

罗伯特·库恩：中国经济之我见

怎样才能真正了解中国经济的总体情况？也许很多人会依据中国的国内生产总值（GDP）增长率来解读。但在我看来，假如单纯看 GDP 增长率，也许会有迷惑性。2016 年中国经济第三季度的增长率为 6.7%，与第一季度、第二季度持平。这一增长速度达到甚至稍稍超过了中国政府设定的年度经济增长目标。世界市场亦为之振奋。事实上，中国经济对于世界经济来说已经到了如此重要的地步：毫不夸张地说，每当中国公布其 GDP 增长速度时，世界市场都会不约而同地凝神屏息；假如增长率符合预期，人们几乎可以听到，国际市场齐刷刷地长舒一口气。

这些较高的国内生产总值增长率对于 2020 年中国“全面建成小康社会”目标来说是十分必要的。届时，中国人均国内生产总值将达到 9000 美元，比 2010 年的人均 4500 美元翻了一番。2015 年的人均 GDP 为 6416 美元。

然而，人们仍有疑虑。特别是一些外国经济学家担心：中国的债务尤其是企业债务问题不断加剧，也许正在接近不可控的水平。而多数中国经济学家仍很乐观：他们认为，中国的债务仍在可控范围。但实际上，债务增长率已远远超过了 GDP 增长率，这说明当前的增长模式从长远来看是不可持续的。

一些分析人士认为，信贷急剧扩张是 2016 年超预期经济增长的推手之一，因为这些贷款主要用于房地产和国家基础设施建设项目。假如对此不加以遏制，持续上升的债务将不可避免地制约金融体系的运转。

2016 年，世界货币基金组织（IMF）就中国债务问题发布了一份工作文件，估计中国 2015 年的非金融债务高达 168 万亿元（约为 25 万亿美元），为国内生产总值的 225%。其中，政府债务相当于国内生产总值的 40%，家庭债务占比略高于 40%。按国际标准来说，二者均不算过高。家庭债务比

亚洲发达国家和发展中国家的标准还要低。但 2016 年的新增抵押贷款预计将比 2014 年高出一倍多，因此，家庭债务也在上涨。

企业债务则属于不同范畴的问题：企业债务相当于 GDP 的 145%，占比很高。然而国际货币基金组织认为，中国的风险看似较大实则可控。

近年来，随着中国经济增长放缓，许多问题也显露出来了。几乎没有太多人相信官方公布的不良贷款率低于 2%。由于 65% 的中国企业债务源自产能过剩行业，因此，要他们偿还贷款是非常困难的。

从债务层面来看，也说明 GDP 增长速度本身不足以反映中国经济整体的真实情况。要想接近事实的真相，我们就必须考量其他因素，尤其是中国的长期经济政策和 GDP 增长的内在属性。

外界对于中国季度经济增长报告有些敏感，从起初的担心到其后的松口气，其实都大可不必。GDP 增长率顶多也只能部分反映中国经济的总体情况。

人们对中国经济增长放缓普遍担忧，那么，问题到底有多严重？十年前，2006 年中国的经济增长率是骄人的 12.7%，大家都很开心——寄望中国拉动世界经济的增长！而眼下，大家又都对中国经济猜测种种。但请大家注意：中国已拥有体量超大的 GDP 基数了。2005 年，中国的 GDP 是 2.3 万亿美元，2006 年 12.7% 的增长率意味着经济增长值达到近 3 千亿美元。

过去十年，中国的经济快速增长。2015 年，中国的国内生产总值为 11 万亿美元，如 2016 年的增长率为 6.5%，其增长值将超过 7 千亿美元，比 2006 年的增长值高出两倍还多。而 2016 年的中国人口与 2006 年相比略有增长。也就是说，2016 年的人均 GDP 增长值远远超过了十年前。

这当然是好消息。然而，经济牵涉方方面面的复杂因素。经济增长率是由哪些要素构成的呢？哪些行业是经济增长的动能呢？人们热衷于投资房地产，那我们要问：这些资产配置的效率究竟有多高？

大量的产能过剩已成为中国经济面临的**最大困境之一**。因**债务驱动**对**固定资产**的投资，尤其是通过**政府刺激经济项目**（出于**维持经济稳定**的需要）拉动的投资已导致一些投资没有效率，甚至产生相反的效果（他们花钱只是为了维持）。

虽然我们**无法得知**每个年度的**GDP**增长中有多少是**非生产性资产**，但我们可以肯定：在过去那些年为经济增长做出贡献的**煤炭、钢铁、水泥、玻璃、重型设备、化工和住宅**等行业，如今已成为**产能过剩**的产业。

所以，一方面，**GDP**增长基于一个相当大的基数仍令人印象深刻；但另一方面，其中的一些增长确实是**低效**的。然而，在**消费品、电商和服务行业**等方面的增长是**实实在在的**。

或许短期前景难以预测，但建立在**经济转型**基础上的长期繁荣还是值得期待的。

显然，我们需要**GDP**数据来制定标准和基准，但我们也不可将其神化。在人们的谈论中，经济增长的话题总是占据首要地位。**GDP**增长率是简单、易识别的数字，似乎很容易就能弄懂。这就是其魅力所在，同时也是其问题所在。

那么，我们还可以从哪些方面来对经济做出评估呢？我试图顺着中国经济政策的轨迹，从政策层面来解析其经济现状和取得的进展。

“**供给侧结构性改革**”对于去除过剩产能、减少企业债务来说非常重要。评估在去产能方面是否取得进展，可以从**破产公司**的数量是否增加来判断——关闭“僵尸”企业是件好事，而不是坏事。一些国有企业缺乏活力，这也不是什么秘密。长痛不如短痛，中国政府愿意做出一个艰难的选择，也许会让更多的国有企业破产，以谋求经济发展的长远利益。同样，以更多的**债转股**交易来减少和清偿企业债务。

另一个经济衡量指标是由银行发放给国有企业的**不良贷款率**。官方公布的基于狭隘定义上的不良贷款率为**1.5%**，人们对这个数据不以为然。分

析人士估计，实际的不良贷款率在 10%到 20%之间。我认为，如官方发布的不良贷款率更高一些，就更能作为可以确实反映经济运营情况的参数。只有这样才能表明政府整顿金融体系的决心，这对可持续增长来说是很有必要的。

只有放宽视野，才能看清未来趋势。因此，我们不能局限于眼前的这些数据。中国经济正处于历史性转型期，机遇与挑战并存。中国面临的问题不容小觑，如经济增长放缓、社会不平衡、产能过剩、债务过高、污染严重等等。

如何解决这些复杂的问题？中国已制定了一个指导经济转型的战略，是国家政策的顶层设计。中国国家主席习近平提出了中国发展的新模式，即“创新、协调、绿色、开放、共享”五大发展理念。

为什么提出的是这五大理念？每个理念如何发挥作用？为什么将它们统合在一起？又为何如此排序？再者，既然每个理念都已广为人知又普遍实施，现在为何又要要把它们一并作为指导性的协调战略提出来呢？

“创新发展”居五大发展理念之首。把创新放在首位，这是因为中国需要突破，渐进式的改进显得远远不够了，中国领导人正在加大改革力度。改革就需要做出改变，要改变就需要不同于以往的做法，而要改变工作方式就需要创新。

“创新”一词也第一次出现在一个理论框架的首要位置。“创新”会涉及诸多领域：毫无疑问有科学技术的创新和管理与流程等方面创新。创新将涉及技术、产业、体制、机制以及文化层面。

但以创新为驱动的商业或工业企业比以低成本制造为主的企业运营更加复杂、更难预测结果。创新不能靠自上而下的命令式指挥，创新也不是靠花钱买来的。人们往往很难说清，市场的成功取决于哪些因素；或许，不受个人控制的微妙因素能催生或创造出新的产品或新的服务。

创新从本质上来说成功率较低。这意味着要允许创新驱动经济承受失败。如果你所有的想法都行得通，那就意味着你的想法太少了。创新就是破坏者，它不因循守旧、不惧资历、不畏权威。中国已经下决心要进行创新，那么，创新就一定会改变中国。

协调发展是五大发展理念中的第二个。为优化经济发展，必须做好资源的有效配置和资源的公平使用。回顾改革开放之初，中国一个劲儿地追求经济增长在当时是很必要的，但其后也产生了许多难以避免的问题——尤其是造成了地区之间、不同领域和不同阶层之间的不平衡，并拉大了城乡之间的差距和东部沿海地区与西部内陆省份之间的差距。此外，省市之间的互相竞争导致资源配置的效率低下，并加剧了产能过剩。

虽然，中国现在已经意识到必须让市场发挥“决定性”作用，但业已存在的问题仍需面对，比如省市之间的竞争造成产业发展同质化的问题。要解决此类问题就需要协调好多个区域经济的发展，并注重城乡之间的平衡发展。

这也是为什么中国政府把“协调发展”作为力促经济转型的重大国策的原因。协调发展就是要减少和解决各类不平衡和各种差距：这意味着要协调好富裕和贫困地区的发展规划，如要解决好现代城市近郊农村地区的贫困问题；这也意味着让发达地区帮助欠发达地区，比如让上海市在医疗方面帮扶青海省。

从国家层面来看，中国已经在多个省市开展了全面的区域协调发展，如长江经济带和京津冀协同发展。从国际层面来看，中国提出的“一带一路”倡议体现了协调发展理念，将促进 60 多个国家的发展和基础设施建设。

对于那些因竞争造成工业重复建设和产能过剩的省市来讲，协调发展显得尤为重要。此类风险依然存在。因此，要让这些省市既有合作又有竞争以便优化经济发展，确实是一项很大的挑战。

环境污染已成为中国的一大痛点，这是工业无约束发展造成的后果。人们对空气、水、土壤遭到污染啧有烦言。中国怎么才能在不影响经济增长的情况下刹住和逆转环境污染的势头？中国要全面实现小康社会，就必须思考和回答这个问题。

中国政府已对此做出了回答。在中国历史上首次把“绿色发展”作为五大发展理念之三提升到国家战略高度。

中国实施改革开放国策将近 40 年了，为何会将“开放发展”置于五大理念的第四位？

我从上世纪 80 年代开始就到中国访问，可以说亲眼目睹了中国近几十年举世瞩目的发展历程。在改革开放初期，“开放”指允许外资进入劳动力成本低的制造业领域。现今，中国已跃升为世界第二大经济体，但面临产能过剩和劳动力成本较高等复杂的结构性问题，需要新的开放模式。

中国开启了哪些新的开放模式？比如建立自贸区，倡导和推进“一带一路”倡议，以及鼓励中国企业走出去——参与一些国家的基础设施建设，修建高铁，收购外国公司，购买技术、管理和品牌，开拓市场和分销渠道等。通过与海外的先进技术、管理和市场接轨，中国企业在全球化的进程中正发展成为新的跨国企业竞争者。

我认为，中国进一步开放不是为了取悦外国人，而是为了满足自身需求。相比三十多年前的开放，如今中国的开放程度更加深入，其意义更加重大。现在中国的开放更强调让经贸交往更加便利、更加快捷、更加通畅。这包括让私有企业进入过去严格控制的能源、医疗等行业领域。

开放当然也包括国外公司可以进入中国的更多行业，受到的限制更少。这样就会促使市场竞争倒逼中国企业进行创新和改进。最终的赢家会是谁呢？当然是中国消费者！

中国要全面实现小康社会就必须消除经济和社会中的不平衡，尤其是要缩小城乡差距和消除贫困。这也是五大发展理念之“共享发展”的题中之义。

共享是一种理念，基于认真担当对最贫困群众和弱势群体的社会责任，且贯穿于社会各个层面。在地区层面上来说，共享发展就是城市地区帮扶农村地区；在国家层面上，共享发展就是发达地区帮扶欠发达地区。

中国政府自信地承诺，一定能持续、强有力地推动和做好扶贫脱贫工作。中国共产党作为长期执政的政党，确保了实施这项战略的政策连续性。例如，为推进消除贫困，中国政府在 2009 年就采取了一系列切实可行的措施，如为贫困人口提供便捷、负担得起的医疗服务。

共享发展作为五大发展理念中的最后一个关键词，并不是因为它不重要，而是因为它必须建立在创新、协调、绿色、开放前四项获得成功的基础之上。一个社会需要充足的资源作为保障来帮扶困难群体。

我们可以用多个标尺来衡量每个发展理念的成果，尽管每一种标尺都不一定完美，但每一种都是有用的。比如说，“创新”发展可以用研发投入（占 GDP 的百分点）、专利数、新技术产品和企业来衡量；“协调”可以用协调发展区域（以前互相竞争）的差异化经济发展计划来衡量；“绿色”发展可以参考非政府环境保护组织的报告；“开放”不妨通过中国自贸区的数据如缩减负面清单（哪些产业禁止进入）来反映；“共享”的成果从城乡差距的缩小程度和基尼系数（测试不平等）是否降低等来进行判断。

在中国经济进入“新常态”的同时，也出现了经济增长放缓等诸多挑战。为此，国家主席习近平呼吁政府与市场共同携手努力，以优化和平衡效率与公平问题。他认为，政府是“聪明的”决策者，而市场则发挥“决定”作用。习主席提出的五大发展理念正在引导各级政府官员转变思想和行为方式。

为在 2020 年实现全面建成小康社会的目标和中国梦的第一步，中国经济必须进行结构性改革，必须实现社会平衡，必须消除贫困。五大发展理念对于推进中国经济转型和社会发展至关重要。

综上所述，我认为，要想真正了解中国经济，在关注 GDP 季度报告的同时，还要分析研究衡量经济状况的其他指标和因素。

【作者：罗伯特·劳伦斯·库恩，公共知识分子、政治经济评论家和跨国企业战略规划师，央视英语新闻频道“走近中国”栏目主持人（制片人：朱亚当）。】

Understanding China's Economy

Robert Lawrence Kuhn

How best to understand what is going on with China's economy? Most people think China's GDP growth rates. I think GDP growth rates can be misleading.

When the Chinese economy expanded at an annual rate of 6.7 percent in the third quarter of 2016, maintaining the same growth rate as in the first two quarters of the year and thus in line to hit or slightly exceed the government's full-year target, world markets were pleased. In fact, China is now so important to the global economy, that every time China reports its GDP, world markets holds their collective breath, and if the numbers are in line with expectations, one can almost hear world markets collectively exhale with great relief.

These GDP growth rates are needed to achieve China's high-profile goal of a "moderately prosperous society" by 2020 (with GDP per capita of about USD 9,000, double the GDP per capita of 2010, which was about USD 4,500. In 2015, GDP per capita was USD 6,416).

But there are concerns. The fear, especially among foreign economists, is that China's mounting debt, especially corporate debt, is reaching unmanageable levels. Though most Chinese economists are optimistic that the country's debt is manageable, the fact that the rate of growth of debt well exceeds the rate of growth of GDP means

that the current growth model is, over time, not sustainable. Some analysts believe 2016's better-than-expected growth has been the byproduct of a precipitous expansion in credit, outstripping nominal GDP growth, employed primarily to finance real estate construction and national infrastructure projects. If left unchecked, the increasing debt will increasingly strain the financial system.

In 2016, the IMF released a working paper on China's debt. It estimated that China's non-financial debts in 2015 stood at 168 trillion yuan (about USD 25 trillion), accounting for 225 percent of GDP. Of that total debt, government debt represents about 40 percent of GDP, while households account for just over 40 percent. Neither is especially high by international standards. Household debt is well below developed and developing Asia standards, but it has been increasing in 2016 with net new mortgage lending this year projected to be more than double that of 2014.

Corporate debt is a different matter: about 145 percent of GDP, which is very high. However, the IMF stated that while China's risks appear high, they are manageable.

In recent years, as China's economy has slowed, more defaults have been occurring. Few are buying the official non-performing loan ratio of less than two percent. Because 65% of China's corporate debt is incurred from industries with over-capacities, paying back loans is much more difficult.

Debt is only one of the reasons why GDP growth rates, by themselves, are not sufficient to portray a true picture of China's economy. To get closer to truth, one must embed other factors, especially China's long-term economic policies as well as the nature of GDP growth rates themselves.

Regarding the quarterly GDP reports, both the initial anxiety and the subsequent relief are over weighted. Neither is entirely justified. At best, GDP growth rates tell only part of China's economic story.

Consider the widespread displeasure over China's slowing growth. How terrible is this? Ten years ago, in 2006, when China's growth rate was a robust 12.7%, everyone was happy – count on China to drive world economic growth! Now everyone is on edge about China. But consider this: the GDP base is far bigger. In 2005, China's GDP was \$2.3 trillion, and 12.7% growth meant an increase of under \$300 billion in 2006. Fast-forward ten years. In 2015, China's GDP was \$11 trillion, and 6.5% growth would mean an increase of over \$700 billion in 2016 – more than twice the absolute amount the economy grew in 2006 when the growth rate was that happiness-

engendering 12.7%. And since China's population in 2016 is only marginally more than it was in 2006, the absolute amount of GDP growth per capita will be well more this year than it was a decade ago.

That's the good news. But there's complexity, pulling in the opposite direction. What are the components of the growth rate? What sectors are driving it? Investment looms large, so we must ask: how productive are those assets being formed? Massive industrial overcapacity is China's most serious economic impediment. Debt-fueled investments in fixed assets – particularly via government stimulus programs (needed for economic stability) – have rendered some investments unproductive or even counterproductive (they cost money to maintain).

While we cannot know in real time how much unproductive assets are embedded in each year's GDP growth rate, we do know for sure that some of the growth of past years now sit as overcapacities – coal, iron, steel, cement, glass, heavy equipment, chemicals, housing, etc.

So, on the one hand, the GDP growth rate on a much larger base continues to impress, but on the other hand, some of that growth is unproductive. Yet, there is real growth in consumer products, e-commerce and service industries.

So while short-term prospects are uncertain, long-term prosperity is founded on economic transformation.

Obviously, we need GDP growth rates for standardization and benchmarking, but we should not deify them. It's no surprise that they dominate discourse. GDP growth rate is a simple, single number, seemingly easy enough to understand. That's its power. That's also its problem.

How else to assess the economy? I track China's national policies, seeking indicators to discern status and progress.

"Supply side structural reform" is critical for reducing overcapacity and corporate debt. Progress in the former could be assessed by, say, an increasing number of corporate bankruptcies – closing down "zombie" enterprises would be a good thing, not a bad thing. It's no state secret that some state-owned enterprises (SOE) are moribund, and so a leading indicator that the government is willing to make hard choices and endure short-term pain to achieve long-term gain would be an uptick in the number of SOE bankruptcies. Similarly, progress in reducing corporate debt would be an increase in debt-for-equity swaps.

Another indicator is the percentage of non-performing loans (NPL) issued by banks, largely to SOEs. No one takes seriously the official NPL rate of about 1.5%, which is based on narrow definitions. Analysts estimate the real NPL rate to be between 10% and 20%. To me, a positive indicator of economic progress would be an increase in officially reported NPLs, because it would mean that the government is ready to clean up the financial system, which is necessary for sustainable growth.

There is a larger vision. To see future trends, one must look beyond current numbers. China's economy is in historic transition. Opportunities and challenges abound. China's problems are daunting: slower growth, social imbalances, industrial overcapacity, excessive debt, massive pollution — the list goes on.

How to address such diverse, complex issues? China has an overarching, guiding strategy for economic and social transformation, the highest-level drivers of national policy. According to President Xi Jinping, China's developmental model, going forward, will be driven by “innovation, coordination, green, openness and sharing.” It's called the "Five Major Development Concepts”.

Why these five concepts? How does each work? Why are they amalgamated? Why this order? Moreover, since each of the five concepts is already well-known and commonly prescribed, why now this guiding, integrated strategy?

“Innovative development” is the first of the Five Major Development Concepts, Innovation in the top spot because China needs breakthroughs —incremental improvements are no longer sufficient — and because it signals that China's leaders are enhancing the role of reform. Reform requires change; change requires doing things differently, and doing things differently requires innovation.

This is the first time that innovation comes first in a theoretical framework; moreover, it encompasses diverse kinds of innovation: obviously in science and technology, but also in management and processes. Innovation is technological, industrial, institutional, and cultural.

But innovation-based businesses are more complex, and less predictable, than business based on low-cost manufacturing. Innovation cannot be top-down commanded. It cannot be bought solely with money. What determines market success is often not obvious —and subtle effects, not in one's control, can make or break new products or services.

The success rate for innovation is by nature low. This means that an innovation-based economy must accept failure. If all of your ideas work, it means that you have

too few ideas. Innovation is a disruptor; it does not respect tradition, seniority or authority. China is committed to innovation. Innovation can change China.

Coordinated development is the second of the Five Major Development Concepts, because in order to optimize economic development, both the efficient allocation of resources and the equitable access to resources are essential.

Historically, from the beginning of reform, China's single-minded focus on economic growth, necessary at the time, generated inevitable problems — especially imbalances across geographies, sectors and classes — disparities between urban and rural and between eastern/coastal and western/inland. Moreover, economic competition among provinces and cities encouraged inefficient allocation of resources and exacerbated industrial overcapacity.

While China now recognizes that the market must play a “decisive” role, still there are issues, such as when provinces and cities compete with each other by developing similar industries. Other issues requiring coordination include how to integrate diverse regions and how to rebalance urban and rural areas.

That's why the Chinese government has designated “coordinated development” as a prime policy to optimize economic transformation. Coordinated development means addressing and reducing diverse kinds of imbalances and disparities: it means integrating the developmental planning of richer and poorer areas, such as rural regions of poverty on the outskirts of modern cities; and it means more developed regions helping less developed regions such as Shanghai assisting Qinghai Province in healthcare.

Nationally, coordinated development means comprehensive regional initiatives integrating multiple provinces and cities, such as the Yangtze River Economic Belt and the Beijing-Tianjin-Hebei Province urbanized region. Internationally, coordinated development means the Belt and Road initiative, involving more than 60 countries in infrastructure development.

Coordinated development is especially important in China where provincial rivalries have contributed to industrial duplications and overcapacities. Similar risks remain. The challenge is to get provinces and cities to cooperate as well as to compete in order to optimize development.

Pollution is a scourge in China, the debilitating consequences of unbridled industrial growth. The Chinese people are exceedingly displeased to see their air, water and soil so spoiled, but how can China halt and reverse the devastating pollution

without undermining economic growth? For China to become a moderately prosperous society, this question must be answered.

And the Chinese government has responded. For the first time in China's history, "green development" has been elevated to highest national importance as the third of the Five Major Development Concepts.

Why is "open development" the fourth of the Concepts, —when "opening up" has been the core of China's policy for almost four decades?

I've been visiting China since the late 1980s and I bear witness to China's historic development. In those ancient days, "opening up" meant allowing foreign capital to manufacture low-cost products with cheap labor. Now that China has become the world's second largest economy, but facing complex structural problems, such as industrial overcapacity and higher labor costs, a new kind of opening up is required.

What exemplifies China's new kind of opening up? Free trade zones; the Belt and Road initiative; and Chinese companies going abroad — building infrastructure, selling high-speed rail, even buying foreign companies and acquiring technology, management, brands, markets and channels of distribution. By connecting with advanced overseas technologies, management and markets, Chinese companies are creating new kinds of multinational competitors in an increasingly globalized world.

China is not further opening up to please foreigners. China is further opening up because it is a domestic necessity. Opening up today means much more than it meant three decades ago. Now it means making it easier, faster and better to do all kinds of business. This includes private companies entering into industries and sectors previously off limits, like energy and healthcare.

Opening up also means that foreign companies should enter more industries in China, and have fewer restrictions, so that intensified market competition will pressure Chinese companies to innovate and improve. The ultimate winners? Chinese consumers!

China cannot become a "moderately prosperous society" until its economic and social imbalances — particularly between rural and urban areas — are reduced and poverty is eliminated. That's why "shared development," the fifth Major Development Concept, is vital.

Sharing is a way of thinking. It begins by taking seriously society's responsibility for its poorest and most vulnerable members, and it operates at all levels. Locally,

shared development means urban areas helping rural areas. Nationally, shared development means developed regions helping less developed regions.

China's government says that it can effect continuous and robust poverty relief, which requires strategic consistency, because the CPC maintains political power long-term. For example, to help eliminate poverty, the government implemented, in 2009, a series of measures aimed at providing affordable, easy-to-access healthcare services.

Shared development is the last of the Five Major Development Concepts not because it is least important, but because it requires the prior success of the previous four development concepts — innovative, coordinated, green, and open. A society needs robust resources to help its poor.

To assess progress on each of the Five Major Development Concepts, various metrics can be tracked. (None are perfect. All are useful.) Following are examples. Innovation: R&D expenditures (as a percentage of GDP), patents, new technology products and companies. Coordination: differentiated economic plans among integrated geographic regions (heretofore competitive). Green: reports from environmental NGOs. Openness: data from China's free trade zones, such as shrinking negative lists (industries off limits). Shared: reductions in urban-rural imbalances, lower Gini index (test of inequality).

As China's economy settles into its "new normal," with slower growth and multiple challenges, President Xi calls for market and government, working together, to optimize and balance efficiency and fairness. The government, in Xi's philosophy, is "smart," while the market is "decisive." That's why his Five Major Development Concepts now informs the thinking and guides the behavior of officials at all levels of government.

For China to fulfill its first comprehensive goal of becoming a "moderately prosperous society" by 2020 — and thus realizing the first part of the Chinese Dream — China's economy must be restructured, society be rebalanced, and poverty eliminated — and to bring about such transformations, the Five Major Development Concepts are crucial.

So, take note of the quarterly GDP, but watch other indicators as well.

Robert Lawrence Kuhn is a public intellectual, political/economics commentator, and international corporate strategist. He is the host of *Closer To China with R.L. Kuhn* on CCTV News produced by Adam Zhu.