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On 15 March 2023, Ambassador Tan Jian was interviewed by FD on the topics covering Dutch government’s recent export restrictions, intellectual property right protection, Sino-Dutch relations, Ukraine crisis etc. The interview was published on 20 March. The transcript of the interview is as follows:

**FD: We begin with the most important issue in the Dutch Chinese relationships at the moment - the technology export restrictions. Last week the Dutch government published the letter saying that they want to subject the export of the chip technology to licenses. China is not explicitly mentioned in that letter, but we all assume that it's about China. What is your assessment of what this announcement means for the exports in China?**

Ambassador Tan: On the 27th of January, media reported that Japan, the Netherlands and the US had reached the framework agreement on the export control of semiconductors or lithography. But that was the media report. The picture has got clearer. Now that on the 8th of March, we saw the letter from the Minister of Trade and Development Cooperation to the parliament, informing that the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs is to introduce export control framework of lithography. I think for China our position has been clear. We see such practices introduced by the US and his allies violate international trade rules, the market principles, and they undermine the stability of the global industrial and supply chains, the global growth or the global recovery. We are firmly opposed to such kind of acts. And if implemented, they will have a negative impact or they will negatively affect our economic cooperation and relations.

**FD: Can you tell us a little bit about your contacts with the Dutch government around this issue, you say in January, the media reported that export restrictions were coming. Were you trying to prevent this in any way? How were your contacts with the Dutch government officials? Were you surprised?**

Ambassador Tan: The rumor has been there for some time, we take this very seriously. We are asking for more information, for clarity. At the same time we have conveyed our position that, they are not in conformity with international rules, they are detrimental to the supply chain stability, they're not good for China, not good for the Netherlands, and not good for the world, for the global economy. So we are asking for information and at the same time we have expressed our position.

**FD: Can you go in a little bit more into these detrimental effects that you see? For example, to the supply chain disruptions that you might see? How would that work?**

Ambassador Tan: Take DUV sales to China as an example, China is not only the market, China is also part of the supply chain. China buys the equipment to manufacture or to produce chips. So now with the suspension of the sales, China's production will also be affected. That's not good for the global supply chain. We all know how important chips are in the global economy. You might have heard that there are certain stages where people were crying the shortage of chips, which may affect the global economic development and global recovery. We have discussed among ourselves and also we have conveyed our concerns.

**FD: Do you have a clear image of what the restrictions are going to be from the Dutch government? Because the letter was very vague.**

Ambassador Tan: We are asking for more information, but they gave us some broad brush positions, like they cited the three considerations why they do that, and we discussed on those three so called considerations or objectives. The discussion is ongoing. They are telling us that it's a framework, details as are still being worked on, the Netherlands will take his own decision in the independent way, they don't want to break stability of the supply chain.

**FD: So you still have hope that export restrictions will be reversed, or that they will not be as big as they might be?**

Ambassador Tan: We hope that we can be on the same page with regard to the negative impacts of any actions as such on bilateral relations, on economies, on global economic development or recovery. We all know that the Netherlands is the standard bearer for free trade, with a good reputation. And we hope that the Netherlands could be a champion in this regard. I think we both are for multilateralism, for globalization, for free trade. So I do hope that the Netherlands will take this very seriously, taking into account our positions and come to a good decision. That is the purpose of our discussions. We hope for the best.

**FD: Do you think that the United States is behind this?**

Ambassador Tan: Yes. The US has been pressuring some of its allies. That's why you see the three party framework agreement at the end of January. For the US, its policy has been very clear: containing China. I don't think that is the right policy. Those acts are coercive, bullying and hegemonic. It will destabilize and disrupt the supply chain, not good for the global economy and cooperation. And that's why China has filed the case in the WTO. We are for multilateralism, so we go to the WTO.

**FD: What level are discussions between China and the Netherlands being held? We've seen Prime Minister Mark Rutte go to the US to talk to Mr. Biden. What's the other side?**

Ambassador Tan: We have been talking to each other at various levels. Even during the covid period there have been exchanges. Maybe in-person exchanges were reduced, but there were phone calls, video conferences and sometimes in-person meetings at different levels. There was a meeting between President Xi Jinping and Prime Minister Mark Rutte on the margin of the G20 in Bali Indonesia on November 15th. They discussed the stability of the supply chain. Embassies of our two countries also talked to the ministries in charge in Beijing and the Hague.

**FD: Does this kind of measure damage the trust between the two nations? When they promise you to take this seriously and then they acted differently.**

Ambassador Tan: When we talk to each other, they also expressed that they will address the issue, taking into account their national security and ensuring that the global supply chain will not be very negatively affected. They also mentioned in the letter of those major principles.

**FD: What do you make of the argument in that letter that restrictions are necessary in light of international security issues? There wasn't so much in the letter, but that's what we constantly hear about arguments that a technologically superior Chinese army is seen as threat to western nations. What do you think of this?**

Ambassador Tan: It is not really about national security. It is about US pressuring its allies to contain China, to suppress China's high tech industries. Talking about national security, the Netherlands will introduce export controls on DUV, right? It has already suspended EUV sale to China, DUV is much less advanced than EUV. It is what experts called the mature node, much less advanced. We understand that there might be more advanced lithography even than EUV in the coming years. DUV is really at the low level in terms of the advancement of the technology.

Besides, the purpose of China importing DUV is to make memory chips, not logic chips, which are for civilian use. So we do not see the risk for national security. And in the letter they also talked about the objective of preventing undesirable long-term strategic dependencies. Well, we do trade to and investment in each other, this kind of mutual need cannot be called dependency or strategic dependency. This is the essence - very essence of trade. And we call it interdependence. And that is exactly what globalization means. We need each other, and then we trade and invest. Stretching the concept of national security, I don't think it's good. If one insists on saying that there is a dependency, my view is that, it's more China depends on the Netherlands than the reverse, China depends on the West. Look at the products produced by China, they can be easily replaced by others. While in the west they produce high-end, high technology products. Who depends on whom? But I do think that this is what globalization is all about. Let's not overstretch or abuse the concept of national security. Geopolitics or national security should not disrupt globalization.

And thirdly, about technology leadership or leadership position. My view is that selling to China, not controlling to sell will serve to preserve your leadership. Because you can make more benefit and do more investment. And you can have a lot of products experience feedback. As I said, DUV is not the advanced technology. Ever since I came here, I have realized that the Netherlands has many high-tech or super competitive companies. While the Netherlands does not have a large population, only 17 million, many of your companies stay super competitive, why? Because those companies go global: global production and global sale. In this regard, China is a very important market. We have 1.4 billion people and we are the largest trader in terms of goods. We have also the largest consumer market. So I do believe that losing the Chinese market will negatively affect your leadership. I'm really not convinced by this national security argument. I believe that export control will not help your national security. It will only hurt the supply chain security. We should be very careful with the overstretching of the national security concept, because nowadays every issue could be a security issue. That is really not good. So that's my feedback to the Trade Minister’s letter.

**FD: Our newspaper has also reported a while ago that our Ministry of Defense, and I believe it was 2020, already communicated, warned the Department of Trade that the export should not continue to China because of building a military capacity. So the Ministry of Defense was already convinced this was not about civilian use, but the risk of increasing capability of producing very smart rockets, radar systems and military use goods. So that was the position of the Defense Ministry as well.**

Ambassador Tan: We disagree with this kind of argument. If they have some concerns, we can discuss about that, like the military use or the dual use or the civilian use. With the overstretching, so many things can be said to cause risks. Even this cup of tea, this cup can be used by the military, right? If I buy a car, I can use this car to carry soldiers. So how to draw the line? As I said, this is DUV. It's just an a mature node. We are against the overstretching of national security. If the US has the policy of containing China, so many things can be cited as a national security concept, every issue could be a security issue. It will really affect our economic cooperation.

**FD: We were here in 2020, talking to your predecessor Xu Hong about the same issue, but it had not escalated to this point yet. And he basically told us that it would negatively affect trade relations if the Netherlands would continue to restrict technology export, and that there will be consequences. But we have not seen any repercussions on the side of China towards the Netherlands. So there have not been any countermeasures so far.Would there be countermeasures in the future?**

Ambassador Tan: I will not exclude that. On the part of the Netherlands, the restrictions are expanding from the EUV now to the DUV. We are trying our level best to communicate with the Netherlands and hope that they will not take these kind of measures. On our side, a lot of efforts has been made to prevent that kind of scenario. Now you are introducing more restrictions. And I know the US has been doubling down its efforts to contain China.

**FD: At least out in the open, we don't really see any repercussions from China against the Netherlands. That could be from the fact that the country sees the US more as the aggressor here than the Netherlands.**

Ambassador Tan: The US by itself has introduced many measures, practices, and at the same time is pressuring its allies to follow suit. So with the US, I don't have illusions. We are trying our level best to limit the damages, and we hope that the Netherlands will not take those measures. But that does not mean that we will swallow if damages are done, then of course we will take actions to protect ourselves. I will not speculate on counter measures, but I do disagree that China will swallow.

**FD: Can we go back to your reasoning about the national security as reasoning for these export restrictions? Because I feel like you're making China maybe a little too small when you say China needs the Netherlands more, then the Netherlands needs China because China is investing a lot of money in their own. President Xi has spoken about bold ambitions on technology independence. So that's of course a factor that western nations have to factor into.**

Ambassador Tan: Talking about the DUV or lithography specifically, I would say that we need you more. But in general terms, I'm talking about the Netherlands as a core member or as part of the western group.

I think your question is about China’s policy of self-sufficiency? The thing is that if we cannot buy it, what we can do. We are left with no choice but to make it ourselves. So this is not our choice. This is something forced on us, imposed on us. Let me give you some examples. Like the GPS, we want to join the international corporation, we asked to join in the European Galileo project, we even paid the down payment. But then we were told that we were not welcomed. Also like the international space station, we also wanted to join. But then the US legislature passed laws that prevented NASA from cooperating with China. Then we had to do it by ourselves. We are for international cooperation. But the thing is that some people, some politicians, are obsessed with cold war mentality, they exclude us, then we have to do it by ourselves. I gave you two examples that we want to join in the international corporation, but not successful. Still, I wish to say, notwithstanding that, China will continue its reform and opening up. We'll buy more and welcome investment. We will continue to embrace and support free trade and globalization.

History has proven that China has never harmed the interests of Europe. If you look back the past decades, or the past hundreds of years, or the past thousand of years, can you give an example China has done anything harmed the interest of the Europe? No. For the two world wars we were allies. I think history will prove again that China is part of the solution, China is not part of the problem. I've been here for two years and more. My major job is to drive home the message that we are part of the solution, be it climate change or global supply chain. It is difficult because there are a lot of people today obsessed with the Cold War mentality. It’s not easy but I will continue keep on doing this work.

**FD: At the same time, we have a war on the borders of Europe with the former cold war counterparts. And China hasn't openly opposed this war, which is seen as a threat to the west.**

Ambassador Tan: China has been consistent ever since the very start. We respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity and the independence of all countries, and we observe the purposes and principles of the UN. At the same time, we are opposed to double standards. On this issue, China is not a party to the conflict or crisis. China's role has been consistent: we are for peace. We have been promoting talk for peace. And with regard to some people asking why you do not use that word “condemn” , well, one country or some countries should not use their own criteria to ask other countries to do exactly the same. So many countries, including many developing countries, have their own positions. So when we look at Ukraine, we don't want to see the prolonged conflict.

And what about the role of the NATO? If we look at the post cold war history, any lessons learned? Should we have more in-depth dialogues and listen to each other carefully? Also we have made it very clear that nuclear weapons must not be used, nuclear wars must not be fought, and the threat or use of nuclear weapons should be opposed. China opposes the research, development and use of chemical weapons and biological weapons by any country under any circumstances. I hope people in the Netherlands, in the West, could appreciate our contribution and our position.

**FD: I do think that there was some surprise in the Dutch cabinet that China does not see the Russian Federation as an aggressor in this conflict. Do you not see Russia as an aggressor in the Ukraine conflict?**

Ambassador Tan: We see the situation as very complex, and we also want to know why it has developed to such a stage. We sometimes have similar feelings of under pressure. We have our own stories, our own feelings. But our emphasis is that we respect the sovereignty and territory integrity, that is the principle of UN charter. We're not providing weapons to any parties. As I said, there are so many countries around the world not expressing their exact position like in the west. So we may ask why? The focus right now is to work together to find a peaceful solution. Political solution is the only solution.

We are now talking about the Ukraine crisis, maybe next time we can talk about how China feels about NATO. During the Madrid Summit last May, why NATO invited three Asia pacific powers to the summit? We want to have explanations. Why some countries in the West sending their gunboat to our part of the world to do the drills. Just imagine Chinese gunboat in the north Atlantic doing the military exercise, how would you feel? We have our own stories. You have so many journalists based in China, and they never report that, or seldom. At least I haven't read any report on that yet. So these are the things I do wish that we listen to each other and talk to each other in good faith. And people in the west, I know they are militarily strong and have loud voices, they have CNN, BBC and many other news media outlets to tell the world. When we speak, even we try so hard, it's difficult to communicate and get our views heard.

**FD: What the Dutch government actually is afraid that ASML equipment might be used to increase military capacity, which might threaten western countries. You say China will never pose a threat in a military sense to western countries?**  
Ambassador Tan: Let me first talk about the so called threat. China is not a threat to peace, with or without ASML products. China has never posed any threat in history harming the interest of Europe. If you don't believe me, I'll give you some examples. We build the Great Wall for defense purpose, not for attacking. Admiral Zheng He made several marine navigations reaching as far as the west coast of Africa, no colonization ensued. It was 87 years before that of the Columbus. We are for peace, but if our interest is affected, especially core interest, of course we defend ourselves.

I don't like some news report here, because they take our reaction as a threat, they don't touch upon the cause for our reaction. They started the crisis, and they said, why China reacted so strongly?

Now coming to ASML. Again, do not overstretch the concept of national security. DUV is not the most advanced. But for some people, if they want to do something, well, they may need a good reason. The US, they want to crush China's high-tech industries, so they say Huawei and Chinese companies spying on the western countries. Have you found any evidence to their claims, to their arguments? No. But the US has been spying on you, your leaders, and you are so quiet. A lot of speculation on China's spying without evidence, but no in-depth or not even reporting on US spying. So that's why we say it's double standard. You cannot criticize our reaction without reference to the provocations.

**FD: We have also had many conversations with ASML directors, the board of directors, about their China strategy and how to expand. They have had many or at least multiple instances of technology theft. Most recently there was another one reported. There was yet another case a years ago where employees stole technology from the company, and one of them took it to China to further develop. And the CFO, Roger Dawson, has told us he has complained towards the Chinese government about this and warn them, these people are stealing our technology and developing in China with Chinese state funding. And he has basically communicated his worries about it. But he told us, well, they listen to you politely, but you don't really get any feedback. So it seems to us as though these kind of warnings have not been really followed up on, even though that this has been already years ago. And in that respect, you might say China has also had parts in this escalation of restrictions. Because the company is very scared of being of exporting technology and having it being stolen in China.**

Ambassador Tan: You were talking about that case which was years ago. Our position has been consistent. We attach importance to IP protection and we really mean it. We need to develop high tech, and we need to protect the IP to be innovative. We might have been more or less exhausted the catch-up growth. We need to stay competitive, to make more contribution to the global economy. We therefore need to be innovative and that has been the objective of our policy. In this regard we do need to protect IP. We are making it very clear that it is not just about IP, we will abide by this the global rules.

With regard to any specific case, we are asking for more information. There are courts, intellectual property courts in China. You can go to the court and there are rules and regulations, and there are some foreign companies who have made use of those mechanisms. I'm not talking about ASML in specific. I'm talking about your investment in China in general. As I shared with you the rationale of our doing so, it's not because of the pressure, it is because we believe in that. Otherwise China can only be a follower. We have to be innovative and we have to protect the IP.

**FD: So a lot of progress was made in the past years in the matter of laws and more courts to protect IP. And cases are being taken off more and more. Yet European companies reports that 46% still see the IP protection in China as not sufficient.**

Ambassador Tan: We take note of that. This kind of a high percentage may also due to the cause that there are more and more investment in China. We're not perfect. We'll improve and this is an important area. Our governmental policy has been very clear.  
  
**FD: If one or two of these cases were not just theft, well actually Chinese local governments are investing in the stolen technology, so that might be seen as Chinese government stimulating the theft of technology. That's a different thing than you can just go to a court, this is actually the government is supporting these people.**

Ambassador Tan: You use the word if, so this is hypothetical. If it is the conclusion of the court, then we'll follow the rules. But at this point, without any legal process, it's difficult for me to say that the government is involved. If there's a court verdict that the local government is wrong or some officials are doing wrong and I think they will be held accountable.

**FD: ASML has found proof of these investigations and raised the concerns about this already two years ago. So there has been enough time for the Chinese government to investigate this case and come to any conclusion. But we don't hear anything about it, so it seems as though nothing has happened since then.**

Ambassador Tan: Saying is one thing. There are mechanisms so they can tell us what are their next steps. And I think they were talking to the media about some cases. If they have further proofs or they want to take further actions, I think there are ways.

**FD: Do you know if the Chinese government has investigated Dongfang Jingyuan company, which has been accused of stealing?**

Ambassador Tan: We will investigate if there is a case filed in the court.

**FD: To prove IP theft, and technology theft, you need notaries in China to classify evidence. European companies have complained that local notaries have not cooperated with them in gathering the evidence. So it seems as though there, in paper, there are many laws preventing the things from happening, but in practice there are lots of systems not functioning to use the law to protect you.**

Ambassador Tan: Well, they may have some difficulties, like the Chinese companies also have a lot of difficulties in their business here. And we can exchange views and improve. So that is a process and they have their stories, but the stories need to go through the procedure to establish the case. And I do see the need for us to double down the efforts, because we need foreign investment and we want to improve our business environment.

**FD: ASML has said that with the trade restrictions, since October, they've seen an increase on the risk of theft of technology in China. They've seen more cyber attacks, and they're warning the western governments don't restrict China too much, because they're going to try to get the technology in different ways.**

Ambassador Tan: I will say that we will abide by the rules, we'll play by the rules. Talking about theft, I think my email box has been under frequent attacks. And I don't think those attacks are from China because my official email box has been broken or collapsed many times. You may focus on the so called threat from China, then what about US? So who are the attackers? And those people spying on us? Attacking us?  
  
**FD: What it means for Chinese people in the Netherlands about the heating rhetoric towards China in the west? For example, I've spoken to Mr. Wennink from ASML and he has said, do I have to treat every Chinese employee as a spy now? And Chinese technology companies in Eindhoven, are they going to be treated everyone as a potential thief of intellectual property? I was wondering if you've heard anything, if you have anything to say about what it does in the Chinese community in the Netherlands.**

Ambassador Tan: I think you may read the yearly reports of the Chinese Business Association in Europe. Their rating of the ease of doing business here in Europe is declining year by year. So on one hand, the Dutch government told us that they welcome more Chinese investment. On the other hand, the Chinese investors, they have a lot of difficulties. You will see that when Chinese companies come here, their products are seen as a risk, may be used for spying. If you have found something, if any proof particular, hold them accountable, but do not speculate and create the atmosphere that may frighten people away.

**FD: Could you elaborate on China’s self proclaimed right to development and how you view the Chinese roadmaps to self-sufficiency in advanced technology areas? Many strategies have been developed from China, do you think that they might indirectly increase the cases of theft? Do you think that the Chinese have unwillingly increased the risk of that kind of instance is happening?**

Ambassador Tan: First of all, I wish to say that those kind of practices led by the US are violating the international rules. And on our part, we will continue to play by the rules. And we do not want to see the relations with other countries deteriorate or further deteriorate. It is not our position to do theft. We want to invest more in our education systems and international corporation. That's the right way for us to be innovative.

We have the right to development, it has been accepted and agreed upon by all the UN members. It has been written into the UN declarations, statements, all the UN documents. So it is universally acknowledged and is especially important for developing countries. Talking about environmental protection, human rights protection, yes, we'll do that. At the same time, the right to development should be acknowledged. When we say the right to development, we may also talk about it in the context of the supply chain, the value chain. Some politicians accept China’s integration in global supply chain, provided that China is at the low end of this supply chain, China is making or manufacturing garments, textiles, toys, all these kind of cheap products, to keep the rich country's inflation low. But when they see China is moving up in the supply chain, and now China is also working on 5G or this kind of high tech, they don't want to accept that. Of course we will play by rules, respect the IP right. But we should be given this opportunity to be innovative and to move up in the supply chain. I do hope that this right could be acknowledged. China's contribution to and participation in the global family could be welcomed.

**FD: Do you consider this particular restriction a low point in the whole relation between China and the Netherlands?**

Ambassador Tan: There are several issues in the whole relations. This restriction is not the only one. We acknowledge the achievements over the past 50 years, we are also very sober minded of the challenges ahead, whether on political front, on the economic front or some other fronts. We are aware of that and that's why I say that I want to communicate more. We talk to each other, we listen to each other.

On cooperation, I hope that China's contribution will not be under-appreciated. I place my bet with many of my friends here. I say that today people are very much concerned with the climate change, I bet that China would do a much better job than the US. The US may be very good at talking, but we are very good at acting. I also give the example of the ozone layer depletion. This is a very successful story of international cooperation. Thanks to China's contribution and determination, it's on track to be repaired. So China is there for international operation. We do want to build a community of shared future for mankind. We’ve made it very clear we would do it on 2030 carbon peaking and 2060 carbon neutralization. Not because of the outside pressure. It's because we believe firmly that it's in our own interests, as well as in the interests of humanity. We are not doing that to exchange for something.

So I do hope that our policies, our actions could be appreciated. And I do hope that we can join hands, and enhance international cooperation.

**FD: But can you kind of compare where we are within this 50 years? I mean, there have been high points and low points both. How serious is this conflict? I'm referring back to where we started about the trade restrictions, which is a new concept for the Dutch as you point out. We have benefited from globalization tremendously, more than most countries. So for the Netherlands, this is a quite a turning point to put that kind of restrictions on exports, which is costing companies in billions of euros with revenues.**

Ambassador Tan: Basically. I do believe that it's not in the interest of China. It's not in the interest of the Netherlands, not in the interest of ASML. I do hope that people could think through the consequences. But I will not speculate on who should do what. I will only say that we will talk more with our counterparts. And we will be more innovative. The US has been doubling down in terms of containing China. So you will never know what could be their policies tomorrow.

**FD: Do you still have the hope that you can in convince the Dutch government to tone it down? Reverse the course or anything?**

Ambassador Tan: Usually we do not set the objective of reversing anything. What we can do is making the efforts. Dutch people have such a high reputation which they accumulated for hundreds of years to pro free trade. So if you introduce these policies, I don't think that's good.

**FD: Has there been any calculations on the damage to the supply chain? How much of damage economically it will do in China. How important this is for China to have DUV machines, which can only be imported from ASML?**

Ambassador Tan: I'm a diplomat. So I cannot give quantified damage, but I know that it will affect us very negatively. It's not only China who is paying the price. It is not good for the Netherlands and the world economy.

**FD: And you made a point earlier that if you force us, we will be forced to build our own?**

Ambassador Tan: I think that is the logic for everyone if they are given no choice. If they don't allow us to buy the grain, then we have to grow it ourselves, otherwise we will be starved to death. But I wish again to emphasize that even with this harsh environment, we will still maintain and strengthen our policy of reform and opening up.

**FD: Is there any way of saying how long it will take China to catch up on this area?**  
Ambassador Tan: It will take a long time. It's not easy but we Chinese are hard-working. My government has made it very clear that meeting the growing needs of the people is our central task. I think the subtext is that we are not interested in geopolitical rivalry, confrontation. But the thing is that we have to defend ourselves.  
  
**FD: It seems as though we have now been talking about the globalization in the past, I would say a few years now, and it's not gone any better recently. Do you think that Chinese policies are partly to blame for de-globalization? There are consistent dissatisfaction with European western companies. Companies are now leaving China. Western experts are leaving China. They don't feel welcome anymore. So much journalism being constrained. There's been many reports about the press, free press associations reporting on not feeling as welcome in China as they did in a few years ago.**

Ambassador Tan: If we are to blame, you tell me what we are blamed for? We are for globalization.

On your second question, I'm not sure if it’s the real situation. The reality is that some western companies are leaving, some are coming in. It may be a dynamic. I'm not sure whether we can come to the conclusion that more are leaving than coming. You may give me the figure, the numbers. What I've heard is that many companies, they acknowledge the improvement of our ease of doing business. I think in the World Bank ranking, China is making progress in terms of the ease of doing business rating for the past several years. Maybe the covid is a reason for many people feel unhappy. But now we are living in the post covid period. And my new Premier has made it very clear that we welcome foreign investors. It's not that China is pushing those people away, that's not our policy, and I don't believe that is the attitude of the people. In fact, we are very much concerned that some companies are relocating their business because of the rising cost of doing business in China. If they are relocating, I will see that basically as a result of the economic kind of things. We are for globalization, and I will not come to the conclusion that globalization has come to the turning point. There might be some ups and downs, and we do hope that with this kind of ups and downs, if we can smooth out, I mean, talking with the Netherlands, with many countries, with Europeans, and have a better understanding, then we can maintain the momentum of the globalization. Because the Netherlands has made it very clear in their communication with China they are against decoupling. So I’m still hopeful.