

Abstracts

- 01 **1. New Changes of Middle East Transformation and New Developments in China-Middle East Relationship**, by Gao Zugui, Professor and Deputy Director at Institute for International Strategic Studies of the Central Party School of the CPC, and Guest Researcher of CPDS. Ever since 2014, the Middle East has experienced over 4 years of evolution and continued to show some new characteristics: the moderate Islamist forces suffered setbacks but would still influence the political development in many countries; the extreme forces messed up the regional setup as they grew stronger, which led to joint response from many countries in the region; the Iranian nuclear issue continued to develop on the track of negotiation, but it is still uncertain whether a final solution could be reached; Israel and Palestine moved from peace talk to conflict and the diplomatic games intensified again. Faced with these developments, the United States had to fine-tune its Middle East policy. Under such backdrop, China and the Middle East countries are in growing need of strengthening their mutual relations. China and the Middle East relations achieved new development under the framework of building “one belt and one road” .
- 16 **2. Security Situation of China’ s Border and Coastal Defense and Responses**, by Ouyang Wei, Professor of National Defense University and Guest Researcher of the CPDS. Since entering into the new century,

the threat of direct military invasion against China is on the decline, while the insecure factors are on the increase with big powers' involvement and sovereignty claims of neighboring countries to the disputed maritime areas. Non-traditional security problems as terrorism and drug trafficking become prominent. Accordingly, China has to make corresponding adjustments to the strategic goals, policies and measures of its border and coastal defense.

- 29 **3. Analysis of the American New Anti-terrorism Policy**, by Zheng Dongchao, Assistant Research Fellow at China Center for Contemporary World Studies. Faced with the strong attack of extreme terrorist forces, the United States has finally come to the fore from the behind, published new anti-terrorism policy, hoping to weaken and completely destroy the Islamic State (IS) forces in Iraq and Syria. The new policy, with extensive comprehensiveness, is to engage military intervention mainly in the form of air strikes, embed the Syrian crisis into the war on terror, form a new international anti-terrorism alliance network and conduct humanitarian assistance. It can be said that the Obama administration has made an up-side down change to its Iraqi policy because of the rise of the IS. This change shows among other things that the U.S. needs to continue the war on terror in order to maintain the interests of its own and its allies, and reflects that the U.S. wants to dominate the Middle East situation and maintain its leading position in the region. However, as President Obama's remaining term is less than two years, the U.S. is unlikely to make significant adjustment to its Middle East policy, but will make a slight swing back from the policy of restraint and contraction to make progress and get involved again.

- 41 **4. Current Development and Challenges of U.S.-Vietnamese Military**

Relationship, by Song Qingrun, Associate Research Fellow at Institute for South Asia, Southeast Asia and Oceania Studies with China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations. After Obama entering into office, the bilateral military relationship between the U.S. and Vietnam has reached the best level in history since the end of the Vietnam War in 1975. Vietnam has become an important cooperative partner of the U.S. in military strategic affairs in Southeast Asia, while the U.S. is an important country that Vietnam could rely upon. The two militaries conducted extensive and close cooperation in such areas as high-level defense dialogue, joint military exercise, maintaining maritime security, military medical science, natural disaster response, joint maritime search and rescue, non-proliferation, dealing with Vietnam War legacy and upgrading the military capabilities of the Vietnamese Army. In October 2014, the U.S. partially lifted the ban on the sale of lethal weapon to Vietnam and a historical breakthrough in their military cooperation was achieved. Now, military and security cooperation has become the main pillar of U.S.-Vietnam relations, which made it possible for them to carry out strategic consultation as well as practical cooperation and pushed forward the promotion of their bilateral relations.

- 58 **5. Obama administration' s Cyber Security Policy and Its Basic Implication to China**, by Ren Yanyan, PhD Candidate at School of International Studies of Renmin University of China, and Fang Lexian, Professor at the same school and Guest Researcher with the CPDS. As the importance of cyber security increases, the Obama administration strengthened the control of cyber security, tried to improve structural construction and strategic planning of the U.S. cyber security. In the meantime, the dispute and conflict between China and the U.S. over cyber security became prominent. Obama administration' s

cyber security policy towards China has the following features: on the one hand, the U.S. vigorously carries out “micro-blog diplomacy” through network, strengthening ideology export and infiltration; while on the other hand, the U.S. ascribes the damage of its critical infrastructure caused by the theft of economic secrets and sensitive military information to the hacker attacks supported by the Chinese military, spreading “the threat of Chinese cyber attack” and smearing China’s international image. Faced with the pressure and challenge of cyber security from the U.S., China should pay more attention to the issue from a strategic height, actively exploring the feasibility of gradually increasing mutual strategic trust from the cooperation on specific affairs. At the same time, China should seek coordination and cooperation with Russia and other developing countries, make full use of multiple platforms to push forward the shaping of international cyber security regulations. In addition, China should try to consider mobilizing the participation of domestic private sectors and masses to create a broad environment of maintaining cyber-space security.

- 72 **6. Ukraine Crisis and Its Revelation for China’s Development**, by Dr. Zhang Yanbing, Deputy Director at the Institute for International Strategic and Development Studies with School of Public Policy & Management of Tsinghua University, and Zeng Zhimin PhD Candidate of the same school. The Ukraine crisis is an international political issue that attracts most international attention. The article outlines the origin and development process of the crisis, and tries to explore the setback and its reason that Ukraine suffered in the process of political democratization after the Cold War in the context of internal unique historical culture, national contradiction, outside geopolitical intervention and modern western democratic politics. Based on the current extremely complicated internal and diplomatic background,

the Ukraine crisis may have many important revelations for China's development. First, political democratization processes in non-Western countries are deeply affected by international political forces. Second, countries beset with complicated ethnic and religious problems are liable to be led into political chaos and national disintegration when they are trying to implement democratic election system. Third, a country's political system should be rested on its unique cultural traditions. Fourth, election itself is necessarily not the only cure-all that can resolve China's current development problems.

84 7. Ukraine Crisis and the New Cold War between the U.S. and Russia,

by Yang Lei, Associate Professor at Zhou Enlai School of Government of Nankai University. There is a big controversy in academic circle over the issue of whether currently the United States and Russia have run into a new Cold War. As two major powers in international politics, the contradictions and struggles between the U.S. and Russia had profound impact to the development of international relations. In the evolution of the Ukraine crisis, it is very easy to notice the existence of Cold-War mentality in their relations, which not only did harm to the U.S.-Russian cooperation, but also hindered the development of international relations, forming a pattern similar to a new Cold War in Eastern Europe. If we recognize this pattern of new Cold War, we could be able to find historical references to its development trend in the Cold War period between the former Soviet Union and the United States. But Russia will not repeat the same mistake as the former Soviet Union and go into disintegration. The international setup today has undergone tremendous changes, which provided Russia with wider room to maneuver. As a battleground of competition in the new Cold War, it is difficult for Ukraine to get rid of the fate of territorial disintegration.

- 96 **8. Japan' s South China Sea Policy and Its Evolution**, by Dr. Li Lingqun, Research Fellow at the Collaborative Innovation Center of South China Sea Studies of Nanjing University. As a major power in Asia and an ally of the U.S., Japan' s South China Sea policy has major influence to the situation of South China Sea region. The understanding of the process and characteristics of the evolution of Japan' s South China Sea policy since the end of WWII, especially since the end of the Cold War, will help China to make accurate prediction and take effective measures to the changes of the surrounding geopolitical security environment, and create a favorable peripheral environment for maintaining China' s sovereign interests in the South China Sea and China' s peaceful development.

New Changes of Middle East Transformation and New Developments in China-Middle East Relationship

By Gao Zugui

I. Moderate Islamic Forces Suffered Setbacks but Would still Influence Political Development in Many Countries

The so-called Islamism is also known as “political Islam” . It is a kind of political thoughts that is most typical and widely rooted in the Islamic countries. It gains widespread support, not only because its political views fully reflect the opinion and requirements of the broad masses in the Islamic world, but also it never gets tired of rendering livelihood support and assistance to those people. However, after the deposition of Egyptian elected President Muhammad Morsi by the military in July 2013, the banning of the Freedom and Justice Party and the Moslem Brotherhood, especially after the latter was punished as a terrorist organization, the political status of moderate Islamic forces in many Middle East countries was severely weakened. These events

show that the governance idea and practice of the moderate Islamists are facing a test. Meanwhile, as they have won a firm base of support from the broad masses of middle and lower classes in the Islamic world, it is difficult for the new rulers or the political forces which are against their ruling to further weaken and even root out the moderate forces. If the moderate forces could adjust their policies according to the political transformation in relevant countries, they may still have chances to regain and expand their political influence.

II. Extreme Forces Mess up Regional Setup Which Lead to Joint Response from Many Countries

In the evolution of the Middle East transformation, the extreme forces, by taking advantage of the power vacuum caused by incessant turmoil in some countries, lost no time in conducting violent terrorist activities with a hope to expand their influence and strength. Some of the extreme forces were becoming more and more rampant, such as al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb in North Africa; al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula in South Yemen; Fighting Islamic Group in Libya; al-Shabaab in Somali and “Boko Haram” in Nigeria. Among them, the one that has done most of troubles to the Middle East and even the world is the so-called “Islamic State of Iraq and al-Shams (ISIS) and its associated forces entrenched in the northeast of Syria and northwest of Iraq.

Under repeated attacks by the Islamic State (IS) forces, the Iraqi government troops steadily lost ground. At Iraqi government’ s request, the United States began large scale air strikes against IS forces inside Iraq in August 2014, then expanded the strikes into Syria in September, and also shifted striking targets from the IS forces to those of the so-called “Khorasan” and other extreme terrorist forces. The US allies

of the UK, France, Canada, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Qatar, Jordan and others took part in the air strikes one after the other. In addition, Iran provided advisers and personnel training for the Iraqi government and sent fighter planes to launch air strikes on the targets in the eastern provinces of Iraq in November 2014. In fact, a cooperative situation emerged between the U.S. and Iran in their fighting against the IS.

III. Iranian Nuclear Issue Continue to Develop on the Track of Negotiation, It Is Uncertain Whether a Final Solution Could Be Reached

The Iranian nuclear issue is an epitome of hostile relationship between the United States and Iran. This issue has shown signs of improvement recently in the new interactions between the two sides. After taking office in August 2013, President Hassan Rohani repeatedly sent out signals that he was willing to adjust policies on a series of issues concerning the Iranian nuclear programs and improve relations with the United States. Positive response from the U.S. was almost instant. The U.S. made it clear that if the Iranian new government chose to fulfill its obligations earnestly and substantially and seek peaceful settlement of the nuclear issue, the U.S. would be its cooperative partner. These developments have created conditions for the Iranian nuclear issue negotiation to achieve real breakthrough. On November 24 2013, the first-phase agreement was reached between the six parties and Iran on the Iranian nuclear issue, taking an important step towards the political and diplomatic settlement. Up to now, however, the Iranian nuclear issue negotiation has not reached a comprehensive agreement, the focus of the issue is how to restrict the scales and capabilities of Iranian uranium enrichment, especially the quantities of centrifuges that Iran

could keep, and how to formulate the timetable to lift the sanctions imposed on Iran by the U.S. and Europe. After the first round of direct talk between the U.S. Secretary of State and Iranian foreign minister in September 2014 at the UN Headquarters, contacts and negotiations have been going on outside the “5+1+1” mechanism, providing supplementary to the multilateral negotiations. In this way, the Iranian nuclear issue negotiations are taking on a situation of bilateral and multilateral negotiations interweaving and paralleling together, promoting each other. However, whether a real breakthrough could be achieved all depends upon the wrangling and interactions between the U.S. and Iran and other stakeholders as well.

IV. Israel and Palestine Move from Peace Talk to Conflict and Diplomatic Games Intensified again

The Palestinian-Israeli conflict is the most complicated and longest-lasting issue since the end of WWII in the Middle East. With the active promoting of the U.S., the two sides reopened direct talks in Washington in July 2013. After more than ten rounds of secret talks, the U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry announced that the talks had achieved substantial progress. After entering into 2014, the U.S. proposed that Israel and Palestine conduct discussions on the framework of the final peace agreement, concerning such major issues of the future boundaries of Israel and Palestine, the deployment of security forces and the resettlement of Palestinian refugees, so that the peace talks could be finished by the end of April 2014. Although the parties have tried hard to push forward, the peace talks failed to make a breakthrough as had expected by the end of April. In June 2014, three Jewish youths were murdered after missing, which led Israel and the Palestinian Hamas run

into an armed conflict lasting more than 50 days. Under the mediation of Egypt and other countries, a ceasefire was finally reached. Later on, the contest of the two sides turned to diplomatic arena at the UN Headquarters. Israel and Palestine changed the forms of their fighting from battleground to conference room, continue to battle.

V. U.S. Conducts Air Strikes on the IS but Its Policy of Avoiding Deep Involvement in the Middle East Has Not Changed

The most important action that the U.S. took in 2014 in the Middle East was forming the global coalition against terrorism and launching limited military strikes against the IS and other terrorist organizations. On September 24 2014, President Barack Obama systematically elaborated U.S. new anti-terrorism policy at the UN General Assembly, mainly focusing on four areas: First, a broad coalition will be established to dismantle the network of death, including cutting off the financing and stopping the flow of fighters into and out of the region. Obama made it clear that the U.S. does not intend to send U.S. troops to occupy foreign lands. The U.S. will use its military might in a campaign of air strikes to roll back ISIL, and will train and equip forces fighting against these terrorists on the ground to reclaim their communities. Second, call upon people of the world with different faiths to be united to eradicate war at its most fundamental source and stop the corruption of young minds by violent ideology, including contesting the space of the Internet and social media that terrorists occupy. Third, address the cycle of conflict – especially sectarian conflict – that creates the conditions that terrorists prey upon. Fourth, promote the development of civil society of the Arab and Muslim world to create an environment that is not conducive to the existence of terrorism. In addition to conducting limited military

strikes to the extreme organizations, the U.S. continued to implement the policy of limited involvement in the Middle East, unwilling to act single-handed. The U.S. paid more attention to drawing support from the multiple mechanisms and international community, encouraged and supported its Western allies and regional partners represented by the Gulf Cooperation Committee countries to play a bigger role, and even asked other international actors, such as China and Russia to follow suit.

VI. New Developments of China-Middle East Relations under the Framework of “One Belt and One Road”

The motive power for closer cooperation between China and the Middle East countries was strengthened under the backdrop of continued evolution of transformation in the Middle East and China’s pushing for the construction of the “Silk Road Economic Belt and the 21st Century Maritime Silk Road ” (one belt and one road).

At the conferences of peripheral diplomacy and foreign affairs held in October 2013 and November 2014, the Chinese government confirmed that China’s periphery plays a very important strategic role in both China’s overall development and diplomacy. As part of China’s periphery, the importance of the Middle East is growing remarkably, especially when China gives great impetus to the construction of one belt and one road. China’s proposal is to realize trinity connectivity, i.e., the connectivity of transportation and infrastructure; the connectivity of rules, regulations, standards and policies and the connectivity of humanity to promote people-to-people friendship, mutual trust and cultural exchanges. In the construction of this framework, the Middle East could play a significant role in linking China’s western region with Central Asia and all the way to Africa and Europe. Some countries

in the region, such as Qatar, Egypt and the Arab League countries, all welcome the initiative proposed by China and are looking forward to expanding cooperation with China.

On the Palestinian-Israeli issue. During his visit to Egypt in August 2014, Chinese Foreign Minister Wang Yi expressed that China would like to make contributions to end the conflict between the Palestine and Israel and proposed five points to resolve the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. First, the Palestine and Israel should achieve a comprehensive ceasefire immediately for the sake of people's safety and maintaining regional peace and stability. Second, the two sides should look for a scheme to achieve common security through responsible negotiations and setting up necessary mechanisms. Under such process, Israel should lift the blockade on Gaza Strip and release the Palestinians in custody and the reasonable concerns of Israel should be taken into account. Third, the root of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict is that the Palestinian issue could not be resolved in a fair and equitable way for a long time. China has all along supported the rightful demands and lawful rights of the Palestinian people for independence and statehood. The relevant parties in Israel and Palestine should take the peace talk as an unshakable strategic choice, show goodwill to each other and resume peace talks as soon as possible. Fourth, the Palestinian-Israeli conflict concerns international peace and security, the UN Security Council should take up necessary responsibilities to resolve the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, take immediate actions, reach consensus and play its due role. The international community should work coordinately to push for the peace between the Palestine and Israel. Fifth, close attention should be paid to effectively improve the humanitarian conditions in the Gaza Strip. The international community should timely provide necessary help and support.

On the Syria issue. In January 2014, Chinese Foreign Minister Wang Yi raised five proposals for the political settlement of the Syria issue. First, persist in the settlement of the Syria issue through political means. Second, persist in that the future of Syria should be decided by the Syrian people. Third, persist in pushing the process of inclusive political transition. Fourth, persist in realizing Syrian national reconciliation and unity. Fifth, persist in conducting humanitarian aid in Syria and the surrounding countries.

On the Iranian nuclear issue. In February 2014, China came up with a five-point proposal for the comprehensive settlement of the Iranian nuclear issue with an aim to reach an agreement as early as possible. The first point is to persist in dialogue between the six parties and Iran. The second point is to seek for a comprehensive, fair and reasonable long-term solution. The Chinese government pointed out that the comprehensive agreement on the Iranian nuclear issue will be a historical one, and must be able to stand the test of history. In order to achieve this goal, the key is to balance the concerns of all parties. Iran should comprehensively address the concerns of international community about the Iranian nuclear program and implement its obligations stipulated in the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty. At the same time, Iran's needs for development and people's livelihood should be guaranteed. The six parties should fully respect Iran's rights of peaceful use of nuclear energy, gradually lift all unilateral and multilateral sanctions against Iran and conduct extensive cooperation with Iran. The third point is to uphold the principles of step by step and reciprocity. The Chinese government proposed that the next round of negotiation should touch upon the core issues related to the Iranian nuclear program and lifting sanctions against Iran, which will concern the major interests of related parties, and be more complicated and sensitive. We hope that Iran will

show more flexibility and take more practical measures in restricting its nuclear program. The six parties should repay Iran for what it has done in lifting sanctions. In such a way, political trust between the six parties and Iran could be gradually built in order to create the conditions for an ultimate breakthrough. The fourth point is to create a favorable atmosphere for dialogues and negotiations. All parties should show goodwill and sincerity and make every effort possible to maintain the atmosphere of dialogue. The fifth point is to seek addressing both the symptoms and root cause. The Chinese side points out that the root of the Iranian nuclear issue lies in lacking political mutual trust among the parties concerned and failing to get rid of the outmoded security concept. In order to reach a comprehensive agreement with Iran, the six parties should also adopt a new security concept that features mutual trust, mutual benefit, equality and cooperation, and do everything possible to develop a more constructive bilateral relationship, carry out cooperation on a wide range of areas and seek for a win-win result in international and regional affairs with Iran.

On the issue of mounting strikes against the IS and its associated forces. China holds that the IS, al-Nusra Front and other terrorist forces posed grave threats to the peace and security of the Middle East and even the world. China supports the UNSC Resolution 2710 adopted by the UN Security Council unanimously on August 15, 2014, calls the international community to work together and take practical measures, cutting off the sources of funding and personnel of the extremist and terrorist organizations. Moreover, China firmly supports the Middle East countries in their fighting against terrorism, supports Iraq strengthening its anti-terrorist capabilities and expressed its willingness to carry out cooperation with the front countries in intelligence exchange and personnel training.

At the same time, China promotes the development of relations with the Middle East countries under the framework of constructing “one belt and one road” . In June 2014, in his speech at the 6th Ministerial Meeting of the China-Arab Cooperation Forum, Chinese President Xi Jinping expressed that the next 10 years will be a critical period for China and the Arab countries to achieve their common mission and challenges of national rejuvenation. He hopes that China and the Arab countries could carry forward the spirit of the Silk Road, deepen mutual cooperation and work in close partnership to build a community of shared interests by the construction of “one belt and one road” as a new starting point.

In November 2014, during his meeting with the visiting Emir of Qatar Sheikh Tamim in Beijing, President Xi Jinping expressed that China supports the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Qatar, supports Qatar’ s efforts in preserving national security and stability and supports Qatar playing a unique role in regional affairs. China welcomes Qatar to join the construction of “one belt and one road” and would like to establish a long-term and stable energy partnership with Qatar, expand cooperation in infrastructure construction, telecommunication, finance, energy and human and cultural exchanges. China also wants to increase military-to-military exchange and cooperation between the two militaries and join hands to crackdown terrorism. China and Qatar decided to upgrade their relationship to the level of strategic partnership.

In December 2014, during his meeting with the visiting Egyptian President of Abdel Fattah al-Sisi in Beijing, President Xi Jinping said that China attaches great importance to the relationship with Egypt and firmly supports Egypt’ s efforts in exploring for a development path suitable to its own conditions. He believed that the upgrading of

China-Egypt relationship to comprehensive strategic partnership is an important milestone, which will promote the cooperation of the two countries in infrastructure, nuclear energy, new energy and airspace to a higher level. The Chinese side is willing to promote military-to-military exchanges between the two militaries, deepen cooperation in law enforcement and security fields and jointly fight against international terrorism and transnational crimes.

(The author is Professor and Deputy Director at the Institute for International Strategic Studies of the Central Party School of the CPC, and Guest Researcher of CPDS. This article was finished on January 9, 2015.)

Analysis of the American New Anti-terrorism Policy

By Zheng Dongchao

I. Content of the American New Anti-terrorism Policy

In June of 2014, the IS suddenly ran wild in Iraq, which has posed austere challenges to the Iraqi government and threatened the American interests in that country. If the IS was left unchecked, the US would lose all its achievements of the War on Terror in the Middle East and its control of the region would be much weakened. Against such backdrop, Obama made two important speeches: one at the White House on the 7th of August, which made it clear that the US would intervene militarily in Iraq and one to the whole nation on the 10th of September, in which he comprehensively elaborated the anti-terrorism policy. The two speeches have basically explained the American new anti-terrorism policy at the current stage, which include the following points:

A. Launching systematic but limited air raids. At first, the air raids had been concentrated on the northern part of Iraq where the IS was mainly located. With the warfare escalating, the scale and intensity of the air raids

increased gradually, which were no longer limited to Iraq, but also included the IS targets in Syria. At the same time, the Obama administration set the bottom-line for the military intervention, namely not sending ground troops into Iraq. Obama believed that military means cannot resolve the crisis in Iraq, and the only way to resolve the issue is to achieve reconciliation of various internal political forces in Iraq and set up its own strong security forces. The Americans did so, having drawn lessons from the Iraqi War in 2003, to reduce casualties of the American service men and women and avoid getting mired once again in the war. Nonetheless, the Americans not getting involved in ground combat does not mean not to station troops in Iraq, as the Obama administration has sent a limited number of military advisers to the country. On the 7th of August, the US sent 475 military personnel to Iraq, who was responsible to train Iraqi security forces and collect intelligence. On the 7th of November, Obama authorized Defense Secretary Hagel to send another 1500 American military personnel to Iraq to support Iraqi security forces and the Kurds in their fights against the IS.

B. Forming an alliance of anti-terrorism networks. Alliance is the US chief approach to implement its foreign policy. Whether in the Afghan War of 2001 or in the Iraqi War of 2003, allies played an important role in American military intervention. In the current military operation against the IS targets, based on the existing regional organizations, the US President, Secretary of State and Defense Secretary have made great diplomatic efforts to form a Core Coalition by trying to draw the NATO in, persuade the EU and encourage the Arab League. On September 19 of 2014, the US State Department announced the list of the international coalition against the IS, which included more than 60 countries and such regional organizations as the EU, NATO and the Arab League. As a result, an American led anti-terrorism alliance has been formed, which included such nations as the UK,

Australia, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Poland and Turkey, with France, the UK, Bahrain, Jordan, Qatar Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates taking part in the air raids. On the 15th of October, the US Central Command announced the multinational military operation against the IS led by the US would be formally named “Operation Inherent Resolve” . In addition to the joint military operations, this coalition also undertakes the responsibilities, as the US special envoy to the coalition against the IS John Allen mentioned, of the five requests that State Secretary Kerrey and Defense Secretary Hagel made to American allies at the NATO summit in September of 2014, which include providing military support for partners, stopping the influx of foreign fighters, cutting off fund flow of the IS, resolving the humanitarian crisis, and exposing the nature of the IS.

C. Conducting cross-border air raids on the IS. In his speech to the nation on October 10 2014, Obama made it clear that the US would strike the IS targets in Syria, which has shattered the US policy of no military intervention on Syria since the outbreak of the Syrian crisis. On the Syrian issue, the US had kept to the policy of avoiding direct military involvement in Syria even at the time when the bottom-line Obama drew on the chemical weapons was breached. Obviously, the air raids were conducted on the factors of both Syrian crisis and terrorism, with the IS as the decisive factor for the US to take military actions. For this reason, the US “has increased military aid to the oppositions in Syria, and called the Congress for additional authorizations and funds to train and arm these oppositions so as to make them front-line forces against the IS” . Presently, the US has trained an opposition army of about 5000 people and encouraged them to fight the IS at the Syrian border.

D. Providing humanitarian assistance. Since the withdrawal of military

forces from Iraq in 2011, the US has never stopped providing humanitarian assistance to Iraq for its national reconstruction. Since the outbreak of war on the IS, the US has added the factor of anti-terrorism to its considerations of humanitarian assistance. On September 10, when visiting Iraq, Kerrey met with the Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri al Abadi and announced that the US would provide an additional humanitarian assistance of US\$ 48 million, of which US\$ 37 million would be provided to the general public through international organizations and NGOs, and US\$ 11 million would be given to the Iraqi refugees in Jordan, Lebanon and Syria. The humanitarian assistance will be given to the Sunnis, Shiites, Christians and other minorities including Yezidis.

E. Forming an inclusive Iraqi government. To form a cohesive, inclusive, well organized and belligerence Iraqi government is an important part of the US anti-terrorism policy, a prerequisite for the US to avoid getting mired in the war, and an effective guarantee for the US to defeat the terrorist organizations and keep them from revival. President Obama pointed out flatly that fighting against the IS called for strong support of the Iraqi government, especially its ground troops. Moreover, the Iraqis should manage their own affairs, and it is impractical to always rely on the US military deterrence on the IS, as the US can only help Iraq raise its security capabilities. Faced with the issue of the IS, the Iraqi government should have the ability to integrate the fragmented political forces within the country, and get rid of sectarian divisions, ethnic differences as well as power struggles. The new Iraqi government should draw lessons from Maliki who excluded other political forces from his government, and include all the three major political forces (Sunnis, Shiites and Kurds) into the government to make it a government of governance, unity, strength and inclusiveness. After a difficult change of government in Iraq, Abadi

defeated Maliki and became the new prime minister, whom the US welcomes and supports.

II. Considerations behind the American New Anti-terrorism Policy

In retrospect of Obama' s Middle East policy, one may notice the changes of the US policy towards Iraq, which were characterized by some passivity and uncontrollability. The US air raids on targets in both Iraq and Syria have breached its bottom line of resorting to force, which have been resulted from the passive response to the sudden appearance of the IS and positive strategic considerations to shape a new alignment of forces in the Middle East.

A. The US vital interests have been directly threatened, which forced it to breach the bottom line on resorting to force. At the end of May in 2014, Obama pointed out in his speech at the West Point graduation ceremony that “in the foreseeable future, the most direct threats internally and externally would come as in the past from terrorist organizations” . At the same time, Obama spelled out the principles for the US to resort to force, which include when the American core interests are threatened, American citizens (including Americans living overseas) are threatened, the living environment is in danger, and allies are faced with threats. Notably, the Obama administration has always been on the alert against terrorism, which may help us see the US intentions to launch air raids on the IS from its top-level design, as Obama has defined the IS as an out and out terrorist organization in his national speech on September 10. In his belief, the IS was not a state, nor was it a community of Islamic Muslim, for no religion permits killings, while the IS killed people who share the same belief.

The US believed that the IS has really threatened American interests, and

it is an anti-American terrorist organization, whose territorial expansion has threatened the security of the Americans living in Iraq. The IS was pressing on towards Erbil, the capital city of the autonomous Kurdish region in Iraq, where American diplomats, some citizens and military advisers stationed. Once Erbil falls to the IS, the American citizens there will be the first of the IS' s slaughtering. If the situation is left untended, its spill-over effect will threaten the security of American allies in the Middle East. The US also worried that the IS would threaten its homeland security. Experts from Rand held that although the IS was not likely to make terrorist attacks on American homeland shortly, it just like Taliban would possibly make terrorist attack on American homeland, if it gained a firm foothold, had a fixed territory, controlled Iraq and set up a regime of terror. The US confirmed that there are extremists within the IS who hold American passports or passports of other Western countries. If these people return to their home country, they are likely to engage in deadly terrorist attacks.

B. To lead the development of the Middle East situation and show its global leadership. From the perspective of the US global strategy, the Obama administration has taken the Asia-Pacific region as a region of strategic importance, which does not mean that the US would neglect the strategic importance of the Middle East and let it go uncontrolled. The relation between the two strategically important regions in the US global strategy is not one of zero-sum. In fact, in keeping the situation in the Middle East under control, the US wants to maintain its leadership and hegemony in the Middle East at the lowest cost possible, but it would not stand aloof in regard to the disorder in the region. Confronted with the steady rising of the IS and its fast spreading, which has sent shocks to the political alignment in the Middle East, the US would not likely tolerate the IS running wild and would increase its involvement in the Middle East.

Although the IS is a terrorist organization, its ambition is bigger than any other organization of its kind and has a grand plan, as it made it clear after “founding a state” in Iraq that it planned to occupy in a few years time West Asia, North Africa, Spain, Central Asia, the whole of India subcontinent and China’s Xinjiang region. Though its ambition currently remains as its slogan or idea, the IS has made real shocks to the regional pattern in the Middle East, which would further complicate the regional situation in the “post-Arab Spring” era. As the transition of the political alignment in the Middle East is not over yet under the impact of the “Arab Spring”, the appearance of the IS would delay such a development or even lead the development astray, and leave a brand of terrorism on the new pattern in the Middle East. Although the US has drawn back of its global strategy under the impact of the financial crisis, it has continued to see itself as the global leader and standing at the center of the world stage, as President Obama has pointed out that the bottom line is “the US should always be a front-line player on the world stage.” As the Middle East is the core region of its anti-terrorist policy, the US global leadership would be much weakened if the Middle East ran into disorder. As a result, the US must play a dominant role in countering terrorism to show its leadership.

C. To keep the Iraqi factor from becoming a “negative asset” for the future of the Obama administration, that would add one more faulty touch to its diplomatic legacy. In 2009, Obama came to office under the slogan “we can initiate change”, and one of the changes was to end the Iraqi War and to drag the US out of the mire. In 2011, President Obama made his campaign promise come true by withdrawing all US combat troops from Iraq and formally ended the US military operations in Iraq, which, as one of the political achievements he boasted, has helped him claim much favor and approval from the broad masses, and consolidate the basis of

his government. Nevertheless, in 2014, the security situation in Iraq took a sudden turn for the worse and the Iraqi security forces failed to maintain security in the country, which made the American domestic public fear that the situation of terror in Iraq would continue to worsen. In September 2-9 of 2014, the Pew found out after a public survey of 2002 grown-ups that 50% of those surveyed believed that the government could limit the freedoms of the citizens on account of counter-terrorism. This is the first time of the past 10 years that the American citizens held counter-terrorism over freedom. 62% Americans feared the rise of Islamic extremism, and the ratio was the highest since 2007. Against such backdrop, if Obama continued to refrain from military actions, Iraq would become a second Afghanistan ruled by Taliban, and the Obama administration would be publicly condemned and the title of “coward president” would be given to Obama, which would to some extent mean the failure of the War on Terror. Therefore, in order to prevent the unexpected, Obama should respond strongly to the offensive of the IS. Before the midterm election, Obama announced his new anti-terrorism policy to increase the possibility of the Democrats to win the midterm election. But contrary to his expectations, the Iraqi issue was the Achilles’ s heel of the Democrats in the election. Will McCants, a leading specialist on the Middle East issue from the Brookings Institution, believed when analyzing the impact of the IS on the American midterm election that the Democrats underestimated the threats posed by the IS, as Obama once saw the IS as “bench warmers” who can hardly do anything. But the IS spread out from Syria into Iraq, and became a serious issue the Republicans used to attack the Democrats.

The issue of the IS is very complicated as it is related not only to terrorism, but also to religious sects, ethnicity, and the Syrian crisis, which calls for the Americans to work out a new policy based on careful weighing of all factors, and consider how to realize their national interests, defeat terrorism

and reach the goals of shaping the regional political alignment with such policy. The complexity of the issue also determines that such policy has to face challenges of various kinds.

III. Challenges the American New Anti-terrorism Policy Will Face

As Obama was forced by the drastic changes of the situation to announce the new anti-terrorism policy, such policy cannot avoid defects and will be met with multiple challenges, which would affect its effectiveness.

A. Air raids lacked ground support. From the history of anti-terrorism, military actions conducted against terrorist groups only scratched the surface of the problem. Limited air strikes without ground support can hardly eliminate terrorist groups. Some scholars from the Brookings Institution pointed out that although Obama's ultimate goal was to destroy the IS, the goal could not be reached only by means of air raids. Richard N. Haass, Chairman of the US Council On Foreign Relations, held that the expanded US military operation was a proper response to the threat posed by the IS to the interests of the US and the world, but the goal set by the president was unrealistic, as air raids could only weaken the terrorists and make them on the defensive without recapturing any lost land.

B. The legitimacy issue of the US air striking Syria. As the US launching air raids on targets in Iraq was consented and welcomed by the Iraqi government, there is no issue of legitimacy. But, the US air striking Syria is quite a different case, as Bashar government has made it clear that air raid on targets within Syria without permission from the Syrian government was illegal aggression. Since the US denied the legitimacy of the Bashar government, it neglected the accusation of Bashar. But, the Bashar

government has a legitimate seat in the UN and enjoys the recognition of the majority within the country. Therefore, from this perspective, the US air striking Syria involves the legitimacy issue. As a result, there are people in the US who questioned the legitimacy of the US air striking Syria, saying that although the US government defended its air striking on targets within Syria by citing the right of hot pursuit, this clause is mainly applicable to Navy striking the pirate vessels sailing into high seas and across border pursuit of criminals. So, this clause is not applicable to the case of Syria.

C. The alliance of anti-terrorism networks is not consistent. The alliance of anti-terrorism networks formed by the US has come across with a lot of internal problems, with its members having different aspirations on fighting the IS. This time, France supported the US as the spearhead, and participated in the air raids. The UK joined the air raids to some extent despite some resistance from the Parliament. Whereas, the US allies in the Middle East have various inclinations, with Saudi Arabia and Qatar superficially echoing the US call, but it is reported that they supported the IS secretly. Although Turkey verbally supported the US fighting terrorist groups, it has made little move in that direction, and hesitated in regard to opening its territory for striking the IS. Lacking effective support from its allies, the US' s achievements in fighting terrorism are much cut back. Moreover, the US excluding such stakeholders as Iran and Russia out of the coalition will also impact the effectiveness of its fighting against terrorism.

D. The Iraqi new government cannot be relied upon. As the Iraqi government plays an important role in the US new anti-terrorism policy, the US fighting capacity against terrorist groups will be much reduced without effective cooperation of the Iraqi government, and the reconstruction of security in Iraq will also be affected. But from the current

situation, the political situation in Iraq is very complicated, and although an inclusive government has been founded, it is questionable whether it can agglomerate all the forces within the country, increase the political and religious identity, and concentrate on the governance of the state.

E. The terrorist groups in the Middle East tend to collaborate. Faced with the joint air raids by the US and its allies, the IS does not pursue a tit for tat policy, but responds with a flexible tactics. The IS has followed the same path as the US by seeking to form a cooperative coalition to jointly respond to the US military intervention. The IS is not the only terrorist group in the Middle East, and there are other terrorist groups such as al-Qaeda, all of which are anti-American. If the IS forms a coalition with other terrorist groups, it will much strengthen its power and make it more difficult for the US to fight terrorism. It is speculated that the IS will soon form a coalition with the biggest sub-group of al-Qaeda in Syria. When Obama increased the US military personnel in Iraq, the IS reached an agreement with al-Qaeda to fight jointly against their common enemy the US, which would pit the US against a coalition of terrorist groups.

F. The IS has strong capacity of self-healing. It is not accidental that the IS has overtaken the once No.1 terrorist group al-Qaeda as the chief terrorist force in the Middle East, because it has unique capabilities. First, the IS has its members spreading in a broader area, as it has great attractions to the middle and lower classes in the Middle East as well as members with passports of the Western countries. So it has no problem for recruiting. Second, it is well funded and has strong “immunity” to sanctions. The IS has a different system of funds collection from other terrorist groups, as its sources of fund are diversified, which include kidnapping and tolling the roads. In addition, the IS has also controlled some oil fields in eastern Syria

and northern Iraq, which have provided it with great oil revenues through smuggling. Therefore, it is believed that the economic sanctions placed by the US and its allies on the IS would not achieve effective results, as the IS has great capabilities to go against sanctions.

From what we can see presently, although the US anti-terrorism policy with air raids as chief means may weaken or contain the IS strong offensive, when the air raids are over, the military operations of the IS will change from open to underground and from group fighting to “lone wolf” attacks. The US may have realized its goal of protecting the present Iraqi regime from falling into the hands of the IS, but it cannot fundamentally eliminate the IS and ensure internal security in Iraq.

IV. Impact of the American New Anti-terrorism Policy

The US new anti-terrorism policy is only a partial one and not a well thought and specific one, which lacks strategic height and is unable to overturn the US established Middle East strategy. The overall strategic contraction trend of the US in the Middle East will not change, but there will be some inclinations in its policy on such hot spot issue as Iraq. There are two reasons that the US would not fundamentally change its Middle East policy. First, as there are only two years left for Obama to stay in office, it is unrealistic for him to adjust the US strategy. Second, from the present situation in the Middle East, such hot spot issues as the Syrian crisis, the Palestine-Israeli conflict and the Iran nuclear issue in the Middle East are “hopeless cases” and show no sign of break through; there is not much room for the US to operate. Under such circumstances, the US would not continue its previous policy of restraint, nor would it adopt a policy of rash advance, but seek a balance in between, hoping to maintain its dominance and be in control of the situation development in the Middle East at low

cost.

The current high-profile anti-terrorism operation of Obama is very risky, as the possibility for the US to be attacked by terrorists at home is rising. The intention of striking the IS is to safeguard the US core national interest, to keep the US from being attacked by terrorists at home. But in reality, with the US air raiding going on, it remains to be seen that whether or not the US has opened another “Pandora’s Box”. It is certain that the anti-American sentiment of the terrorists is increasing. Once the arrogance of the terrorist groups is pressed down, they would break up into smaller groups or individuals, and follow traditional terrorist tactics of random attacks. More importantly, it is known from the US intelligence that about 15000 foreign nationals from more than 80 nations have gathered in Syria, of which about 2000 are from the Western countries. With the time passing on, their number will increase. These are the people the US fears most, as they may legally come home at any time and conduct illegal terrorist acts.

(The author is Assistant Research Fellow, China Center for Contemporary World Studies. This article was finished on December 22, 2014.)