of arrows employed in the archery rites in Early China as preserved in classical texts. Based on archaeological and epigraphic evidence, he has traced the habit of using four arrows back to the Shang dynasty, showing that the ancient origins of the ancient Chinese archery culture and expounding on the moral values embedded in the archery culture.

Professor Edward L. Shaughnessy was the second scholar to present his paper, “The Tsinghua Manuscript Zheng Wen Gong Wen Tai Bo and the Question of the Production of Manuscripts in Early China”. Among the texts published in the latest volume of the Tsinghua University Warring States Bamboo Strips is a text that the editors have entitled Zheng Wen Gong Wen Tai Bo 郑文公问太伯, which is available in two different copies. What is most interesting about these two copies is that they were apparently copied in antiquity by a single scribe, with the calligraphy and lay-out of the two copies being essentially identical. Nevertheless, the copies also reveal certain important differences, including especially the systematic placement of the “city” (i.e., 邑) to the left or right-hand side of characters. This suggests that the scribe was copied from two different source texts, one possibly deriving from the state of Chu 楚 and the other from the state of Qin 秦 or a related northern state. This constitutes important new evidence concerning the question of manuscript production in ancient China.
Professor Kotera Atsushi was the third scholar to present his paper, “On Women in the Bamboo-strip Manuscript “Xinian 系年” from the Tsinghua University Collection”. Unlike in Zuo zhuan 左传, Guo yu 国语, Shiji 史记 and other transmitted historical texts, women are mention rather scarcely in the excavated manuscript Xinian 系年 from the Tsinghua University collection. Through a comparison with these transmitted texts, Professor Kotera discussed the image of women as presented in the Xinian manuscript, showing that although the female characters play certain role in the manuscript’s historical narrative, they do not appear as active agents who bring change, but rather as passive figures. In light of similar characteristics of the Tsinghua manuscript Chu ju 楚居, it appears that such depiction of female characters may be a specific feature of Chu historical manuscripts.

Professor Sin Chou-Yiu was the fourth scholar to present his paper, “The Dialect Theory Raised in Karlgren’s ‘On the Authenticity and Nature of the Tso Chuan’ in Light of Unearthed Manuscripts”. The authorship of Zuo zhuan 左传 has long been disputed. In his paper, “On the Authenticity and Nature of the Tso Chuan”, Bernhard Karlgren (1889-1978) has proposed to analyze the question of authorship from the perspective of historical linguistics. Based on the analysis of grammatical particles in Zuo zhuan, which are used in a different manner than in texts originating in Lu (e.g. Mengzi and Lunyu), Karlgren argues that Zuo zhuan was neither composed by Confucius nor by Zuo Qiuming, and was most likely not composed in Lu at all. However, ancient manuscripts excavated in past decades indicate that the transmitted texts do not fully reflect the graphical aspect of the ancient manuscripts, and Karlgren’s comparison therefore seems to be methodologically unreliable and cannot resolve the question of the authorship of the Zuo zhuan.

Professor Zhu Fenghan was the fifth scholar to present his paper, “On the Identity of Large Tombs’ Occupants in the Cemetery of the State of Zeng 曾 and the Zeng Hou Yu Bell 曾侯與钟 Inscription”. The recent excavations of the Yejiashan cemetery, Suzhou, have shed important light on the early history of the Western Zhou period. Through an analysis of the tomb arrangement, art-historical features of the excavated bronzes and their inscriptions, Professor Zhu proposed three possibilities on the relations between the tombs and their occupants. In light of the inscription on the late Chunqiu period Zeng Hou Yu bell, Professor Zhu challenged extant theories on the date of the Zeng enfeoffment and pushed this date later towards the end of Early Western Zhou Period, which seems to be in accordance with the historical data battles with Huaiyi tribes as provided by
Contemporary bronze inscriptions.

Professor Li Ling was last scholar to present his paper, “The Qin Bamboo-strip Manuscript ‘Yu Jiu Ce’ from the Peking University Collection”. Professor Li introduced the newly acquired Qin dynasty manuscript Yu jiu ce 禹九策 in the Peking University collection. The manuscript comprises of three parts on 51 strips. The first part is an introductory preface, which focuses on the auspicious 吉 and inauspicious 凶. The second part is titled Yu jiu ce and is the main part of the manuscript. The whole text is rhymed and deals with divination about illnesses and travels and probably reflect popular way of divination. The third part deals with good and bad omens. The manuscript has very important value for research of both the Book of Changes and hemerological manuscripts.
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Unearthed Documents and Ancient Chinese Civilizations (II)

On the morning of November 5th, the panel session “Unearthed Documents and Ancient Chinese Civilizations” was inaugurated in the Starlight Hall, Yingjie Exchange Center, Peking University. Eight speakers gave speeches on topic of “Research on Bronzes and Ancient Chinese Characters”.

Professor Maria Khayutina from University of Munich was the first scholar to present her paper, “Commemoration Policies in Early China: Memories of the Conquest of Shang, King Wen and King Wu as Reflected in Bronze Inscriptions”. Professor Khayutina argued that the memory of the conquest of Shang in Chinese cultural memory and historical tradition was not naturally preserved and widely shared in the Zhou society, but was a product of a purposeful “memory policy” maintained and selectively employed by the royal court. It can also be recognized as a part of culturally constructed rather than communicatively transmitted collective memory. She further pointed out that the royal court had cultivated and Western Zhou elites had access to this memory during the Western Zhou period. They used bronzes, graphs and rituals to present situations involved commemorations of the conquest and they can be understood in current social and political contexts by the collective memory. She emphasized that this memory was transmitted during the first centuries of the Zhou dynasty by Yihouzegui 宜侯夨簋, Hezun 何尊, Dayuding 大盂鼎 and so on. It constructed the collective memory of Zhou elites and then became the basis of identity.

Professor Shim Jae-Hoon from Yonsei University was the second scholar to present his paper, “On the Ambivalence in the Exceptionality of Bronzes Unearthed from the Cemetery of the State of Ba 霸 in Dahekou 大河口”. He pointed out that the recent excavations of the Peng 僭 cemetery at Hengshui 橫水, Jiang Prefecture 縣 and Ba 霸 cemetery at Dahekou 大河口, Yicheng Prefecture 翼城縣 in southwestern Shanxi provide invaluable information on the development of regional polities, concluding a possible existence of close relationships between these areas and the state of Jin 晉 in the region. His study critically examined various issues on the excavations, especially pointing out that the previous scholarships on the nature of the two polities, Peng and Ba, toward Jin, have been obsessed with the dichotomy of "independence" or "subordination." By instead
focusing on the unbalance and exception of the funerary practices in the two Dahekou tombs (M1 and M1017) of Ba rulers, his study suggested the ambivalence of the regional Ba and Peng polities in their relationship with the state of Jin. He further argued that this ambivalence seems to have signified the process of the assimilation from the pro-Shang indigenous polities to the regional polities under the Zhou realm. Therefore, it is more evident to propose the role Jin, the feudal state of Zhou, played for overseeing the neighboring polities such as Ba and Peng in southwestern Shanxi.

Lee You-Pyo from Sungkyunkwan University was the third scholar to present his paper, “On Military Leadership Relations in the Duoyou ding 多友鼎 Inscription.” He introduced the Duoyou ding, which was unearthed from Doumenzhen, Xian, in 1984. Dating to the King Li period of Zhou, it contains 279 characters on the bottom of the vessel. This inscription is very important in two respects: First, it covers the process of the campaign in detail. Second, it further highlights the relations among the Zhou King, Duke Wu, and Duoyou. Focusing on the two respects, Lee You-Pyo first tried to reconstruct the entire process of the campaign. He additionally examined the military leadership relations from the Zhou King to the elites of the time based on the “cumulative subordination” among those people.

Ondrej Skrabal from Charles University in Prague was the fourth scholar to present his paper, “A Survey of Scholarship on Posthumous Names Using Heavenly Stems (riming 日名) and Honorary Titles (shihao 誥号) in Western Zhou Bronze Inscriptions, with a Perspective on Patterns in Epigraphic Behavior Reflected in Inscriptions with the Two Kinds of Appellations”. He pointed out that the habits of creating posthumous names using the heavenly stems (riming 日名) or using the honorary titles (shihao 誅号) have long been perceived as markers of ethnicity by majority of scholars: bronzes with riming were linked with the people of Shang descent, whereas the use of shihao was regarded to be a hallmark of Zhou descent of its users. He argued that this comparison suggests that the ultimate motivation for using either of the two appellations was not the ethnicity, but the conceptualization of the ancestral ritual in which vessels were presented. In the historical process of gradual substitution of riming by shihao, he outlined the habit of using riming can be characterized as reflecting rather “conservative”, “orthodox” and more “private” attitude of the donors towards the ancestral ritual. On the other hand, the habit of using the shihao may reflect the “trend-following” and more “public” conceptualization of the ancestral ritual and subsequently of
inscribed bronzes employed therein.

Professor Zhao Ping’an from Tsinghua University was the fifth scholar to present his paper, “On the Phenomena of Using Character 冶 to Write 野 in Warring States Script”. He explained that the character 野 comprised of the earth 土 and field 田 components with yu 予 serving as phonetic, and the earth and field components later merged into a single component, and can be perceived as a variant character of 冶. He further argued that such reading is legitimate not only from the perspective of both graphic etymology and ancient phonology, but also fits well to the context. He emphasized that such variant writing can be so far observed only in the Jin and Chu writing systems.

Chrystelle Maréchal from Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique was the sixth scholar to present her paper, “On the Graphical Etymology of Character 虹 in Ancient and Modern Scripts in China and Popular Believes It Reflects.” In her paper, she analyzed the graphic etymology of the character hong (rainbow) as preserved in the oracle-bone inscriptions. She pointed out that this character has its close counterpart in the Naxi script, and its graphic motivation in fact reflects popular beliefs about the rainbow that were preserved to present times in southeast parts of China.

Professor Lai Guolong from University of Florida was the seventh scholar to present his paper, “Loan Characters and the Research on Warring States, Qin and Han Manuscripts”. He pointed out that recent revival of New Philology has important implications for the paleographic research on excavated manuscripts. First, he argued that the attention must be shifted from single isolated characters towards the overall context and complete textual units. Second, he recommended that research on paleographic materials yielded by unearthed manuscripts must primarily use synchronic comparative analysis of paleographic materials and not transmitted texts. He stressed that the use of the methods of New Philology can offer important new perspectives for the study of the cultural and intellectual importance of the early Chinese manuscripts.

Professor Mark Csikszentmihalyi from University of California-Berkeley was the last scholar to present his paper, “Testimony from Revenants and Sacrificial Regimens in Early China”. He explained that two recently unearthed texts contained the testimony of revenants (persons who have returned from the dead), one excavated at Fangmatan 放馬灘 in Gansu province, and one a part of the unprovenanced bamboo slips held at Peking University 北京大學. Professor Csikszentmihalyi contrasted these accounts with received mentions of revenants in other contexts and argued that
these two texts share a central concern with validating a particular sacrificial regimen. However, he noted that across these texts, revenants share a unique epistemic position having experienced the world of the living and that of the dead and as such occupy the status of interpreters who can validate particular understandings of the world of the dead. In the case of revenant testimony about optimal methods of sacrifice, he further informed that the testimony likely validated the sacrificial regimen used in the tomb where the testimony was buried.
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Unearthed Documents and Ancient Chinese Civilizations (III)

On the afternoon of November 5th, the panel session “Unearthed Documents and Ancient Chinese Civilizations” was inaugurated in the Starlight Hall, Yingjie Exchange Center, Peking University. Eight speakers gave speeches on the topic, “Research on the Bamboo Slips of the Warring States, Qin and Han”.

Professor Liu Zhao from FuDan University was the first scholar to present his paper. In his talk on “Classic of Mountains and Seas in Light of Unearthed Documents,” Professor Liu Zhao examined the content, form and time of composition of the transmitted Shan hai jing text. Combining the evidence from Shang dynasty oracle-bone inscriptions and Warring States and Qin bamboo and silk manuscripts, Professor Liu revealed important values and proposed correction to several characters and the interpretation of this transmitted text. In light of his analyses, Shan hai jing originates in Warring States period Chu and contains important historical and linguistic materials. Following this pioneering work, he further advised that researchers continue to use excavated manuscripts to reevaluate the text of this classic.

Professor Dirk Meyer from University of Oxford was the second scholar to present his paper, “The ‘Shu’ Tradition and the Text Recomposition: Re-evaluation of ‘Jin Teng’ and ‘Zhou Wu Wang you ji’.” He explained that the text of the Tsinghua bamboo-slip manuscript “Zhou Wu wang you ji” is known from the transmitted texts like Shiji and the “Jinteng” chapter of the Shang shu. In his talk, Professor Meyer scrutinized the distinctive characteristics of the manuscript’s text vis-à-vis its transmitted counterparts. Unlike the transmitted texts, he notes that the text as preserved in the manuscripts seems to be composed to meet different needs of its composers and users. He further argued that by employing the dramatization strategies, composers increased manuscript text’s performativity, which seems to suggest that the text was used for rather different purposes than the texts that were eventually preserved in the “Shu” tradition.

Professor Constance A. Cook from Lehigh University was the third scholar to present her paper, “Comparison of Two Recently Discovered Trigram Divination Texts Associated with Ancient
Chu Culture: The Fourth Century BCE “Shifa 筮法” (Tsinghua University Collection) and the First Century BCE “Jingjue 荆诀” (Peking University Collection). This talk focused on comparing two divination manuscripts separated by several centuries but both associated with the traditions of Chu. She explained that each divination method relied on numerical calculations to produce the trigrams or gua, but they were displayed in radically different ways and employ outside factors that were also mostly different. She further pointed out that particular attention should be paid to these factors. These factors—including images and time—were external to the numerical calculation of each trigram, but they were also critical data points which a diviner had to include in his equation when determining auspiciousness or inauspiciousness. She further added that each trigram in both texts—in contrast to the Zhouyi tradition—indicates the potential sources of curses that could influence a person’s life. She mentioned that these sources would be explored in context of the ancient Chu cultural tradition.

Professor Shen Pei from The Chinese University of Hong Kong was the fourth scholar to present his paper, “The Plight of Qin after the Battle of Xiao in Light of the Tsinghua Bamboo-strip Manuscript Zi Yi 子仪.” Professor Shen noted that the Tsinghua bamboo-slip manuscript “Zi Yi” records a dialogue between the Duke Mu of Qin and Zi Yi before his release from the Qin custody. Several strips preceding the dialogue narrate the policies implemented by Qin after the battle of Xiao between Jin and Qin and thus provide the historical background for Zi Yi’s return. Since the language of the text is often difficult to understand, he pointed out that the historical background was not yet fully understood. In fact, the text reflects the ambition of Duke Mu of Qin to become a hegemon again after having stabilized the situation in his country. Lastly, he argued that Zi Yi was released because they needed to obtain the help from Chu, which also stemmed from the favorable domestic situation in Qin.

The fifth speaker of the afternoon session was Professor Scott Cook from The Grinnell College with the topic “On the Origins of the Shanghai Museum Manuscript ‘The State of Lu Suffered a Great Drought 鲁邦大旱’”. He started with an explanation of this important manuscript from the Shanghai Museum collection, which he pointed out carries two dialogues between the Duke Ai of Lu and Confucius and his disciple Zi Gong about the great drought that ravaged Lu and the policies that the ruler should implement in order to face it. He further explained that the story is similar to that of “Nei pian” chapter of the Yanzi chunqiu to the extent that it is possible to assume that
these are actually two versions of the same story. Through a meticulous analysis of the differences between the two versions, Professor Cook discussed the problems of origin and textual transmission of this text as well as its value for study of intellectual history of Early China.

Professor Erica Brindley from The Pennsylvania State University was the sixth scholar to present her paper, “On the Creativity in the Bamboo-strip Manuscript ‘Heng Xian 恒先’.” In this presentation she presented the Hengxian as a paradigmatic example of early Daoist discourse. She believed its central concept and spontaneous arising, served as a positive formulation of the essentially Daoist concept of wuwei. She further emphasized on the following: how boundary-making in time and space helps define cosmic creativity as endless change, how such an interpretation of cosmic creativity might be transposed to the human realm of action and activity, and why the necessity of cosmic creativity is the best and most fundamental type of action in the world.

Christopher Foster from Harvard University was the seventh scholar to present his paper, “On the Authenticity of the Peking University Laozi 老子 Manuscript”. He mentioned that in January 2009, Peking University acquired a large cache of Han bamboo strips, the contents of which promise to significantly advance our understanding of early China. He pointed out that one highlight from this collection is a nearly complete early edition of the Laozi. He explained that unfortunately, the Peking University Han strips were not archaeologically excavated and Xing Wen has recently questioned the authenticity of Laozi manuscript. Based in part on new observations of the artifact itself, he responded to Xing Wen, proving that his position unfounded and vindicated the Peking University Laozi.

The last speaker of the afternoon session was Chen Kanli, a research fellow of the Center for Research on Ancient Chinese History, Peking University. In his presentation on “The Battle Between Memories: A Comparative Study on Shi ji 史记 and the Book of Zhao Zheng 赵正书,” Chen Kanli compared the differences in historical records regarding the enthronement of Hu Hai, a son of the First Emperor. He explained that the text of Western Han manuscript “Book of Zhao Zheng” has partially common origins with Li Si’s and Meng Tian’s biography in Shi ji, but also partially differs from these texts. He pointed out that this was most salient in the records about Hu Hai’s succession, which, unlike the transmitted version, indicate that Hu Hai’s succession was authorized by the First Emperor himself and was not a complot by Zhao Gao and Li Si. He argued
that such a substantial difference in the narrative seems to reflect different views coexisting at the beginning of the Han dynasty. He further elaborated that Shi ji apparently made use of a mainstream version from the time of its composition. This version was a product of Chu political propaganda after having overthrown the Qin dynasty and was inherited by the Han dynasty and finally won the battle of historical memory due to its inclusion to the Shi ji. He stressed that this significantly influenced the interpretation of these events throughout next two millennia.
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On the morning of November 6th, the panel session “Unearthed Documents and Ancient Chinese Civilizations” was inaugurated in the Starlight Hall, Yingjie Exchange Center, Peking University. Five speakers gave speeches on the topic of “Research on the Unearthed Documents of Qin, Han, Wei, Jin, Sui and Tang Dynasties.”

Professor Chen Wei from Wuhan University was the first scholar to present his paper, “On the ‘Ju County 居县’ in Qin and Han Manuscripts.” He introduced the phrase ‘Ju County 居县’ in Qin and Han manuscripts, which he explained was usually considered as the county where a person was living at present. In the past, Professor Chen also had inferred that ‘Ju County 居县’ not only could be the place one was living currently, but also the county where one’s hometown was located as well. Through a comprehensive analysis with carefulness, he found that there was both a misreading and a misunderstanding on the manuscripts which involved the phrase ‘Ju County 居县’. He observed that in some manuscripts, ‘Ju County 居县’ is apparently opposite to the phrase ‘Sisuo County 死所县’, which means the county where a person had died, and therefore ‘Ju County 居县’ was the county where a dead person should be escorted to return as one’s home place. Lastly, he stressed that in Qin and Han manuscripts, ‘Ju County 居县’ should be interpreted as the county to which one’s hometown belonged.

Professor Abe Yukinobu from Chuo University was the second scholar to present his paper, “On ‘Purchasing Cloths 市布’ in the Wu Manuscripts from Changsha.” He noted that there are three main relations between the manuscripts of Rushibu slips入市布简 and account book of cloths 布簿. First, Minrushi slips民入市简, Rubu slips入布简 and Rudiao slips入调简 were counted separately but were collected for accounting in each xiang乡. Second, there were statistical records for a second time on Minrushi slips民入市简. Third, officers’ account books of Purchasing Cloths 市布 were administrated respectively with account book of cloths 布簿 for regular tax affairs. He therefore argued that the character ‘Diao调’ from the phrase ‘Diaobu调布’ in the Changsha Manuscripts essentially means logistical adjustment.

Lee Sukhee from the State University of New Jersey was the third scholar to present his paper, “Stories from the Dead: Unearthed Epitaphs and a New Perspective on Pre-Modern Chinese Social
History”. He pointed out that to use new archaeological discoveries, especially excavated funerary epitaphs (muzhiming 墓誌銘), scholars are able to develop a truly revolutionizing understanding of Chinese social elites. He further argued that historians are now able to probe in even greater detail, such questions as what kind of people pre-modern Chinese social elites were, how their family was organized and maintained, how they formed their marriage alliances, and what kind of relationship they held with the state.

Han Wei from Peking University was the fourth scholar to present his paper, “An Investigation into the Physical Form of the Qin and Han Manuscripts in the Peking University Collection”. He explained that carved lines on the back of slips have much effect on arranging the slips in sequence. He pointed out that there was some carelessness during the process of rearrangement, making the observation and understanding for the carved line inadequate. He however argued that it is neither to reach a conclusion that Beida slips are counterfeit nor the slips were counterfeited for a second time. To add to that, he mentioned that the craved line can not only be found in Laozi manuscripts, but also Zhaozhengshu, Zhouxun, and some Tsinghua slips as well. From the warring state to the mid-Western Han, to carve a line onto a tube of bamboo culm before individual strips were split from it formed a sort of spiraling line, which had been a stable tradition of craftsmanship. He stressed that it could not be considered as an evidence for the suspicion that Beida slips were counterfeit.

Professor Kim Kyung-Ho from Sungkyunkwan University was last scholar to present his paper, “On the Contents and Dissemination of Unearthed Analects 论语 in Ancient China”. He first explained that the usage of slips of bamboo and wood in ancient Korea and Japan was mainly during the period from late 6th century to late 8th century. He further argued that according to investigating the relation from the culture written in Chinese characters and wood slips, which both circulated from China, there was a possibility to make positivism research on society in ancient East Asia. He noted that centralized governments in ancient East Asia had been constructed by absorbing the system of laws and decrees which operated in China. With the help of secretarial administration, effective domination had been established through central authority to local areas, he explained that Confucianism ideas in ruling people also had been widely accepted and so on. All of above had consisted of important elements of establishment of ancient nations. Because of all elements spread by the means of Chinese characters, he further argued that it was pivotal for officers to acquaint themselves with classicals which had a close relation with the skills of government administration, such as Lunyu and Xiaojing. Lastly, he stressed that the unearthed Lunyu seems to be a kind of positivism resource to acknowledge the similarity of ancient East Asia societies.
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On the afternoon of November 4th, 2016, the City-Sub-Forum continued its sessions in the Four Seasons Hall, Ba Fang Garden, Diaoyutai State Guest House. There were two sections, keynote speeches and dialogue respectively. The first session was chaired by Prof He Canfei, Vice Dean of College of Urban and Environmental Sciences and the four keynote speakers gave lectures about urbanization, construction of satellite towns and evolution and equitable development of megacities. The second session was chaired by Professor Liu Zhi, Director of Lincoln Center of Peking University and five experts talked about how to manage megacities’ development.

At the beginning of the session, Academician Yeh Anthony G.O. presented the topic, “From Mega-Cities to Mega-City Regions”. He emphasized that management and research of cities should transfer from mega-cities to mega-city regions, and pointed out the factors affecting mega-city region development. Academician Yeh then introduced some international experiences, based on which he considered that major challenges of mega-city region development in China included function of regional planning highly fragmented among different central ministries, departments, local provinces, cities, and towns. He further argued that this top-down nature of strategic planning with local interests being undermined in various degrees and regional plan tends to increase rather than address inequality.

The counselor of the State Council of China, Qiu Baoxing minister, gave a lecture about international experiences in regard to construction of satellite cites in mega-cities. He firstly introduced the history of cities from the twentieth century and pointed out the differences of experiences between the UK and France. Finally, he concluded that construction of satellite towns in China must generate enough attractiveness and be distinctive and complementary to the downtown.

Professor Robert D. Yaro, from University of Pennsylvania, gave a speech on “Promoting Equitable Development in Megaregions”. Taking the US as an example, he pointed out that mega-regions gathered a large amount of population and industries while produced a series of problems such as traffic congestion, inequality problems and high unemployment. He thought that solving the inequality problem should hold on the perspective of mega-city regions and particularly implement policies such as job training for displaced workers, improving schools, local transit and public services and so on.
Academician Fu Bojie, Peking University’s Dean of College of Urban and Environmental Sciences, discussed the environmental effects of urbanization and new type urbanization in China. He quantified the extent, rate, and spatial pattern of urban expansion, and associated landscape changes from 1980-2010 across different regions in China and examined the ecological effects of urbanization. He suggested that the urbanization in China should move onto different paths: urban-region interaction and rural-city co-evolution. He also stated that science, technology and governance were most important support for urban sustainable development.

Peter Wallace, Toronto’s city manager, firstly gave a lecture named “Toronto: Our Future is Bright” in the session of dialogue. He pointed out that Toronto was one of the best competitive cities in the world, which had many sectors with globally leading companies driving the growth of the local economy. He also stated the challenges that Toronto faced, such as balanced growth and infrastructure, demographically inclusive communities and so on.

After that, Professor Allan Cochrane, from Open University in the UK; George W. McCarthy, the President of the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy in the US; Professor Robert D. Yaro, Peter Wallace, and Professor Yang Kaizhong discussed how to manage the mega-city.

For the key challenges faced by mega-cities, experts generally believed that mega-cities were facing the challenge of the infrastructure, financial expenditure and organizational patterns, etc. Regarding whether or not urbanization is a good thing, the experts agreed that the key point of urbanization was not good or bad, in other words, the importance lied in whether the urbanization could be effectively managed.

For the important work of the mega-cities, Allan Cochrane considered improving traffic condition, solving the problem of industry and coordinating the relationships of center and periphery as key things. President George W. McCarthy and Professor Robert D. Yaro both believed that updating the infrastructure and finding the reasonable funds were very important. Peter Wallace emphasized the sustainable development of the city and Professor Yang Kaizhong thought China should improve the governance structure of urban development, change the city planning and establish urban management system of professional managers.

For the challenges of mega-cities in the future, Professor Allan Cochrane and Peter Wallace both thought that mega-cities should face and contain diversity. President George W. McCarthy insisted that a series of resources in transformation were the most challenging. Professor Robert D. Yaro thought the government role was very important. Professor Yang Kaizhong stressed the habitability of the city and the importance of the environment.
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On the morning of November 5th, the Panel session “Global Megacities and Regional Coordinated Development in the Civilized World” held its second session at the Moonlight Hall of the Yingjie Exchange Center at Peking University.

The theme of the first session was “Megacities of the World”. Professor Robert Yaro from University of Pennsylvania chaired the presentations.

Professor Eric Heikkila from University of Southern California told the story of Chinese cities in the evolution of the prototype, and through five years of planning Chinese keyword extraction. Clustering analysis of city samples, he believed that the economic value of culture, the historical and geographical background of the city identity and development cannot be ignored.

Professor Allan Cochrane of British Open Universities shared the experience and new positioning of London’s making of a global city region. He talked about the association of the Greater London area and the city in the global network. He stressed that in these days, the phenomenon of unbalanced development in the Greater London area was prominent and further argued of the urgent need to seek appropriate governance methods and promote the effective implementation of the policy.

Professor Hiroshi Matsubara from the University of Tokyo offered a depth analysis on how to comb the transformation of the internal structure and city structure of Tokyo metropolitan area to foster city culture, industrial organization, industrial agglomeration and global competitiveness. He further argued that in the future we should strengthen the metropolitan area between the various links among industries.

Professor Geunhee Choi from University of Seoul gave a speech themed "Is Seoul a Creative City?". His study found that Seoul has the main features of postindustrial city. He argued that its economic structure has changed greatly in the past few years, where the manufacturing sector accounted for ratio has decreased significantly. He further noted that the center of the city spatial
structure has changed. Lastly, he stressed that Seoul has formed a multi-center city where the creative industry is emerging and vibrant.

Professor Marcos Costa Lima of Universidade Federal de Pernambuco pointed out the complex problems in St Paul. He noted that some of these problems exist in the process of globalization, the development of the mega city development and the implementation of the policy of the city game. He also cited an example on the sustainable community to think about the future prospects of the mega city.

The topic of the second session was “Governance and Finance of Megacities”. This session was moderated by Professor Geoffrey Hewings from University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

George W. McCarthy, the chairman of the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, presented the framework of the city development in the next twenty years. He also explained how to monitor the implementation of the United Nations "New City Agenda”.

Professor Fan Cindy from University of California, Los Angeles presented her research topic, “China's Hukou Puzzle: Why Don't Rural Migrants Want Urban Hukou?". She performed investigation and analysis of different factors, which influence the city population and agricultural accounts. She found that floating population benefitted the household registration reform and agriculture Hukou is closely related with homestead, land, and government subsidies. On the other hand, she identified that the city residence is related with the quality education of medical conditions.

Professor Enid Slack from the University of Toronto compared the differences among Beijing, London and Toronto. She pointed out that finance and governance of metropolitan area plays a key role in affecting the overall situation, and enumerated five kinds of government governance models.

Professor George Lin from the University of Hong Kong put forward a "big event" as the starting point. A "big event" promotes the development of economy and the appearance of megacities. He stressed of the need to pay attention to the city change of the time and space.

Professor Mike Raco from the University College London explained that the planning mechanism of London self-regulation is influenced by complex factors. Finally, he argued that this put forward the direction of further research on how to handle capitalism.
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On the afternoon of November 5th, the third session of the panel “Global Megacities and Regional Coordinated Development in the Civilized World” was held at Moonlight Hall, Yingjie Exchange Center, Peking University. All scholars focused on the topic of megacities and had an in-depth discussion on this point. Linda McCarthy from UWM and Mark Fox from Toronto University co-chaired the session.

The first topic of this session was on “Megacity Regions.”

The first presenter was Professor Wu Fulong from University College London, who shared his research on “The Rise of a Megacity Region.” He cited Beijing-Tianjin-Hebei Region of China as his example and offered a general understanding of the state and non-state forces to integrate cities into an inter-locking and densely formed region of mega cities. He pointed out that the characteristics of this spatial form are summarized with regard to their scale and governance. For a mega-city region, he further stressed of the importance to be able to turn the inter-city competition into collaboration. He further noted that the functional city-region may often lead to various challenges that are akin to ‘urban illness’ and recommended the need to put a larger region into consideration in order to deal with these problem for mega-cities.

Professor Gu Chaolin from Tsinghua University shared his understanding on the topic “Spatial Restructuring of Beijing-Tianjian-Hebei Mega-Region.” Professor Gu considered that it is the time for China to generate the Mega-regions and pointed that is actually happening at the moment. He indicated that the Beijing-Tianjian-Hebei Mega-region is essential for regional development in China in the national development strategies map. He further argued that the new cities such as Yanjiao and Kunshan near the core cities like Beijing and Shanghai develops so fast indicating the mega-regions in China are currently under construction. Professor Gu emphasized the spatial restriction in the mega-regions is the key to the further development. He stressed that to do this, it is necessary to generate multi-central spatial structure, form function areas and build vertical and horizontal axes.
Duncan Bowie from University of Westminster gave his speech on “Housing and Planning in London–Spatial Impacts, Social Polarization, Sustainable Development and Social Justice.” He focused on the governance of the London metropolitan region in the context of recent developments in national policy and regional governance. He expressed his understanding of the potential spatial impacts in terms of the supply of existing affordable homes and the location and affordability of new supply. He also considered the governance relationship between London and the wider London metropolitan region. Finally, he analyzed the potential impact of new government policy and legislation on whether London’s housing requirements can be delivered in accordance with the objectives of sustainable planning and social justice.

The Vice Dean of Institutes of Science and Development of CAS, Fan Jie shared his understanding of aggressive expansion of megacities and its impact on regional coordination in China. He argued that in the economic globalization process, China's regional economic centricity has been increasing, the development gap between the central areas and the marginal areas is getting wider, leading to the formation of megacities. He pointed out that industrial structure adjustment makes changes of regional economic distribution happen in the recent years. Additionally, he noted that regional development rules, tax revenue system, political performance of officials, corruption all contributes to the rapid development of the marginal areas of megacities. He however argued that this kind of development constrains the diffusion of the industrial space from the center to the edge, which definitely increases the incongruity among areas and makes resources and environment carrying capacity in this region overload. Finally, he stressed that the transformation of development mode is urgent to deal with.

Professor John Keith Zacharias from College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture of Peking University, focused on urban form and dynamics in megacity development. He argued that megacities would continue to proliferate, especially in Asia and eventually in Africa. He pointed out that conventional planning approaches are challenged by the scale of these urban areas and the flows generated by rising mobility. He suggested a more integrated spatial development policy that directly addresses the problems using the cases of Beijing, Tokyo and Shenzhen. In particular, he emphasized that it is better to build a more hierarchical urban structure, higher connectivity in movement networks, more intensive vegetative cover and more three-dimensional development.

After the break, the second topic on “Megacity Challenges” commenced.
Geoffrey Hewings from the Regional Economics Applications Laboratory (REAL) at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, gave his report on aging and the megacity. He considered that almost all countries are facing the prospect of an ageing population with the share of those over 65 increasing to >20% by 2030. On the basis of this, he analyzed the effects aging population in a large metropolitan region (Chicago) on the labor market and macroeconomic aggregates. He also highlighted the role of immigration and changes in the retirement age in potentially mitigating the impacts.

Professor Eric Sheppard from UCLA talked about housing the urban majority in ‘southern’ mega cities using Jakarta as a case. He nurtured an opinion that in “southern” megacities, the emergence of a wealthy middle class demanding the attributes of a western urban lifestyle has triggered an explosion of large and sophisticated real estate developments and infrastructure projects. He pointed out that the construction of these projects is displacing the lower-income urban majority from the informal settlements they long have occupied and which support their economic livelihoods. This, he argues, will lead to a tougher situation of housing shortage, the disappearance of attractive alternative residential spaces and lower acceptance to the poor.

Professor Mark Fox from Toronto University presented on smart city problems. He considered cities as the most complicated system in the world and focused on the information management of megacities. He posted the following three connected questions: Is information a tool to better manage and operate a city? Is it an infrastructure that needs to be built and maintained for use? Is it a service that is to be consumed by the citizens? By answering these question, he emphasized the simultaneous role of infrastructure and service in future megacities.

Professor David Hulchanski also from Toronto University and who has worked on urban studies for years led the audience’s attention to inequality, socio-spatial polarization, and neighborhood restructuring. He mentioned that socio-economic and ethno-cultural divisions cause an increasingly segregated trend of megacities, whose neighborhoods are becoming the new fault line of social isolation. He argued that this socio-spatial order with stronger and more rigid divisions is based on greater inequality and social polarization and exclusion. Professor Hulchanski analyzed this dilemma with the materials of Chicago and Toronto from 1970 to 2010.

Professor Li Guoping from Peking University, introduced his research on the industrial spatial
layout of Beijing based on functional orientation of the capital. He argued that Beijing is currently in a critical period of transition, facing two main tasks of accelerating economic growth as well as alleviating the pressure from population, resources and environment. He argued that the key to overcoming these issues is to further optimize the urban function layout of Beijing, take advantages of the development potential of the surrounding areas, and help concentrated industries of the central city to ease out.
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Global Megacities and Regional Coordinated Development in the Civilized World (IV)

On the afternoon of November 6th, the fourth session of the panel “Global Megacities and Regional Coordinated Development in the Civilized World” was held at Moonlight Hall, Yingjie Exchange Center, Peking University. The session was chaired by Professor Wu Fulong from University College London.

The first presenter was Professor Cecilia Wong from the University of Manchester, who presented on “Planning for Agglomeration in Britain: from Greater London to the Northern Powerhouse.” She analyzed the core status of Greater London and the Northern Powerhouse through the data on trains, airlines and ports. Meanwhile, she mentioned that the British development is significantly imbalanced and recommended the need to read these agglomerations from various perspectives.

Professor Linda McCarthy from University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee presented on “Polycentric Megacity Regions and Regional Planning and Governance.” She used two representative regions, New York and the Rhine-Ruhr, as her examples to argue about the regional coordination and planning of governance of multi-central megacities, considering the regional property and complexity.

Professor Darryl Low Choy from Griffith University in Australia and a professional planner, introduced the concept of supporting planning method framework. He used many successful cases of coordinated planning for the urban fringe of the city-region and highlighted the interactions among various value of peri-urban.

Professor Yang Jiawen from Peking University shared his study and experience on China's urban rail transit planning. He compared density-oriented and development-oriented transit investment in urban China and argued that there was need take advantages of investment to cater for commuting, overall development and long-term planning.

Professor Jin Ying from Cambridge University was the last scholar who talked about his
understanding of the heterogeneity of location and travel choices in mega city regions. He presented the changes of the traffic, employment and physical infrastructure in London, helping understand the location connections in megacities. Through carding the complex factors of the location selection of firms and city residents, he used SEM method to analyze the relationship between built-up areas environment and travel behavior.

In the end, the director of Peking University – Lincoln Institute Center, Liu Zhi, made a brief summary on the panel presentations. He pointed out that megacity is a new concept with dynamic development that brings, without any doubt, various kinds of benefits. He further added that it causes significant environmental cost which challenges planning, finance and governance a lot. Lastly, he mentioned that the past three-day presentation and communication brought many worthy international thoughts and experience for China, and on the way to better develop megacities, taking into consideration both the many challenges with opportunities.
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Building World-Class Universities: An Institutional Perspective (I)

On the morning of November 4th, PKU-Stanford Forum, which is also one of the sub-forum of Beijing Forum (2016), opened at the Stanford Center at Peking University (SCPKU). The theme of this forum is “building world-class universities: an institutional perspective.” Jean C. Oi, director of SCPKU and professor of Stanford University, served as the chair in the opening ceremony. Prof. Ann M. Arvin, Vice Provost of Stanford University, and Weifang Min, President of Chinese Society of Educational Development Strategy (CSEDS) and professor of Peking University, delivered opening remarks. Professor Fengqiao Yan from the Graduate School of Education, Peking University, gave a keynote speech during the opening ceremony.

Prof. Jean C. Oi first gave the welcoming speech. As she mentioned, in the past five years, the Stanford Center at Peking University (SCPKU), with the support of Peking University, has not only provided Stanford University’s faculty and students a platform to learn more regarding China but also served as a bridge to connect excellent minds throughout the world. Nowadays, building world class universities has become a strategy of many countries to improve competition and develop their higher education. Today’s forum is just a unique and excellent opportunity to dig into this issue. Prof. Jean Oi also expressed her appreciation of Peking University for their support of this forum.

In response to the challenges facing the 21st century and the trend of building world class universities, Prof. Ann M. Arvin pointed out that realizing the special mission of promoting excellent higher education had become the question requiring the consideration from all universities administrators. She looked forward to the deep discussion on this theme in the coming two days.

Prof. Weifang Min analyzed the topic of world class universities from the perspective of institutionalism. The world class university building had become a world-wide phenomenon as well as a means to build the hard and soft power of nation states. By gathering top scholars, pursuing truth and making cutting-edge research advances, universities act as engines to promote economic development and as bases to produce cultural outputs, values and beliefs. However, analysis of deeper institutional factors that allow the creation of world class universities have drawn less
attention than the input of technology and resource distribution in the struggle to build world class universities. In this context, the forum tries to improve the theoretical exploration and practical experiments from an institutional perspective.

Based on his research, which he co-authored with Professor Min, Prof. Fengqiao Yan spoke regarding the role of structural and institutional elements in both practice and theoretical thinking behind world-class university building. Many countries have undertaken “building world-class university” as the strategy to develop their higher educational systems in order to enhance their competitive advantage in this era of knowledge-based economy. Professor Yan suggested that key values and beliefs of leading academic institutions -- such as academic freedom and institutional autonomy -- should be conserved in the process of building world class universities. The differentiation of higher education systems can be achieved more effectively in state supervision system, improving the quality of higher education system as a whole. The abstract idea of world class university is now a driving force behind international competition in higher education. As for the developing countries, it is likely that policy priorities have been given to increasing funding for elite national universities with structural and institutional changes left behind in the process of building world-class university. Prof. Yan pointed out that institutional changes were slower in the deeper layers (such as with respect to values and believes) than with respect to more surface manifestations like formal rules. Compared with developed countries, developing countries show similarities in institutional formalities but substantial differences in institutional contents. We must still undertake deep research into institutions in order to understand better the process of world class university building.

PKU-Stanford Forum is composed of four sub-sessions, each of which includes two Keynotes Speeches and four Panelist Initial Remarks. During the next two days, scholars and university presidents from the United States, Canada, United Kingdom, Australia, Russia, Japan, Finland, Korea, Philippines, Pakistan, and China will conduct heated discussions on the emergence, organization, management and development of world-class universities. The four sub-sessions will focus on the following themes: “the differentiation of higher education systems and the emergence of world class universities in different institutional environments”; “institutional contexts and organizational structures of world class universities”; “managerial characteristics of world class universities shaped by institutional factors”; and “world class universities and institutional development.”
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Building World-Class Universities: An Institutional Perspective (II)

The Education Panel of Beijing Forum (2016) debuted at the Stanford Center at Peking University (SCPKU) on the morning of November 4th. Scholars and university leaders from the United States, Hong Kong, Australia, Russia and China have conducted heated discussions on the topic “The Differentiation of Higher Education Systems and the Emergence of World-Class Universities in Different Institutional Environments”. Prof. Jean C. Oi, Director of Stanford University, served as the chair of the session. Two speakers gave keynote speeches, which were followed by remarks from four scholars.

In addressing this sub-theme, Roger L. Geiger, professor of Pennsylvania State University, emphasized that the degree of research innovation, which was measured by publications, citations, research expenditures, and awards, was very important. His speech contributed to the discussion of emergence and differentiations of institutional contexts by analyzing the internal characteristics of universities from the perspective of students, faculty, and research.

Based on personal experience as a university president in Hong Kong and previous academic career in the United States, Prof. Tony Chan, President of Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, shared his discussion on the role of university governance in the development of higher education. Taking the increasing public interest into account, he concluded that the importance of university governance has been gradually understood and appreciated, but the attention paid on this area is not enough for building world-class research universities.

For panelists’ remarks, there were four scholars attending the discussion. Prof. Peter Coaldrake, Vice-Chancellor and President of Queensland University of Technology, discussed the challenges young universities faced when becoming world-class ones. In the competition with older, traditional universities, newer universities needed to sustain higher policy pressure and make more careful strategic decisions in achieving the financial support of Australia government. Similarly, universities in Russia faced similar challenges. However, as introduced by Prof. Timothy Edward O’Connor, Vice Rector of National University of Science and Technology MISiS, Russian
government conceived and launched the 5-100 Russian Academic Excellence Project, which is a strategy for Russian universities to enter the top one hundred universities in the world. Taking National University of Science and Technology MISiS as a case study in this context, Prof. Timothy Edward O’Connor, concluded that with the assistance of ideas stemming from the institutional framework, increased budgetary allocations, dynamic leadership at all levels and sound governance are all essential to successfully transforming elite national institutions into world-class universities.

As far as the definitions of a world-class university, Xie Weihe, Vice Chairman of University Council and Professor of Tsinghua University, contended that the criteria for world-class university should be the degree of the university’s ability to attract excellent talents in the world in the global age. In addition, since universities have become instruments of global competition in an era of mass higher education, Gerard A. Postiglione, professor of University of Hong Kong, analyzed available steps taken to institutionalize world class universities. His analysis is divided into three parts, including the identification and comparison of national frameworks, the examination of selected cases of institutionalization of world class universities in Asia, and the exploration of the implications of a new global context.

During the open discussion, participants interacted with speakers on issues of university differentiation, research grants, and democratic governance. For the government, it is very important to establish a fair competition mechanism for research funding that based on the university’s performance. On the other hand, universities should reach out to enterprises and the private sector to get more research funds. To improve democratic governance, universities should encourage faculties and students to participate in university decision making.
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Building World-Class Universities: An Institutional Perspective (III)

On the afternoon of Nov. 4th, the second session was hosted at the Stanford Center at Peking University (SCPKU). Professor Weifang Min, President of Chinese Society of Educational Development Strategy (CSEDS) and Professor of Peking University, served as the chairs. Scholars from the United Kingdom, the United States, Japan, Korea and China held a heated discussion on the theme of “Institutional Contexts and Organizational Structure of World-Class Universities.”

During the keynotes speech, Simon Marginson, professor of University College London focused his speech on state power, bureaucratic power and academic power that shapes the multiversity. Synergies and tensions arise at the conjunction of such powers. Bureaucratic power within the institution plays a pivotal role in that it simultaneously articulates and implements external forces (state, markets, stakeholders, and global pressures), represents the identity of the multiversity in the world beyond it, and provides the necessary conditions for academic practice and production. He explored the dynamics, incidents and scope of national variation with respect to these powers, with some attention to distinctions among universities in the Anglosphere, Western Europe, Eastern Europe, Latin America, and East Asia including China. Finally, Professor Marginson concluded that global systems and patterning in information-related areas drive institutional adaptation and transformation and a dialectic of global and national drivers shape internationalization practices and mobility patterns.

Prof. Lloyd B. Minor, Dean of Stanford University School of Medicine, identified the indispensable role of academic medical centers in building world-class universities and helping those universities lead the biomedical revolution. This biomedical revolution promises to transform health care and usher in a more predictive and preventive medical care. He further analyzed the inextricable linkages among education, research and patient care in academic medical centers located in research universities. For an academic medical center, the clinical enterprise is an essential component, necessary for the conduct of clinical research, the translation of fundamental and clinical research findings into clinical practice, and the education and training of future leaders in medicine and biomedical science.
During the ensuing panelist initial remarks, Professor Qian Yingyi, Dean of Tsinghua University School of Economics and Management, delivered a speech on the nature of the university in the context of the remarkable growth in research quantity and university quality that Chinese higher education has experienced in the last fifteen years. The nature of the university is ultimately about the value of the university and institutions that are created for that value. Professor Qian identified three pillars that define the nature of the university—for whom, for what, and how. He defined universities as institutions built primarily for students and to pursue truth, light and freedom through liberating the mind and training the mind to think. He then provocatively asked whether Chinese universities are moving closer to being “world class” but away from being the “university.”

Professor Takahiro Ueyama, the Executive Member of the Council for Science, Technology and Innovation of Japan, examined the ways in which American research universities have transformed their managerial style of academia since the 1980’s to cope with serious cutbacks in public funds and growing competitiveness in research environments. Through his case study of Stanford University and the University of California, he explored strategic governance and management of research universities.

Similarly exploring the issue of governance, Prof. Wang Yingjie, former Vice President of Beijing Normal University, articulated three main changes in universities and three basic conflicts faced by university governance reform. In order to solve conflicts, he suggested that shared governance might be a good solution. From the standpoint of Korean universities, Jung Cheol Shin, professor of Seoul National University, mainly explored how academic department has been institutionalized under socio-cultural contexts as well as the academic contexts in Korea. He concluded that academic departments are core components of social network, which is a critical factor in distributing economic wealth, political power, and social reputation. Meanwhile, social network plays a core role in academic life as well.

In the open discussion, scholars and session participants were engaged, among other issues, in a discussion about shared governance. Some recommended that universities should form democratic decision-making systems. They proposed giving faculty the authority for deciding on hiring and promotions and allocating resources through negotiation between university authority and departments/colleges.
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Building World-Class Universities: An Institutional Perspective (IV)

On the morning of November 5th, the third panel session of the PKU-Stanford Forum, which is also the Education Sub-form of Beijing Forum (2016), was held at the Stanford Center of Peking University. The theme of this morning’s discussion was “Managerial Characteristics of World-class Universities Shaped by Institutional Factors”. This session included two keynotes speeches, four panelist initial remarks and a lunch presentation. Professor Jean C. Oi, Director of Stanford University, served as keynotes speeches chair while Ann M. Arvin, Vice Provost of Stanford University, served as panelist initial remarks chair.

From a social perspective, Jaeho Yeom, President and Professor of Korea University, explored complex relationships between universities and other institutions in Korea. By outlining the strong cultural legacy, regulations and other factors that present challenges for Korean higher education in the 21st Century, he highlighted creative ways that Korea University is tackling challenges within the Korean higher education context.

In addressing the conference theme, Jianhua Lin, President and Professor of Peking University, delivered an informative speech on what steps Peking University has taken to innovate its institutional mechanisms so as to accelerate the construction of world class universities. After reviewing the trends in the development of higher education in China, President Lin shared the strategies historically and currently taking place at Peking University, for example, undergraduate teaching reform, personnel system reform, and comprehensive reform. Referring to the goal of Chinese higher educations’ reform, President Lin stressed that the main goal is to construct a set of modern university management mechanisms, which would match the operations and development of top-level universities in a global context. To realize this goal, President Lin stressed that reforms in the whole educational system, personnel system, distribution of resource, regulatory framework and academic management are needed.

In panel remarks, Wei Zhao, Rector and Professor of the University of Macau, discussed how to “discover oneself” and build a unique university in this era. As the Rector of University
of Macau, he explained ways of being different based on the real experience of University of Macau. He informed that the University of Macau has selectively borrowed while adding their own ingredient and as a result, placed “discovering oneself” above all else, instead of coping wholesale from a successful model.

Further explaining the governmental role of university itself, Professor Glen A. Jones, Ontario Research Chair in Postsecondary Education Policy and Measurement and Professor of Higher Education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, analyzed contemporary challenges associated with traditional academic self-governance. Professor Jones concluded that academic self-governance continues to play an important role within university decision-making, but there is a fragility associated with the balance of power within and between governance structures.

Considering that environment influences the development of the university greatly, Professor Isak Froumin, from the National Research University of Russia, took excellence initiatives as cases to discuss the influence of environment and the contradictory strategy of government. He found that excellence initiatives represent transition to the greater state control, making the universities’ external environment more and more state-driven.

Motohisa Kaneko, Professor of University of Tsukuba, Japan, discussed on how to institutionalize ‘Super Research Universities’ in Japan. His speech examined the rapid expansion of international mobility of students, and analyzed why the pace of internationalization has been slow among Japanese higher education institution. He argued that the present challenge for researches in higher education lines in demonstrating systematically the long-term effect of internationalization of higher education institutions.

On topics regarding the influence of government policy on higher education, fund support, resource support and government decisions, a heated discussion was chaired by Professor Ann M. Arvin. Towards the contradictory strategy of government, Professor Weifang Min made detailed comments based on his own real experiences and Chinese development. Professor Min pointed out that there is no absolute answer towards government decisions, because the formulation of government decisions depends on the background of specific institutions or even a specific country. He addressed that universities should have more self-governance to realize their passion, capability
and creativity. Referring to self-governance, President Jianhua Lin and Professor Ann M. Arvin, Rector Wei Zhao and Professor Glen A. Jones shared their comments. Based on his personal experience as a president to three Chinese Universities, President Jianhua Lin shared what he did and what he felt when he was the president of these Universities. He argued that the extent of self-governance depends on the real situation of the university, such as the culture of university and the aptitude of faculty. Towards the question on how to change the achievements of research into the success of economy, President Lin pointed out that universities can create more technologies and cultivate more innovative talents to improve the development of economy.

During lunch time, a lunch presentation was chaired by Sungsup Ra, who is the Director of Education Sector Group of Asian Development Bank (ADB). Technical Advisor Brajesh Panth delivered the presentation on ADB’s approach to Higher Education. Through highlighting ADB’s support to higher education and how it has evolved over the years, the presentation reflected on what ADB is currently doing in some of its member countries (Cambodia, Lao PDR, Mongolia, Viet Nam) and how ADB views the emerging demand for higher education in some other countries (Bangladesh, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Thailand). Overall, the whole purpose is to analyze the growing demand for high quality higher education and what options are available to evolve such a model in developing countries through regional and international partnerships.
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Building World-Class Universities: An Institutional Perspective (V)

On the afternoon of November 5th, the fourth and last panel session of the PKU-Stanford Forum, which is also the Education Sub-form of Beijing Forum (2016), was held at the Stanford Center of Peking University. Scholars from the United States, Hong Kong, Canada, Pakistan and China held a heated discussion on the theme of “World-class Universities and Social Development.” This session was chaired by Gi-Wook Shin, Professor of Stanford University.

Professor John W. Meyer of Stanford University delivered a speech on “Societal Effects of University Expansion”. In his speech, Professor Meyer analyzed the enormous expansion of tertiary education across the world and its effects on society. He demonstrated how this expansion has resulted in increases in such societal organizations as professional associations, civil society organizations, and rules of transparency across the world. He further added that it has also led to increasing homogenization of content in universities and flattening of culture as represented in “cosmopolitanism.” He argued that cross-national analyses of the effects of tertiary educational expansion also strongly correlated with expansion in the service sector compared to other traditional sectors as manufacturing, agriculture and industry.

Chia-wei Woo, President Emeritus and Professor Emeritus of Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, asked of the function of a “university” and inquiring the meaning of “world-class universities.” He suggested that each higher education institution must be judged on the basis of its own mission, objectives, and added value – each to develop accordingly, and each to strive towards becoming world-class among its peers.

Four scholars participated in the panel discussion following the keynote addresses. Xueguang Zhou, Professor from Stanford University, offered a sociological analysis of the university ranking phenomenon focusing on the institutional logic of ranking. Professor Xueguang Zhou concluded that, institutional conditions generate the grand trend of legitimizing various ranking orders and help explain variation thereof. However, with respect to ranking of universities, he argued that the multiple ranking systems suggest that the system is not yet settled and the question remains as to
whether there is a stable, consistent and reliable ranking order for tertiary education across social contexts.

Ruth Hayhoe, Professor from the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto, explored what Chinese historical civilization have to offer and how Chinese universities both embody and communicate Chinese civilizational identity. She identified two little noticed areas where it is possible to see a convergence between Chinese patterns and those in Europe (especially in France) that might be starting points for reflection. One is the relationship of the university to the state, and the other is the curriculum and student-teacher relations in teaching universities. On these two historical aspects, Professor Ruth Hayhoe suggested that the Chinese model and the French model might have some convergence.

From a socioeconomic perspective, Amer Ahmad Hashmi, Advisor of the National University of Sciences & Technology in Pakistan discussed the role of universities in socioeconomic growth. He attempted to enumerate different ways in which universities are promoting their age-old function in new ways.

Finally, Professor Wei Ha from Peking University argued that attracting talents among Chinese expatriates was one of the main features of its endeavor to build world class universities. By using demographic information and publication records of the first two cohorts of returnees sponsored by the “Young 1000 Talent” program, Professor Ha explored the factors that determine the performance of these returnees and their relative performances compared to those who decided not to return to their motherland.

After this last session, a short concluding session was held between Prof. Weifang Min, President of Chinese Society of Educational Development Strategy (CSEDS) and Honorary Dean of Graduate School of Education, Peking University, and Prof. Ann M. Arvin, Vice Provost of Stanford University. Prof. Jean C. Oi, Director of SCPKU, served as the chair. Conference speeches were briefly summarized, and a discussion on the implications for reforming higher education was engaged.
Beijing Forum 2016

China and Global Governance: The Role of International Organization and International Norms (I)

On the afternoon of 4th November 2016, the panel “China and Global Governance: The Role of International Organization and International Norms (I)” was held at the Banquet Hall of VILLA 5, Diaoyutai State Guest House.

This first half of the session was moderated by Professor Jia Qingguo, Dean of the School of International Studies at Peking University. He pointed out that a wide spectrum of theoretical issues ranging from the logic of international cooperation, international law and norms, international organizations and regimes, developmental assistance, and international humanitarian intervention would be discussed in the panel.

Mr. Enrico Letta, the Former Prime Minister of Italy and the Dean of the Paris School of International Affairs (PSIA) at Sciences Po in Paris, emphasized the role of G20 and UN and the utility of a multilateral system towards resolving global crises. He pointed out that global crises such as refugee migration has been threatening the existing international order, and the rise of nationalism, populism and protectionism with the deepening of globalization constitute another challenge. In this global context, reconstructing a multilateral governance system with sovereign states as units becomes increasingly necessary. Mr. Enrico Letta spoke highly of the role of China in G20 Hangzhou Summit and expressed his expectation for the performance of the new secretary general of UN in the campaign against global crises.

Dr. Laurel McFarland, the Executive Director of Network of Schools of Public Policy, Affairs and Admin and Professor Yang Kaifeng from Renmin University of China discussed measures to promote global cooperation in accreditation. Dr. McFarland noted that global cooperation in accreditation should focus central attention on the promotion of benign competition and effective cooperation between countries, the improvement of education quality and the problem-solving capacity of students instead of attaching undue importance to university rankings. Professor Yang Kaifeng compared the MPA education in China and that in the US, arguing that cooperation is the only option for attempts to address global issues. He also emphasized the importance of mutual
trust, communication and sharing for a win-win cooperation.

Cornell University professor Xu Xin gave a speech titled “China’s Rise as a Global Reformer: The Way to Global Governance”. He argued that China’s foreign policy in recent years was widely perceived as becoming increasingly assertive. While Deng Xiaoping’s post-Cold War dictum of tao guang yang hui (TGYH) remains in use, another part of the dictum you suo zuo wei (YSZW) was becoming more distinct since Xi Jinping assumed the top party-state leadership. One area that distinguishes Xi’s proactive diplomacy from the past practice is China’s new initiatives in global governance. Many of these diplomatic campaigns bear reformist tenets and Chinese characteristics and are set against the backdrop of China rise.

The second half of the session was moderated by Professor T. J. Pempel from the University of California, Berkeley.

Professor Zhang Xiaoming from Peking University gave a speech titled “China and Transition of International Norms”. He started by defining two key concepts: international society and international norms, and then analyzed tensions between China as a late comer and the western-dominated international society from the standpoint of China and the international norms. These conflicts, in his opinion, resulted from China’s historical memories, the Chinese-western divide, as well as different policy choices. He also proposed that as an emerging power, China has been playing an active role in the changes of international order.

Seung-Youn Oh from Bryn Mawr College shared her analysis of case studies of China’s WTO trade disputes in the automobile and wind turbine sectors. Through these studies, she asserted that China’s industrial policies stay ahead of WTO sanctions, and analyzed the extent to which the WTO has successfully integrated emerging economies like China into the existing international economic order.

Professor Jing Huang from National University of Singapore gave a speech titled “China, Rising by Integration into the International System”. He noted that China does not simply benefit from global governance during its rise, but also has made significant contribution to global governance. Currently, international economic integration and world multipolarization are challenges and opportunities for both China and global governance.
Professor Pan Chengxin gave a speech titled “China Challenge: A Global Governance Perspective”. He pointed out that, through the lens of conventional international politics and power transition theory, the rise of China was seen as the rise of another great power which is considered as a potential challenge to the existing international order and the global leadership of the US, and bringing about another Thucydides Trap. However, this viewpoint is both outdated and misguided. The rise of China was more likely a result of economic globalization and its domestic policies. To a large extent, its said challenge to the international order reflects profound changes, challenges, and paradoxes within that order itself. Neither problems of, nor solutions to, the said “China challenge” lie with China alone.

After the presentations, speakers and participants contributed actively their thinking on other theoretical issues such as the aim of global governance, the role of China, deglobalization and populism.
Beijing Forum 2016

China and Global Governance: The Role of International Organization and International Norms (II)

On the morning of November 5th, the panel “China and Global Governance: The Role of International Organization and International Norms (II)” opened in the Meeting Room No.2 of Yingjie Exchange Center at Peking University. The participants had an in-depth discussion on the issue of “International Organizations and Mechanisms: Nature, Roles and Challenges”.

The first half of the session was moderated by professor Amarjargal Rinchinnyam from University of Finance and Economics of Mongolia.

T. J. Pempel, professor of the University of California, Berkeley, delivered a speech titled “Institutions and the Contest Over East Asia’s Future Regional Order”. He pointed that in the aftermath of World War II, the United States led the establishment of numerous economic and security institutions, including the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. He further informed that other arrangements shaping developments in East Asia were security-focused products of the Cold War — the security alliance connecting America to its allies, as well as linking China to the DPRK. He therefore argued that the political-economic-security order across most of East Asia was a product of this matrix of global and regional arrangements. He cited sweeping array of new institutional arrangements illustrate the extent to which old Cold War bifurcations have been diminishing in finance and economics across East Asia. Security arrangements such as the ASEAN Regional Forum (AFR), the ASEAN Defense Ministers Meeting Plus (ADMM +) and the now dormant Six Party Talks (SPT), have been forged to deal with changes in state power and new security challenges. He however asserted that Cold War walls—real or imagined—remain divisive reminders of the diverging state visions of any ideal East Asian security order; in the interim powerful vestiges of the old order shape security relations. Finally, he stressed that the U.S. still maintains its critical influential power in Eastern Asia and globally.

Professor Wang Yizhou from Peking University delivered a speech titled “China and International Institution”. He pointed out that the history of China’s involvement with the world order has three phases. In the first phase, he explained that China acted as a revolutionary in 1960s, during which time China took the leadership with other developing countries in confrontation
against the system of Western bloc. In the second phase, he outlined that China acted as an engine of world trade. Upon the emergence of open and reform policy in China from late 1970s, China’s economy had raised dramatically, currently ranking the second largest economic entity in the world. Finally, in the third phase, he argued that China shows its proactive role of global player in global governance in 21st century. He further indicated that China has shifted from a free-rider to a more active creator in the international affairs becoming a constructor for the global governance rather than a destroyer. Additionally, he stressed that although China’s rising arouses security dilemma in East Asia, China is not willing to change any existing international norms and rules since he argues, China will provide more global and regional public goods which will benefit both Chinese national interests and global peace and development.

Professor Zhao Suisheng from University of Denver gave a speech titled “China and the Evolving New World Order: The Rule-taker, Rule-Maker or Rule-Breaker”. Professor Zhao pointed out that, China’s rapid rise has raised the question of whether China is accepting the current world order, or is acting as a challenger. He argued that although China is not content to simply preserve and follow this existing order, it has not yet developed any extreme discontent, nor is it currently aiming to destroy this existing world order. He further asserted that not only is China far from the position to overtake the US power, it has not articulated distinctive values to underwrite the world order. Additionally, he pointed out that with a historical identity as an East Asian empire, China’s visions of a Sino-centered hierarchical order or tianxia (all under heaven) system have been rejected by many of its neighbors. He therefore stressed that embracing the Westphalian principles of the state sovereignty while adapting to the emerging transnational norms, China is a reformist/revisionist power, dissatisfied not with the current order but its position in the order. Finally, he suggested that if China’s demands can be accommodated through negotiations with the US and other powers to increase China’s voice and weight in the existing institutions and adjustment to tweaking of some rules, China would not necessarily become a revolutionary power.

Professor Zhao Suisheng from University Denver moderated the second half of the session.

Professor Mine Yoichi from Doshisha University spoke of the concept of human security as a newly emerging standard. He explained that the human security approach provides us with a framework in which negative and positive freedoms, civil liberties and social rights, as well as group rights can be reconciled and developed in an integrative way. He further argued that the relationship between human security and human development is like that between light and shadow.
To start with, he outlined that human security requires us to listen carefully to the voices of the most disadvantaged people who are exposed to serious risks and live in extreme poverty. Lastly, he stressed that human security may not be a universal theorem that explains every aspect of human life, but still can be a powerful lighthouse, which illuminates critical aspects of human society in a constant state of change.

Zhang Yun, professor of National Niigata University, talked about “Regional International Organization and Regional Governance”. He said there were three key points of ASEAN’s perception toward international order and its external relations. First, the linkage between domestic order and international order; second, ASEAN’s core expectation toward regional governance is ASEAN’s internal solidarity; third, the difference of the perception toward international order between ASEAN and great powers. He concluded that ASEAN had played an important role as a regional governance provider by stabilizing the Southeast Asian sub-region and facilitating dialogues with and among major powers. He finally argued that whether ASEAN could continue this role would depend on what extent the new consensus and understanding of international order perception could be reached among ASEAN and among China-ASEAN-U.S.

Professor Shang-Eung Ha from Sogang University talked about how two dimensions of national identity—civic and ethnic—were associated with South Koreans’ attitudes toward North Korean defectors and their opinions on the relationship between the two Koreas. She introduced a survey that showed that individuals high on ethnic identity were more likely to harbor negative attitudes toward migrants from North Korea and less likely to believe that the reunification between two Koreas is necessary. The findings suggested that alleged common belief in “one nation, two countries” and undeniable ethno-cultural similarities between North and South Koreans notwithstanding, political division for the past six decades had led South Koreans to regard North Korea and her citizens as an out-group, which was not clearly distinguishable from non-ethnic immigrants.

The participants raised a number of pointed questions during the discussion that followed the presentations. A general debate took place on a wide range of issues encompassing the U.S presidential election and the possible changes of U.S foreign policy, Sino-U.S relations, Sino-ASEAN relations, China and global norms relations, culture and international relations, non-traditional security, and UN and international security norms.
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China and Global Governance: The Role of International Organization and International Norms (III)

On the afternoon of November 5th, the panel “China and Global Governance: The Role of International Organization and International Norms (III)” opened in the Meeting Room No.2 of Yingjie exchange Center at Peking University. The participants had an in-depth discussion on the issue of “Developmental Assistance”.

The first half of the session was moderated by professor Wang Yizhou from Peking University.

In the topic “Neo South-South Cooperation,” Prof. Li Xiaoyun from China Agriculture University argued that there are new trends in south-south cooperation. She pointed that some countries, such as China, Singapore, develop much faster than others and added that south-south cooperation is a unique experience of development. She mentioned that the trade and technology cooperation contribute more cooperation models for the process and argued that the south-south cooperation is more important than the south-north cooperation. He asserted that China and India are more efficient on the decision-making process than the U.S. and stressed that contemporary south-south cooperation is also institutionalized, for example, the rise of AIIB and Bricks Bank. Those institutions transform south-south cooperation into a new period.

Professor Yasushi Katsuma from Waseda University gave a lecture on “Rethinking Global Health Governance: Lessons Learned from the Ebola Outbreak in West Africa.” He reviewed the transmission of Ebola in West Africa and the subsequent actions taken by local and international actors. He stated his own answers to the two research questions: Why couldn’t the WHO declare a Public Health Emergency of International Concern (PHEIC) sooner? What promoted the establishment of UN Mission for Ebola Emergency Response (UNMEER)? Lastly, he made some proposals in order to improve global health governance.

Professor Li Anshan from Center for African Studies at Peking University gave a speech on “Technology Transfer in China-Africa Relations.” For the different views of technology transfer(TT) in China-Africa relations, Professor Li took a historical approach and illustrated different notions and types of it. He pointed out that the purpose and function of TT is changing with the times and there is much room for improvement in TT of the present in order to achieve mutual benefits. He
argued that some Chinese companies have realized the importance of TT. He further stressed that technology transfers in a wider range as well as the higher technology transfer are expected.

Dr. Niels Hanh from London College deliver a speech on “Global Governance and Projection of Power: China-Africa-US Relations.” Dr. Hanh focused on the relationship between China and Africa and the responses from the U.S. The West labeled China’s development in Africa as neo-colonialism. However, Dr. Hanh pointed out that according to the official documents released by U.S. government, U.S government severally carried out secret operations, such as coups, in Africa in 1960-1970s’. The U.S. now exports democracy to Africa. He argued that The U.S. manipulates human rights ideology, NGOs even presidential elections in Africa. On the other hand, he stressed that China’s principal non-interference of foreign policy promotes the friend relations between China and Africa but challenges the West’s interest in this region. He further argued that if the notion of Western neo-colonialism continues to be marginalised or ignored in mainstream Western literature and dominant media, it will be difficult for most people in the West to understand the underlying political and economic tensions between Western powers and African states.

Professor Zhao Quansheng from American University moderated the second half of the session.

Prof. Xia from Peking University analyzed the relationship among international collective, capital flows and Belt and Road Initiative through game theory. According to Prof. Xia’s model, those developing countries are short of enough infrastructure and market which drags the local economic growth. Prof. Xia pointed that China is becoming the biggest consumer market in the world and therefore, it can not only can help those countries to improve their infrastructure, but also provide its the huge demotic market as well.

Alison Gillwald, professor from University of Cape Town of South Africa gave his report on “The Political Economy of the Internet Governance: Why Africa is Absent” and explained the limited or uneven participation of African stakeholders in both decision-making and non-decision making fora of Internet governance. He regarded this as an outcome of late capitalism characterized by globalization and uneven development. He adopted a political economy approach to identify the underlying power relations in the Internet system. He proposed that global governance frameworks operating on the basis of consensus can hold all countries to minimum universal standards, which is also required to safeguard the vitality of the Internet and ensure its continuous expansion.
Professor Liu Haifang from Peking University gave her speech on “From Bandung Spirit to New Silk Road: China and Afro-Asian Connection”. She noted that Afro-Asian Connection is not only a friend tradition between China and Africa, but also a human feeling as well. She further pointed that many Africa scholars argue that China should bring Bandung Spirit back to today while Several Chinese scholars are conducting research on “Silk Road and East Africa” and African scholars are re-writing African history. She argued that much of Chinese and African literature expressed their friendly relations and stressed that this connection tradition can further promote can further promote Sino-Afro friendly relations.

The participants raised a number of pointed questions during the discussion that followed the presentations. A general debate took place on a wide range of issues encompassing the political and economic development in Africa, China’s role in African development, the role of BRICs Bank in Africa, Ebola disease, and African regional cooperation.
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China and Global Governance: The Role of International Organization and International Norms (IV)

On the morning of November 6th, 2016, the panel “China and Global Governance: The Role of International Organization and International Norms (IV)” opened in the Meeting Room No.2 of Yingjie Exchange Center at Peking University. The participants had an in-depth discussion on the issue of “International Humanitarian Intervention.”

The session was moderated by Mr. Enrico Letta, the Former Prime Minister of Italy and the Dean of the Paris School of International Affairs (PSIA) at Sciences Po in Paris.

Dr. Fay King Chung from Women’s University in Africa, lectured on the topic “Rights and Responsibilities under International Norms”. She pointed out that we inherited a divided world characterized by regional conflicts, developmental gap and ideological and religious differences, of which the foundations are quite complex making resolutions difficult to work out but still possible. She explained that the evolutionary trajectory of the scope of fundamental rights of human beings stipulated by 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights in the 20th Century and Challenges emerged in the present global situation. She therefore argued that this attached great importance to the utility of well-crafted international institutions in human rights protection, the critical role of governments in establishing and prioritizing human rights, and the function of international organization in providing a measuring rod for diverse political and legal systems where one size for all.

Professor Zhao Quansheng from American University started with an analysis of the developmental trajectory of the historical legacy of Confucianism and the social basis for its revival in contemporary China in his speech on “Confucianism and China Foreign Policy.” He introduced how key concepts of Confucianism such as the Thoughts of Tianxia and the Tribute System have influenced the ideas of contemporary domestic and foreign policies of China such as the emphasis on harmony, order and non-intervention of internal affairs, and the establishment of Confucius Institutes abroad. He also discussed the debates between several prominent scholars in China on the compatibility of Confucianism with mainstream values of western countries and the political influence of Confucianism on Japan, South Korea and other East Asian countries.
Professor Jia Qingguo, Dean of the School of International Studies, gave a speech on “Reflection on ‘Responsibilities to Protect’”, sharing with participants his viewpoints on the responsibilities of states to protect citizens and the rights of international community to intervene when a state fails to fulfill such responsibility. He pointed out that the legitimacy and importance of international intervention at the existence of severe humanitarian crises such as genocide and war crimes has become a worldwide consensus. He however argued that relevant issues such as the circumstances for international intervention, the adjudicator of the existence of such circumstances, the responsibility of intervention and necessary means lacks a uniform criterion, which, has partly accounted for the unsatisfactory record of intervention in past decades. Given this context, he stressed that experts, officials in international organizations and governments should cooperate and work out a holistic, concrete institutional framework to foster desirable changes.

After the presentations, speakers and other participants raised a number of pointed questions. A general debate took place on theoretical issues including but not limited to the human rights issues reflected in the land ownership of Zimbabwe, the compatibility of Confucianism with democratic values, the “Asian way” in humanitarian intervention, the concept of a state’s “Responsibility to Protect” and the criteria for its application.
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Ecological Security and Ecological Urbanism: International Experience and the China Experiment (I)

On the afternoon of Nov. 4th, Beijing Forum (2016), the sub-forum "Ecological Security and Ecological Urbanism", held its first session at the China Hall of Lakeview Hotel. The theme report was on "Eco-Urbanism Connotation". The sub-forum was hosted by Prof. Kongjian Yu from Peking University and Prof. Gareth Doherty from Harvard University School of Design.

Wang Guangtao, former Minister of the Ministry of Construction and Chairman of the Eleventh NPC Environmental and Resources Protection Committee and an academician of the International Eurasian Academy of Sciences, introduced his keynote report entitled "Urban Ecological Protection and Restoration - Legal Protection and Technical Support". He introduced several eco-city pilot works including the building energy efficiency and green building work of Xinjiang Turpan demonstration area. To better understand the Chinese government's urban development requirements, he carried out several ecological performance evaluation studies and used system theory to study urban ecological protection and restoration. Based on his findings, he stressed the importance of adhering to legal protection and technical support to achieve the protection and restoration of urban ecology.

Professor Barry Bergdoll, from Columbia University and a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, talked about how city designs in the modern era often involve human control over natural resources and grand transformation of landscapes to provide social amenities such as providing cities with clean running water. He further argued that as the world today is faced by the dual phenomenon of rising sea levels and growing shortages of fresh water for human use, a new approach to the urban reality of the 21st century is imperative. He stressed that there is need to develop means of crafting the urban cities in dialogue with nature.

Professor Eva Castro from UK AA Architectural Institute and the United Kingdom Plasma Chief Designer gave a keynote report focused on "The Origin of the Radical Nature." She talked about her interests in architecture and landscape design. She pointed out that her interest in geometry and mechanics was increasingly turning to ecological considerations, as her design
practices increased. She presented several design projects to illustrate her "radical nature" design concept, "perfect neighborhood" concept and "green fingers".

Professor Vladan Babovic, from the National University of Singapore, shared his intuitive formula on “Sustainable Cities = 1/(Water × Energy × Temperature) Climate Change”. Singapore, which is a small country with the most serious water crisis in the world, faces rapid urbanization where more than half of the population lives in the city. He stressed the seriousness of the water problem in urbanization and introduced how to use the ecological technology to solve this problem. Professor Babovic presented the latest technological achievements, which his team of scientists at the National University of Singapore have experimented with a large number of new eco-storm water technologies in the laboratory.

Under the auspices of the breakout presidents, the four keynote speeches were discussed in depth and questions from the audiences were answered in detail.
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Ecological Security and Ecological Urbanism: International Experience and the China Experiment (II)

On the morning of Nov. 5th, the second session of Sub-forum "Ecological Security and Ecological Urbanism" was held in the Chinese Hall of Lakeview Hotel. Stephen Ervin, deputy director of the Department of Information Technology at the Harvard School of Design, served as the president for this division. Due to bad weather, Charles Waldheim, professor of Harvard University School of Design could not make it to this morning’s session. Academic leaders on this topic expressed the hope to promote eco-environment through eco-city construction.

Gareth Doherty, professor of Harvard University School of Design, proposed that ecology, at its core, is the study of the interaction of organisms with one another and with their environment. He further noted that ecological urbanism depicted these relationships as social, cultural, economic, aesthetic, and environmental. He therefore stressed that it is essential to consider the multiple ecologies of a given area as we speculated on urban futures. Additionally, he argued that designing and planning cities in ways that are more ecological required us to find ways to better understand and measure these various ecologies. The presentation discussed some of the work of the Ecological Urbanism Collaboration, an initiative between Harvard GSD and PKU, which is developing a collaborative method for the measurement and projection of ecological urbanism in a Chinese context.

Stephen Al, associate professor of Urban Design at the University of Pennsylvania, gave a keynote presentation entitled "Contemporary Urban Sustainability and Urban Form". Al's speech featured some "high-risk communities" around the United States, such as Las Vegas, where the so-called "casino capitalism" city is a severely water-deprived desert city. He noted that Macao, Singapore and other places of urban construction enumerated this similar situation. In response to these situations, Al introduced the city's urban development model, which included urban density and population density, public transport and pedestrian zone design, block layout, and sunshine and lighting, through his participation in the "Metro Transport and Real Estate" project in Hong Kong. Finally, he presented his ongoing research project, "Cities Faced with Sea-Level Rise," which involved Shanghai, Guangzhou and Shanghai, three major cities in China. He informed that
rising sea levels was one of the major current urbanization process critical issues and needed further investigation and research.

Rojas Luis Vallejo, professor of Harvard University School of Design and founder of Urban Ecology Architecture Design Agency of Madrid, Spain, gave a speech titled "Network Urbanism". He mentioned that cities were first developed to support basic human activities, but gradually transformed into complex, evolving, living laboratories, where socio-environmental relations were currently being redefined. In this context, and with over half of the world's population now living in urban areas, he argued that there could be no single solution to environmental, social, or economic challenges. Instead, he informed that the multilayered contemporary experience demanded a more holistic approach to designing cities. He further asserted that designers need to pay attention to the multiple forces at play in the construction of the territory and its institutions, as well as the redefinition of the operational processes of architecture, landscape, and urban design practice and research. Finally, he stressed that it is necessary to be aware of our socio-environmental responsibility and promote emergent collaborative forms of government, linking municipal thinking, urban policy, education, and civic engagement.

Wang Zhifang, associate professor of School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture of Peking University, asked the participants to ponder on this thought provoking question: "Is China developing towards eco-urbanism?" Wang Zhifang first used Professor Charles Waldheim’s definition of "eco-urbanism" as an important reference standard for discussion. After that, Wang Zhifang used a series of data to compare Chinese and foreign cities, and pointed out that China's top-down decision-making model and those from the West had a huge difference. She argued that policy-making at a considerable extent determines the process of urban development and direction of China and concluded that the process of ecological urbanism in China must be unique. Wang Zhifang introduced her newly published book, "Hundred Flowers Blossom," which introduces the history of contemporary Chinese landscape and pointed out how "landscape", as a by-product of urbanization, played an important impact on the Chinese way of life and economic development. Finally, she pointed out that China is facing the most serious environmental problems with a very fragile ecosystem and the most rapid process of urbanization in the world. She therefore stressed that we should not waste too much time analyzing the practice of eco-urbanism, but should instead use it in practice as soon as possible. This she argues will help establish an ecological red line to
promote eco-cities in the process of urbanization in both the cities and rural areas.

Under the auspices of the breakout presidents, the four keynote speeches were discussed in depth and answered questions from the audiences. After the meeting, the guests were also guided by Gareth Doherty and Hannes Zander, a researcher at Peking University and Harvard University's Eco-city Cooperation Laboratory. They finally went to the second teaching building to watch the "China City Comparison" photo exhibition.
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Ecological Security and Ecological Urbanism: International Experience and the China Experiment (III)

On the afternoon of Nov. 5th, Beijing Forum (2016), the sub-forum "Ecological Security and Ecological Urbanism", began the last theme report on "Eco-Urbanism in Practice" in the China Hall of Lakeview Hotel. Li Dihua, associate Professor of Architecture and Landscape Design of PKU hosted the lecture.

Alvaro Rojas, member of the Scientific Committee of the World Architecture Congress, gave a presentation on Costa Rican music before the start of the lecture, which led to the opening of a keynote report entitled "Essential Buildings" with ease. He introduced the natural environment of Costa Rica and the capital city of San Jose, and then cited the famous American designer Michael Sorkin on the definition of "sustainable building" and showed his view of architecture "critical localism". In introducing his "essential building" concept, he was mainly concerned about the tropical countries and cities from his life experience and design practice, especially the situation in Costa Rica. He strongly pointed out that Costa Rica's architectural design must be "tropical" because Costa Rica is a tropical country, stressing the need for architecture to be compatible with the local natural and cultural conditions, rather than in vain to add a lot of modernist decoration. He later on introduced the architectural and landscape design project in the El Rodeo community, emphasizing the importance of adaptability, flexibility, cost control and public participation.

Philippe Rham, chief architect of Philippe Rham Architects, gave a lecture entitled "Climate Project: Buildings in the Age of Sustainable Development", focusing on the architects' offices in Copenhagen, Denmark and the park in Kaohsiung. He pointed out that in the past, architecting designs were based on climatic conditions where designers built comfortable, healthy buildings based on local climate. However, he argues that in the 20th century, with the intensification of climate change such as global warming and the depletion of energy, people must make corresponding adjustments in architectural design in order to achieve the control of greenhouse gas emissions through green building design. He stressed that this is the era of sustainable development and of the correct choice of architectural design.

Stephen Cairns, Professor of ETH Zurich and FCL Founder, delivered a keynote speech
on "Urban and Rural Ecology of Asian Cities in the Future", focusing on the relevant research projects conducted by Singapore Future Labs. He first introduced the diverse research background of FCL research members and using the UN-issued process of urbanization curve, he showed that the elements of urbanization could not be ignored. He pointed out that urbanization was not a completely urban-centered issue, but should also focus on and study the rural areas, such as food security. He explained that Future urban laboratories worldwide used large-scale data to study global urban belts. They found that in Indonesia's West Java region, crop production, urban construction, and population density were traditionally associated with traditional urban and rural definitions and therefore chose to carry out the project of "Tropical Town" there. He mentioned that they achieved good results, reshaping a new type of urban and rural form which can adapt to the local economy, culture and ecological environment in a sustainable way. Cairns pointed out that the project was also showing good growth, and he hoped that the experience could be spread around the world.

Tom Verebes, a visiting scholar at the University of Pennsylvania, proposed the theme "Cities, Nature and Adaptive Cities." He first compared the mechanization of the city from the thirties, which featured rigid and unadaptable city models to the twenty-first century with frequent hurricanes, earthquakes, tsunamis and other natural disasters. He then combined with his ocean CN (Ocean CN) design team in the design practice of Osaka, China and Shenzhen, introducing the development trend of the new intelligent eco-city with high adaptability. He also briefed the participants on his own book, "Master Plan: Adaptive City", which provided a comprehensive introduction to how to develop a general rule for heterogeneous cities through a computer model in the context of rapid urbanization.

Stephen Ervin, deputy director of information design at the Harvard Graduate School of Design, made the final keynote speech on the theme "The City is not a Tree, but ...." He pointed out that the tree in this book is not a tree with leaves but an abstract structure, whose structure he uses to contrast with a more complex structure, the half-lattice structure. Using these two structures, Ervin combed a series of changes in the understanding of urban morphology, while introducing more image metaphors to describe the new development of contemporary cities, such as the network, forest and so on. He finally concluded that the city is neither a tree nor a simple tree structure, but landscape designers can still learn a lot from the "tree" on the eco-city design philosophy.

Five guests also discussed on ecological crisis, eco-city design practice and other issues in-depth discussion hosted by Li Dihua.
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China’s Growing Role in Economic Globalization (I)

At 14:00 on November 4th, the panel “China’s Growing Role in Economic Globalization”, the Economy sub-forum of Beijing Forum 2016, was inaugurated in the Four Seasons Hall, the 10th Building, Diaoyutai State Guest House. The session was divided into 2 parts, and chaired respectively by Professor Yu Miaojie and Professor Yao Yang both from National School of Development at Peking University. Altogether seven speakers gave talks in this session, including Professor Yao Yang, Professor Taiji Furusawa from Hitotsubashi University, Professor Zhang Weiyqing from Peking University, Professor Yan Weilong from Nanjing Audit University, Professor Li Ling from Peking University, Professor Lee Keun from Seoul National University, and Professor Yu Miaojie.

First, professor Yao Yang delivered the speech, “Fixed Exchange Rate Regimes, the Balassa-Samuelson effect and Economic Growth”. Through modeling analysis and empirical analysis, Professor Yao demonstrated that with trade surpluses, the output and tradable sector’s employment grows faster under the fixed exchange rate regimes.

Professor Taiji Furusawa from Japan gave a talk on “The Economic Impact of the TPP: What Have We Learned from CGE Simulation?”. Through computable general equilibrium model, he analyzed the impacts of TPP on member countries and non-member countries. He finds that the total gains on member countries from TPP trade liberalization would be $15 billion in the medium-run and $38 billion in the long-run. However, TPP trade liberalization may have a little negative effect on China’s economy.

Professor Zhang Weiyqing from Peking University delivered his speech on “Globalization and Entrepreneurship”. He argued that globalization had been a major driving force of world economic growth as well as China. In addition, the entrepreneurship was also the key driver of economic growth. Unfortunately, however, existing literature focused too much on the effect of government policy and bilateral and multi-lateral agreements on globalization, while the role of entrepreneurs was not emphasized, for which the mainstream economics should be blamed.

Professor Yan Weilong from Nanjing Audit University gave a talk on “Auditing in China”. He
especially introduced the institutional background and governance logic of government auditing in China. In his opinion, government auditing in China played an important role in controlling economic risks as well as enabling benign interaction among government, market and society.

Professor Li Ling delivered the speech of “The Feature of Chinese Revolution Road and China’s Role”. She believed that Chinese revolution road featured social revolution before economic revolution and economic construction promoted by social construction. After the establishment of New China, the Chinese government made the utmost of its ability to mobilize people, and launched “Health Revolution” and “Educational Revolution”. All these efforts succeeded in realizing a relatively high life expectancy and a low illiteracy rate when the country was faced with a comparatively low income level. Thanks to that, China managed to accumulate valuable human capital, and laid a good foundation for economic growth after the reform and open. Neither an effective government nor an efficient market should be dispensable if China were to walk on a new path of development.

Professor Lee Keun from Seoul National University shared his thesis “Industrial Catch-up in China: A Sectoral Systems of Innovation Perspective”. In this study, he focused on five economic sectors. Compared with Korea, China witnessed a strong rise in mobile phone industry, a slow pursuit in auto industry, but still some pace with Korea’s semiconductor industry. He found that in developing countries, industrial sectors with a high speed of technological updating grew faster, while those with a low speed usually had more trouble catching up with and surpassing their counterparts in developed countries. Meanwhile, the industrial policies established by government had different impacts on various industrial sectors.

In the end, professor Yu Miaojie from Peking University shared his thesis “Outward FDI and Domestic Input Distortions: Evidence from Chinese Firms”.

After speeches given by the seven professors, scholars present and other participants launched a heated discussion on the topics like economic globalization, the choice of exchange rate regime and industrial policy. The strong academic atmosphere brought the session in the afternoon to a successful close.
Beijing Forum 2016
China’s Growing Role in Economic Globalization (II)  
(Session A)

On the morning of November 5th, the Economic Session IIA “China’s Growing Role in Economic Globalization” of Beijing Forum 2016 was held in Meeting Room No.3, Yingjie Exchange Center, Peking University. The session was divided into 2 parts and respectively chaired by Professor Huang Yiping from National School of Development at Peking University and Professor Laszlo Halpern from Hungarian Academy of Science. The seven speakers of this session included Professor Kevin Salyer from University of California, Professor Yas Todo from Waseda University, Professor Huang Yi from Geneva Institute of Graduate, Professor Huang Yiping, Professor Peter Morrow from University of Toronto, Professor Wang Yong from Peking University, and Professor Laszlo Halpern.

Professor Kevin Salyer introduced his research on modeling risk shocks. Within the context of a financial accelerator model, his team modeled time-varying uncertainty (i.e. risk shocks) through the use of a mixture Normal model with time variation in the weights applied to the underlying distributions characterizing entrepreneur productivity. Specifically, they modeled the capital producers (i.e. the entrepreneurs) as either low-risk (relatively small second moment for productivity) and high-risk (relatively large second moment for productivity) and the fraction of both types is time-varying. He demonstrated that a small change in the fraction of risky types (a change from 1% to 2% of the population) can result in a large quantitative effect of a risk shock relative to standard models. The bankruptcy rate and the risk premium in the economy are very sensitive to a change in the composition of agents and are countercyclical.

Professor Yas Todo gave a presentation about globalization of Chinese firms in transactions, capital ownership, and patent holding within the network framework based on the evidence from large-scale firm-level data around the globe. He demonstrated that Chinese firms are well globalized with high PageRank despite low degrees in supply chains and shareholding networks. He further argued that the coexistence of clustered ties and diversified ties as well as R&D collaborations with foreign firms is very important. He pointed that the Chinese government plays a significant role in supply chains and shareholding networks as the government has many ties with different types of firm and foreign firms.
Professor Huang Yi took a trans-currency perspective to the real and financial effects of bond issuances based on the evidence from Chinese non-financial firms. He investigated bond issuance by non-financial firms in China and examined a firm's currency choice between the local and foreign currency in order to study the real and financial effects. He demonstrated that firms with higher leverage, lower profit margin and no foreign cash flow, as well as state-owned firms, are more likely to use dollar-denominated bonds. He explained that the hedging and financial intermediation behavior of those firms exposed to dollar liquidity is very common. He further argued that dollar bond issuances are negatively related to firm value, investment rating, and indicators of firm performance and positively correlated with inter-firm loans, representing financial intermediation activity of non-financial companies. He observed that strikingly, dollar bond issuing firms with weaker corporate governance, no investment grade rating and no foreign cash will extend more inter-firm loans. He finally stressed that there are severe financial risks due to currency mismatch, shadow banking activities, and the spillover effect of global dollar liquidity.

Professor Huang Yiping introduced his topic on “China Pioneering Digital Inclusive Finance”. He noted that digital finance has experienced a boom since 2013 and it is doubling every year which is mainly driven by the young people. He further discussed the courses for the development of digital finance in three main aspects: the shortages of traditional finance, the improvement of Internet technology and the inclusive regulation for Internet finance. He mentioned that big data analysis is used to agents’ micro financial activities, which has reduced the investigation cost a lot. He finally hoped that the digital finance can develop well to satisfy almost everyone’s need and provide convenience for them.

Professor Peter Morrow presented his talk on “Tariffs and the Organization of Trade in China” by examining the impact of China’s falling import tariffs on the organization of its exports between ordinary and processing trade. He commented that these trade forms differ in terms of tariff treatment and the ability of firms to sell on the domestic market. At the industry level, he observed that falling input tariffs cause the share of ordinary trade in gross exports to increase, with both the intensive and extensive margins playing roles. He further argued that the choice of trade form is tied to a lesser degree to the size of the domestic market, which processing firms cannot access. Consistent with the literature, he finally showed that changes in the organization of trade linked to input tariff cuts caused the share of Chinese domestic content in gross exports to increase at the industry-province level.
Professor Wang Yong gave a speech entitled “Trade and Non-Convergence of Middle Income Countries”. He built a three-country general equilibrium model with trade and technology diffusion to illustrate how mid-income countries can be sandwiched by poorer countries that chase from behind and richer countries that press from front. He argued that the chasing effect conditionally exists and is never effective in both intensive and extensive margins simultaneously. In contrast, he asserted that the pressing effect is always active in the intensive margin but only conditionally active in the extensive margin. He noted that empirical evidence supports this model mechanism. He emphasized that in the globalization process, we should assess the performance of a country with both what it does inside and outside the country taken into consideration. He finally stressed that a middle-income country should optimally allocate resources between boosting productivities of incumbent variances and enhancing the learning of new varieties, depending on the behaviors of its trade partners.

Finally, Professor Laszlo Halpern talked about products, jobs and firms in light of economic globalization. He noted that supply-chain trade has made profound changes affecting the structure of participating economies. Product-level competition effects are to be disentangled into price and non-price components. He explained that a country is able to cope with competitors if non-price components are enough to compensate for the loss of price competitiveness. He further added that export performance is strongly connected to price quality ratio. He however cited that the export of luxury products and branded products by advanced economies seems to behave differently and more resistant to competition from emerging economies. He additionally informed that labor markets in advanced economies are confronted with massive job polarization where it is assumed to be explained by the recent technological change which is biased toward replacing labor in routine tasks. He concisely explained that in advanced economies middle-wage jobs were losing their employment shares and low and high paid jobs were rising. He noted some specific jobs exposed to import competition, e.g. machine operators, are less demanded compared to those non-exposed to import competition. He argued that tougher competition induces a downward shift in the distribution of markups across products, and increases the relative market share of the better performing products. He further clarified that this leads to better performance and higher productivity at firm level. He finally stressed that protectionist policies are counterproductive, and specifically targeted policies are needed to cope with the globalization challenges in both advanced and emerging economies.
Beijing Forum 2016
China’s Growing Role in Economic Globalization (II)
(Session B)

On the morning of Nov 5th, the Parallel Session IIB of the panel session “China’s Growing Role in Economic Globalization” of Beijing Forum 2016 was held in Meeting Room No.4, Yingjie Exchange Center, Peking University. The session was divided into two parts. Eight speakers gave their talks, including Professor Tao Zhigang and Qiu Dongxiao from the University of Hong Kong, Professor Tomohiko Inui from Gakushuin University (Japan), Professor Antonio Rodriguez-Lopez from University of California, Irvine, Professor Kia-yiu Wong from University of Washington, Professor Lili Yan Ing from Economic Research Institute for ASEAN and East Asia (ERIA) and Professor Zhang Jianhua from Huazhong University of Science and Technology. Professor Qiu and Professor Zhang chaired the two parts of the session.

Professor Tao’s talk focused on the influence of trade liberalization with China on U.S. elections. He employed variations of tariff rates across industries and used difference-in-difference and regression discontinuity design to evaluate the effects. His results showed that counties exposed to the change in US trade policy with China exhibited larger increases in turnout, the share of voters cast for Democrats and the probability that a Democrat represents the county in the mid-2000 elections. He also found that Democrats were more likely to support anti-trade and pro-economic-assistance legislation, especially after the 2001 surge in US imports from China and decline in manufacturing employment.

Professor Tomohiko evaluated the effects of Japanese customer firms’ overseas outsourcing on supplier firms’ performance. He and his coauthor combined the financial information of Japan’s manufacturing firms with buyer-seller network information. Using this unique dataset, they could investigate the differences in productivity and markups of suppliers whose customers are importer or non-importer. To overcome potential selection problem in estimation, they employed propensity score matching with DID estimation. They found that suppliers whose customers start to import from foreign countries experienced a decrease in markups, productivity and sales. However, the change of employment and wage were not necessary.

Professor Antonio gave a presentation entitled “Job Flows and All-Around Trade
Liberalization: Theory and Evidence from China”. Based on a Melitz-type model, he derived the theoretical predictions of change of firms’ jobs as responses of trade liberalization. The model predicted firms with high productivity would create more jobs while low productive firms would destroy jobs. His analysis of Chinese manufacturing data supported the predictions. He also found firms are more responsive to changes in domestic final-good tariffs than to changes in input tariffs or external final-good tariffs. All types of firms responded similarly to changes in domestic output tariff. By contrast, a decline in external tariffs benefits employment in pure processing firms most and most of the employment action after a decline in input tariffs occurs in importing firms.

Professor Qiu made a comprehensive survey of China’s global influence through the lens of international trade. He presented detailed quantitative description of China’s presence in global trade, impacts of China’s trade on China and impacts of China’s trade on other countries. He noted that China’s trade value and its share in global trade has experienced a fast growth since 1990s. Meanwhile, China also has become the one of the most important trading partners of U.S., Europe and other Asian countries. He further outlined that capital goods, intermediate goods and raw materials are the major part of China’s import while consumer goods are the largest part of China’s exports. China’s trade contributed its growth of GDP as well as increases in wage and income inequality. He pointed out that previous research has found evidence that China’s export led to a decline of employment of US manufacturing and an increase of US’s income inequality. He observed a heterogeneous effect on other Asian countries. He further added that China’s trade growth has led to industry upgrading of Latin American countries. On the whole, he stressed that China’s trade has a positive effect on the rest world.

Professor Wong talked about China’s excess capacity and export. Excess capacity has been one of the hottest topics in China. He made a distinction between supply-side excess capacity and demand-side excess capacity. As one of the main industry thought to be in excess capacity, the steel industry of China has expanded at a quite fast speed. He pointed out that the export of steel industry has also experienced a large increase since 1990s while the import is more volatile. He therefore argued that the Chinese government’s major job to do is to derive an optimal capacity and help firms to produce the optimal output level. China’s excess capacity is driven by both supply-side and demand-side factors. On the supply side, there has been overinvestment in production of many Chinese firms. On the demand side, many countries have not fully recovered from global financial
crisis in 2008 and the demand for steel is low.

Professor Ing analyzed the effect of quality competition from China on the productivity of Indonesian firms. Combined China’s export products and Indonesia firms’ data, she and her coauthor constructed a measure of product quality. As main findings, she found an increase in quality of imported products from China could improve Indonesian firms’ productivity through a pro-competitive effect, both in domestic market and export markets. She stressed that for Indonesian exporters, the effect of quality competition from China in export market is more pronounced than in the domestic market.

Professor Zhang explored the connection among income level, income gap and independent innovation. He constructed a patent race model including demand-driven and technology-driven factors. He found that income level and income gap would affect the innovation behavior of domestic and FDI enterprises dissimilarly in different stages of economic development. Income gap, proportion of basic research investment, level of economic development, R&D investment, human capital quality and number of researchers’ input have a significant effect on the innovation of domestic enterprises in turn. He thus concluded that the government needed to adopt both demand-driven and technology-driven policies to improve the independent innovation capability and implement the innovation-driven development strategy to cross the middle-income trap.

After the presentations, audiences provided their insightful comments and presenters gave their responses.
On the afternoon of Nov. 5th, Group A's seven scholars gave their presentations on China's Growing Role in Economic Globalization at the Beijing Forum.

Frederic Warzynski, from Aarhus University, gave his presentation on “Physical Productivity and Exceptional Exporter Performance: Evidence from a Chinese Production Survey.” His joint work with Yao Amber Li and Valerie Smeets investigated in particular the role of pricing heterogeneity in relation with one important characteristic of Chinese manufacturing - processing trade. They combined three datasets: NBSC firm-level accounting data reporting revenue-based information on inputs and outputs of production, the Chinese Customs data and the NBSC firm-product level survey that contains physical output quantity information. They found several interesting findings. First, in the Chinese footwear and apparel industry, exporters are not less efficient. They price differently, and have lower TFPR but higher TFPQ. Second, processing trade explains part of the puzzle, but not all. Third, in other more domestically oriented (beer and rice) industries, the pricing bias does not necessarily go in the same direction.

Edwin Lai, from Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, presented his paper on “Fragmentation and Domestic Value-Added in Gross Exports.” His joint work with Steffan (Han) QI discovered the following findings. First, the DVAR(Domestic Value-added Ratio) of each exporting country for each sector increases with, and is largely determined by, the exporting country’s domestic intermediate goods share for producing the good and the value-added share in production of the good in the exporting country. Second, for any given sector, a country with lower labor cost, less access to foreign intermediate goods or higher technology level in producing the intermediate goods for this sector, has a higher domestic intermediate goods share. Third, for a given final good, a country with higher (lower) labor cost will have higher (lower) value-added share in production if the elasticity of substitution is less (greater) than 1. Fourth, for a given final good, a country with higher technology level in producing the intermediate goods and less global access to intermediate goods, has a higher DVAR.

Fernando Parro, From Johns Hopkins University presented on his paper “Trade and Labor
Market Dynamics”, a joint work with Lorenzo Caliendo and Maximiliano Dvorkin. In this paper, they developed a model of trade and labor market dynamics that explicitly recognized the role of labor mobility frictions, goods mobility frictions, I-O linkages, geographic factors, and international trade. Moreover, they proposed a new method to solve dynamic discrete choice models: Dynamic Exact Hat Algebra (DEHA). In addition, they calibrated the model to 38 countries, 50 U.S. states, and 22 sectors to quantify the impact of increased import competition from China over the period 2000-2007 on employment and welfare across spatially different labor markets. Finally, they studied how China’s import competition impacted U.S. labor markets and discovered that although exposure to import competition from China reduced manufacturing employment, aggregate U.S. welfare increased.

Jota Ishikawa, from Hitotsubashi University & RIETI, gave a presentation on “Parallel Imports and Repair Services.” He introduced parallel imports(PI) as goods purchased from authorized distributors in the source countries and exported to the destination countries without the consent of the original producers. He pointed out that producers usually discriminate against parallel imported goods in after-sales services, such as restricting service to authorized goods only. This paper presented the following compelling findings. First, service discrimination(SD) made the authorized good and the PI good vertically differentiated. Secondly, SD generates higher profits, but it decreases incentive to improve the goods quality. Lastly, trade liberalization increases the goods quality without PI or SD, but may decrease the goods quality with PI & SD. The policy implication of this paper is that countries should impose some restrictions on the firm’s SD when allowing PI, and regulating SD becomes more important as trade liberalization proceeds.

Yanrui Wu, from the University of Western Australia, presented on the topic “Can China Avoid the Middle Income Trap?”. He pointed out that China is facing three major positive developments including services-led growth, growing R&D spending and continuously expanding innovation capacity. He also believed there was still room for more investments in areas such as education, health and aged care. He further argued that China's absorption of rural migrant works could lead to another round of growth, as Japan once experienced since 1960s. Moreover, he argued that assuming China's growth rate as 6.5% or 4% in the future, China seemed to follow the growth trajectory of Japan and South Korea. In addition, he pointed out that one major innovation challenge for China is the changing R&D investment structure and quality, such as the declining investment in basic
or applied research, or the declining invention patents. Finally, he suggested that future deepening economic reforms in China need to allow for private participation in services and innovation, including foreign providers, and to reinforce Intellectual Property Right (IPR) protection to promote innovation.

Alyson Ma, from the University of San Diego presented her paper on “Global Value Chains, Organizational Flexibility, and Tariff Circumvention.” Her joint work with Ari Van Assche has introduced vertical specialization into Chaney (2008) and showed that some firms indeed circumvent trade policy shocks by relocating production to a foreign country. As the measure of country-specific trade policy shocks, they used anti-dumping cases against China as identified in the World Bank’s Global Antidumping Database. Based on the Chinese Customs Dataset, they found the following intriguing findings. First, firms not only set up global value chains to reduce production costs, but to also create operational flexibility that protects against country-specific shocks. Their theoretical model illustrates that such operational flexibility makes trade more elastic to trade policy shocks. Second, such operational flexibility also increases the sensitivity of footloose value chain tasks (manufacturing) to country-specific shocks, while reducing the sensitivity of non-footloose value chain tasks (headquarter services).

Qiu Dong, from Beijing Normal University, presented his paper on “Price Measurement Uncertainty.” He mentioned two kinds of prices: the volume price and the quantity price. He argued that "the volume-price breakdown" is in fact quite different from the price in "the quantity-price breakdown", where the latter includes the omitted quality factors and the former only covers the original price factors. Moreover, he believed that due to the non-measurable quality factors and the fuzzy property of the similar quality factors contained in the product, we cannot clearly separate the quality factors from the price factors. In addition, he discussed the reason why the price measurement uncertainty is fundamental and introduced the Standard Product Description (SPD), the impossibility of pure pricing and the paradox hidden in the comparison methodology. In the end, he offered further thinking about three products: the physical identified product, the philosophical identified product and the economical identified product.
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(Session B)

On the afternoon of November 5th, the Economic Session IIIB “China’s Growing Role in Economic Globalization” of Beijing Forum 2016 was held in Meeting Room No.4, Yingjie Exchange Center, Peking University. The session was divided into 2 parts, and respectively chaired by Professor Jack Hou from California State University and Professor Hong Junjie from University of International Business and Economics. Seven speakers gave talks in this session including Doctor Yang Wenyan from the United Nations, Professor Harutoshi Matsutani from Aichi University, Professor Shi Xunpeng from National University of Singapore, Professor Jack Hou, Professor Xu Jintao from National School of Development at Peking University, Professor Chen Kong-Pin from National Taiwan University, and Professor Hong Junjie.

Doctor Yang Wenyan introduced her research on inclusive development for social and economic sustainability. She pointed out that in the years since World War II, the modern world has seen then greatest escape of all where rapid economic growth in many countries has delivered hundreds of millions of people from destitution. Material wellbeing has risen as death rates have fallen, and people are living longer and richer lives. With the paradox of unprecedented material wellbeing and popular discontent, she called for the need for inclusive development. She cited the rise of political discontent in Western countries and increase in global extremism at the same time. She however noted that the prosperity is not shared and not all countries benefitted equally from globalization. She outlined that these observed inequalities are often rooted in historical circumstances but tend to persist after the structural change. Inequality always matters because development needs to be inclusive. She further explained that there is a growing global consensus on the need to bridge the divide between the haves and the have-nots. She argued that a universal approach to social policy is key to inclusive development, because it addresses the underlying causes of exclusion and social injustice. Lastly, she informed that China is doing well in all measures, where it is doing good for the world, sharing its experiences and actively engaging in global affairs.

Professor Harutoshi Matsutani gave a presentation about the analysis of traffic congestion
in the automotive social cost and the “Tokyo Model”. He started by pointing out that automotive traffic leads to a variety of societal problems, such as traffic congestion, traffic accidents, noise pollution and so on. He argued that all these negative social influences brought by automobiles can be summarized as a “social cost”. He introduced several approaches applied to curtail this cost. One approach is the “London Model” characterized by its coercive fiscal means of collecting congestion charges, and the other is the “Beijing Model”, characterized by its tough executive means of “putting limits the traffics and purchases of automobiles.” He demonstrated the “Tokyo Model”, which is a gradually progressive approach to improve transportation through incremental reforms. He explained that the “Tokyo Model” has three major characteristics: the restriction on self-driving trips, the development of three-dimensional rail transit system, and the emphasis on the construction of urban “sub-center”. Finally, he advocated the importance of sorting out causes and origins of transportation demand, divert the traffic flows, disperse them in accordance with their momentums and trends, so as to internalize the external cost of China’s automobile society.

Professor Shi Xunpeng took a specific perspective to the belt and road initiative in Southeast Asia based on a case study of energy investment. Despite mutual benefits for cooperation under the China-leading Belt and Road (OBOR) initiative, he noted that the perception of OBOR is polarized. He argued that Southeast Asia which plays an important role in the OBOR, is highly suspicious of this initiative. He further argued that the technical complexity of energy projects, confronting political environment, and improper investment behavior all have contributed to the problems and complication of the mutual benefits. Prof. Shi proposed that building a sense of ownership is the key to success and suggested ways of improvement that could contribute to building this sense of ownership in the processing of implementing the OBOR initiative.

Professor Jack Hou gave a speech entitled “One Belt One Road: Is it Water Too Far?” He mentioned that China’s economic success since 1978 and current struggles are well documented. He pointed out that even though it is not entirely her own effort, the majority of the current economic dilemma in China’s past is catching up with her. In the 1980s, China struggled to obtain foreign exchange, and started to allow FDIs access to domestic markets in the early/mid 1990s. He argued that China occasionally surpassing the U.S. and become the largest recipient of FDI in the world, and the surge in exports experienced by the joining WTO in 2001 was a calculated risk. He further identified that sustainable growth, including “New Normal”, middle income trap and the Lewisian
Turning point have raised a lot of concern in the recent years. He explained that they are actually three-sides of the same coin where under this backdrop, with China searching for the “New Normal,” that the “One Belt One Road” initiative came into play. Lastly, he stressed that there is no doubt that the OBOR, if successful, could be the most important development since the Industrial Revolution.

Professor Xu Jintao talked about how traffic jams affect air quality and policy implications. He identified that traffic congestion and poor air quality have become two of the most pressing problem in developing metropolis, especially in Beijing, and solving traffic congestion would also reduce air pollutant levels. Prof. Xu tried to answer the following two questions: What is the contribution of vehicle traffic on air pollution? How does air quality vary with severity of traffic congestion over time? He demonstrated that clearly understanding the net traffic-induced air pollution and the effect of potential policy interventions can provide crucial assistance in making optimal policy recommendation. He observed that on-road traffic contributes to 47.6% of the deteriorating air quality and the marginal effect of vehicle traffic on AQI at night is 2.47 times larger than on the daytime. He therefore argued that there is need to control the number of vehicles at night. Lastly, he stressed that the non-linear effects of traffic congestion on air quality has the policy implications that efforts to keep the congestion index from rising above the “turning point” will have disproportionate effects on alleviating pollution in Beijing.

Professor Chen Kong-Pin introduced the optimal listing strategy in online auctions. Because of China's large population, he noted that Internet business especially on transaction platforms has the greatest advantage in exploiting the enormous network effect. He explained that some theoretical comparison between various forms of listing might be useful. Prof. Chen took three formats of auction into consideration: Regular Auction, which must run through sale duration to determine winner; Fixed-Price listing, which ends immediately once a bidder place order; and Buy-It-Now, which is in between. He demonstrated that platforms should allow various listing formats to satisfy the seller's needs and if a proxy of seller's time preference can be identified, it should be inversely related to reserve price. He stressed that this is a simple framework that completely characterizes seller's listing strategy, reserves price and clears empirical implications.

Finally, Professor Hong Junjie talked about the new global economic and trade rules and China’s wisdom. He explained that the reconstruction of global trade rules has experienced
thousands of years of development. With the development of global value chain and the promotion of multinational companies’ benefits, he noted that the construction of new global economic and trade rules takes environmental protection and the labors’ benefits into consideration. Prof. Hong promoted that China’s wisdom for the new global economic and trade rules adhere to five concepts: perfect complement coming first for the concept of harmony, taking the reform into account for the concept of development, maintaining the benefits of multilateralism for the concept of Datong, promoting cooperation for the concept of win-win, and benefiting more people for the concept of democracy. When constructing the new global economic and trade rules, he suggested a need to take both domestic and foreign factors into consideration. To show China’s wisdom in the construction of new global economic and trade rules, Prof. Hong emphasized the following contents: the processing trade rules, cross-border infrastructure, new rules of electronic commerce, inclusive concept for innovation, emphasizing the reasonability for the low cost of developing countries and against the blue barriers, underlying the carbon emissions responsibility based on trading profits and against the green barriers, promoting the plurilateral or multilateral investment system. With the extension of the global industrial chain, he noted that the level of professionalism is also rising. He stressed that the trade liberalization of important intermediate inputs is very important to integrate into the global value chain and make full use of their own comparative advantages.
At 9:00 on November 6th, the panel “China’s Growing Role in Economic Globalization”, the Economy sub-forum of Beijing Forum 2016, held its fourth session at No.3 meeting room of the Yingjie Exchange Center at Peking University. The session was chaired by Professor Sandra Poncet from University of Paris 1. Four speakers gave talks in this session including Professor Lin Shuanglin from Peking University, Professor Sai Ding from University of Glasgow, Professor Nao Ijiri from Nihon University and Professor Sandra Poncet.

First, Professor Lin Shuanglin delivered a speech on “The Effects of Housing Property Tax Reform in China”. He pointed out that property tax reform is the most debated issue in China today. He further explained that the focal point is the effects of property tax on the economy and whether China should establish a personal housing property tax. Through modeling analysis, Professor Lin demonstrated that with the introduction of property tax, housing consumption is lower than the baseline (without the property tax) in the short run and in the long run, private investment, private capital, and output are all higher. He argued that the tax reform would increase the welfare of the future generations while reducing the welfare of the current and the old generations.

Professor Sai Ding from University of Glasgow gave a talk on “Do Firms Care About Investment Opportunities? Evidence from China”. While most literature focuses on the role of financial factors (such as cash flow), she explored this most important question in corporate finance from the perspective of economic fundamentals. She developed a simple model to decompose investment opportunities to both supply- and demand-side factors. Empirical results from both the impulse response functions of panel vector autoregressive and the system generalized method of moments estimations show that private firms cherish investment opportunities more in China. State-owned enterprises response more to the investment opportunities from the supply side, but much less so to demand-side shocks. These findings provide interesting policy implications for China’s on-going ownership and financial sector reforms.

Professor Nao Ijiri from Nihon University shared his thesis “Non-Harmonized Mandatory Standards as Non-Tariff Barriers: Experience from Japanese imports.” He explained that the
WTO/TBT agreement has been promoting a harmonization of national standards with relevant international standards worldwide since 1995. He further pointed out that such a harmonization of the standards may reduce trade costs stem from the differences between national standards across countries, and then would facilitate international trade. Accordingly, if national standards are mandatory and not harmonized with international standards, he argued that such standards function as non-tariff barriers to trade in the home country. In his paper, he empirically examines the effects of the standards harmonization and the mandatory standards on international trade flows, especially the emergence of newly imported products in Japan. The results suggest that non-harmonized national standards with mandatory statutes deter new entrants from foreign countries to home market. This empirical study is not possible without our new concordance between international standards and HS 6-digit products.

Professor Sandra Poncet from University of Paris 1 gave a talk on “How effective are VAT Export Taxes? Evidence from China”. She pointed out that compared to most countries, China’s value-added tax (VAT) system is not neutral and makes it less advantageous to export a product than to sell it domestically. She however argued that the large and frequent changes to the VAT refunds which are offered to exporters have led China to be accused of providing its firms with an unfair advantage in global trade. She used city-specific export-quantity data at the HS6-product level over the 2003-12 period to assess how changes in the VAT export tax have affected China’s export performance and find that the VAT rebate system is indeed an effective industrial policy and can improve China’s international competitiveness. She showed that the efficiency of this export tax policy is magnified when it applies to products with denser links with the local productive structure. Hence export benefits from VAT rebates are greater for activities for which the necessary capabilities and resources are available.

After speeches given by the four professors, scholars present and other participants launched a heated discussion on the topics like economic globalization, the housing bubble, China’s on-going ownership and financial sector reforms. The strong academic atmosphere brought the session in the morning to a successful close.
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On the morning of Nov 6th, the Parallel Session 4 of the panel session “China’s Growing Role in Economic Globalization” of Beijing Forum 2016 was held in Meeting Room No.4, Yingjie Exchange Center, Peking University. Four speakers gave their talks on the session including Professor Lex Zhao from Kobe University, Professor Hu Weimin from National Chengchi University (Taiwan), Professor Du Fenglian from Inner Mongolia University, Professor Ju Jiandong from Shanghai University of Finance and Economics. Professor Ju was chaired the session. Scholars from U.S, Mongolia, Indonesia and other countries also attended this meeting.

Professor Lex Zhao’s talk focused on the challenges faced by Sino-Japanese relations. He analyzed four big issues in the relations: border disputes, war-time history, nationalism and ideology and institutional differences. He explained that border disputes are zero-sum games at best and become a negative-sum game if third parties jump in. He further clarified that the disputes are probably driven by special interest groups like Ishihara Shintaro and other ultra conservatives for domestic political purposes. Additionally, he argued that war history between the two countries complicates the relations as well as the large differences in ideology and institutions in the two countries. He further mentioned that the idea of nationalism involves who is leader of Asia, a role which both China and Japan once played. He stressed that neither China nor Japan can prosper without cooperating with the other and argued that these two countries could learn from the English speaking countries as a potential direction for bilateral relations.

Professor Hu Weimin analyzed the Japanese automobile sales and the Chinese boycotts of 2008 and 2012. Using market share and sales as dependent variable, he observed that the sales of Japanese automobiles have dropped significantly after the boycott. He further pointed out that the sales are estimated to persistently drop between as much as 17-52%. With market share as dependent variable, he explained that the reduction in share had lasted more than fifteen months and with sales as dependent variable, the reduction in sales had lasted seven months. He argued that China’s indigenous brand had benefited most from the reduction in Japanese car sales, and suggested that the reduction in Japanese’s vehicle sales was related to the Diaoyutai Incident. Detailed analysis showed that the boycott effect of unoccupied provinces during WWII is significantly smaller than in other regions. He
further observed that the effect in small-scale occupied provinces is less than that of the large-scaled occupied ones. Besides, the disparity between the effect of the large-scale occupied provinces and the Manchuria State is not significant. On city level, he noted that the Chinese cities with production bases of Japanese vehicle had a greater negative impact on sales during the boycott than the other cities because these cities’ production bases provide a more convenient boycotting target.

Professor Du Fenglian gave a presentation on “Roles and Relations: Impact of China’s Economic Development of Sino-Mongolian Relations”. Professor Du informed that Chinese economy and Mongolian economy are complementary, where the comparative advantages of China lie in clothes, shoes and foods while those of Mongolia lie in non-edible raw materials. He further argued that the growth of Chinese economy also brings the growth of Sino-Mongolian trade values. Since 1994, he explained that Sino-Mongolian relations have stepped into a new stage where the two countries keep close on politics, and China insists to develop its good neighborly friendship foreign policy. Additionally, he argued that the rise of Chinese economy has made China become the largest trade partner of Mongolia, in replace of Russia and also led to the rapidest growth of Mongolian economy in history. He however points out that the influence of economic connections on the foreign relations is never monotonous and suggested that its deep implications are still waiting for further explorations with tools like discourse analysis.

Professor Ju Jiandong talked about Huaxia community and a new normal of global trade and new architecture of global governance. Professor Ju explained that with 2012 as the demarcation point, the global trade is evolving from the old normal “rapid growth, US-dominated and China-driven” to a new normal “slowdown in growth, tri-polar world order and block-structured.” He further argued that neither the G1 which the US attempts to restore, nor the G2 that implies American-Soivet confrontation, but the G3, that is, NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement), EU (European Union) and Lunar (Huaxia) Community, which adapts to the tri-polar structure of global economic, is the future direction of global economic governance. He further argued that the Belt and Road promote economic layout optimization through horizontal adjustment while the Lunar (Huaxia) Community promotes industrial upgrading by vertical adjustment. He stressed that they complement each other and together constitute China’s new opening strategy of “one community & two wings” under the new normal of global trade.

After the presentations, audiences provided their insightful comments and presenters gave their responses.
Beijing Forum 2016
Dialogue on Conceptualization and Certification of Social Enterprise (I)

On the morning of November 5th, the first session of the panel “Dialogue on Conceptualization and Certification of Social Enterprise” was held in Meeting Room No.8 at Yingjie Exchange Center, Peking University. Speakers were distinguished practitioners and scholars in the field and they had an in-depth discussion on the topic.

The first half of the session was chaired by Ruijun Yuan, Associate Professor of the School of Government and executive director of the Center of Civil Society. At the beginning of the session, Professor Jingpeng Li and Professor Keping Yu from Peking University gave opening remarks and shared their personal view on social innovation and the significance of social enterprise certification. Professor Li summarized that a well-instructed criterion is important for investors to gain confidence and a strict standard on quasi-social enterprise can motivate them to improve themselves. He further acknowledged that social enterprise can gain social credibility through certification and avoid some so-called social enterprise to emerge.

Keping Yu, Chair Professor and founding director of PKU Research Center for Chinese politics, congratulated the success of workshop on social enterprise held the day before. He gave a short report on the significance of social innovation from the perspective of modernization. He also introduced the definition of social innovation in two senses. In the broader sense, he defined social innovation as that of the entire society while in the narrower sense, argued that social innovation is held by social enterprise. He further stressed that social innovation is a new concept for the society.

Thomas Straub, Professor of International Management from University of Geneva, Switzerland delivered a speech on conceptualization and certification of social enterprise in Europe. He introduced the European definition of social enterprise with EMES approach, which identifies social enterprise in both economic and social criteria, including scale of production, level of autonomy, economic risk, community benefit, and citizen initiative as several fundamental aspects. He later introduced different legal forms of social enterprise supported by the cases from Italy and Switzerland, including limited companies, community interest companies, industrial and provident
societies, and limited liability partnerships.

The next part of the session was hosted by Xin Cui, vice general secretary of China Research Development Foundation. The discussion moved the focus to East Asia. The first speaker was Yu Zucheng, associate professor at the School of International Relations and Public Affairs, Shanghai International Studies University. He made a presentation entitled “The Development of Certification of Social Enterprise in Japan”. He explored the background for the emergence of social enterprise in Japan and traced the development of definition from Community Business to Social Business. He pointed out that Japan integrated concepts from America and Europe to generate a new one with sociality, business and innovation as three characteristics. Under these aspects as large indicators, he argued that in 2009, a certification system containing both medium and small indicators was established and encouraged by the government.

EunSoo Lee, from Sungshin Women’ University shared the experience of certification in South Korea. After defining social enterprise from creation of both social value and economic value, she briefly introduced the role of social enterprise and corresponding domestic supporting polices as well as agencies. She pointed out that the certification system in Korea included indicators like type of organization, paid workers, type of social purpose, decision-making procedure, total income and cost, articles of association, and reinvestment of profits. Through these indicators, she further argued that different types of social enterprise can be clearly divided. To further explain the different type of social enterprise in Korea, several cases like Job Creation Happiness Plus, Other Beautiful Store, Mixed Dasomi Foundation etc. were illustrated in her speech.

Yu-Yuan Kuan, Professor of Social Welfare and Social Policy at National Chung Cheng University, Chiayi, Taiwan, focused on the concept and certification mode in Taiwan. He explained the role of government, with more emphasis on its influence in nurturing social enterprise, including human resources supporting, institution establishment and so on. Under the co-promotion by government and NPOs, he argued that the procedure to register and certificate social enterprise was set up and effectively maintained. By introducing an empirical analysis conducted in 2013, he showed several basic features to identify social enterprise, including service groups, operation time, major income, annual volume etc. To summarize, he emphasized the importance of across-department collaboration and hoped that the argument should place great emphases on public welfare and value rather than concepts only.
The topic of presentation made by Dr. Chen Jintang from Hong Kong Polytech University was on “Social Value of Social Enterprise in Hong Kong”. After shortly introducing three development phase of social enterprise in Hong Kong, he reported some methods to measure the social value of social enterprise, among which SROI (Social Return on Investment) and SIAT (Social Impact Assessment Tool) are the most important ones. Besides measuring the impact of social enterprise with quantitative methods, Dr. Chen also elaborated the social value of social enterprise through a specific case of Yinxing Guan, a civil society organization aimed at the promoting employment among the elders.

The whole session successfully came to an end with a heated discussion among scholars and listeners, bringing with it many thoughts and questions for future studies.
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The second session of the panel “Dialogue on Conceptualization and Certification of Social Enterprise” took place on the afternoon of November 5th, at Meeting Room No.8 at Yingjie Exchange Center, Peking University with the topic on “Identity and Certification Indicator of Social Enterprise”.

Hongyun Zhou, deputy director of Urban Governance Institute at Peking University presided over the session. The first speaker was Zhang Xiaomeng, associate professor at School of Marxism Studies at Renmin University and she presented a report focusing on “Social Mission of Social Enterprise”. She showed the dilemma confronted by social enterprise as her introduction and gave four suggestions on how to handle this problem. The four suggestions included tracing the origin and perfectly oriented; justice and profit equally regarded; inheriting the past and breaking new ground for future; and all-embracing of quasi-social enterprise. Based on the dilemma and corresponding solutions, she discussed the orientation of social enterprise and a proper relationship with government as well as market was hopefully raised for better development of social enterprise. She ended the speech with significance of certification, which could build authority in the industry and motivate social responsibility as well as morality.

Professor Qing Miao, from Zhejiang University did a research on the identity of social enterprise. In his presentation, his definition of social enterprise contained two senses of social responsibility and economic profit. He argued that this dual definition made public acceptance and legal transactions two basic requirements for social enterprise. To further promote certification system, he argued that cultivating the incentive mechanisms, setting the supervision mechanism by a third party, tracking certified social enterprise and introducing new policies were indispensable.

Jiantuo Yu, director of research department in China Development Research Foundation (CDRF), shared his thoughts on issues on bonus and property lock in social business sector. He clarified the reasons for certification as requirement for social construction and then raised the question on who is qualified to certificate, which he points out has been a center of academic
argument. As for the standard of certification, he argued that we should set a lower threshold for social business and gradually increase it. Based on the importance of certification, he noted that systemizing legal framework has naturally become a big issue. He stressed that dynamic interaction between government and industry under a thorough policy framework and flexible law system is considered to be a suitable routine.

Then followed a 45-minute discussion, during which most participants had an in-depth discussion around the nature of social enterprise and government’s role in nurturing social enterprise.

After a short tea break, Xiaohong Zhu, professor at School of Humanities and Social Science at North China Electric Power University, continued to host the session. The first speaker was Yanlong Zhang, Assistant Professor at Guanghua School of Management at Peking University and he led the discussion on the topic “Intuitional Logics and the Governance of Social enterprise”. As an introduction of theories, he showed a spectrum of organizations in which social enterprise was part of the social economy. In the second part of basic theory, he proposed the concept of institutional logics to describe the way in which a particular social world works and to which different logics directly led to different organization forms. To support the theory, he introduced a specific research on the conflicts among institutional logics in a social enterprise. The conflicts between a board member and regional office, as well as the conflict between secretariat and regional office were both the result of different logics and caused traps in social enterprise governance. Thus, he concluded that the success in social enterprise governance lies in the proper integration of various institutional logics.

Professor Thomas Straub from University of Geneva did a presentation on “Governance of Social Cooperative in Europe”. After defining the word “cooperative”, he adopted the concept into the governance models he had initially mentioned in the morning session. The emphasis of the presentation was on a detailed case study of a successful enterprise called Migros and its experience in governance. By showing an organizational chart of Migros Group, he pointed out that a clear governance structure, which can be divided into assembly of delegates, board of directors and executive board, really worked and improved the efficiency. Apart from the governance structure, Micros ethical stance also helped a lot since its “responsible” philosophy for example their strict laws against the sale of any alcoholic beverages or any tobacco strongly reflected and maintained its...
public welfare characteristic. Besides Migros Group, Raiffeissen was also a typical social enterprise, which also shared similar features as that of Migros.

The last speaker was Joon Choi, a senior member of Corporate Contribution Committee in SK SUPEX and he talked about credit and transparency of social enterprise with SK corporate as his example. He pointed out that SK corporate claimed that the ultimate goal of their value is the happiness of stakeholders and in order to achieve it, they made the choice of harnessing the power of social entrepreneurship. However, confronted with key challenges like lack of transparency, failure in global capital markets, misaligned investor rewards etc., he noted that making the impact sector into the mainstream seems to be a problem towards which he gave the suggestion of “Social Progress Credit”. Correspondingly, he stressed that the social progress appraisal system was built to examine the financial and social performance of social enterprise, in order to offer incentives to improve transparency and social value.

At the end of each speech, the host made a short commentary and guided all of the participants to explore some core issues. The whole session successfully ended with a heated discussion among scholars.
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The last session of the panel “Dialogue on Conceptualization and Certification of Social Enterprise” was held on the morning of November 6th at Meeting Room No.8 in Yingjie Exchange Center, Peking University.

The host was Yongguang Xu, the Chairman of the Narada Foundation and the vice president of the China Charity Alliance. Professor Ruijun Yuan from Peking University, as the first speaker for the day, presented her research on certification system building of social enterprise in China. With an under-constructed social enterprise data base, she presented to the participants a brief introduction to an on-going program that focused on China Social Enterprise Certification Research (SECR). She mentioned that this program could provide reference, guidance and policy suggestion for all the stakeholders concerned with the development of social enterprise in China. As for the worldwide experience on certification, she concluded with three international social enterprise certification models including government register, industry register and the third party register. Professor Yuan later moved the argument to the developmental strategy of social enterprise in China. She pointed out that China not only has a long history of social enterprise in China since Song Dynasty but also has rich practice models of social enterprise. To conclude, she introduced some heated disputed issues in her field and ended the presentation with an optimistic future for social enterprise.

Zhong Wang, associate professor of Business School of Hunan University, gave a presentation based on his own experience in entrepreneurship. With comparison between the entrepreneurship on education from abroad and at home, he pointed out that what matters was the economic operation and proper management which shaped the developmental routine of social enterprise. He also put up some intriguing points on the definition of social enterprise with sociality, innovation and market orientation as basic features of social enterprise. Integrated with concept of philanthropic entrepreneurship from Oxford University, Professor Wang emphasized that the market is the most important form of philanthropy. He however stressed that the inner disadvantages of market mechanism made it impossible to realize everything, hence the certification system to promote legal transactions.
The last speaker was Juan Tang, associate professor in Institute of Urban Governance from Shenzhen University. She presented her research on the effect that social enterprise had on philanthropic supermarket and its sustainable development. She proposed this topic with an introduction of the background against which the philanthropic supermarket emerged. She mentioned that the corresponding literature review can be traced back to 2004 and reached a temporary peak in 2013 resulted from the publishing of official documents. In general, she argued that there were three basic operating modes as operated by government, charity organization and neighborhood committee. She however explained that all of them have been suffering from the lack of social participation and inefficient management. She later took a detailed case in Shenzhen which experimented on social host operation as one of the solutions.

The whole session successfully ended with a heated discussion around the question on how to effectively manage the social enterprise in practice. Professor Yuan made closing remarks and conveyed her wish for better development of social enterprise.
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On the afternoon of November 4th, the first Student Panel session on “Culture and Civilization” was inaugurated in Ewen Building. The student panel invited over 50 delegates from countries and regions including America, Britain, Australia, Japan, Korea, etc.

The session began with an opening speech given by Professor Li Qiang, Vice Provost of Peking University. He extended a warm welcome to students from all over the world and gave his view on global governance.

The first speech was given by Samantha Yen from UCB. Her topic was on the development of soft power through Chinese arts and culture. She examined the increased efforts by the Chinese government to develop and disseminate Chinese culture both at home and abroad to create soft power. She argued that China can leverage its soft power to shift global perceptions from being a manufacturing state to a model of cultural and political significance. In conclusion, she stated that now is the perfect opportunity for China to elevate its cultural equity and increase its soft power agendas. These agendas not only provide for China’s seemingly insatiable thirst for resources, but can also benefit other countries—both global powers or developing ones alike—by fostering connections that can translate into meaningful foreign policy and economic or social impact.

The second speech was given by Tianjiao Li from the University of Chicago. She talked about how non-government organizations respond both to the autonomy and security challenges to capitalism. This is indicated by the nature of non-government organizations, which compensate for the lack of trust caused by the new development of capitalistic corporations in the new age on the one hand and reassures that individuals enjoy autonomy in the decision making and implementing processes.

The last speech was given by Yang Xu from Yenching Academy. Her topic was on “European Refugee and Civilization Crisis - Religious Challenges in the Era of Globalization”. She pointed that since 2015, the intrusion of millions of refugees from Mid-East to Europe has raised many concerns from both social and cultural perspectives. Meanwhile, Europe is open itself to migrants.
from different cultures and countries. The crimes and terrorist attacks related to Muslim groups also raise a civilization crisis between Islam and Christian belief. She tackled the conflicts under a context of globalization era and analyzed the economics, terrorism and refugee crisis facing the nowadays Europe. In the end, she argued that religious dialogue and non-nihilism based on common values is a possible solution.

After the speeches, the delegates engaged actively with the speakers during the Q&A. Both the questions and answers were interesting and incisive.
Beijing Forum 2016
Global Governance in an Era of Change - A Youth Perspective (II)

On the morning of November 5th, the second session of student panel “Global Politics” was inaugurated in Ewen Building.

The first presenter was Florence Cooke from King’s College London. She talked about the achievements, challenges and importance of economic power relations with the EU. She mentioned that China and the EU have created a strategic partnership – firmly grounded in economic ties – that they can use to collaborate on a huge range of global issues. She pointed out that the dynamic of the partnership has shifted in the twenty-first century and has experienced political and structural limitations, with more challenges to face in the future. She further argued that the relationship has also begun to result in a reformed system of global economic governance, aided global economic recovery and spurred multi-polarity.

The second talk was given by Yuliana Dementyeva from Yenching Academy. She focused on development models of different country, especially the China model. She discussed that the China model debate rooted in the Beijing consensus and was exemplified by the global economic crisis. She concluded that the core features of China model consist of pragmatism, gradualism, experimentalism, adaptability and flexibility. These, she pointed out, create a specific combination conducive to economic growth in China. Yuliana also offered a counter-argument, which points out the non-sustainability and non-replicability of the China model.

Eric Schimidt later gave a speech themed “Is the Power Shift from the West to the East a Myth or a Reality?”. In his speech he sought to look behind this popular image and expose it for what it is: a myth. He used three schools of thought in international relations to debunk the myth of a power shift from the west to the east. He argued that suggestions that China is becoming the new world hegemon are ill-informed misperceptions, which ignore that the rules of the international game are still made for the most and vital parts in Washington.
The third session of Beijing Forum Student Panel was hosted on the morning of November 6 at Russian Building in Peking University. The topic for this session was “Global Economics.” More than 30 guests from different countries attended the session.

The first instructor was Hannah Niese from King’s College London. In her presentation on *The Global Governance of Currencies: USD, EUR and CNY*, she analyzed the status of three important currencies worldwide - the US Dollar, the Euro and the Renminbi - in the context of the global governance of currencies. Given China’s economic growth and the eastward shift of the global economy, she argued that China’s growing economic and political importance has not yet transformed into a similar significance of its currency, the Renminbi. Compared to the indispensable role and wide use of the US Dollar, the paper concluded that neither the Renminbi nor the Euro was likely to rival the current global reserve currency in the short term.

The second presentation was given by Zeyu Ren from University of Chicago. His topic was on *China’s Participation in the Global Governance: Through PE and M&A*. To begin with, he discussed the role that private equity played in China’s transition economy. He then demonstrated the mergers and acquisitions (M&A) trend as well as its implications in 2016, followed by an in-depth discussion of the motivation and approaches of M&A deals. The paper also introduced several defense strategies and concluded with the characters and lessons of Chinese M&A through three case studies.

As the last presenter, Changyu Ren from Peking University gave his speech on *Disparity of RMB Purchasing Power: From the Perspective of Cost of Living*. Inspired by the possible implementation of Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) and the Law of One Price, he conducted an empirical analysis on the regional disparity of RMB. The paper revealed that disparity of RMB existed stably in a relatively long term and was greatly influenced by housing price. It argued that this trend would bring significant impacts on individual living standards as well as the productivity of firms.

In the following academic discussion part, the audience shared their viewpoints on questions related to the presentations, including the dominant status of US Dollar, the future of Euro, Chinese Yuan and Japanese Yen, and the possible barriers for Chinese enterprises faced in overseas M&A deals.