

Dr. Connie Rahakundini Bakrie

Quadruple Foundations Towards Building the World Anew

This is the edited transcript of the presentation of Dr. Connie Rahakundini Bakrie to Panel 1, “The Growing Danger of World War III Underlines the Necessity for a New Security Architecture,” of the Schiller Institute’s April 15-16 Conference, “Without the Development of All Nations, There Can Be No Lasting Peace for the Planet.” Dr. Bakrie is an author, lecturer, defense analyst and strategic thinker of Indonesia.

Subheads have been added.



Schiller Institute

Dr. Connie Rahakundini Bakrie

My presentation today is “The New World Order and Quadruple Foundations,” which means I’m taking the position in favor of joint development towards the realization of the rebalance of power on global economic and security [issues].

Why do I say this? Because I think this is exactly the right time for the 6.3 billion people who live outside of the West: 66% feel positive toward Russia in the Russia-Ukraine war and 70% feel positively toward China, even though the Taiwan issue is coming lately. And among the 66% who feel positively about Russia, the breakdown is 75% in South Asia, 68% in francophone Africa, and 62% in Southeast Asia. And public opinion of Russia remains positive in Indonesia—in my country—in Saudi Arabia, Malaysia, India, Pakistan, and Vietnam. It was the University of Cambridge that actually did this survey.

There are five reasons why this has happened.

First, the Global South does not believe that the West understands or empathizes with their problems.

Secondly, history matters: Who stood and where did they stand during colonialism and after their independence?

Third, the war in Ukraine is seen by the Global South as mainly about the future of Europe, rather than the future of the entire world.

Fourth, the world economy is no longer American-

dominated or Western-led, so therefore—of course—the Global South does have other options.

And the last one is that the “rules-based international order” is lacking credibility and of course, interest in that is declining.

And the Global North’s “*über alles*” attitude has become a problem: For decades now, for many in the Global South, the West/Global North is seen to have had its way with the world, without regard to anyone else’s views. Several countries were invaded at will, mostly without UN Security Council au-

thorization. These include the former Yugoslavia, Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya, and Syria. So, actually, those people were put under subjugation. And under what “rules” were those countries attacked or devastated? Were those wars provoked or were they unprovoked?

We see that Julian Assange is languishing in prison, and Edward Snowden is in exile, for having the courage (or audacity) to expose the truths behind these actions. The latest one is the ICC charges regarding President Putin.

So you know, sometimes the other part of the world sees the West quite differently.

I say that the “quadruple foundations” I mentioned before are the basis for today’s New Deal, the four elements of which are the following: First, the BRICS; the second one is the new Non-Aligned Movement; the third one is Trump for President; the last one is the New Russia.

Relevance of the Non-Aligned Movement Today

Why does the Non-Aligned Movement have relevance on the balance of power between the Global North and the Global South? Because as long as there are gaps between nations, it is still relevant for the Non-Aligned Movement to struggle for equality.

World bipolarity now was ended after the Cold War, so there was a big economic gap between 1 billion [people in the Global North] towards 7.6 billion human beings [in the Global South]. And the Non-Aligned Movement has relevance for maintaining world peace, by playing a more active role to achieve its foundational principles and objectives, especially building a real peaceful and prosperous world.

The Non-Aligned Movement as an international movement is still very relevant, because of its principles, with the world defined by the superpower, consisting of those nations inside the “coalition of the willing” versus those inside the “coalition of the non-willing” countries. These are the principles that can strengthen the Non-Aligned Movement.

The other element is actually the BRICS. China’s Belt and Road Initiative, together with the new Non-Aligned Movement initiative can show us the way to become a genuine tool of trade, finance, technology, industry, currency, and investment and of course cooperation with a “Global South Sisterhood” vision. So, instead of going North, now, I think the BRICS is really, as we see, turning more to the South. And if we include Russia today, I think we believe Russia is turning toward the South, instead of putting herself in the North.

And Trump is the only answer to make the U.S. concentrate more on an inward-looking strategy, not an outward-looking one.

So, the Non-Aligned Movement has relevance on maintaining the balance of power between the Global North and Global South: The new Non-Aligned Movement has a significant role to strengthen, change or improve the role of the UN, in order to keep the United Nations as a peaceful platform. And I think we really need a Non-Aligned Movement to change the UN’s weakness—if I may say that.

And then the new Non-Aligned Movement becomes an integral part of a relevant foreign policy, mainly related to policies to avoid other forms of “control and dictation” by the Global North towards Global South countries. And the New Non-Aligned Movement has to be able to act as a catalyst to drive the Global South to accelerate connectivity, to accelerate development, to be able to build equality, and move toward a fair and balanced world.

So now let’s talk about the New Russia, and how the New Russia could weaken globalization. First, President Putin has stressed that the New Russia will further develop its ties with the Global South through

the Global Development Initiative and the Global Security Initiative on “Military Operations other than War” (MOOTW). This issue is really important.

Second, as globalization weakens, freedom should become the goal pursued by ordinary citizens, so we have to give enlightenment to the citizens.

And third, the last one is the defense of personal rights, which may very well be the most significant sign of Russia’s political awakening. So, I think the point has to be to convince Russia to do that.

Concerning the Trump for President movement, we have to have this, because then America will try to be great again, meaning they will concentrate more on the inward-looking attitude, rather than the outward-looking attitude, and controlling the greater part of the world.

A New Military Doctrine for the Global South

The last topic of discussion is going to be the new Non-Aligned Movement on Russia and the Global South strategic depth:

As Russia’s and Global South nations’ strategic depth continues to catch up with their economic, trade, resources, and technology, some of those guidelines, and of course, legal frameworks of specifically the “Military Operations Other than War” (MOOTW), have to be augmented as Non-Aligned Movement countries’ militaries adapt to new situations on the ground.

The objective facts on the ground do not suggest that the destruction now devastating Europe will spread and befall East Asia or tear up Southeast Asia in the immediate future (2025). Which is why I come to think about how America has to stop being fussy about Taiwan, and about South and East Asia.

So, the Global South “Military Operations Other than War” has to have 10 initiatives:

We have to help them to create—to build the initiative of sovereignty; territorial integrity; counter “state terrorism”; stability maintenance; safety and security operations; humanitarian assistance; environment security assistance; disaster relief; the Global South rescue and relief; and Global South peacekeeping operations. These initiatives have to apply more to the Global South rather than internationally.

The Global South “Military Operations Other than War” has to have some kind of joint doctrine. That MOOTW doctrine will indeed determine how the New Russia, China and New Non-Aligned Movement countries’ military and coast guard activities are opera-

tionalized in missions designated to safeguard Global South nations so as to claim their sovereignty and territorial integrity. Along their disputed land borders and in the maritime and airspace domain, we have to design a “New Russia, China and New Non-Aligned

Movement Joint Doctrine for Military Operations Other than War.”

I think that is my point that I can share at this opportunity. And so, I’m waiting for the discussion period. Thank you.

Prof. Wen Yi

The Secret of China’s Economic Success

This is the edited transcript of the presentation of Wen Yi to Panel I, “The Growing Danger of World War III Underlines the Necessity for a New Security Architecture,” of the Schiller Institute’s April 15-16 Conference, “Without the Development of All Nations, There Can Be No Lasting Peace for the Planet.” Professor Wen is a macroeconomist and former senior researcher at the Federal Reserve Bank of the United States.

Subheads have been added.



Schiller Institute

Professor Wen Yi

Thank you very much for inviting me to this wonderful conference. First of all, I was called upon with very short notice, so I do not have a power point to share with you. But I would like to say something with respect to the essence or the secret of China’s rapid development. Because I think China’s experience is very important to be shared with other developing nations. But so far unfortunately, all the conventional, Western-style economic theory has not been able to provide any coherent explanation for the rapid rise of China, and also not able to provide a good explanation of the origin of the British industrial revolution.

I think the two phenomena are intrinsically related. If we cannot explain China’s economic development, then there’s no hope we could also explain the industrial revolution which happened about 250 years ago in the UK. And vice versa, there’s no good theory to explain the industrial revolution, and that’s why people still cannot understand the development of China very well.

So here, I’m going to be offering something which is quite different from the conventional economic theory. First of all, let me mention three sort of superficial differences in terms of the China model and the Western capitalistic kind of development model. After that,

I’m going to try to get into some more fundamental logic behind that.

First of all, if you compare the rise of China, or the development of China, with the development of Europe or the West, the big difference, of course, is the scale. So far, after almost 250 years of industrial revolution, started by the UK, we only have less than 15% of the global population living in industrialized societies. More than 85% of the global population is still unindustrialized. That’s a very unfortunate situation. If China could manage to finish its

industrialization process, that alone would add another 20% of the global population into this group of people living in industrialized society. So that’s the first.

Secondly, the industrialization process in China, despite many struggles, has been very rapid, very fast. So, if we count Deng Xiaoping’s economic reform as a starting point, and actually to be more reasonable we should start with the establishment of the People’s Republic of China—so that’s still a mere 70 years. And yet, it took the Western powers several hundred years to develop, and eventually led to industrialization. Even after the UK kick-started the industrial revolution, it still took the West 250 years to finish that phase. So, in terms of speed, this is also very dramatic.

And lastly, but not least, the Chinese way of industrialization is very different from the Western way of industrialization. It’s very peaceful, at least so far. And we know the West’s way of industrialization has been very painful and is full of wars. That’s why we call the Western capitalism, war capitalism.

So, those are three, we can say, superficial features. But the underlying economic logic however is very similar. That’s what I want to point out, and therefore shed light on this Chinese experience, as well as the