



厦门大学公共事务学院文库

FUHE QUANLI JIEGOU YU
GUOJIA TONGYI MOSHI

Fuhe Quanli Jiegou Yu Guojia Tongyi Moshi

复合权力结构与国家统一模式

——对越南、德国、也门的比较研究

夏路 著

中国社会科学出版社



厦门大学公共事务学院文库

FUHE QUANLI JIEGOU YU
GUOJIA TONGYI MOSHI

Fuhe Quanli Jiegou Yu Guojia Tongyi Moshi

复合权力结构与国家统一模式

——对越南、德国、也门的比较研究

夏路 著

中国社会科学出版社

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

复合权力结构与国家统一模式/夏路著. —北京: 中国
社会科学出版社, 2011. 4

ISBN 978-7-5004-9856-8

I. ①复… II. ①夏… III. ①国家统一—对比研究—
世界 IV. ①D52

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2011) 第 095049 号

责任编辑 孔继萍

特约编辑 张 鹏

责任校对 郭 娟

封面设计 弓禾碧

技术编辑 王炳图

出版发行 中国社会科学出版社

社 址 北京鼓楼西大街甲 158 号 邮 编 100720

电 话 010-84029450 (邮购)

网 址 <http://www.csspw.cn>

经 销 新华书店

印 刷 北京奥隆印刷厂

装 订 广增装订厂

版 次 2011 年 4 月第 1 版

印 次 2011 年 4 月第 1 次印刷

开 本 710×1000 1/16

印 张 17.5

插 页 2

字 数 230 千字

定 价 37.00 元

凡购买中国社会科学出版社图书, 如有质量问题请与本社发行部联系调换

版权所有 侵权必究

总 序

公共管理与公共政策是一个重大理论与实践领域，而我国改革开放和市场经济发展急需公共管理与公共政策的创新研究。近年来，党和国家领导人反复强调要实践科学发展观，深化行政体制改革，实施政府管理创新和建设服务型政府，创新社会管理，推进基本公共服务体系建设，提高决策科学化民主化以及依法行政的水平。随着全球化、信息化和知识经济时代的来临，当代国外的公共管理与公共政策的理论和实践发生了深刻变化；在我国改革开放和现代化建设实践中，产生了大量亟待解决的关于公共管理与公共政策方面的重大问题。因此，加强公共管理与公共政策以及公共服务的创新研究，对于推动公共管理学科领域的向前发展，增强公共管理学科的知识应用，更好地服务于中央和地方的政府治理与政策创新以及经济社会的发展，就具有十分重大的理论与实践意义。

厦门大学政治学与行政学学科具有悠久的历史。早在 20 世纪 20 年代中期，我校就设立了相关的系科，中间几经调整分合及停办。80 年代中后期，作为国内首批恢复政治学与行政学学科的重点综合性大学之一，我校复办政治系，不久更名为“政治学与行政学系”，2003 年成立公共事务学院。厦门大学公共事务学院以及原来的政治学与行政学系始终把公共管理与公共政策作为学院的发展重

心。经过二三十年的努力，我校的公共管理学科已经取得了长足的发展。现设有公共管理一级学科博士点、博士后科研流动站和公共管理硕士（MPA）专业学位点（另有政治学一级学科博士点、人口、资源与环境经济学和社会学等二级博士点），行政管理国家级特色专业，行政管理、社会保障和政治学理论3个省级重点学科，福建省文科重点研究基地——“公共政策与政府创新研究中心”，福建省“公共管理与公共政策研究生教育创新基地”，福建省公共政策教学团队，厦门大学“211工程”三期“公共政策和政府治理”及“985工程”——公共管理重点学科建设项目，厦门大学“公共政策与政府治理研究”创新团队等。

我校的公共管理与公共政策的研究与教学走在全国前列，已经形成一支以青年教师为主、专业结构比较合理、创新能力较强的人才团队。其中有教育部“长江学者特聘教授”、全国宣传文化系统“四个一批”人才、教育部“青年教师奖”获得者、国务院学位委员会学科评议组成员、国家社会科学基金评委、宝钢教育基金“优秀教师奖”及特等奖提名奖获得者、教育部“新世纪人才支持计划”入选者、“闽江学者特聘教授”、福建省高校名师、福建省“新世纪人才支持计划”和“百千万人才工程”入选者等优秀人才；并形成了包括公共管理理论、公共政策分析、政府改革与治理、公共服务及其管理、公共部门绩效管理、社会管理及社会保障、国家学说、新政治经济学、社会性别与公共事务等在内的多个特色和优势研究领域或方向。

作为厦门大学“211工程”三期“公共政策和政府治理”及“985工程”——公共管理重点学科建设项目的研究成果，“厦门大学公共事务学院文库”围绕公共管理与公共政策这一核心，遴选我院教师“211工程”及“985工程”课题研究成果以及优秀博士论文汇集出版，旨在显示近年来我院公共管理及相关领域的研究进展，加强与

国内外学界的交流，推进我国公共管理及相关学科的理论创新与知识应用。

厦门大学公共事务学院院长

陈振明

于 2011 年 4 月 6 日

（厦门大学九十华诞纪念日）

中文摘要

第二次世界大战后，国际社会中出现了朝鲜、德国、越南、也门等分裂国家。其中，越南、德国、也门分别通过武力、吸收、一体化模式完成了国家统一。为什么三国能够完成国家统一？为什么三国采取了不同的统一模式？作者认为，分裂国家统一不是“行为体取向”单一发展的逻辑，而是“结构性取向”综合作用的结果。本书尝试构建“复合权力结构”的新视角，通过对越南、德国、也门统一的比较分析，论证“复合权力结构影响分裂国家统一及其模式选择”的理论假设。

复合权力结构是一种多维力量的综合体系，横向上包含硬权力和软权力结构两大内涵，纵向上涉及国家、地区、全球权力结构三个层面，可以细化为国家—硬权力结构、国家—软权力结构、地区—硬权力结构、地区—软权力结构、全球—硬权力结构、全球—软权力结构六项指标。每项指标都分别对应一个重要的参考因素：政治军事、经济社会、区域大国、区域组织、极的关系、意识形态。

越南、德国、也门统一是复合权力结构综合作用的结果。就国家权力结构而言，在越南武力统一中，硬权力结构与软权力结构分别体现为：南北越南政治军事对立，北越武力主导政治军事统一；南北越南经济社会离散，北越武力主导经济社会统一。在德国吸收统一中，硬权力结构与软权力结构分别表现为：东西德国政治军事缓和，西德和平主导政治军事统一；东西德国经济社会整合，西德和平主导经济社会统一。

在也门一体化统一中，硬权力结构与软权力结构分别呈现为：南北也门政治军事缓和，南北也门和平主导政治军事统一；南北也门经济社会整合，南北也门和平主导经济社会统一。

就地区权力结构而言，在越南武力统一中，硬权力结构与软权力结构分别体现为：中国与南越敌对，中国默认北越武力主导统一；南北越南均处于东盟之外，越南统一不受地区规范限制。在德国吸收统一中，硬权力结构与软权力结构分别呈现为：法国与东西德国缓和，法国默认西德和平主导统一；西德处于欧共体之内，德国统一受到地区规范限制。在也门一体化统一中，硬权力结构与软权力结构分别表现为：沙特与南北也门缓和，沙特默认南北也门和平主导统一；南北也门处于阿盟之内，也门统一受到地区规范限制。

就全球权力结构而言，在越南武力统一中，硬权力结构与软权力结构分别表现为：美苏缓和，美国从东南亚的战略撤退；美国在南越影响力的收缩，美苏默认越南武力统一。在德国吸收统一中，硬权力结构与软权力结构分别呈现为：美苏缓和，苏联从欧洲的战略撤退；苏联在东德影响力的收缩，美苏默认西德和平主导统一。在也门一体化统一中，硬权力结构与软权力结构分别体现为：美苏缓和，苏联从中东的战略撤退；苏联在南也门影响力的收缩，美苏默认南北也门和平主导统一。

通过对越南、德国、也门统一的比较分析，可以得出以下结论：第一，分裂国家统一的实现与“同质性复合权力结构”密切相关：在国家层面，国家—硬权力结构为内部主导政治军事统一；国家—软权力结构为内部主导经济社会统一。在地区层面，地区—硬权力结构为区域大国默认分裂方主导统一。在全球层面，全球—硬权力结构为两极缓和，一极在地区的战略撤退；全球—软权力结构为一极在分裂一方影响力的收缩，两极默认分裂方主导统一。

第二，分裂国家统一模式的选择与“异质性复合权力结构”密切相关。(1) 在统一模式中，影响武力模式或和平模式（吸收与一体化模

式均属于和平模式)选择的异质性复合权力结构为:在国家层面,国家—硬权力结构体现为分裂双方政治军事“对立”还是“缓和”,分裂方内部“武力”或“和平”主导政治军事统一;国家—软权力结构呈现为分裂双方经济社会“离散”还是“整合”,分裂方内部“武力”或“和平”主导经济社会统一。在地区层面,地区—硬权力结构体现为区域大国与分裂双方关系“对立”或“缓和”,区域大国默认分裂方“武力”或“和平”主导统一;地区—软权力结构呈现为分裂方处于区域组织“之外”或“之内”,分裂方“不受”或“受到”区域规范限制。在全球层面,全球—软权力结构表现为两极默认分裂方“武力”或“和平”主导统一。其中,国家、地区和全球层面中各项因素的前者影响了武力统一模式的选择,后者影响了和平统一模式的选择。

(2)在和平统一模式中,影响吸收模式或一体化模式选择的异质性复合权力结构为:在国家层面,国家—硬权力结构表现为内部“一方”或“双方”和平主导政治军事统一;国家—软权力结构体现为内部“一方”或“双方”和平主导经济社会统一。在地区层面,地区—硬权力结构体现为区域大国默认分裂“一方”或“双方”和平主导统一;地区—软权力结构呈现为分裂“一方”或“双方”处于区域组织内。在全球层面,全球—软权力结构表现为两极默认分裂“一方”或“双方”和平主导统一。其中,国家、地区和全球层面中各项因素的前者影响了吸收统一模式的选择,后者影响了一体化统一模式的选择。

综上所述,复合权力结构影响分裂国家统一及其模式选择。其中,同质性复合权力结构影响分裂国家统一的实现,异质性复合权力结构影响分裂国家统一模式的选择。该理论对深入研究中国的统一问题具有重要的参考价值。

Abstract

Among the Divided-Nations such as Korea, Germany, Vietnam and Yemen arising after the Second World War, Vietnam was reunified by force; Germany was reunified in an absorption way; while Yemen was reunified in integration. Why were they able to reunify? Why did they adopt different reunification models? The author believes that these issues could not be explained in the logic of “actor orientation”, but in the logic of “structure orientation”. This book attempts to compare the reunification models of the three nations in the perspective of Complex Power Structure and support the hypothesis that Complex Power Structure determines Divided-Nations’ reunification and their model selection.

Complex Power Structure is a system of multi-powers. It contains both hard power structure and soft power structure. It involves three levels—national power structure, regional power structure and global power structure. Therefore, Complex Power Structure includes six components which are national-hard power structure, national-soft power structure, regional-hard power structure, regional-soft power structure, global-hard power structure and global-soft power structure. Each one was embodied in a corresponding indicator: politics and military force, economy and society, regional big power, regional organization, polar relations and ideology.

The reunifications of Vietnam, Germany and Yemen were all the consequences of given complex power structure. On the national level, the hard and soft power structures in Vietnam's forceful reunification were special. The political and martial relationship between the RVN and the DRVN was in tension. Finally the DRVN led the political and martial reunification process by force. The economic and social relations between the RVN and the DRVN were in separation. Later the DRVN led the economic and social reunification process by force. The hard and soft power structures in Germany's absorption reunification were quite different. The political and martial relationship between the GDR and the FRG was in *détente*. The FRG led the political and martial reunification process in a peaceful way. The economic and social relations between the GDR and the FRG were in integration, and similarly the FRG led the economic and social reunification process peacefully. The hard and soft power structures in Yemen's integration reunification correspondingly were significant. The political and martial relationship between the DPRY and the YAR was in *détente*. The DPRY jointly with the YAR led the political and martial reunification process in a peaceful way. The economic and social relations between the DPRY and the YAR were in integration. Likewise, the DPRY jointly with the YAR led the economic and social reunification process peacefully.

On the regional level, the hard and soft power structures in Vietnam's forceful reunification were separately concluded as the following: the PRC and the RVN were in hostility, so the PRC admitted Vietnam's forceful reunification led by the DRVN; both the DRVN and the RVN were out of the ASEAN, therefore, Vietnam's reunification was not constrained by regional norms. The hard and soft power structures in Germany's absorption reunification were different. The FR improved the relations with the GDR and the FRG and accepted Germany's peaceful reunification led by the FRG. The FRG

was one of founders of the EC, so Germany's reunification was restricted by regional norms. The hard and soft power structures in Yemen's integration reunification were similar as those in Germany's reunification. The SA improved the diplomatic relations with the DPRY and the YAR admitted Yemen's peaceful reunification led by the DPRY and the YAR. Both of the DPRY and the YAR were members of the LAS, so Yemen's peaceful reunification was effected by regional institutions.

On the global level, the hard and soft power structures in Vietnam's forceful reunification were helpful. The polar relations of the U. S. and the U. S. S. R. were in détente. The U. S. 's strategic strength in East Asia was declining. The influence of the U. S. weakened in Vietnam. Both the U. S. and the U. S. S. R. admitted Vietnam's forceful reunification led by the DRVN. The hard and soft power structures in Germany's absorption reunification separately were also helpful. Situations between the U. S. and the U. S. S. R. were in détente. The U. S. S. R. 's strategic strength in East Europe was trailing off. The influence of the U. S. S. R in the GDR had bated. Both the U. S. and the U. S. S. R. accepted the absorption of the GDR into the FRG. The hard and soft power structures in Yemen's integration reunification played significant roles; U. S. - U. S. S. R. relations achieved détente. The U. S. S. R. 's strategic strength in Middle East weakened. The influence of the U. S. S. R in the DPRY was trailing off. Both the U. S. and the U. S. S. R. accepted the integration by the DPRY jointly with the YAR.

By comparison, we can find the homogeneities and heterogeneities of "Complex Power Structure" in the process of Divided-Nations' reunification. (1) The homogeneities of Complex Power Structure determine whether the Divided-Nations could be reunified or not. Homogeneities are characterized by the following. On the national level, national-hard power structures were that

one of the divided parts led the political and martial reunification process. National-soft power structures were that one of the divided parts led the economic and social reunification process. On the regional level, regional-hard power structures were that the regional power accepted the divided nation's reunification process. On the global level, global-hard power structures were that the two poles were in détente, and one pole withdrew from the strategic region. Global-soft power structures were that one pole lost its influences on divided part, and two poles admitted the divided nation's reunification by the divided part.

(2) The heterogeneities of Complex Power Structure determine the selection of the Divided-Nation reunification model. As to the selection of reunification model, the heterogeneities which led to the forceful model or the peaceful model (both the absorption model and the integration model belong to the peaceful model) were characterized by the following. On the national level, nation-hard power structures were that political and martial relations were in tension or in détente and one of the divided parts leading the political and martial reunification process by force or in a peaceful way. National-soft power structures were that economic and social relations were in separation or in integration, and one of divided parts leading the economic and social reunification process by force or peacefully. On the regional level, the regional-hard power structures were that the relations between regional power and divided parts were in hostility or in friendship and the regional power accepting the divided nation's reunification process by force or in a peaceful way. The regional-soft power structures were that the divided parts were in or out of the regional organization and the reunification process constrained by regional norms or not. On the global level, the global-soft power structure was that global poles admitted the divided nation's reunification by force or in a peaceful way. In the above,

the former factor led to the forceful reunification, and the latter factor made for the peaceful reunification.

As to the selection of peaceful reunification model, the heterogeneities which led to the absorption model or the integration model were characterized by the following. On the national level, nation-hard power structure was that one or two of the divided parts led the political and martial reunification process in a peaceful way. National-soft power structure was that one or two of divided parts led the economic and social reunification process peacefully. On the regional level, the regional-hard power structure was that the regional power accepted the divided nation's reunification process led by one or two of divided parts in a peaceful way. The regional-soft power structure was that one or two of the divided parts were in the regional organization. On the global level, the global-soft power structure was that global poles admitted the peaceful reunification led by one or two of the divided nation. In the above, the former factor led to the absorption reunification, and the latter factor made for the integration reunification.

All the works help us draw a conclusion: "Complex Power Structures determine Divided-Nation's reunification and its model selection". The homogeneities of Complex Power Structure determine whether the Divided-Nations could be reunified or not. While the heterogeneities of Complex Power Structure determine the Divided-Nation's reunification model selection. These theories will count for China's reunification studies to some extent.

序

民族国家的“统分”问题一直是国际政治学领域的焦点。该问题始于1648年威斯特伐利亚体系现代国家的诞生，凸显于20世纪全球民族国家独立与兴起的浪潮。其中，第二次世界大战以后某些统一国家分裂之后再次走向统一的历史进程，备受学界关注。夏路博士的专著《复合权力结构与国家统一模式——对越南、德国、也门的比较研究》，是该领域的最新学术力作。

全书历时六载，六易其稿。写作思路基于作者的复旦大学国际政治系博士论文，之后在厦门大学工作期间继续得以补充与完善。近些年来，夏路一直致力于国家统一问题的研究，在专业权威期刊上发表了一系列有影响力的学术文章，相关课题获得了国家社会科学基金与福建省社会科学基金的资助，相关论文受到了“国际政治学会”（International Political Science Association, IPSA）之“分裂国家系统整合研究分会”（System Integration of Divided Nations）的瞩目，得到了海内外学术界的积极鼓励与充分肯定。

本书是作者关于国家统一问题长期耕耘的结晶。全书选择了第二次世界大战后分裂国家中已经实现统一的越南、德国与也门作为研究案例。通过对越南武力统一、德国吸收统一、也门一体化统一的比较分析，论证了“复合权力结构影响分裂国家统一及其模式选择”的研究结论，体现了以下几个方面的创新与特点。

第一，分析视角的创新。与以往“行为体取向”的分析不同，本书采取了“结构性取向”的研究视角。由于国家统一问题属于国际政治中的变革性问题，因此，结构性取向比行为体取向的研究方法更有助于对该类问题进行整体性、系统性的分析与解读。

第二，理论概念的创新。借鉴华尔兹体系权力结构与温特社会权力结构的理论成果与不足，作者构建了“复合权力结构”的新范式。该概念是“硬权力与软权力两大内涵”与“国家、地区、全球三个层次”的结合，可以细分为国家—硬权力结构、国家—软权力结构、地区—硬权力结构、地区—软权力结构、全球—硬权力结构、全球—软权力结构六大子内容。用复合权力结构框架探讨分裂国家统一问题，有助于提高该研究的分析深度，实现从简单历史分析到深入理论研究的有效转变。

第三，结论运用的创新。中国也存在统一问题。作者运用研究结论对如何认识中国统一问题作出了解答。书中解析了制约中国统一的复合权力结构因素，探讨了中国统一模式的可能性选择。作者特别指出，“一国两制、统一中国”的关键是促成同质性权力结构的转变，这一观点对认识中国统一问题颇具启发意义。

国家统一问题是一项较为复杂的历史进程，该书在论述此问题时难免存在疏漏。理论的抽象有助于增强解释力，但也存在某些因简化而带来的不足。如在复合权力结构概念的设定时，六项子内容的参考指标难以涵盖所有的现实因素。复合权力结构中国家、地区、全球三个层次之间的互动分析有待加强。此外，在中国统一问题的探讨中，大陆台湾关系与分裂国家双方关系在领土面积、实力大小等领域相差甚大，如何借鉴结论全面认识中国问题也有待深入。不足之处，诚恳欢迎学术同人斧正与指导，也希望作者能在今后的研究中进一步补足。

然而，大醇小疵、瑕不掩瑜。夏路的这本专著以严谨的规范逻辑与翔实的史实材料，深入探讨了国家统一及其模式选择问题，具有重要的理论意义与现实价值，是一篇优秀的学术著作。作为夏路的导师，我为

她所取得的学习进步感到欣慰和骄傲。在复旦大学攻博期间，夏路治学严谨、勤问好思、学贯中西、博学多才，给大家留下了深刻的印象。我记得，我常常对学生提及撰写论文和学术研究的“三度”要求：角度——精巧的、有见地的研究视角；高度——较为系统的、统领全局的理论框架；深度——观点的创新分析和翔实的历史资料。我惊喜地发现，夏路在该本著作中尝试对“三度”的结合及所取得的学术进步比我做得好。在她研究作品付梓出版之际，我欣然写了以上文字，是为序。

倪世雄

2011年春