

“Working Towards an Inclusive World : Global concept of a Community with Shared Future”

The world has never been homogenous since time immemorial. Over the ages, the inherent plurality in the human world has on one hand been blamed as the root of various conflicts. But on the other hand, it must also be acknowledged that it is through such diversity that mankind managed to compete and progress, ultimately contributing to what it is today.

Waning and waxing of human cooperation might have characterised the entire history of mankind. Nonetheless, we don't need rocket science knowledge to dawn upon us that mankind would most likely risk its very survival if coordinated collaboration continues to remain fragile in the face of existential threats. Common sense would ring alarm in any sensible minds among us that "No Man Is An Island". This is particularly so when the world is wantonly ravaged by the prevailing pandemic.

In the past one year, admittedly mankind community has generally failed to put up a good fight against the coronavirus concertedly. Multilateral international collaboration left much to be desired, though not in absolute tatters. The unipolar hegemon had, for the first time in the past 7 decades, conspicuously been absent from the international web of collaboration, let alone providing leadership to a globalised endeavour in the fight against the deadly contagion.

On the other hand, paradoxically, the US having been incensed by its escalating anxiety of being displaced as the unipolar superpower, notably in view of the meteoric rise of China, the US has grown excessively intolerant of, if not paranoid of, any outreach initiatives of China in engaging the international community.

The level of intolerance has breached the record high that even successful model of containing the spread of pandemic in China is selectively discriminated against with ideological prejudice. The pouring of Chinese aid in terms of PPEs to several pandemic worst hit countries on humanitarian ground has also met with scornful labeling as 'geopolitical Trojan'. The spectre of McCarthyism was deliberately resurrected at the expense of multilateral international cooperation. Indeed, the coronavirus outbreak has heavily polarised the globalised community. Instead of enhancing coordinated synergy of human resources and endeavours, the contagion has been made a convenient tool to stoke a fresh round of Cold War, pushing the world to the brink of conflict.

In the American perspective, realizing the dwindling of its global geopolitical influence, the unbridled spread of the contagion across the US, as well as among its allies readily reminds the superpower and the world of the analogy of Suez Moment. This has also fueled the trumpeting of such belief as the end

of 'Pax Americana' —the relative peace thought to be brought about by the preponderance of the US power after WW II. The rise of China and its increasing role and weightage in global geopolitics has since been labeled as the potential threat.

Against such a biased geopolitical backdrop, no amount of persuasion or preaching of the virtues of consolidating international cooperation could ever convince the prejudicial minds obsessed with arrogance of power preponderance. The Pax Americana, compounded with the American exceptionalism, has over the past 7 decades bred the ubiquitous American dominance.

The collapse of Soviet Union and its satellite Eastern bloc had further buttressed the US status as the sole unrivalled hegemon.

In the Chinese perspective, the rule-based paradigm in the global governance has time and again been taken for a ride as a *carte blanche* for the US to impose unilaterally its doctrine of ideology throughout the world

under the cloak of liberal democracy . Any alternative model of governance, deemed not in sync with the Western model of democracy, is virtually left with no room for survival on the world stage under the prevailing global order dictated by the US.

In the present context of escalating polarization, the concept of forging a community with shared future, as was espoused by China, is no doubt a timely wake-up call for the international community. More so, in the wake of increasing existential cataclysms that no single nation state could ever handle single-handedly.

Taking cognizance of such imperative, any recalcitrant resistance, motivated by geopolitical interests, to inclusive global cooperation is not only irrational and foolhardy, but also disastrously suicidal. International community has to come to sense that schism along ideological divide has no place in the face of cataclysm onslaught, particularly when the mankind survival is at stake. Multilateral international cooperation could only be marshaled and anticipated to live up to the expectation of fending off common threat, if and only if, genuine inclusiveness is upheld.

In this perspective, working towards an inclusive world should be made the realisable consensual goal of our pursuit for a community with shared future before it is too late. It is simply hyperbolic to contend that the goal runs contrary to the existing global order merely because it did not originate from the West, more so from a nation state of differing model of polity and civilization . After all, the Post-war international order has never dictated that the international institution of cooperation is the exclusive club for western democracies.

In this regard, universities or research - based institutions of BRI participating countries can play meaningful roles in shaping an inclusive world. Hosting of forum and seminars designed to explore the humanity aspect of forging a community with shared future should not be the sole initiative in the present context. Enough rhetorics centered on inculcating awareness worldwide have been endeavoured. But this has to be matched with more implementable initiatives to showcase the building of inclusive collaboration.

China, with its wide gamut of technological innovations, should endeavour to promote its innovative forte beyond mere market exploration for its products of cutting edge technology. Knowing the constraints restricting the technological capacity building in most developing countries, China has more to contribute in shaping inclusive collaboration through powering of such capacity with China's established expertise. More tech-based innovations with local cultural touch could be produced in the developing world in the name of 'joint research'. Instead of marketing the ' Made In China' products in the third world market, China could easily seek to make the locally produced tech innovations 'powered by China' the shared intelligent property with the host country. By so doing, China is virtually powering the local technology and supply chain through technology transfer , in addition to buttressing the self-confidence and national pride within the local social fabric. This would further endear the ideal of ' forging a community with shared future' to the populace of the developing world which constitutes the major bulk of the world.

This could be a real litmus test to China's soft power and its willingness to share the intellectual property rights of its technology with the rest of the world. It is not difficult for us to envisage such a gesture of altruistic sharing would ultimately reshape the world, not merely in terms of improving quality of life per se, but also in setting the stage for genuine global collaboration in anticipation of more imminent crises impacting our very survival on earth in times to come.

ONG TEE KEAT (Tan Sri)

Chairman,

Centre for New Inclusive Asia.

23rd December 2020 @ Kuala Lumpur.

[Presented at the online International Conference on “Working Together Towards a Community with Shared Future”, hosted by the Pakistan Research Center for a Community with Shared Future, Islamabad, Pakistan.]