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ABSTRACT

“China threat” has been one of hotly debated topics since the early 1990s. But there have been very few systematic attempts to test the relevant propositions in this debate. This dissertation is an effort to test the China threat thesis.

The author argues that a test of the China threat thesis requires addressing two fundamental questions: whether China has the capabilities to challenge the international system and whether China has the motivations to do so. As there has been an abundance of scholarly works focusing on the subject of China’s capabilities, and hardly any systematic efforts to address the subject of China’s motivations, this dissertation will offer a systematic study of China’s motivations, i.e. to see whether China is a status quo or a revisionist country.

For this purpose, this dissertation resorts to an image approach. The author argues that the formulation of a state’s foreign policy is affected basically by two considerations: the national interest involved in bilateral relations and key characters of a target state. Consequently, image study as an approach to study a state’s foreign policy should
include these two parts. In terms of the interests involved in the bilateral relations, this project will explore the Chinese perception of threat from the US, namely how interactions with the US are perceived as harming China’s national interests, the Chinese perception of opportunity from the US, namely how relations with the US are perceived as serving China’s national interests, and the Chinese perception of American power/capabilities, namely how Chinese perceive the US as superior, similar, or inferior to China and other countries in various major dimensions of national power.

In terms of key characters of the US, this project will explore China’s perceptions of American politics and economy. In doing so, the author will try not only to update the description in the existing literature, which usually focus on the Chinese perceptions before and around 1990, but also to structure the description so as to shed light on China’s foreign policy orientation.

The conclusion as to whether China is a status quo or a revisionist country will be reached by exploring how consideration of national interests and how China’s perception of key characters of the US affect China’s foreign policy orientation. A summary of the dominant Chinese images of the US will also contribute to understanding China’s motivations vis-a-vis the US.
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CHAPTER 1

THE RESEARCH QUESTION

How will the Chinese define their greatness in the 21st century? Will they define their greatness in terms of the incredible potential of their people to learn, to produce, to succeed economically, culturally and politically? Or will they define their greatness in terms of their ability to dominate their neighbors and others, perhaps against their will, or to take other actions which could destabilize the march toward democracy and prosperity of other people?

-----Bill Clinton

1.1 The Puzzle

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the US becomes the sole and indisputable hegemon, while China, because of its territory and population, and because of its economic development, is widely regarded as a rising power in the international arena.

If post-Cold War international politics is scrutinized through the lens of international relations theories, one puzzle emerges. According to classic realism, because of evil human nature, states will try perennially to dominate other states and to avoid being

1 cited in Ness, p.149
2 Nye, 1990; Kapstein, 1999; Krauthammer, 1990/91; Nolan, 1995; Lees, 1997; Harris, 1995
dominated by others. A dominant power therefore will necessarily try to decrease the power of second-tier states and second-tier states will necessarily try to increase, or at least to preserve, their power.\(^3\) Structural realism offers a basically similar prediction: the preponderance of power in the hands of one single state is dangerous especially to the security of other great powers, just as Waltz puts it, "unbalanced power, whoever wields it, is a potential danger to others," because the dominant power will inevitably try to weaken other great powers in order to preserve and strengthen its dominance, and other great powers will not rest at ease until they are secure from the not impossible attack by the dominant power.\(^4\) Power transition theory also predicts inherent tension between the dominant power and second-tier states: all great powers eventually decline and the most attractive approach to prolong a hegemon's dominance is to weaken or even destroy rising powers before they are strong enough to deliver a credible challenge.\(^5\)

Taken together, in the context of post-Cold War international politics, all the above three IR theories predict intensified confrontation between the US and second-tier states, and second-tier states' efforts to balance against the US. But for more than one decade after the end of the Cold War, the relations between the US and its traditional allies (Western Europe and Japan) remain close,\(^6\) the relations between the US and its

---

3 Morgenthau, pp. 4-13, 35-79, 1956; Carr, pp. 63-67, 80-88, 1964
4 Waltz, pp. 102-128, 1979
6 Lepgold, pp. 80-85, 1998; Langdon, 2001; Oka, 2001; Okamoto, 2002
traditional enemy (Russia) have significantly improved,\textsuperscript{7} the relations between the US and its Cold War ally of convenience (China) remain lukewarm,\textsuperscript{8} and the US apparently accepts and accommodates the rise of another new great power -- India.\textsuperscript{9} Why has the prediction of reputable IR theories so far failed to materialize in the post-Cold War context? In the case of US-China relations, the general puzzle can be translated into the puzzle of why during the post-Cold War period engagement rather than containment has been the main tone of the US's China policy, and why accommodation rather than balancing has been China's preferred US policy.\textsuperscript{10} To address this puzzle in US-China relationship, as will be elaborated further below, we need to answer the fundamental question of whether China is a status quo or a revisionist country, which will be the research question of this project.

1.2 The Research Question and Literature Review

As demonstrated in the heated debate concerning a possible China threat, many scholars have one way or another tried to address the above puzzle in the US-China relations.

\textsuperscript{7} Kupchan, pp. 73-76, 1999; Rumsfeld, p.28, 2002
\textsuperscript{8} Johnston, 1999; Lieberthal, 2002; Scobell, 2002
\textsuperscript{9} Singh, 1998; Rubinoff, 2001; Mistry, 2001
\textsuperscript{10} Ross, 1999; Johnston, 1999
This chapter will contain two parts. The first part will discuss the on-going debate over a possible China threat, and the second part will justify the research question of this project: whether China is a status quo or a revisionist country.

The China threat debate focuses on two different but interrelated topics: whether China poses a threat to the international system, and whether containment or engagement is the better policy for managing the relations with China. Scholarly descriptions and prescriptions can be captured by the following table. (See Table 1.1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threat</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Containment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kristof, Mazarr, Shinn, S. Goldstein</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Bernstein/Munro, Betts, Buzan/Segal, Dibb, Friedberg, Mearsheimer, Rachman, Roy, Waldron, Pollack, Gertz, Pillsbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks/Wohlfarth, Brzezinski, Cronin/Cronin, Gallagher, Gill, A. Goldstein, Harris, Johnston, Kissinger, Lampton, Lieberthal, Mandelbaum, Nathan, Oksenberg, Overholt, Papayoanou/Kastner, Ross</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1: Schools in the China Threat Debate
The threat school is generally associated with the containment perspective: Cell C; and
the no/little threat school is generally associated with the engagement perspective: Cell
B. Some scholars regard China as a threat, but nonetheless suggest that engagement at
least for now is the appropriate policy with regard to China: Cell A, because engagement
might produce a better result, or because it is infeasible to contain China.11 Some
scholars do not regard China as a threat, but insist that China should be contained: Cell
D, because "selling the Philippines a couple of cruise missiles and the much-discussed
Chinese threat will be easily erased," but China is nonetheless "a problem to be
circumvented or moved."12 The threat/containment school is the minority, but a vocal
and influential one. Containment here often does not mean outright and comprehensive
confrontation, as in the case of the US-Soviet Cold War, and it usually allows for
engagement of one form or another, such as economic engagement.13 The no/little
threat/engagement school is apparently the majority, but different scholars often have
different things in mind when they talk about engagement. Thus there is comprehensive
engagement,14 constructive engagement,15 realistic engagement,16 limited engagement,17
conditional engagement,18 coercive engagement,19 etc. Because of the proliferation of

---

11 Kristof, p.59-64, 70, 72-74, 1993; Mazarr, pp. 35-37; Shinn, pp. 3-11, 1996; S. Goldstein, pp. 21-
22, 28-29, 1998
12 Segal, pp. 29, 32, 1999
14 Lieberthal, Overholt
15 Oksenberg
16 Cronin/Cronin
17 Gill
18 Shinn
engagement with adjectives, engagement and containment sometimes become indistinguishable. Polite containment,\textsuperscript{20} or hidden containment,\textsuperscript{21} for instance, is little different from coercive engagement. Some scholars adopt different positions at different times: Shambaugh 1995 (Cell C) vs. Shambaugh 1996 (Cell B); and Segal 1996 (Cell C) vs. Segal 1999 (Cell D). Some scholars suggest conflicting policies at the same time: Betts' article is containment in tone, but he also points out that "active efforts to keep China poor or to break it up ... would be counterproductive ... Realist at best can passively hope for Chinese economic misfortune."\textsuperscript{22}

Although the China threat debate has attracted extensive participation, and has generated a number of powerful arguments, with several of them attaining the status of conventional wisdom,\textsuperscript{23} some problems nonetheless remain. First, with rare exceptions, the debate generally speaking lacks adequate theoretical grounding.\textsuperscript{24} Second, given the widespread interests in the debate, it is interesting to notice that there are very few systematic tests of relevant propositions. Third, while some works about the China threat do touch upon the subject of China's motivation, they do it usually in an indirect

\begin{itemize}
  \item Mazarr\textsuperscript{19}
  \item containment without confrontation -- Betts, p.54
  \item Posen/Ross, p.39
  \item Betts, p.55
  \item Examples are self-fulfilling prophecy, Nye, p.11, 1995; luxury to engage, Ross, p.44, 1997, Brooks/Wohlforth, 2002 etc
  \item Segal, p.107, 1996; Johnston, 1998, p.1
\end{itemize}
and tentative way, such as inferring China's inclination through its ancient history,\textsuperscript{25} political and economic value systems,\textsuperscript{26} and records of conflict with other countries\textsuperscript{27} etc. So the third defect in the China threat debate, as will be further discussed below, is that few direct and in-depth studies of China's motivations have been carried out.

Two fundamentally important questions are at the core of the China threat debate. The China threat scholars base their argument either on the proposition that threat comes automatically from another state's potential or growing power,\textsuperscript{28} or on the proposition that threat comes from both a state's aggregate power and its aggressive motivation.\textsuperscript{29} The no/little threat scholars are more optimistic either because they regard China as too weak to present a threat to the international system,\textsuperscript{30} or because they regard China as a status quo country or as being capable of evolving into a status quo country.\textsuperscript{31}

To see whether China will present a threat to the international system therefore, one need only to focus on two questions: whether China has the capability to challenge the international system, or whether China has the motivation to do so. Both psychological

\textsuperscript{26} Betts, pp. 74-75; Roy, pp.160-162; Overholt, p.78, 1996
\textsuperscript{27} Nathan/Ross, p.230, 1997; Gallagher, pp.189-90, 1994
\textsuperscript{28} Betts, pp. 42, 45, 47, 53, 55-64; Segal, pp. 108-110, 1996; Wohlfforth, p.32, 1999
\textsuperscript{29} Bernstein/Munro, p.18-19, 24-26, 1997; Waldron; Roy, pp. 160-162, 1994
\textsuperscript{30} Shambaugh, pp. 19-33, 1996; Ross, p.34, 1997; Hornik, pp. 28-42, 1994; Gallagher, pp. 192-193; A. Goldstein, 1997/98; Brooks/Wohlfforth, 2002
\textsuperscript{31} Christensen, p.52, 1996; Overholt, p.78, 1996; Mandelbaum, pp. 94-95, 1997; Nye, pp. 11-12,
theories and international relations theories support focusing on these two questions in testing the China threat proposition. According to psychologists, outcomes are explained mainly by four variables: internally, capability and resolve (motivation), and externally, difficulty of task and luck.\textsuperscript{32} Since difficulty of task and, often luck, are largely the function of both capability and preparedness, in testing the China threat proposition, we need to look only at two variables: China's capability and motivation.

International relations theories also support looking at these two variables. Some IR theorists regard capability as the most important variable. Morgenthau, the modern-day father of realism, calls for guarding against the popular fallacy of concerning with motives. He suggests that we should assume that statesmen think and act only in terms of interest defined as power. Therefore, analysts of international politics should ignore the different motives, preferences, and intellectual and moral qualities of different statesmen.\textsuperscript{33} Waltz, the father of neorealism, claims that states can all be assumed to be security-maximizers, and what explains the outcomes in international politics is the structure of the international system (the most important being the distribution of capabilities across units), while the motives from which men act have little, if not nothing at all, to do with the consequences of their action.\textsuperscript{34} States' motivation is therefore assumed to be a constant. Grieco, another prominent realist, points out that

\textsuperscript{32} Heider, 1958: pp. 79-100; Jones et al., 1971; and Shaver, 1975; cited in Herrmann, p.177, 1988
\textsuperscript{33} Morgenthau, pp. 5-6
states should pay attention mainly to other states' capabilities, which are the ultimate basis for their security and independence.\textsuperscript{35}

I wish to argue that state motivation is at least as important as state capability in the test of the China threat proposition. If capability only were relevant, we should not have had so much talk about a possible China threat, because militarily, Russia is much stronger than China, India is set to catch up with China in military capability, and China is behind not only the US and Japan but four other countries in military expenditure,\textsuperscript{36} and economically, Europe and Japan are much wealthier than China, and as we know, wealth can easily be converted into power.\textsuperscript{37} If capability only is relevant, countries like the US should never have to worry about North Korea which is miserably backward. But people in the US and Japan are nevertheless very much concerned about a possible threat from the poverty-stricken North Korea, because with a not impossibly dangerous motivation, a little material capability can go a long way in disrupting the stability of the world, as demonstrated by the capability of North Korea to develop advanced missiles from its meager material resources.\textsuperscript{38} Canada and Mexico are (presumably) not concerned about a possible threat from the US, not because they have the capability to fend off a US attack, should there be one, but because they can rest assured that the US

\textsuperscript{34} Waltz, pp. 82, 93-97, 1979; 1997; Zakaria, pp. 190-96, 1992
\textsuperscript{35} Grieco, pp. 498, 500
\textsuperscript{36} Segal, pp. 29-32, 1999; Betts, p.42; Christensen, p.55, 1999; Singh; Gholz/Press/Sapolsky, p.8
\textsuperscript{37} Viner
\textsuperscript{38} Eberstadt
does not have the motivation to do so. In studying the China threat proposition, motivation therefore warrants at least as much attention as capability. Segal points out, if China matters at all, it is not because of its capability but because of its motivation.\footnote{Segal, p.29, 1999}

As a matter of fact, even though conventional wisdom is that realists are against studying motivation, nearly every realist accepts the importance of motivation. More specifically, they acknowledge the importance of differentiating between status quo and revisionist states. According to Hans Morgenthau, though a status quo country often seeks adjustments within the existing system, it basically aims at the maintenance of the existing distribution of power, while an imperialist country seeks to overthrow the existing distribution of power.\footnote{Morgenthau, pp. 35-66}

To Kissinger, the dichotomy is between a status quo power and a revolutionary power. A status quo power accepts the legitimacy of current international framework, but a revolutionary power seeks to transform the system itself. One major power dissatisfied with the status quo would transform the whole system into a revolutionary world order, thus greatly destabilizing the world system. In his view, Napoleonic France and the former Soviet Union are both revolutionary states.\footnote{Kissinger, pp.1-3, 1964; Dougherty/Pfaltzgraff, pp. 111-116, 1981}
To Herrmann, the dichotomy is between offensively or defensively motivated states. Offensively motivated states are power-maximizers with unlimited aims while defensively motivated states are security-maximizers with limited aims. Peaceful coexistence therefore is much easier with the latter than with the former.42

Schweller distinguishes among a whole range of state interests (his term for motivation), from states with unlimited ambitions to states strongly committed to maintaining the status quo. He regards a state's level of satisfaction with the status quo a critical variable for understanding its foreign policy,43 because a satisfied status quo country (e.g. the US) would use its power to help stabilize the world system, and make other countries more secure, while a dissatisfied revisionist country (e.g. Hitlerite Germany) would use its power to disrupt or even destroy the existing world system. Therefore, Schweller rightly points out that states are less concerned with power imbalances than they are about who holds power.44

Waltz, who tends to regard all states as satisfied ones concerned mainly for their own survival, has to admit that beyond the survival motive, the aims of states may be endlessly varied: from the ambition to conquer the world to the desire merely to be left alone. He also admits that things like the qualities and the motives of actors are not

42 Herrmann, p.3-5, 1985
43 Schweller, p.184, 1998
uninteresting or unimportant.\textsuperscript{45}

Even though Morgenthau is against studying state motives, he nonetheless has to contradict himself by saying that identifying the motivation of possible challengers is "the fundamental question" and the correct answer to which determines the "fate of nations."\textsuperscript{46} We may therefore conclude that realist theorists would also support studying motivation as an indispensable task in testing the China threat proposition.

Though different scholars give different predictions of the future evolution of the international system, understanding the foreign policy orientation of various major powers remains an important task. To Wohlforth, the current world system is unambiguously unipolar, and the unipolarity is both peaceful and durable. In such an international system, balancing the US by any other countries is futile and impossible. The US therefore can afford not to learn, can be freer than most states to "disregard the international system and its incentives" (meaning the systemic constraint upon other countries to balance against the US), because "a state cannot be blamed for responding to systemic incentives" (meaning the systemic constraint upon the US to play the leading role in international arena).\textsuperscript{47} Muravchik enthusiastically expresses his observations: "We can afford whatever foreign policy we need or choose. We are the richest country in

\textsuperscript{44} ibid. pp. 189, 201
\textsuperscript{45} Waltz, pp. 81, 91, 1979
\textsuperscript{46} Morgenthau, p.59
the world, the richest country the world has ever known. And we are richer today than
we have ever been before." Kristol/Kagan dismiss warnings of a possible imperial
overstretch as misguided, and advocate a sense of mission among Americans to go
abroad in search of monsters to destroy, because only such an American-style "empire
management" can effectively protect and promote both American interests and
principles, and perpetuate American hegemony and international peace and order.

Kagan points out that true multilateralism is impossible in a world of unequal powers,
and the US should act decisively in spite of obstruction by other countries, either France
or Russia, "lest the entire international system come crashing down." And by acting
more resolutely, the US will increase the gap between the hegemon and the rest.

Brzezinski confidently refers to America's allies and friends as "vassals and
tributaries."

But other scholars are more cautious. Haass declares that an effort to assert or expand
U.S. hegemony will fail, and the world is already becoming more multipolar. Kupchan
asserts that America's unipolar moment will not last long even if the US economy grows
at a healthy rate, and he also suggests that the US should prepare for the decline of its

47 Wohlforth, pp. 8, 18, 25, 29, 40-41, 1999
48 Muravchik, p.36
52 what Wohlforth calls "conventional wisdom," p.8
53 Haass, p.38, 1999
preponderance and encourage the emergence of regional unipolarity in Europe and East Asia.  

Gholz/Press/Sapolsky appeal for American restraint, caution against leading a new crusade abroad, and call for the US to come home.  

Russett/Stam and Art regard expanding NATO as courting disaster.  

Walt perceives the waning of the most powerful alliance in human history between Europe and America.  

Huntington points out that "political and intellectual leaders in most countries strongly resist the prospect of a unipolar world and favor the emergence of true multipolarity."  

Layne claims that three mechanisms: differential growth rates, balancing, and sameness effect, will make sure that the unipolarity is but a short-lived illusion.  

Maynes warns against the perils of an imperial America because of domestic costs, impact on the American character, international backlash, and lost opportunities.  

Posen/Ross suggest that pursuit of primacy might be unsustainable and self-defeating for the US, and the mechanisms they mentions are somewhat similar to those of Layne and Maynes.  

The same Brzezinski who regards America's allies as vassals suggests a cautious policy of preserving the American primacy not only by making the costs of challenging the US too high for other countries, but also by not threatening the vital interests of major Eurasian powers, a

\[54\] Kupchan, pp. 40-42, 1998  

\[55\] Gholz/Press/Sapolsky, pp. 5-17, 1997  

\[56\] Russett/Stam, 1998; Art, 1998  

\[57\] Walt, pp. 3-11, 1998/99  

\[58\] Huntington, p.42; 1991  

\[59\] Layne, pp. 133-141, 1993  

\[60\] Maynes, pp. 39-47, 1998  

\[61\] Posen/Ross, pp. 42-43
logical follow-up of Walt's balance of threat theory. Kissing...
But if other scholars are correct, understanding other major powers' motivation would be all the more important. In such a case when the systemic constraint is to encourage second-ranking countries to balance against the dominant power,\(^6\) it is important for the US to adopt judicious foreign policies. If a particular country is a revisionist one, failure to properly manage the potential threat might result in a severe disruption of the international system by the potential challenger, and possibly even prematurely end the unipolar distribution of power which is in the best interest of the US.\(^6\) On the other hand, as demonstrated by the balance of threat theory, unwarranted assertiveness might provoke a balancing coalition, which also would jeopardize the status of the US as the sole hegemon.\(^6\) Additionally, confrontation with a big power would not only make it necessary for the US to spend a large amount of resources in this effort, in order to win the cooperation from other countries and to prevent a balancing coalition dictated by the system structure, the US will also have to pay ever greater prices to other countries, especially to an increasing number of other second-tier powers.\(^6\)

Jervis gives an oft-cited explanation for the necessity of adopting different foreign policy strategy in dealing with the two different kinds of countries: deterrence or

\(^6\) Waltz


\(^6\) Walt, pp. 5-6, 18-32, 263-266, 1987; Mastanduno, pp. 146-149, 151-157, 167-170, 1999; Kupchan, pp. 73-79, 1998; Posen/Ross, pp. 42-43, 52
assurance (corresponding to containment or engagement in the China threat parlance).

The deterrence model is applicable to cases where a country is acting out of greed (thus a revisionist country), because a less resolute strategy would most likely encourage its greater assertiveness. The assurance model is applicable to cases when a country is acting out of fear (thus a status quo country), because an overly assertive strategy would most likely intensify its apprehension, and result in an undesired spiral of hostility.\textsuperscript{70}

The importance of correctly identifying second-ranking states' foreign policy motivation can also be shown by employing the concepts of type I and type II errors in statistical hypothesis testing.\textsuperscript{71} Hard-liners would regard a type II error as less risky than a type I error, since, according to them, mistaking a status quo state as a revisionist one would only incur some unnecessary costs, while failure to destroy a monster might curtail the US's primacy. Soft-liners on the other hand tend to think that type II error is more dangerous, since, according to this perspective, unnecessarily coercive diplomacy might create/exacerbate a threat from where there could have been none/little, and eventually conjure up global catastrophes from what might have been peaceful co-existence and benign hegemony, while failure to confront a revisionist country in an early time would

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{69} Riker, pp. 211-243; Walt; Kagan
\item \textsuperscript{71} Nachmias/Nachmias, p.455
\end{itemize}
at worst result in another manageable, if undesirable, cold war. To hard-liners, the
fashion is "to commit type II error is patriotic," and to soft-liners, the catchword is "to
avoid self-fulfilling prophecy." To hardliners, demonization of a target country is
natural, and to soft-liners, the tendency is to give the target country the benefit of the
doubt. As a social scientist, one should resist either temptation, avoid letting
preconception lead him astray, and allow only the reality principle to guide his
research. From a practical perspective, to err in either direction might lead to serious,
perhaps even disastrous, consequences. Hardliners might think that to demonize a target
country might help mobilize internal support for the sake of national interests, but such
a posture might curtail the American primacy through the mechanism of imperial
overstretch. US-China confrontation in the 1950s and 1960s provides salient
examples. On the other hand, Great Britain's inability to manage rising challengers
resulted in the premature loss of its vast empire.

As mentioned in the above, a possible China threat can be studied from two
perspectives: China's capability and its motivation. So far, scholars have made solid
contributions to the understanding of China's capability. They have done in-depth
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72 A. Goldstein, p.73, 1997/98
73 Herrmann, p.183, 1988
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analyses of China's military capability, the prospect of China's economic development, political stability, the possible integration of a greater China, and China's aggregate capability.

As for China's motivation, some relevant works have also been done. They include those about Chinese nationalism, China's prospect of democratization and social development, China's perception of the current world system, China's foreign/defense policy doctrine, China's foreign policy behavior, and China's relations with other countries. Unlike works about China's capability, which directly and clearly present each author's arguments and evidence as to whether China has or will have the capability to challenge the international system, we do not yet have any direct and in-depth study of China's motivation. Each of the works cited in this paragraph can help shed light on a certain aspect of China's motivation, but as they are not meant to be

77 Vasey, 1993; Shambaugh, 1996; Gallagher, 1994; Ross, p.35-3, 1997; A. Goldstein, 1997/98; Gill/O'Hanlon, 1999; Lilley/Ford, 1999; Mulvenon, 1999; Puchala, 2001; Tsai, 2001
78 Overholt, 1993; Jue, 1994; Segal, 1994; Hornik, 1994; Nolan, 1995; Jim, 1995
79 Segal, 1994; Huang, 1995; Goldstone, 1995; Pei, 1999
80 Crane, 1993; Chen/Gong, 1994/95; Metzger/Myers, 1996
81 Kristof, 1993; Gurtov, 1994; Roy, pp. 150-156; Ross, pp. 86-90; Segal, pp. 108-112; S. Goldstein, pp. 1-22, 25-27; 1998; Segal, 1999
82 Pye, 1993; Unger, 1996; Zhao, 1997; Harris, 1997; Garver, 1998; Fitzgerald, 1999, Gries, 1999; Gries, 2001
83 Zheng, 1994; Tyson/Tyson, 1995; White/Howell/Shang, 1996; Shi, 1997; Pei, 1998; Peng, 1998; Zweig, 1999; Crane, 1999; Nathan, 1999; Li, 2000; Foot, 2001; Oksenberg, 2001
84 Zhao, 1992; Chu, 1994; Faust/Kornberg, 1995
85 Sheng, 1992; Shambaugh, 1994; Zhao, 1995; Garrett/Glaser, 1995; Johnston, 1995; Yao, 1995; Zhao, 1996; Feigenbaum, 1999
86 Cordner, 1994; Wu/Mesquita, 1994; Roy, pp. 160-162, 1994; Christensen, September/October, 1996; Ross, 1997; Johnston, 1998
studies of China's motivation, they offer at most bits and pieces of circumstantial and inconclusive evidence with regard to China's motivation.

Since China's motivation is one of the two fundamental questions in the study of a possible China threat, a direct and in-depth study of China's foreign policy motivation is desirable, or indeed, imperative.
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87 Lieberthal, 1995; Langlois/Langlois, 1996; Ross, pp. 92-96, 1999; Christensen, 1999
CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

2.1 Image Study as an Approach to Explore China’s Motivations Toward the US

Chapter 1 raises the research question: whether China is a status-quo or a revisionist country and what is China’s motivation vis-a-vis the US? Chapter 2 will explain how this project is going to address this question systematically.

As demonstrated in the series of works by Herrmann etc, one effective way of understanding a state’s foreign policy motivation is through the image approach, i.e. to see what the source country's image of the target country is. Images can be considered as sets of schemata consisting of the components as listed in Table 2.1.  

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Images</th>
<th>Character of Foreign Policy Toward One's Own Nation</th>
<th>Capability compared to One's Own Nation</th>
<th>Cultural Level Compared to One's Own Nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperialist</td>
<td>Threatening</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbarian</td>
<td>Threatening</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Inferior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enemy</td>
<td>Threatening</td>
<td>Comparable</td>
<td>Comparable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rogue</td>
<td>Presenting an opportunity for exploitation</td>
<td>Inferior</td>
<td>Inferior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degenerate</td>
<td>Presenting an opportunity for exploitation</td>
<td>Comparable but declining</td>
<td>Comparable but declining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hegemon</td>
<td>Presenting both a threat and an opportunity</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (Complex)</td>
<td>Presenting both a threat and an opportunity</td>
<td>Comparable</td>
<td>Comparable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child (Colony)</td>
<td>Presenting an opportunity for exploitation</td>
<td>Inferior</td>
<td>Inferior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron</td>
<td>Presenting mainly an opportunity for mutual gains</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ally</td>
<td>Presenting an opportunity for mutual gains</td>
<td>Comparable</td>
<td>Comparable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protege (Dependent ally)</td>
<td>Presenting mainly an opportunity for mutual gains</td>
<td>Inferior</td>
<td>Inferior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Components of National Images
From the above schemata of images, we may infer the motivations of a source country with regard to a target country. For instance, if the source country holds an imperialist (barbarian) image of the target country, we may infer that the source country perceives an overwhelming threat from the target country. It recognizes the distinct superiority of the target country in, especially military, capability, and it is apprehensive that the target country would exploit its own weakness. The motivation of the source country with regard to the target country then would be defensive, a desire to avoid conflicts with the target country, and a general inclination to appease the target country. It will be firmly resistant to the target country usually when it is convinced that appeasement does not work. In the case of the imperialist image, the source country perceives a distinct superiority of the target country also in culture, so is not confident that it could catch up with the target country anytime soon. In the case of the barbarian image, the source country would adopt a policy of appeasement, but as it believes in the superiority of its own culture vis-a-vis the target country, it has the confidence in ultimately catching up with the target country in capability.89

If the source country holds a degenerate/colony image of the target country, we may infer that it perceives weakness in the target country. In the case of the degenerate

image, it recognizes that the target country enjoys a comparable level of culture and capability as its own, but it also perceives a degeneration in the target country, and an inability on the part of the target country to make good use of its own resources. In the case of the colony image, it understands that the target country is clearly inferior in both capability and culture. The source country therefore has an inclination to take advantage of the target country's weakness, and to actively seek opportunities to exploit its weakness. We may thus conclude that the motivation of the source country with regard to the target country is offensive. A degenerate image of the target country therefore indicates a significant threat from the source country. And a colony image of the target country signifies an even greater threat from the source country.90

The above national images can be placed in a deductively derived table, the two dimensions constituting each image being affect (threat, opportunity for exploitation, and opportunity for mutual gains, or positive, neutral and negative) and capability (material and/or cultural). (See Table 2.2)

90 Herrmann, 1985, pp. 32-33, 37-38; Herrmann/Fischerkeller, pp. 430-431, 433, 435; Herrmann et al, 1997, pp. 409, 411. The implications of all the other images can be spelled out in a similar way, but are omitted here due to space consideration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Capability</th>
<th>Affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Patron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Hegemon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degenerate</td>
<td>Degenerate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Imperialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogue</td>
<td>Barbarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ally</td>
<td>Protege</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: National Images

In Table 2.2, except in the case of the barbarian image, which indicates superior capability but inferior culture, the cultural level of all the other images is the same as their capability level.

From the perspective of the perceiver, the three underlined images indicate perception of opportunity for mutual gains, the three bold-faced images indicate perception of opportunity for exploitation, the three redlined images indicate perception of threat, and the two italic images indicate perception of both threat and opportunity for mutual gains.
To see whether China is a status quo or a revisionist country, one effective way through the image approach is to see what China’s image of the US is. The more China perceives threat and/or opportunity for mutual gains, the more a status quo country China is, and the more China perceives opportunity for exploitation, the more it is a revisionist country. In cases not relevant with threat/opportunity, the more positive China’s perception of the US is, the more likely it is a status quo country, and the more negative its perception of the US is, the more likely it is a revisionist country.

2.2 Key Decisions Regarding Image Study

In studying national images, an author needs to tackle the following problems. Firstly, who the perceivers are. In other words, whose perception can be regarded as representative of one state’s perception of another state? Secondly, through what approaches does the author intends to obtain data from which to construct a meaningful image of the target state. And thirdly, what to perceive, i.e. what information about the target state is important in helping to shed light on the source state’s understanding of the target state. In the following, I will discuss how existing literature handles these problems and how this dissertation will deal with them.
2.2.1 The Perceivers

2.2.1.1 Approaches in the Existing Literature

Who should the perceivers be in national image studies? As listed in Table 2.3, the
existing literature offers five possibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceivers</th>
<th>Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>state as unitary actor</td>
<td>Herrmann 1985, Frei 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision-making elites</td>
<td>R. Cottam 1977, Larson 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general public</td>
<td>Steele 1966, Gries 1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3: Perceivers of National Images

One approach is to treat a state as a unitary actor. In this approach, statements of a
head of state or other top officials, documents of the government, editorials and other
articles of government-owned newspapers, will all be regarded as presenting the
perception of a state as a unitary actor. Herrmann’s *Perceptions and Behavior in Soviet Foreign Policy* and Frei’s *Perceived Images -- U.S. and Soviet Assumptions and Perceptions in Disarmament* are two important examples of this genre.

In some countries, a state’s foreign policy is determined solely or mainly by one supreme leader, such as in Stalin’s USSR and Mao’s China. In such cases, the perceptions of the supreme leader can to a great extent explain the state’s foreign policy toward a target state. Sheng’s *Battling Western Imperialism* is a good example of this genre, which studies Mao’s self-perception and his perception of the US and how such perceptions had a substantial impact on the US-China confrontation for several decades.

In most cases, however, states rely on the expertise of a small group of top elites for foreign policy decision making. Studying those top elites’ perception of target states therefore becomes necessary to explain a state’s foreign policy decision making. Graham Allison’s *The Essence of Decision* and Deborah Larson’s *The Origin of the Cold War* are two classic examples of this genre. They explain how the US handled the most serious foreign policy crisis in its history, the Cuban Missile Crisis, and how the US decided to enter into the Cold War with the USSR.
Studying influential elites’ perception may shed light on how a state formulates its foreign policy. This approach is quite useful because sufficient data about a state’s top elites are often not available. Influential elites, according to Putnam, are defined as individuals with “substantial indirect or implicit influence; those to whom decision-makers look for advice, whose opinions and interests they take into account or from whom they fear sanctions.”91 Shambaugh’s Beautiful Imperialist and Jianwei Wang’s Limited Adversary are two prominent examples of this genre. The former studies China’s America watchers’ perceptions of the US while the later studies the mutual perceptions of the target country held by scholars, business people and diplomats in both the US and China.

In democratic countries, the government’s power comes ultimately from voters. Decision makers therefore often have to take public sentiments into account in the formulation of the state’s foreign policy, especially in non-crisis situations. Even in non-democratic countries, such as the current China, government leaders have to seek legitimacy at least partially through the support, or acquiescence, of the masses. In the case of China, to ignore public opinion, according to Gries, would be to “dangerously trivialize the role of Chinese popular sentiment.”92 Going down further from the level of influential elites to the level of masses therefore makes sense in studying a state’s

91 cited in Shambaugh, p.21, 1992
92 Gries, p.120, 1999. Italics in the original
foreign policy formulation. A.T. Steele’s *American People and China* is a good example studying the American people’s perceptions of China and how they affected the US’s China policy, and Peter Gries’ *Face Nationalism: Power and Passion in Chinese Anti-Foreignism* focuses on some of the responses of the Chinese people to the frustrations China encounters in its relations with other major powers.

2.2.1.2 The Perceivers in This Dissertation

In this dissertation, I intend to focus on China’s influential elites as the perceivers. They in this project refer to those who published in China’s leading international relations journals. The job of these scholars is to think about the US and China’s foreign relations, especially China’s relations with the US. Many of them have access to internal government documents about foreign policy decision making. Moreover, they often serve as advisers to decision making elites in China. In writing articles for those journals, they are communicating with their colleagues in the field, and offering advice, directly or indirectly, to decision-making elites.

Compared with public government documents or statements as sources, academic writings are more candid, less for the purpose of propaganda, and more thorough in analysis. Compared with focusing on predominant leaders or the decision making elite as
the perceivers, academic writings are more easily available, thus offering an opportunity for systematic analysis. Compared with writings reflecting popular sentiment, academic writings offer more in-depth analysis, less sentimentalism, and more direct relevance to actual decision making.

2.2.2 Source Materials

2.2.2.1 Approaches in the Existing Literature

The second necessary decision to make when studying national images is to decide how to obtain data from which inferences can be made concerning what national image specific perceivers hold. There are many approaches to this task as evident in Table 2.4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approaches</th>
<th>Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>Herrmann 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Steele 1966; Kusnitz 1984; Yue 1999; Hurwitz/Peffley 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation Collection</td>
<td>Pillsbury 2000; Frei 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impression Collection</td>
<td>Grayson 1978, 1979; Arkush 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Statements</td>
<td>Herrmann 1985; Shimko 1991; Frei 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Analysis</td>
<td>Mei-ling Wang 1998; McNelly, Liqun Liu 1991; Shangming Su 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Fairbank 1974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4: Sources for Studying National Perceptions
The 11 approaches listed in the above table can be divided into 5 groups: 1. survey, including survey in general terms and face-to-face interview; 2. content analysis, which is the most frequently used approach in national image studies, including literature survey, quotation collection, impression collection, media analysis, archival research, and government statement analysis; 3. experiment; 4. mixed approaches, and 5. others.

The survey is widely used in Western countries to study national perceptions. This approach is helpful in ensuring the representativeness of the respondents, capturing diverse views, and identifying the distribution of various opinions across the intended community. It is therefore the best approach for studying national perception of the masses that are widely spread out geographically. As other approaches, it has disadvantages. In addition to disadvantages such as requiring simple questions thus unable to explore respondents’ perception in-depth, and low response rate, this approach has severe limitations when used in relatively closed societies, since exhaustive surveys on sensitive subjects such as China’s perception of the US are often politically impossible. Yue offers a brief treatment of China’s perception of the US using this approach, and the best work on US-China mutual perceptions seems to be A. T. Steele’s *The American People and China*. 
Some scholars regard sampled interview as the best approach in studying national perceptions. Iriye, for instance, claims that “ideally, the same approach should be used in any study of images”93 Compared with studying national perception from written sources, there are two salient advantages with this approach. Firstly, it is potentially capable of tapping the perception of those whose opinion is important in the decision making process but whose profession does not require writing for publication, such as businessmen, military leaders, government officials etc.94 Secondly, this approach can also tap perceptions that subjects find inconvenient to have published, especially in a censored environment. Western academic practice which emphasizes protection of interviewees’ identity makes it easier for subjects to utter perhaps long pent-up thoughts. There are also drawbacks with this approach. One is that during the brief interview, usually between two total strangers, it is virtually impossible to treat any subject thoroughly. Interviewees usually can only provide, literally, on-the-spot responses rather than well-thought-of answers. A second drawback is that the identity of the interviewer cannot but affect interviewees’ responses. Some other problems with this approach include the inability to talk to people whose perception really matters in the decision making process, and the difficulties involved in assembling a representative sample from a national population. Isaacs’ Scratches on our Minds is a classic work using this approach. Wang’s Limited Adversary is perhaps the most sophisticated

93 Iriye, p.16
94 Wang, Jianwei, p.44
example of it.

The content analysis of published literature is the most widely used approach in the study of national perceptions. Virtually every written work about a target country can serve as a source for studying perceptions of that country. Thus, poems, essays, travelogues, academic treatises etc are all potential sources. The strong point of a literature survey is its replicability, as sources cited can also be read by other scholars who can then see if the text is as the scholar reports. But, ironically, the most serious problem with this approach actually is also replicability. With the exponential increase of international contacts, scholars adopting this approach often face the problem not of insufficient source materials but of an overabundance of them. Consequently, different authors may cite different sources and present readers with very different picture of what they claim are the national perceptions of a target country. There is no way for a reader to tell whether an author has presented an accurate and representative cross-section of the national literature. As a result, studies of perception that adopts this approach can potentially become more the author’s subjective meta-perception than a fair summary of the images evident in the source country.
One variant of content analysis is quotation collection. Two major existing works adopt this technique in presenting national perceptions. Its strong point is that each state can then speak for itself. Since accuracy is most important in national perception studies, and a sophisticated misrepresentation is much worse than an accurate crude presentation, quotation collection can be a valuable approach. By allowing the representatives of a state to speak for themselves, the credibility of the work is greatly enhanced. But there are pitfalls in this approach. Different people in different times might speak differently. The author’s main task in this kind of research is then to make sure that the quotations collected faithfully represent a state’s dominant perception, rather than “rare exceptions from a dominant theme.”

Impression collection is to put together articles, usually by celebrities, to represent a national perception. What is best about this approach is that the readers are then treated with the unabridged version of the authors’ perception. This largely avoids quoting fragments out of context. The most serious problem with this approach is that readers have to rely completely on editors’ discretion to provide them with a representative sample of national perceptions. The author usually do not follow strict rules to select their sample. As a result, it would be difficult for a sample to be truly representative of the universe of national perceptions. This approach therefore is especially strong in
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presenting different types of perceptions rather than the distribution of different perceptions. The two books edited by Grayson concerning American perceptions of the USSR and China respectively and the one edited by Arkush et al are excellent examples of this genre.

There are two salient advantages of using media as sources for national image studies. One is that media sources are easily available and in great abundance, and the second is that media are the most sensitive of all sources to change of sentiment in each country. There are also two disadvantages, however. One is that media are vulnerable to propaganda. Thus they are often less valid than other approaches as a source of the national image people actually hold. And the second is that media tend to reflect current sentiments and are thus often affected more by single recent events than by stable long-term tendencies. Generally speaking, journalists tend to use media as a source of national image studies much more often than political scientists.97

When it comes to studying national perception in the past, scholars often resort to archival research. One advantage of this approach is that it usually studies top elites whose perception directly affects foreign policy decision making. A limitation is that it allows mainly the exploration of past rather than current perceptions. Another

97 Montgomery, Wolfe, Gross, Perry, McNelly/Izcaray, Liu Liqun, Mei-ling Wang, Yanmin Yu
limitation is that only limited individuals can be studied through this approach because it is quite time-consuming. Michael Sheng’s Battling Western Imperialism is an excellent example of this genre exploring Mao Zedong’s perception of the US which reputedly resulted in decades of confrontation between China and the US. Larson’s The Origins of the Cold War is another excellent example exploring the perceptions of top American elites that led to the Cold War between the US and the USSR spanning five decades.

Public government statements are also often used to study national perceptions. When it comes to studying a state’s current perceptions, or past perceptions for which relevant documents are not yet de-classified, public documents remain a viable source. One problem with this approach is that public statements are frequently meant for propaganda purposes, and in the worst case scenario, for “outright deception.” But according to Frei, for following reasons, public documents can still serve a useful purpose in national image studies. First, there are strong incentives for governments to be consistent in their statements. Playing around with foreign policy statements could cost a government its “internal and external credibility” which few governments can afford. Secondly, words, especially those as authoritative and official as by the representatives of a government, “tend to create a reality of their own,” i.e. they are usually followed by deeds. Though they do not necessarily determine deeds, they do
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usually guide or bound deeds. Even in as closed a society as the former USSR, according
to Zimmerman,\textsuperscript{100} government statements often provide ample information about
subsequent behavior. Furthermore, judicious designs can ensure greater validity of the
approach relying on governments’ public statements for research purposes, as in
Herrmann’s *Perceptions and Behavior in Soviet Foreign Policy*.

Experiment often involves measuring the effect of an independent variable on a
dependent variable. Unfortunately, because we are interested in foreign policy we are
usually interested in leaders who will not participate in experiments. Where necessary,
scholars can use surrogates (such as university students) in such experiments, but this
practice raises serious questions of validity. One effort to use an experiment to test the
internal operation of imagery is “Images in International Relations: An Experimental
Test of Cognitive Schemata.”\textsuperscript{101} The experiments described in this article demonstrate
that, among other things, subjects’ judgment of a target state’s relative capability and
culture, together with the perception of threat and opportunity, constitute important
components of a national image, and that a national image does carry with it a certain set
of policy choices.\textsuperscript{102} As these experiments used American students as subjects, it is
doubtful whether the conclusion can be applicable to other countries, for instance,
people of the former Soviet Union might not necessarily associate democratic decision

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Zimmerman 1983
\item Herrmann et al, 1997
\item Herrmann et al, p.422
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
making with more benign intention. Applying the same approach to other states therefore would offer useful insight in national image studies.

Mixed Approaches: The most frequently applied approach in studying national images is a mixed approach. In such works, authors use data gathered through various approaches, such as literature survey, government documents, media reports, surveys, and perhaps authors’ direct experiences, to reconstruct a national perception. The advantage of this approach is that it ensures an abundance of source materials. If all data support the existence of one national image, the accuracy and credibility of the reconstruction will be significantly enhanced. But if authors are not able to use their data in a scientific way, the resultant construct might more often be misleading than illuminating. Because of human inclination of selective attention to, retention of, and recall of information, a misuse of this approach will often result in an author’s perception of the perception of a country, rather than an objective representation of a national perception.

In addition to the above, scholars occasionally also resort to other approaches to study national perceptions. One example is John King Fairbank’s “Chinese Perception of the West and Westerners.” This article relies mainly on a series of pictures published in a

---

103 Bronfenbrenner, White
Chinese magazine. Conceivably, the abundance of films, television programs, photographs etc may give rise to more works on national perceptions using these vivid sources. This, however, would again raise the difficult question of how to select a representative sample.

2.2.2.2 The Source Materials in This Dissertation

Content analysis will be the approach for this dissertation. More specifically, Chapters 3 and 4 will adopt the quotation collection approach famously employed by Michael Pillsbury, and Chapters 5, 6 and 7 will resort to the literature survey approach the most successful relevant example of which is Shambaugh’s Beautiful Imperialist.

The research of this dissertation will be based on articles on the US and on US-China relations between 1991 and 2000 in the following six journals: Mei Guo Yan Jiu (American Studies), Xian Dai Guo Ji Guan Xi (Contemporary International Relations), Guo Ji Wen Ti Yan Jiu (International Political Studies), Zhan Lue yu Guan Li (Strategy and Management), Shi Jie Jing Ji yu Zheng Zhi (World Economy and Politics), and Wai Jiao Xue Yuan Xue Bao (Journal of the Foreign Affairs College). In selecting the sample of articles for the research in this dissertation, the author follows the arbitrary rule: in all the five journals (except Mei Guo Yan Jiu), the US (or the names of its leaders) should be specifically mentioned in the title for an article to be included in the
reflect the perceptions of China’s Foreign Ministry, the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences -- the top civilian think tank in China, the Ministry of State Security -- often called China’s CIA, and the Chinese Society for Strategy and Management -- a semi-private organization staffed with senior scholars with governmental and military backgrounds.

Table 2.5 lists the research institutes covered in my project and those in David Shambaugh’s Beautiful Imperialist and Michael Pillsbury’s China Debates the Future Security Environment. The explanations concerning various research institutes in China are based on the works of Shambaugh, Saunders and, especially, Pillsbury.

---

105 Shambaugh, pp. 5-16, 115, 127
106 Saunders, pp. 42, 44
107 Pillsbury, pp. 363-377
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shambaugh</th>
<th>Pillsbury</th>
<th>Zhang</th>
<th>Institutional Affiliation</th>
<th>Journal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIIS</td>
<td>CIIS</td>
<td>CIIS</td>
<td>Foreign Ministry</td>
<td>International Politics Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIIS</td>
<td>SIIS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign Ministry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign Ministry</td>
<td>Journal of Foreign Affairs College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASS</td>
<td>CASS</td>
<td>CASS</td>
<td>Chinese Academy of Social Science</td>
<td>American Studies, World Economy and Politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CICIR</td>
<td>CICIR</td>
<td>CICIR</td>
<td>Ministry of State Security (China’s CIA)</td>
<td>Contemporary International Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCIS</td>
<td></td>
<td>CSSM</td>
<td>State Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese Society for Strategy and Management</td>
<td>Strategy and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Central Military Commission, General Staff Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Central Military Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIISS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PLA General Staff’s Second Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.5: Research Institutes Covered in Three Comparable Projects
Both the China Institute of International Studies (CIIS) and the Shanghai Institute of International Studies (SIIS) are affiliated with China’s Foreign Ministry. CIIS publishes a journal Guoji Wenti Yanjiu (International Political Studies). The articles in this journal are usually written by its staff, who are often “diplomats in rotation.” In this dissertation, I will regard the articles in this journal, together with those in the Journal of the Foreign Affairs College (Waijiao Xueyuan Xuebao), which is considered to have become more influential in the 1990s in China’s foreign policy decision making, as more or less representing the perception of the US held by China’s Foreign Ministry. The Foreign Affairs College is also affiliated with China’s Foreign Ministry.

The Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS) is regarded as highly influential in China’s foreign policy decision making. The president of CASS in the late 1990s is also a member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. Two institutes in CASS, the Institute of World Economics and Politics and the Institute of American Studies, conduct research on the US. In this dissertation, I will use the journals of the two institutes to represent CASS’s perception of the US: Shijie Jingji yu Zhengzhi (World Economy and Politics) and Meiguo Yanjiu (American Studies).

The China Institute of Contemporary International Relations (CICIR) is affiliated with the Ministry of State Security, reputedly China’s CIA. It is, according to Shambaugh,

---

Saunders, p.44
“the main civilian current intelligence analysis unit serving China’s top leadership and central government.”  

109 Its monthly journal, Xiandai Guoji Guanxi (Contemporary International Relations), will be used as one source of China’s perception of the US in this dissertation.

The last source is Zhanlue yu Guanli (Strategy and Management), a quarterly published by the Chinese Society for Strategy and Management (CSSM). “The chairman of CSSM is former Vice Premier of the State Council Gu Mu, and one of the vice chairmen is former Defense Minister Zhang Aiping,” “best known in China for his leadership in Chinese nuclear weapons program.” This is often regarded as (one of) the most nationalistic journal(s) in China. A study by the East-West Center in Honolulu in 1996 cited only articles of this journal to demonstrate the rise of nationalism in China.  

110

Among the five important institutes with most regular policy input mentioned in Shambaugh’s Beautiful Imperialist, this dissertation considers only three of them. SIIS is not considered but as it is affiliated with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, just as CIIS, it is hoped that the inclusion of CIIS’s journal in this study will to some extent make up for the omission of SIIS’s perspective. It is regretful that I am not able to locate a journal systematically representing the perspective of CCIS.

109 Shambaugh, p. 127
110 Pillsbury, p. 373
As for the seven institutes mentioned in Pillsbury’s book, I consider three of them in this dissertation. SIIS perspective can be made up by focusing on the journals of CIIS and Foreign Affairs College, since all the three represent the perspective of the Foreign Ministry. The Academy of Military Science (AMS) “performs analysis for the Central Military Commission and the General Staff Department.” The National Defense University (NDU) operates also under the Central Military Commission. The China Institute of International Strategic Studies (CIISS) is “a research institution subordinate to the PLA General Staff’s Second Department.”111 Obviously, these three institutes can be regarded as more or less representing the views of the Chinese military. Because of logistic problems, I will not explore the perspective of the Chinese military, but it is hoped that my inclusion of CSSM’s journal, Zhanlue yu Guanli, can make up for the omission of the military’s perspective.

Shambaugh, Pillsbury, and some other authors of the Chinese perception of the US cover many more sources than I will in this project. As I am interested mainly in exploring the dominant Chinese perception of the US, I believe focusing only on a limited but sufficient number of authoritative sources would serve my purpose better.

111 Pillsbury, pp. 368-373, 376-377
2.2.3 The Perceived

2.2.3.1 Approaches in the Existing Literature

The third important question is to decide what to perceive in a perception study. Regarding the national image, scholars tend to offer an all-encompassing definition. To William Scott, a national image “constitutes the totality of attributes that a person recognizes (or imagines) when he contemplates that nation.”\textsuperscript{112} The definitions by other scholars such as Kenneth Boulding,\textsuperscript{113} Jianwei Wang,\textsuperscript{114} Allen Whiting\textsuperscript{115} etc are similar. Thus, whatever is perceived about a target nation constitutes a part of the image of that nation. But as an image study after all serves mainly the purpose of understanding a source country’s behavioral inclination toward a target country, given the bounded rationality of human information processing, it is obviously impossible to include everything about a target country in a national image study. To solve this problem, image scholars tend to resort to one of two schemes to organize important facets of the national image. One is to organize what is to be perceived into different issue areas, and the other is to organize information along different dimensions. I will now discuss the

\textsuperscript{112} Shimko, pp. 12-13
\textsuperscript{113} Kenneth Boulding, JCR, 1959, p.120
\textsuperscript{114} Wang, Jianwei, p.34
\textsuperscript{115} Whiting, 1989
two schemes a little further.

2.2.3.1.1 Issue Areas

Most image scholars organize what is to be included in national image studies into different issue areas, as is obvious in the following tables. Tables 2.6 and 2.7 list major books and articles in the existing literature on the Chinese perception of the US. From these two tables, we can see that these authors generally agree that China’s perception of the American economy, polity, foreign policy (especially that concerning the perceivers’ own country), people, society, and culture are important issue areas in national image studies. The American Image of Russia, 1917-1977 is another example. The dozens of articles in this book were written by well-known Americans in various fields: politicians, diplomats, writers, journalists, lawyers, social activists, philosophers, etc. These authors are not image scholars, but their articles nonetheless reflect the stereotypical perceptions of the USSR held by Americans during the Cold War. Obviously, they mostly also organized their perception of the USSR into these issue areas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Objects in the US Studied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shambaugh, 1991</td>
<td>American economy, society, polity, and foreign policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillsbury, 2000</td>
<td>current and future American power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jianwei Wang, 2000</td>
<td>American people, society, culture, and international behaviors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.6: Objects Studied in Major Existing Books on the Chinese Perception of the US
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Issue Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tu Wei-ming, 1973</td>
<td>China policy, political system, values, science and technology, society including sex, eating, social customs etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang/Lin, 1992</td>
<td>China policy (fighting Chinese socialism etc), capabilities and status in world politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt, 1988</td>
<td>political system, China policy, racial discrimination domestically and internationally, economic development (including science and technology), foreign policy, society, economic system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu Liqun, 1991</td>
<td>media’s anti-China reports, China policy, pop culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shambaugh, 1988-1</td>
<td>China policy, political and economic systems, society, functioning of the US politics and economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shambaugh, 1988-2</td>
<td>people, political system, economic development, China policy, social vices; especially during the PRC period: economy, politics, society, foreign policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ren Yue, 1999</td>
<td>wealth and power, China policy, foreign policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu Yawei, 1998</td>
<td>foreign policy especially its China policy, racial tensions, politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guangqiu Xu, 1998</td>
<td>China policy, society, media, US-China economic relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hongshan Li, 1998</td>
<td>activities of Chinese students in the US in representing China, and in advising Chinese government, China policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Sheng, 1998</td>
<td>ideology, China policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbank, 1974</td>
<td>Western technological sophistication, interactions between Westerners and local people in Chinese settlements (Shanghai), China-West social, cultural, religious conflicts, Western lifestyles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome Ch’en, 1979</td>
<td>people, China policy, economic wealth, military might, religion, legal system, lifestyles, economic system, education, political system, race relations, art, culture, scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saunders, 2000</td>
<td>China policy, power, how US’s domestic politics affects its China policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ming Zhang, 1999</td>
<td>(The first section about a general image of the US, including perception of its society, foreign policy, economic and military capabilities) media’s anti-China tendency, Taiwan policy, China policy in general</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.7: Objects Studied in Major Existing Articles on Chinese Perception of the US
2.2.3.1.2 Dimensions

Some image scholars however organize information in national image studies along different dimensions. The reason these dimensions are used is because they posit theoretically it is these things that affect strategic policy choice. Table 2.8 lists dimensions considered important by those scholars.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Shimko</th>
<th>Scott</th>
<th>Boulding</th>
<th>Frei</th>
<th>Ole Holst</th>
<th>Stoessinger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>capabilities</td>
<td>perceived power</td>
<td>strength/weakness</td>
<td>capabilities</td>
<td>power or capabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>threatening or benign image</td>
<td>hostility/friendliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>like or dislike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>self-image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>intentions, goals, and objective</td>
<td>aims, motives and underlying aims</td>
<td></td>
<td>goals</td>
<td>intentions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>strategies and tactics</td>
<td>choice of strategies, disarmament and arms control policies</td>
<td></td>
<td>strategies and tactics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sources of motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.8: Dimensions in Image Study (continued)
Table 2.8: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Snyder/ Diesing</th>
<th>Pruitt</th>
<th>R. Cottam</th>
<th>R. Herrmann</th>
<th>M. Cottam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>capabilities</td>
<td>capabilities</td>
<td>power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>threat perception</td>
<td>threat and opportunity</td>
<td>threat and opportunity</td>
<td>threatening or benign intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>self-image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>culture</td>
<td>culture</td>
<td>culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ultimate aims, specific aims</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>probable strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some of dimensions are unique to one of two particular scholars. (see Table 2.9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Scott</td>
<td>associated response repertoires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Snyder/Diesing</td>
<td>preference function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Snyder/Diesing</td>
<td>unity of government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Snyder/Diesing</td>
<td>bargaining style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Ole Holsti</td>
<td>approaches to political calculation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 R. Cottam</td>
<td>interaction of domestic forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Pruitt</td>
<td>responsiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Boulding</td>
<td>geographical space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Frei</td>
<td>structure of adversary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Frei</td>
<td>assessment of information about the adversary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Shimko, R. Cottam</td>
<td>decision processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Shimko, Frei</td>
<td>meta-perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Pruitt, Frei</td>
<td>trust/distrust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Stoessinger</td>
<td>character of adversary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 R. Cottam</td>
<td>decision loci</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.9: Dimensions Endorsed by Very Few Authors
In this dissertation, I intend to explore Chinese perceptions of the US using both schemes, i.e. issue areas and strategic dimensions. The rationale will now be explained.

2.2.3.2 The Perceived in This Dissertation

Image scholars in existing literature adopt one of two schemes in organizing what is perceived in national image studies: issue areas and image dimensions. As both of these kinds of information affect a source country’s behavioral inclination toward a target country, I will not in this dissertation neglect either one of them. The sources of cooperation or conflict between two countries include two aspects. The first is how interactions between two countries enhance or impair each country’s national interests. The second is how perception of similarities or differences affects each country’s inclination to develop relations with the other. The first aspect can be addressed by studying a country’s perception of the target country’s relative capability and threat/opportunity from that country, and the second aspect can be studied by exploring one country’s perception of the key features of another country.
2.2.3.2.1 Dimension I: Why Study Capability?

Capability, or power, is one of the most important concepts in political realism. The reputedly most frequently quoted sentence in Thucydides’ *Peloponnesian War* is about power: “What made war inevitable was the growth of Athenian power and the fear which this caused in Sparta.” All the other realists following Thucydides emphasize “the primary and inescapable importance of power.”¹¹⁶ According to Morgenthau, “the struggle for power is universal in time and space and is an undeniable fact of experience” and states’ three basic types of foreign policy therefore are to keep power, to increase power, and to demonstrate power.¹¹⁷

Similarly, many image theorists regard power, or capability, as one of the most important dimensions in national image formation. M. Cottam offers a fine explanation of the similarity and difference between the cognitive and realist schools. “The cognitive perspective is not inconsistent with the realist school of international politics. Capability calculation and power matrix are certainly sources of national role conceptions. ... The cognitive approach and the realistic approach suit different analytical loci. The cognitive approach can be applied to decision making process before policy is made, while the realistic approach explains the success or failure of the policy

¹¹⁶ Michael J. Smith, p.4
¹¹⁷ Morgenthau, pp. 97-98, 21
after it is made.”

The reason why power/capability is an indispensable dimension in national image formation is that the perception of relative power determines the policy options available to parties involved, and it constrains the options decision makers can seriously consider pursuing. In foreign policy decision making, the decision maker must have some sense of the feasibility and utility of the resources he has in pursuing his policy goals. Their perception of relative power, for instance, will help decision makers to decide whether the use of military, or economic, force, or other means, is a serious option for them and whether it is likely to succeed. If a target country is perceived as much weaker, a more coercive approach may be viable; if it is regarded as enjoying substantial power, more cautious strategies will be considered; and if the target country is perceived as much stronger, appeasement will be among likely options. Ralph White offers a succinct and persuasive explanation of the great importance of capability in the perception of a target country: the fear of another actor is the result of a perception that he or she has hostile intentions toward you as well as the capability to inflict harm. Hostility without power or vice versa is not a cause for concern because “if either is zero, the product is zero.”

118 M. Cottam, p. 55, 1992
119 Herrmann/ Fischerkeller, p.425, 1995; Herrmann/Voss/Schooler/Ciarrochi, p. 408
120 M. Cottam, pp. 53-54, 1986
121 Herrmann/Fischerkeller, p.425, 1995
122 White 1984, p.336
In studying the Chinese perception of the US as an approach to understanding China’s foreign policy toward the US therefore, Chinese perception of the US’s capability or power should naturally be a vitally important component of that perception. Among the three major works in the existing literature on China’s perception of the US, only Pillsbury’s book devotes serious attention to this aspect of China’s perception.

Pillsbury’s work focuses mainly on China’s perception of the US’s military power, and it is based mostly on materials in the first half of the 1990s. In all the other existing works on the Chinese perception of the US, books and articles included, this important component of national image has not received special attention. Chapter 5 in this dissertation will be devoted specifically to exploring China’s perception of American power/capability.

2.2.3.2.2 Dimension II: Why Study Threat and Opportunity?

To realists, the dominant school in international relations, national interest should be the sole consideration in the formulation of a state’s foreign policy. Morgenthau’s prescription for a successful foreign policy is that it should be based on the national interest “restrictively and rationally defined,” and the national interest provides the foundation for a wise and prudent foreign policy. He further argues that “a foreign
policy guided by moral abstractions without consideration of the national interest is bound to fail ... all the successful statesmen of modern times, from Richelieu to Churchill, have made the national interest the ultimate standard of their politics.”

“The term ‘national interest’ has been applied by statesmen, scholars, and military planners since the Middle Ages to the foreign policy and national security goals of nation-states. American presidents and their secretaries of state have invoked the term since the beginning of the republic, and today it is widely used to defined the broad purposes of U.S. foreign policy.”

Given the primary importance of national interest in the formulation of a state’s foreign policy, it is natural that a theory of foreign policy decision making should take this aspect into account. Image theory as an approach to studying foreign policy decision making should therefore necessarily include national interest as an essential dimension. Indeed, quite a few scholars from the image school have in one way or another taken it into consideration.

In the case of Shimko, Frei, Holsti, and Snyder/Diesing, national interest is represented by the dimension of intentions, goals, and strategies, and in the case of R. Herrmann, M.

---

123 Michael Joseph Smith, p.153-156
124 Nuechterlein, p.13
Cottam, Scott, Boulding, national interest is represented in the dimension of threat
and/or opportunity, or hostility vs. friendliness. In the case of Shimko etc,
intentions/goals and strategies of the target country serve their purpose in including
national interest in national image formation, since they study exclusively the image of a
target country as an adversary, and the adversary’s intentions and goals can be assumed
to be harmful to the source country’s interest. And the adversary’s strategies and tactics
can be assumed to be implementing the goals and intentions harmful to the source
country’s interest. This approach however is not quite satisfactory on three counts.
Firstly, when a target country is not necessarily an adversary, its goals and intentions
cannot be assumed to be harmful to the interest of the source country. Secondly, even
when a target country is considered an adversary, not all of its goals and intentions can
be assumed to be contrary to the interest of the source country. Thirdly, focusing only
on a target country’s goals and intentions, even when it is an adversary, cannot
adequately reflect the extent of threat to the source country’s interest.

On the other hand, focusing on threat and opportunity can more adequately take into
account the relevance of a target country to the source country’s national interest. In the
existing image literature, R. Herrmann gives an excellent treatment to the dimension of
threat and opportunity in national image. He regards threat and opportunity as central
to any image of another national actor. According to him, if leaders believe that

125 Herrmann/Fischerrkeller, p.425
another nation poses a challenge to preferred political values, they perceive that nation as a threat; and if leaders observe a chance to foster preferred political values, either through direct exploitation or cooperative alliances, they perceive a situation as offering an opportunity.\textsuperscript{126} Thus, the threat the target country poses to the source country is a purely negative value, but perception of opportunity is different. It can represent negative affect: when the target country represents a source for exploitation, as in the British perception of its colonies in the 19th century,\textsuperscript{127} or the US’s perception of Latin American countries,\textsuperscript{128} or positive affect, as in the US’s perception of its allies during the Cold War. Since China’s perception of the US differs from both Cold War superpowers’ perception of their adversaries, and from the US’s perception of its allies during the Cold War, an exploration of both threat and opportunity will ensure adequate consideration of the relevance of national interest in China’s perception of the US.

In the existing literature on the Chinese perception of the US, this dimension has not received adequate treatment. As mentioned in the above, Shambaugh and Wang study the Chinese perception of the US mainly along issue areas, not how relations with the US affect China’s national interest. Pillsbury discusses only the security aspect of US-China relations. Other analysts of the Chinese perception of the US treat the element of

\textsuperscript{126} R. Herrmann, p.31, 1985
\textsuperscript{127} R. Cottam
\textsuperscript{128} M. Cottam
national interest generally by analyzing some of the US’s China policies. By examining China’s perception of threat and opportunity in its relations with the US, this dissertation intends to give this indispensable dimension in national image formation a systematic treatment. Chapter 3 will be devoted specifically to China’s perception of threat from the US, and Chapter 4 to China’s perception of opportunity from the US.

2.2.3.2.3 Issue Area I: Why Study Chinese Perception of American Politics?

What are the key features affecting one country’s inclination toward another? In the case of US-China relations, important differences between the two countries include the following: political system and ideology (democracy vs. non-democracy), economic system (market economy vs. planned economy), culture (Christianity vs. Confucianism), and race (mainly Caucasian vs. Mongolian). Among these, political and economic differences in the recent world history have been the most salient aspects affecting people’s identification of friends and foes.

An examination of the existing literature indicates that to most scholars of national perception, a state’s political system/ideology are among the most important. Among the three major works on the Chinese perception of the US, two (Beautiful Imperialist and Limited Adversary) treat political system and ideology as an important issue area.
Out of the 15 articles on the Chinese perception of the US, 8 take political system and/or ideology into consideration. In *The American Image of Russia, 1917-1977*, the articles in which were written by prominent Americans of various fields, most authors include perception of the USSR’s political system/ideology.

Why is political system/ideology so important in a national perception study? One answer is that people have long been accustomed to identifying friends and foes on the basis of political system/ideology. One study demonstrates that to American college students, national enemies are determined more often by ideological differences than by actual perception of threat from the target country. 87% of students in the study identified the USSR to be an enemy. As for the reasons why they considered the USSR as an enemy, 48% mentioned clash of values, ideas, policies, while only 47% mentioned threat, military danger. In the case of Cuba, only 4% of US students in the study thought that Cuba wants to harm the US, but Cuba nonetheless was considered an enemy, because, 54% of the students mentioned, “they are communists,” and “they have different beliefs and values.”129 In the opening paragraph of Bill Gertz’s book, *The China Threat*, the difference in political system and ideology is considered the most important source of conflict between nations, one which would end only when the political system/ideology different from one’s own is eliminated or subdued to

---

129 Holt, pp. 43-45

64
In the China threat debate which has been going on on and off in the US since the early 1990s, both engagement and containment scholars attach great importance to the difference between the US and China in political system as a possible source of conflict between the two countries. Bernstein/Munro point out “Of course, if China became a democracy its military build-up would be far less threatening than if it remained a dictatorship.”\textsuperscript{131} Mazaar argues that “Sino-American relations will also suffer from a basic fact of life in international politics: democracies and dictatorships generally do not get along well. ... The values, mode of operations, official personality, and many other aspects of democracies simply do not accord with those of undemocratic nations.”\textsuperscript{132} Betts sees that a difference in political system does matter in the case of US-China relations: “Efforts to prevent dominance by a single power center in East Asia should be limited if the contender for dominance has a genuinely democratic government. The level of tradeoffs with non-strategic interests (for example, absolute economic gains), or of acceptable costs and risks in strategic competition, should vary with the odds that a rival (in terms of national power) will be unfriendly and dangerous. There is good reason to believe that such odds are lower with kindred democracies.”\textsuperscript{133}

\textsuperscript{130} Gertz, p.xi, 2000
\textsuperscript{131} Bernstein/Munro, p.26
\textsuperscript{132} Mazaar, pp. 21-22
Engagement scholars share the same view in this respect with containment scholars. Avery Goldstein points out “This perspective suggests that democratic great powers will feel justified in embracing confrontational policies against a Chinese regime that rejects liberal democratic values and in which the foreign policy decision-making process on crucial security matters is not much constrained by institutions, but rather monopolized by at most a handful of leaders only loosely accountable to a slightly larger elite. And because China’s small, authoritarian ruling group believes that the West is engaged in a campaign of “peaceful evolution” designed to subvert communist rule without a fight, hostility and intransigence will be reciprocated.”¹³⁴ Zbigniew Brzezinski in his “Living with China” clearly encourages China’s democracy though he did not mention why. Mandelbaum suggests that “The desirable outcome, for adolescents and post-Cold War Russia and China alike, is that they voluntarily adopt the norms of responsible adults -- in the case of Russia and China, those of the West.”¹³⁵ “A democratic China would be more likely to work out a mutually acceptable relationship with Taiwan. As full-fledged democracies, both countries (Russia and China) would be more likely to cooperate more closely with the United States to enforce international norms of nuclear nonproliferation ...”¹³⁶

¹³³ Betts, p.74
¹³⁴ Goldstein, pp. 66-67
¹³⁵ Brzezinski, Zbigniew “Living with China,” p.94
¹³⁶ ibid, p.95
Obviously, people in the US attach great importance to the difference between the two countries in political system and ideology. As the other part of the dyad, what is the Chinese perception of US politics, and in what ways does this perception affect China’s choices with regard to the US? This is obviously an important but under-researched topic. Existing literature on the Chinese perception of the US tends to emphasize difference in the political system and ideology as a source of conflict between the two countries, it largely neglects the problem of how such a difference would affect China’s intention with regard to the US. It is advisable therefore that we include this aspect of the Chinese perception of the US in this project (see Chapter 7).

2.2.3.2.4 Issue Area II: Why Study Chinese Perception of American Economy?

The dominant economic system of the world is a free market system while the dominant economic system in China is a planned economy. An exploration of the Chinese perception of US economy would reveal whether China perceives the dominant economic system of the world in a favorable or unfavorable light, thus indicating whether to the Chinese difference in economic system constitutes a source of conflict between China and the US. Obviously, China in the last two decades of reform and opening has tried to incorporate more and more of market mechanisms into its own economic system, but an exploration of China’s perception of US economy can still add
to our understanding of China’s intention as to whether it genuinely accepts a more market-oriented economy and whether China is merely adapting reluctantly to the mainstream of world economy.

During the Cold War, economic system was one important way for a state to identify itself as belonging to the West or the East camps, thus an important way to identify a target state as a friend or a foe. With the Cold War being ended just one decade ago, it is reasonable to expect that the way people identify friends or foes has not changed much. An exploration of China’s perception of the US economy, especially its economic system, would contribute to the understanding as to whether China tends to identify the US as a friend or a foe in economic terms.

It has been widely acknowledged that the type of economic system is closely associated with the type of political system. A planned economy, which makes people dependent on the state, constitutes a foundation for an authoritarian political system, while a market economy, which gives people control over the means of production, is conducive to a democratic political system. A study of China’s perception of US economy therefore would not only reveal whether China will be moving toward a more market-oriented economy, but would also provide an important clue as to whether China is moving toward a more democratic political system.

---

137 Walder, Oi
China’s perception of the US economy, as indicated above, would shed light on whether China would accept a more market oriented economic system, which in turn would determine whether China would develop even greater interdependence with the world economy. A great extent of interdependence would change the interest preferences of China toward greater willingness to cooperate with the world community, to solving disputes with other countries through peaceful means.\textsuperscript{138} As a result, China’s perception of US economy would shed light on whether China would be willing to integrate itself more fully with the existing international community, thus developing a stake in maintaining the system rather than challenging the system.

In a word, an exploration of China’s perception of US economy may contribute greatly to the understanding of China’s inclination with regard to both the current international system and the US.

\textsuperscript{138} Mansfield/Pevehouse/Bearce
CHAPTER 3

CHINESE PERCEPTION OF THREAT FROM THE US

3.1 Methodology

This dissertation intends to present the dominant Chinese perception of the US, and to largely ignore idiosyncratic utterances. For this purpose, I will observe the four rules in Table 4.1 in this chapter on the Chinese perception of threat from the US. Each of these rules would increase the possibility that the perception presented in this chapter reflects the dominant Chinese perception of the US. The four rules combined would ensure a substantial chance that this chapter reflects the dominant Chinese perception of threat from the US. Such a strategy would also enhance replicability of this research. It is hoped that another scholar going through the same research process would produce roughly similar results as the author of this dissertation.
Table 3.1: Rules for Presenting the Dominant Chinese Perception of the US

The six journals mentioned in Chapter 2 have thousands of articles during the 1991-2000 decade each of which more or less discusses various aspects of the US. To cover all of those articles would be too time-consuming and unnecessary. For the two chapters on China’s perception of threat and opportunity from the US, I focus only on articles relevant to international politics in the 1990s and with both the US and China specifically mentioned in the titles.\textsuperscript{139} This approach reduces the size of the sample to 182 articles (see Appendix A for the titles of these articles). Obviously, many articles containing information about Chinese perception of the US will not be included in the sample, but it is expected that most dominant Chinese perceptions of the US will be

\textsuperscript{139} including the names of leaders in either country and, in the case of China, including Taiwan and Hong Kong. Phrases like “our country” in a title is regarded as referring to China.
present in the articles selected. Table 3.2 is the number of articles in each of the six journals included in the sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Number of Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guo Ji Wen Ti Yan Jiu</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mei Guo Yan Jiu</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shi Jie Jing Ji yu Zheng Zhi</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wai Jiao Xue Yuan Xue Bao</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xian Dai Guo Ji Guang Xi</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhan Lue yu Guang Li</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>182</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Articles in the Sample for Studying Chinese Perception of Threat and Opportunity from the US

After selecting articles in the sample, I carefully read these articles and put together all the sentences, passages in these articles reflecting a perception of threat from the US. In this chapter, I intend to answer the following two questions. One, does China perceive a threat from the US; and, two, what are the contents of the Chinese perception of threat from the US. The answers to the two questions will be based on the quotations collected in the way described above.
3.2 Whether China Perceives Threat from the US?

To answer this question, I develop Table 3.3 explaining the number of articles expressing perceptions of threat from the US.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journals</th>
<th>Number of articles in the Sample</th>
<th>Articles Including a Threat Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guo Ji Wen Ti Yen Jiu</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shi Jie Jing Ji yu Zheng Zhi</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mei Guo Yen Jiu</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wai Jiao Xue Yuan Xue Bao</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xian Dai Guo Ji Guang Xi</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhan Lue yu Guang Li</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: Number of Articles in the Sample Expressing Perceptions of Threat from the US.

From the above table, we can see that an overwhelming majority of articles in the sample perceive more or less a threat from the US. Threat in this chapter is defined as anything the US has done to China arousing negative comments by Chinese authors, either criticism or complaint. This is not an academically satisfactory definition, but it makes collecting quotations easier for this project. Obviously, to decide whether the dominant
Chinese perception of the US is threat or otherwise, we need to look further into the contents of the threat perception, and balance the perception of threat with the perception of opportunity, and other major Chinese perceptions of the US, which will be the subject of the following chapters.

3.3 The Contents of Chinese Perception of Threat from the US

The answer to this question constitutes the bulk of this chapter. In order to increase replicability, I intend to adapt Nuechterlein’s national interest matrix\(^\text{140}\) for the presentation in this section (see Table 3.4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic National Interest</th>
<th>Survival</th>
<th>Vital</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Peripheral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defense of Homeland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Well-Being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable World Order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4: Nuechterlein’s National Interest Matrix.

In presenting the Chinese perception of threat from the US, I will adopt the first three categories in Nuechterlein’s matrix, i.e. perception of threat to China’s national security, economic well-being, and favorable world order. Nuechterlein’s interest matrix is designed to describe mainly the US’s perception of its own interest. After scrutinizing the Chinese articles in the sample for the Chinese perceptions of threat and opportunity from the US, I notice that I need to add two more categories so as to present the Chinese perceptions more adequately: threat/opportunity to China’s political system and internal stability, and threat/opportunity to China’s national prestige. The promotion of values in Nuechterlein’s matrix does not seem to fit well with the Chinese perception of the US, and I will delete this category.

3.3.1 Threat to China’s National Security

3.3.1.1 Territorial Integrity

3.3.1.1.1 Taiwan

When it comes to the Chinese perception of threat from the US to China’s territorial integrity, Taiwan is undoubtedly the most salient topic. In the sample of 182 articles,
for literally numerous times Chinese scholars emphasize the importance of Taiwan in China-US relations. The following are a few examples from each of the six journals.

Wai: “The most important, and the most sensitive problem affecting China-US relations is the Taiwan problem.”141

Guo: “Taiwan problem has always been the most sensitive and the most important problem in China-US relations.”142

Xian: “Taiwan problem has always been a core factor affecting and obstructing the development of China-US relations.”143

Zhan: “The key problem in China-US relations is the Taiwan problem.”144

Shi: The Taiwan problem is “the biggest obstacle” in the constructive strategic partner relationship between the US and China.145

---

141 wai, 96-3, p.23, Li Shouyuan
142 guo, 97-1, p.7, Wang Haihang
143 xian, 99-10, p.3, Ding Kuisong
144 zhan, 94-6, p.75, Gao E
145 shi, 97-12, p.53, Ke Juhan
Mei: “Among all the problems in the US-China relations, the Taiwan problem is the most sensitive one, and it has the potential of leading to China-US confrontation.”

In explaining why China attaches such great importance to the Taiwan problem, Chinese authors explain that “the Taiwan problem is relevant to China’s national sovereignty, security, territorial integrity, and national unification, and it thus concerns China’s fundamental national interest.” Besides, it is a problem involving profound national sentiment and pride. They cite Deng Xiaoping’s words to the effect that in such a problem concerning fundamental principles, “Chinese government and people do not have room for compromise.”

As for the instances in which the US is considered as violating China’s territorial integrity regarding the Taiwan problem, Chinese authors typically point to the following.

1. Weapon sales and military technology transfer to Taiwan. Zhang Qingming points out, “the US’s arms sale to Taiwan is a very sensitive problem in the China-US relations, is the core of US-Taiwan substantive relations, and is also an indicator of how the US regards Taiwan as a political entity. It is therefore strongly opposed by the

---

146 mei, 95-4, p.35, Zhou Qi
Chinese government.” Zhang further points out that there are two direct consequences of the US’s arms sales to Taiwan. “One is to set a bad example for other countries, thus greatly increase China’s difficulties in preventing such transactions between Taiwan and other countries,” and “the second is to seriously affects China’s great cause of peaceful unification.”

During the first post Cold War decade, the Bush administration’s decision to sell Taiwan 150 F-16 fighters is the focus of Chinese authors’ resentment, because it is considered for the first time to have unambiguously and seriously violated the August 17 communique between China and the US signed during the Reagan administration, and might possibly lead to more violations of a similar nature in the times to come.

The US’s transfer of military technology to Taiwan is also deeply resented by Chinese authors. Its transfer would strengthen Taiwan’s military capability, making it difficult for the Chinese military to control the sky and conduct a blockade when necessary, and provide Taiwan with the capability to engage in a war of attrition.

---

147 xian, 00-5, p.14, Chu Shulong; mei, 95-4, pp. 46-47, Zhou Qi; zhan, 97-3, p.27, Zhang Linhong
148 mei, 00-4, p.99, Zhang Qingming
149 wai, 94-4, pp. 91-92, Zhang Qingming
150 wai, 94-4, 87-88, Zhang Qingmin; wai, 96-2, 24, Su Ge; wai, 96-4, 28, Lu Naideng; zhan, 97-5, p.109, Liu Jinsong.
2. Direct military intervention in the Mainland-Taiwan Conflict. The US sometimes is portrayed as being willing to use its military forces to back up Taiwan’s efforts toward separation from China. The most noticeable case was in 1996 when China conducted war games in the Taiwan Straits as a response to Lee Teng-hui’s US visit to promote his Taiwan independence cause. The US went so far as to send two aircraft carrier battle groups to the waters near Taiwan to directly intervene in the mainland-Taiwan dispute.  

3. Possible TMD to cover Taiwan. Chinese authors perceive a possible TMD cover over Taiwan as the US’s potential step which would seriously jeopardize China’s goal of reunification. China therefore asked the US not to include Taiwan in the TMD, but the US refused to make a commitment. In the near future, according to some Chinese authors, it is unlikely for the US to include Taiwan in the TMD, but the US is taking steps in this direction, “through secret US-Taiwan military cooperation and by providing Taiwan with TMD-related equipments and weapons.” From a long term perspective, however, it may be possible that the US would include Taiwan in its TMD. One author points out the severe consequence for China of the US covering Taiwan with the TMD, since, according to a senior US officer, the TMD can basically

---

151 shi, 99-9, p.77, Dai Bin
152 guo, 97-1, 5, 7, Wang Haihang; guo, 00-1, 25, Guo Zhengyuan
153 shi, 99-5, pp. 11-13, Zhu Feng
154 xian, 00-5, p.12, Chu Shulong
155 guo, 00-1, p.28, Guo Zhengyuan; shi, 99-5, 15-16, Zhu Feng.
be regarded as “a potential anti-China alliance.” Another scholar points out that the TMD is “not a simple problem of weapons technology, but a strategic problem with comprehensive significance in China-US relations. Once the TMD is extended to cover Taiwan, a decisive change will take place in mainland-Taiwan relations and in East-Asia strategic situation.” We may conclude that the mainstream perception of Chinese authors is that China strongly opposes covering Taiwan with the TMD and regards it with great resentment, since it would mean turning a part of China into a part of an anti-China alliance.

4. Japan-US Security Arrangement. Another salient source of Chinese alarm and resentment is a Japan-US security arrangement that uses the ambiguous term of “peripheral incidents” to indicate the areas covered. Chinese authors generally believe that even though this security arrangement does not exclusively target China, it does include China as one of its targets, especially regarding the possible conflict over the Taiwan Straits. The US’s and Japan’s strategic ambiguity over the scope of their security arrangement increases Chinese authors’ worry that the two big powers in the Asia-Pacific region might gang up against China.

156 zhan, 97-5, 110, Liu Jingsong.
157 shi, 99-5, 16, Zhu Feng
158 xian, 98-7, p.6, Liu Jiangyong; shi, 00-2, p.54, Han Weidong, Han Yaodong; xian, 98-5, p.5, Xi Laiwang
159 xian, 98-5, p.5, Xi Laiwang (This source is not good, need to find another one)
The US’s overall Taiwan policy is perceived to “maintain the status quo” of “no independence and no unification, no war and no peace,” or “separated but not independent” and “peaceful but not unified.”

The US’s weapon sales, military technology transfer, and security guarantee to Taiwan is perceived as obstructing China’s unification, and supporting separatist activities in Taiwan. It is because of the US’s support and connivance that “hidden independence” and “public independence” forces in Taiwan coordinate with one another, and vigorously promote separatism.

But the US is also seen at times as “properly containing the clamorous ‘Taiwan independence’ tendency, and not allowing Taiwan authorities to go too far on the road of separatism.” Consequently, the US is seen as encouraging dialogue between the mainland and Taiwan, but at the same time, hoping that the dialogue “would not produce any substantive results.”

---

160 shi, 00-7, p.38, Ding Shichuan, Wei Hongzhou; xian, 98-5, p.5, Xi Laiwang; guo, 00-1, p.26, Guo Zhengyuan; wai, 99-1, p.45, Zhuang Qubing
161 shi, 00-7, pp. 39-40, Ding Shichuan, Wei Hongzhou; guo, 00-1, p.28, Guo Zhengyuan; zhan, 97-3, p.21, Zhang Linhong; zhan, 97-5, p.109, Liu Jinsong; wai, 94-4, p.91, Zhang Qingming
162 shi, 00-7, 39, 41, Ding Shichuan, Wei Hongzhou.
163 shi, 00-7, pp. 39-40, Ding Shichuan, Wei Hongzhou
164 xian, 98-5, p.5, Xi Laiwang
On the whole, the US’s Taiwan policy is perceived as vacillating between prevention of China’s unification and support for Taiwan’s independence. When US-China relations are relatively peaceful, the US’s policy is perceived to prevent China’s unification, but when there are more troubles in US-China relations, the US is perceived to shift to promoting Taiwanese independence. During the Cold War and after the establishment of the US-China diplomatic relations in 1979, the US’s policy is perceived as maintaining Taiwan’s separateness from China, “implementing its security commitment to Taiwan but very seldom publicly emphasized it.”\textsuperscript{165} Shortly after the end of the Cold War, the US was perceived as making a greater effort to promote Taiwan independence, including comprehensively enhancing the US-Taiwan relations, and especially in the Congress, publicly advocating “two Chinas” or “one China and one Taiwan.”\textsuperscript{166} After President Clinton’s visit to China in 1998, the US was again perceived as returning to the policy of maintaining mainland-Taiwan separateness rather than promoting Taiwan independence.\textsuperscript{167}

The US’s support has been considered “the main reason why Taiwan’s Lee Tenghui authorities has the audacity to promote Taiwan independence.”\textsuperscript{168} The reason why Chinese authors are resentful of the US Taiwan policy is that they regard the Taiwan

\textsuperscript{165} guo, 00-1, p.27, Guo Zhengyuan
\textsuperscript{166} guo, 97-1, 4-5, Wang Haihang; wai, 94-4, 87-88, Zhang Qingming; guo, 94-4, 6, Pan Tongwen; mei, 98-2, 97-99, Jia Qingguo; shi, 95-3, 63-66, Liu Lianli; zhan, 94-6, 75, Gao E; shi, 00-7, 39-40, Ding Shichuan, Wei Hongzhou; xian, 00-5, 13, Chu Shulong.
\textsuperscript{167} shi, 00-7, 39, Ding Shichuan, Wei Hongzhou
problem as purely one of “China’s internal problems in which no other country has the right to intervene.” They oppose the US’s intervention because they regard it as not acceptable for the US to draw its security boundaries in China’s territory. One author points out, “no matter what reasons the US uses to justify its Taiwan policy, it has to admit one basic fact, i.e. it was the US’s intervention in China’s internal affairs that produced the Taiwan problem.” Another author argues that “If China and the US, or any other countries, are to develop normal and friendly relations, each has to demonstrate the basic respect for the other’s fundamental national interest such as the sovereignty, security, and territorial integrity.”

3.3.1.1.2 Tibet

Regarding the Chinese perception that the US threatens China’s territorial integrity, Tibet is also brought up from time to time by Chinese scholars, though it is far less salient than Taiwan.

---

168 xian, 99-12, 33, Cao Fumiao.
169 wai, 96-3, p.23, Li Shouyuan
170 mei, 96-2, p.17, Liang Gengcheng
171 mei, 95-4, 133, Niu Jun.
172 xian, 98-6, p.5, Chu Shulong
The US is perceived as supporting Tibetan separatists and encouraging Tibetan independence.173 “In November 1998, the Clinton administration ignored the Chinese government’s firm opposition, and set up the position of Special Coordinator for Tibetan Affairs” -- perceived as an act of flagrant intervention in China’s internal affairs. “In April 1999, during Premier Zhu Rongji’s visit to the US, the US urged China to conduct political negotiation with the Dalai Lama.”174 From time to time, the US president would drop by to meet with the visiting Dalai Lama.175 Just as in the Taiwan case, the US Congress, and especially Senator Jesse Helms, went much further than the executive branch. It has passed bills, resolutions, and amendments claiming that Tibet is an occupied country even though the US government, as well as nearly every country in the world, officially recognizes that Tibet is a part of China.176

The Chinese articles reviewed here often describe the US as using the protection of Tibetan religion as an excuse to intervene in the Tibetan affairs. Chinese scholars are resentful that some Americans ignores the fact that after the serf system was abolished following the Dalai Lama’s departure, “human rights in Tibet have greatly improved.”177

174 shi, 00-7, 22, Zhu Feng.
175 wai, 96-2, 21, Su Ge; shi, 00-7, 21, Zhu Feng; mei, 98-2, 101, Jia Qingguo; mei, 96-2, 14, Liang Gengcheng
176 xian, 96-10, p.15, Zhang Linjun, Lu Qichang; xian, 96-11, pp. 10, Wu Jiong; mei, 96-2, 13-14, Liang Gengcheng; shi, 93-1, p.39, Fang Zhou
177 shi, 98-8, p.27, Sheng Jiru; xian, 98-5, p.6, Xi Laiwang; mei, 96-2, pp. 13-14, Liang Gengcheng
The US’s intention to intervene in the Tibetan affairs is perceived to obstruct China’s unification and disrupt its stability. It is seen as “urging China’s central government to ‘retract’ its ‘control and influence’ in Tibet, even to separate Tibet from China.” One most poignant comment points out: “the US government and politicians know clearly that the Dalai Lama’s ultimate goal is to pursue separatism, division of China, step-by-step, on the pretense of ‘religion,’ ‘human rights,’ ‘protecting cultural heritage,’ and ‘autonomy.’” The US’s Tibetan policy fits well with Dalai’s goals. One cannot but conclude that “the US’s strategy and ultimate goal is the same as that of the Dalai clique: to separate Tibet from China.”

The US’s intervention in Tibetan affairs arouses resentment from Chinese scholars because it threatens China’s sovereignty, security, and territorial integrity, “while China has not presented a threat to the US’s sovereignty, territorial integrity, and national security.” Chinese authors point out that if some people inside and outside the US government always try to cause troubles in things concerning China’s fundamental national interest, “it would be very harmful to the US-China relations.”

---

178 mei, 96-2, pp. 13-14, Liang Gengcheng
179 xian, 98-6, pp. 5-6, Chu Shulong.
180 xian, 00-5, 12, Chu Shulong.
3.3.1.1.3 Hong Kong

At one time, Hong Kong was perceived as one of the central foci in the China-US security relations. The US’s policy behaviors that Chinese observers see as concerning Hong Kong include the following: (1) US Congress passed six bills, resolutions, and amendments that concern Hong Kong, claiming that it has an interest in Hong Kong’s democratization and human rights even after Hong Kong’s return to China; (2) the US sent delegations of representatives to Hong Kong to inspect implementation of “one country two systems” there; (3) the US openly supported Hong Kong’s British colonial authority in its confrontation with China; (4) the US president supported Hong Kong’s democracy advocates by meeting their representative -- Martin Lee.182

On the whole, Chinese authors regard the US as having intervened inappropriately in Hong Kong affairs.183 They regard the US as trying to “disrupt and weaken the Chinese government’s resumption of its sovereignty in Hong Kong” and to ensure the US’s interest and status in Hong Kong.184

181 xian, 98-6, pp. 5-6, Chu Shulong
182 xian, 96-10, p.15, Zhang Linjun, Lu Qichang; xian, 98-5, p.6, Xi Laiwang; zhan, 97-5, p.115, Wu Xianbing; mei, 96-4, p.133, Yang Jiemian; shi, 94-1, p.57, Wang Chiming; mei, 98-2, p.101, Jia Qingguo
184 mei, 96-2, pp. 14, Liang Gengcheng; xian, 96-10, pp. 14-15, Zhang Linjun, Lu Qichang; zhan, 97-5, p.115, Wu xianbing. Wording in Zhang and Wu’s article somewhat different from Liang’s.
As Hong Kong concerns China’s sovereignty and territorial integrity, as in the case of Taiwan, the US’s perceived intervention in the Hong Kong affairs is seen as evidence that the US does not fully regard Hong Kong to be a part of China. This US posture is generally opposed by Chinese authors. But some of them also believe that the capability of the US to cause troubles in Hong Kong is limited.

3.3.1.1.4 Nan Sha Archipelago (Spratley)

China authors generally perceive a non-constructive role for the US regarding disputes in the South China Sea. They think that at times the US’s position concerning these disputes has been unfriendly, such as instigating the perception of China threat to Southeast Asian countries which have disputes with China over territorial waters.

The US is perceived as being ready to intervene in these disputes, and one major instrument of intervention is the US-Japan security arrangement.

---

185 xian, 00-5, p.12, Chu Shulong; wai, 96-4, 28, Lu Naideng.
186 xian, 98-6, 5, Chu Shulong; zhan, 97-5, 118, Wu xianbing.
188 shi, 95-11, 60, Chu Shulong.
189 xian, 96-11, p.10, Wu Jiong; xian, 96-10, 15, Zhang Linjun, Lu Qichang; zhan, 97-5, p.109, Liu Jinsong
190 zhan, 97-5, p.106, Liu Jinsong; shi, 00-2, 57, Han Weidong, Han Yaodong; shi, 99-3, 10, Zhang Linhong, Han Yugui; shi, 98-10, 47, Li Changjiu.
3.3.1.2 Strategic Encirclement of China

Quite a number of authors in the sample argue that the US tries to disrupt China’s relations with its neighbors, and erect a strategic encirclement around China.\textsuperscript{191} One author argues, for example, that “some of the policies are clearly targeted at China, and some others under present circumstances and in near future are not targeted at China or are not directly targeted at China, but from a deeper and longer strategic perspective, it is not difficult to discern the indirect or implicit strategic intention of dealing with China.”\textsuperscript{192}

Several authors in several different journals list specifically the potential members of an alliance to encircle China, though the lists are somewhat different for different authors.

\textsuperscript{191} shi, 94-1, pp. 57-60, Wang Chiming; guo, 97-1, p.7, Wang Haihang, shi, 98-10, p.48, Li changjiu; shi, 98-5, 59, Wei Xiaofeng.

\textsuperscript{192} shi, 94-1, p.57, Wang Chiming
Chu Shulong: Japan, South Korea, Australia, together with ASEAN\textsuperscript{193}

Liu Jinsong: Japan, Australia, the Philippines etc\textsuperscript{194}

Wu Jiong: strengthening military alliances with Japan, South Korea, Australia, and New Zealand, and improving relations with Vietnam, and Mongolia\textsuperscript{195}

Xia Liping: Japan, South Korea, Australia, Thailand, and the Philippines through bilateral military alliances, “supplemented by various bilateral and multilateral mechanisms,” including Taiwan.\textsuperscript{196}

Lu Qichang: “strengthening existing security alliances with Japan and South Korea ... signing various military cooperation agreements with the Philippines, Singapore, Indonesia etc; incorporating the five Central Asian countries into its ‘peaceful cooperation plan,’ and developing military cooperation with Kazakhstan, Kurdistan, and Turkmenistan”\textsuperscript{197}
It seems that none of the above is a complete list, and the status of different countries in the above lists is also different. In the following, I will dwell in some detail on each individual member, including some potential members not mentioned in the above.

3.3.1.2.1 Forward Military Deployment

The most important member of this alliance is of course the US itself. The US’s forward deployment of 100,000 troops in Asia is regarded as having China as its likely target.\textsuperscript{198} It is seen as serving several possible purposes including: intervention in China’s internal affairs,\textsuperscript{199} encircling China,\textsuperscript{200} and containing China’s rise in times of needs.\textsuperscript{201} For some Chinese authors, the US secretary of Defense’s speech in Oct 30, 1995 confirms their concern that the US troops in Asia are intended to deal with China: Engagement (of China) is in complete conformity with the US adopting measures to prevent and stop the threat to the interest of the US’s allies and the US itself. It is because of this that the US will continue to maintain a strong force ready for action and have a forward deployment of about 100,000 troops in the Pacific region.\textsuperscript{202}

\textsuperscript{198} zhan, 97-5, pp. 108-109, Liu Jinsong
\textsuperscript{199} xian, 00-5, pp. 9-10, Chu Shulong
\textsuperscript{200} guo, 97-1, p.7, Wang Haihang
\textsuperscript{201} xian, 96-11, 9, 11, Wu Jiong, xian, 95-12, 8, Xi Laiwang.
\textsuperscript{202} mei, 96-2, pp. 12-13, Liang Gengcheng. Double translation, so no quotation marks.
3.3.1.2.2 Japan

Other than the US itself, in Chinese authors’ perceptions, Japan is the most salient member in the US’s design to encircle China. In April 17, 1996, the US and Japan promulgated a “Joint Communique,” which expands Japan’s defense parameter to encompass the whole Asia-Pacific region. It only mentions North Korea as a destabilizing factor, and it does not specifically mention China. Instead, it mentions that “peripheral incidents” are not a geographical concept, but a situational one.\(^{203}\)

Chinese authors do not accept the US’s and Japan’s claim, and regard this alliance as targeted at China.\(^{204}\) Some authors regard the new alliance as undoubtedly targeted at China,\(^{205}\) but most agree that China is not the sole target of this security arrangement.\(^{206}\) They point out that what made China feel especially threatened is that this treaty openly or secretly covers Taiwan,\(^{207}\) and its hidden purpose is to prevent China from using non-peaceful means to prevent Taiwanese independence.\(^{208}\) One author therefore argues that “the amendment of the Japan-US security cooperation guidelines gave

\(^{203}\) xian, 98-7, p.6, Liu Jiangyong

\(^{204}\) zhan, 96-6, p.17, Wang Yong, Zhang Yunlin; xian, 00-5, p.9, Chu Shulong; wai, 97-1, 49, Su Hao

\(^{205}\) xian, 98-4, p.23, Ma Jiali; xian, 99-12, p.23, Yan Julu,


\(^{207}\) shi, 99-3, p.12, Zhang Linhong, Han Yugui, wai, 97-1, p.38, Zhang Yiting; xian, 98-7, p.6, Liu Jiangyong; xian, 98-5, p.5, Xi Laiwang; xian, 98-3, p.4, Shi Ren

\(^{208}\) xian, 98-3, p.2, Shi Ren.
Taiwan a wrong message.”\textsuperscript{209} Some authors point out, the new US-Japan defense treaty has changed from its defensive character during the Cold War covering only the security of Japan to an offensive treaty tasked with dealing with China’s rise, carrying with it the possibility of containing China when necessary.\textsuperscript{210}

The reason for their suspicion include the following. 1. “One of the tasks of the US base in Okinawa is to deal with situations in the Taiwan Straits.” During the 1996 Taiwan Straits crisis, the US aircraft carrier which intervened in the crisis was based in Japan’s Yokosuka.\textsuperscript{211} 2. Japan’s nostalgia for its rule in Taiwan during the colonial period predisposed Japan to be sympathetic to the US’s intervention in Taiwan.\textsuperscript{212} 3. “The new US-Japan Security Guidelines and relevant acts do not clearly exclude Taiwan.”\textsuperscript{213} 4. China is regarded by the US as a potential adversary, and the US-Japan alliance can objectively play the role of containing China.\textsuperscript{214} 5. The ambiguous concept of “peripheral incidents” in the treaty allows the US-Japan security cooperation to cover any area in the world, especially in the Asia-Pacific region.\textsuperscript{215} 6. Given the different relations between the Japan-US dyad and the Japan-China dyad, if the US chooses to

\textsuperscript{209} xian, 97-12, p.11, Lu Zhongwei.
\textsuperscript{210} shi, 99-2, p.22, Wu Xinbo; zhan, 97-1, p.34, Tang Yongsheng; xian, 98-6, 5, Chu Shulong; guo, 97-1, p.9, Wang Haihang; mei, 96-2, 12, Liang Gengcheng
\textsuperscript{211} wai, 96-4, p.32, Liu Jiangyong.
\textsuperscript{212} wai, 97-1, p.38, Zhang Yiting;
\textsuperscript{213} shi, 00-2, p.54, Han Weidong, Han Yaodong; xian, 98-7, p.6, Liu Jiangyong. Liu’s wording somewhat different.
\textsuperscript{214} wai, 97-1, pp. 48-49, Su Hao.
\textsuperscript{215} shi, 98-10, p.47, Li Changjiu.
contain China, “Japan might follow.”216 8. “Everyone knows what its target is, because there is no military alliance without a target.”217 9. On Nov 15, US defense secretary specifically pointed out that the Japan-US security alliance was the most important in preventing China’s strengthening of military forces.218 10. The US’s and Japan’s joint efforts regarding the TMD in recent years were mentioned, and a Chinese author uses an understatement “it perhaps is not meant to deal only with North Korea.”219 11. According to a Japanese scholar, if the US wants to contain China’s development, it conforms to Japan’s interest,220 since Japan is afraid that its dominance in Asia might be “challenged by China’s economic rise.”221 12. Japan’s more aggressive action regarding the disputed Diaoyu island (Senkakus) was regarded as one result of the encouragement from the US-Japan new Security Guidelines.222 Therefore, one Chinese author points out, the enhancement of security alliance relationship between the US and Japan “apparently includes the intention to erect a preventive ‘strategic shield’ against China.”223

216 zhan, 96-6, p.18, Wang Yong -- Jiang Lingfei; xian, 97-12, p.11, Lu Zhongwei. Lu’s wording somewhat different.
217 xian, 97-12, p.14, Lu Zhongwei.
218 mei, 96-2, pp. 12-13, Liang Gengcheng. Double translation, so no quotation marks.
219 shi, 94-1, 61, Wang Chiming
220 shi, 97-6, 43, Li Changjiu,
221 wai, 97-1, p. 48, 49, Su Hao.
222 wai, 97-1, p.49, Su Hao.
3.3.1.2.3 Taiwan and South Korea

In this probable alliance to encircle China, Taiwan is perceived as the second most salient potential member. Chinese authors argue that after the cold war, “US political and military circles again recognize Taiwan’s important strategic status,” and “consider the Taiwan problem more from the perspective of the US’s global strategy,” and in the context of regarding China more than before as its “strategic competitor.” When the US plays “the Taiwan Card,” it is perceived as a part of the dangerous strategy of containing China’s rise. Taiwan constitutes an integral part of the US’s effort to encircle China because the US military is afraid that a unified China may “break through the island chain of encirclement and enter the Pacific.”

Several Chinese authors mention South Korea as the US’s potential ally in this alliance to encircle China, but none of them offers a more detailed explanation. It seems that Chinese authors do not perceive much threat from South Korea.

223 zhan, 97-5, p.110, Liu Jinsong
224 guo, 00-1, p.25, Guo Zhengyuan,
225 xian, 00-10, p.25, Xia Liping
227 zhan, 97-5, p.109, Liu Jinsong.
228 xian, 95-12, 8, Xi Laiwang; xian, 99-1/2, 82, Ding Kuisong, Niu Xinchun; xian, 96-11, 10, Wu Jiong.
3.3.1.2.4 ASEAN

Another important potential member in this alliance is ASEAN. One author points out that the US tries to exploit some of the ASEAN countries’ differences with China.\(^{229}\) The US’s military exercises with the Philippines in the South China Sea are thus perceived as targeted at China.\(^{230}\) The possibility of the US playing the Vietnam card is mentioned several times.\(^{231}\) Another US effort to use ASEAN against China is that the US tried hard “to reform the ASEAN Forum into a multilateral security mechanism to ‘entangle’ China.”\(^{232}\) But on the whole, authors in the sample do not perceive much threat from ASEAN either. One author points out that even though “one or two ASEAN members welcome tensions in the South China Sea (because of the new Japan-US security guidelines) so as to pressure China for concessions regarding the territorial disputes,” most ASEAN countries are described as wishing to improve relations with China.\(^{233}\)

\(^{229}\) shi, 94-1, p.57, Wang Chiming; shi, 95-11, 60, Chu Shulong.
\(^{230}\) xian, 96-11, p.10, Wu Jiong.
\(^{231}\) shi, 94-1, p.57, Wang Chiming; xian, 96-11, 10, Wu Jiong; xian, 95-12, 8, Xi Laiwang; xian, 95-9, 2, Lu Qichang; shi, 96-4, 65, Yang Yunzhong.
\(^{232}\) guo, 97-1, p.9, Wang Haihang.
\(^{233}\) shi, 00-2, p.57, Han Weidong, Han Yaodong.
Several authors point out that the Central Asia plays a part in the US’s efforts to encircle China. Chinese authors regard the US’s presence in Central Asia mainly as a threat to Russia, but some of them regard it also as a threat to China. One author points out that in order to constrain Russia and China, the US wants very much to penetrate central Asia. Another author points out that after the Cold War, “the US formulated a Central Asia strategy, the first ever Central Asia strategy in the US history. It targets not only Russia, but also China.” One major threat of the US’s influence in this area is that “the Central Asia will become a forward position of Western countries especially the US to strategically contain China,” and another major threat is that the US’s “support of separatists might seriously threaten the security and stability of China’s North Western region.” Another author, however, points out that while the US’s expansion of its military influence to the Central Asia “might not target mainly at China,” it nonetheless “takes ‘the China factor’ into consideration.”

Chinese sense of threat from the US is enhanced by the perception that it is “the first time ever that the US and other NATO members expand their military influence and

---

234 shi, 00-2, 55-56, Han Weidong, Han Yaodong.
235 shi, 98-10, pp. 51-52, Tang Yongsheng
236 xian, 99-12, p.22, Yan Julu.
237 xian, 99-12, p.24, Yan Julu.
238 shi, 94-1, p.60, Wang Chiming.
presence to China’s North-Western border.”

NATO’s eastward expansion, though not specifically regarded as targeting China, is regarded as having objectively “changed China’s external environment.” Some authors are concerned that the US might even try to use Mongolia and Russia to deal with China. Besides the security threat from the US presence in Central Asia, one author is afraid that the US’s control of the petroleum and natural gas in this area may increase its leverage over Europe, Japan, China and other Asian developing countries.

The US’s change of support after the Cold War from Pakistan to India is perceived as having taken into consideration the China factor, and the strengthened military cooperation between India and the US is perceived to some extent as constituting a potential threat to China.

3.3.1.3 Threat in Reducing China’s Nuclear Deterrence

The US turned its full efforts to a NMD after President Bush assumed office in 2001. But during President Clinton’s administration (the sample for this research is based on articles written mostly during the Clinton administrations), China and the US already

---

239 shi, 94-1, 61, Wang Chiming
240 shi, 99-5, p.9, Tang Yongsheng, Chen Zhuhua
241 shi, 94-1, pp. 60, Wang Chiming; xian, 96-11, 10, Wu Jiong
242 xian, 99-12, 22-23, Yan Julu.
243 shi, 94-1, pp. 60, 61, Wang Chiming.
had serious disputes concerning the NMD and the TMD.\textsuperscript{244} The reasons why China opposes the NMD, according to Chinese authors in the sample, are as follows. China perceives the US as pursuing “absolute security” through the NMD while China advocates “relative security.” “Relative security” to them means joint security of all countries, while “absolute security” means security of one country at the expense of insecurity in all the other countries.\textsuperscript{245} One article explains the serious threat to China’s security by the US’s MND in the following words: “if a nuclear state has both Mao (spear, meaning powerful offensive weapons) and Dun (shield, meaning adequate defensive weapons), you can imagine what would happen.”\textsuperscript{246} Another article is more straightforward, by citing approvingly a Western scholar’s explanation: if a country has made a surprising breakthrough in technology, such as having invented an air defense and anti-ballistic missile defense system to effectively prevent retaliation, it will regard a preemptive strike much more advantageous than the risk involved.\textsuperscript{247} Perhaps to avoid a self-fulfilling prophecy, Chinese authors on the whole are very careful not to spell out the scenario of the US possessing absolute power through the development of the NMD. In international politics, Chinese authors seem to be concerned that absolute power would corrupt absolutely. Now that “the US already has the most powerful conventional forces and the most powerful nuclear arsenal,” its policy of “insisting on

\textsuperscript{244} xian, 00-1/2, p.95, Fu Mengzi; xian, 99-6, 13, Zhao Jingfang; xian, 00-5, 11-12, Chu Shulong; shi, 99-5, 11, Zhu Feng.

\textsuperscript{245} xian, 00-9, p.3-4, Yuan Peng; shi, 00-2, 53-54, Han Weidong, Han Yaodong; shi, 99-5, 11, Zhu Feng.

\textsuperscript{246} xian, 00-5, p.11, Chu Shulong
the first use of nuclear weapons” and its supposed impunity from retaliation because of the NMD would turn the world into a highly dangerous place.\textsuperscript{248} It is natural therefore that Chinese authors think that the US’s NMD “would seriously affect the mutual trust and cooperation among major powers, and is unfavorable to the stability of the world.”\textsuperscript{249} What makes Chinese authors especially apprehensive of NMD is their perception that it aims at “reducing the deterrence of China’s strategic missiles.”\textsuperscript{250} Understandably, more and more talks in the US Congress and media after the world enters the 21st century about the NMD targeting at China would further confirm their uneasiness.\textsuperscript{251}

3.3.2 Threat to China’s Political System and Internal Stability

After the collapse of the USSR, Washington is thought to regard China as an ideological adversary, and as the last stronghold of communism.\textsuperscript{252} Some Chinese observers perceive that “the most fundamental conflict between the US and China is the one

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{247} shi, 00-2, 54, Han Weidong, Han Yaodong. Double translation, so no quotation marks.
\textsuperscript{248} xian, 00-10, 25, Xia Liping
\textsuperscript{249} xian, 00-10, p.24-25, Xia Liping
\textsuperscript{250} zhan, 97-5, p.109, Liu Jinsong
\textsuperscript{252} shi, 93-1, p.36, Fang Zhou; xian, 98-10, pp. 30-31, Zheng Baoguo; guo, 97-1, pp. 7-8, Wang Haihang.
\end{flushright}
between two ideologies,"²⁵³ and China’s rise is regarded by the US as a challenge not only in a geopolitical sense, but also in terms of values.²⁵⁴ Consequently, the US is seen as resorting to “peaceful evolution” as a strategy toward China, with China becoming a major target of the US’s crusade to enlarge democracy. Some Chinese observers believe that as the China-US differences over ideology will persist for a long time to come, “peaceful evolution” will be the US’s long term strategy toward China.²⁵⁵

Most Chinese authors in the sample regard peaceful evolution as promoting evolution in China toward an “Americanized democratic political system and capitalist economic structure.”²⁵⁶ This includes first of all economic liberalization which in turn is seen as leading to political liberalization.²⁵⁷ Some Chinese observers believe that peaceful evolution includes dividing China, and to divide and to Westernize China are closely related.²⁵⁸ The purpose of peaceful evolution is perceived to be to “integrate China into the Western world system led by the US,”²⁵⁹ to force China to submit,²⁶⁰ and to

²⁵³ shi, 93-1, pp. 38-39, Fang Zhou
²⁵⁴ shi, 98-8, p. 18, Jin Canrong
²⁵⁵ shi, 92-9, p.54, Liu Liandi; xian, 97-10, p.2, Chu Shulong; shi, 93-1, p.36, Fang Zhou; xian, 95-7, p.25, Li Zhongcheng; shi, 93-2, 61-62, Qian Wenrong; shi, 94-12, 5-6, Wang Shuzhong; shi, 96-4, p.65, Yang Yunzhong; mei, 95-4, p.32, Zhou Qi; shi, 98-5, p.60, Wei Xiaofeng
²⁵⁶ shi, 99-5, p.56, Chen Zhuhua; shi, 92-9, p.54, Liu Liandi. Liu’s wording somewhat different.
²⁵⁷ zhan, 94-2, p.69, Wang Jisi, Zhu Wenli
²⁵⁸ zhan, 97-3, p.25, Zhang Linhong; xian, 97-8, p.12, Nai Zuji; xian, 00-12, 5, Lu Qichang
²⁵⁹ xian, 99-1/2, p.82, Ding Kuisong, Niu Xinchun
maintain the US’s position as a world leader.261

Human rights is considered “a breakthrough point” to promote evolution in China.262 It is seen as a big stick in the hands of the US to cudgel China into submission.263 Human rights are said to have become “the center of the US’s China policy.”264 The US resorts to the following approaches to promote human rights in China.

GATT/WTO: The US’s policy regarding China’s GATT/WTO membership is seen as having a political purpose, which is deeper than the superficial economic purpose. The US is thought to regard China’s GATT/WTO application as an extremely favorable opportunity for the US to influence China’s domestic politics. And the US is seen as wanting to seize the opportunity to “force a major reform in China, to compel China to deviate from the system of a socialist market economy,” and to integrate China into the political and economic systems dominated by the US.265

MFN: Especially during Clinton’s first term, the MFN was seen as a fashionable weapon for the US to pressure China. Following its strategic principle of promoting

---

262 shi, 92-9, p.54, Liu Liandi.
263 shi, 98-5, p.60, Wei Xiaofeng; xian, 96-10, p.16, Zhang Linjun, Lu Qichang; mei, 96-2, p.18, Liang Gengcheng; guo, 94-4, p.1, Pan Tongwen; shi, 93-6, pp. 38-39, Zhang Yebai.
264 shi, 98-8, p.17, Jin Canrong.
265 shi, 96-7, p.26, Zhao Yongqing; shi, 97-6, p.25, Li Jiang.
change through pressure, the Clinton administration decided to link the MFN with human rights. In May 28, 1993 President Clinton announced the extension of China’s MFN status for one more year. At the same time, he put forward 7 conditions, asking China to make comprehensive, and major progress in improving human rights conditions. For Chinese authors, to accept the US’s conditions means accepting the US’s value system, and change China’s domestic policy and its own political system. After the US de-linked the MFN and human rights, the MFN was seen as continuing to be a powerful tool for the US to pressure China over human rights.266

Taiwan/Hong Kong: The US is thought to use Taiwan and Hong Kong to promote peaceful evolution in China. The more or less separate status of these two lands from China is seen as an incentive inducing China to follow the road of Westernization.267 Several Chinese observers argue that the US supports the economic integration of Taiwan, Hong Kong and China, and wishes to maintain the momentum toward democracy in Taiwan and Hong Kong, in order to use them “to exercise political influence in China,” and to change China’s political and economic systems.268
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266 xian, 97-10, p.2, Chu Shulong; shi, 00-7, 19-20, Zhu Feng; mei, 96-2, p.18, Liang Gengcheng; mei, 98-1, p.9, Niu Jun; xian, 96-10, pp. 15-16, Zhang Linjun, Lu Qichang; guo, 94-4, p.2, Pan Tongwen, shi, 93-10, p.61, Zhang Mingqian
267 shi, 00-7, p.24, Zhu Feng; shi, 92-9, p.51, Liu Liandi; wai, 94-4, p.91, Zhang Qingming
Radio Broadcast: In recent years, the US has strengthened the VOA broadcast, and set up a new “Radio Free Asia.” Chinese observers see China as the main target and regard Washington’s purpose as the promotion of peaceful evolution. Just as one US House representative puts it, radio Free Europe helped break down the Iron Curtain, and Radio Free Asia can help break down the Bamboo Curtain.\(^{269}\)

Dissidents: The US’s support of Chinese dissidents is considered an integral part of the US’s strategy to promote peaceful evolution in China. Washington is said to use human rights, freedom of speech etc as excuses to protect those dissidents who attempt to overthrow the Chinese government and China’s social and political systems. By doing so, the US is perceived to “sow the seeds of destruction” inside China.\(^{270}\)

Others: The US is seen as resorting to other means than the above to promote peaceful evolution in China. One author mentions that in order to promote peaceful evolution, the US “urges US businesses in China to formulate ‘voluntary regulations’ to help promote China’s human rights.”\(^{271}\) Soliciting support from Europe and Japan to pressure China on human rights is another approach.\(^{272}\) And the US also directly uses

\(^{269}\) mei, 96-2, p. 14, Liang Gengcheng. Double translation, so no quotation marks. guo, 94-4, p.6, Pan Tongwen; guo, 97-1, p.9, Wang Haihang.

\(^{270}\) xian, 96-11, pp. 10, Wu Jiong; xian, 98-3, p.4, Shi Ren; mei, 96-2, p.14, Liang Gengcheng; guo, 94-4, p.6, Pan Tongwen; shi, 99-10, 36, Chen Deming

\(^{271}\) guo, 94-4, p.6, Pan Tongwen

\(^{272}\) shi, 92-9, p.51, Liu Liandi; wai, 96-3, 21, Li Shouyuan.
sanctions to promote human rights in China.273

Chinese authors generally agree that human rights is one of the most serious problems in the US-China relations.274 It is seen as constituting a major obstacle in the IR healthy development,275 and as seriously poisoning the bilateral relations between the US and China.276 Even though it is “not as intense as the Taiwan problem, it covers broad issue areas and has deep roots” causing disputes between the two countries.277 Both of these two problems are seen as the result of the US’s intervention in China’s internal affairs.278 For some Chinese scholars, human rights are no less a problem than the Taiwan problem,279 for others, after the de-linking of human rights and the MFN, human rights might “not assume a central position in the bilateral relations,” but “would still be an important problem in the China-US relations.”280

273 wai, 96-3, p.16, Zhao Pingan, Li Xuebao, and Guo Yuan
274 shi, 98-8, p.21, Su Ge; shi, 99-2, p.22, Wu Xinbo; xian, 95-7, pp. 25, Li Zhongcheng; shi, 94-12, p.7, Wang Shuzhong; shi, 99-10, pp. 34, 36, Chen Deming; xian, 98-10, 30-31, Zheng Baoguo; xian, 97-11, p.5, Xi Laiwang; xian, 99-1/2, pp. 81-82, Ding Kuisong, Niu Xinchun; xian, 96-11, p.3, Chu Shulong
275 shi, 99-5, pp. 53-54, Chen Zhuhua
276 shi, 00-7, pp. 19-20, Zhu Feng
277 shi, 98-8, p.19, Jin Canrong
278 shi, 96-4, p.65, Yang Yunzhong
279 xian, 98-10, p.31, Zheng Baoguo
280 guo, 94-4, p.6, Pan Tongwen
Some Chinese observers believe that the essence of peaceful evolution is to overthrow the Chinese government and China’s political and economic systems, and to disrupt China’s political stability. The collapse of the USSR is perceived as the success of the US’s peaceful evolution strategy, and Chinese scholars do not want China to repeat the collapse. Besides, to pressure other countries over human rights is said to violate the UN Charter. According to the UN Charter, every sovereign state should have the right to determine its own path of development. Chinese observers argue that “the US and China are different, and that each should respect the other, and try to promote common interest while recognizing the existence of differences. Differences should be the cause for exchange, but not the reason for interfering in the other’s internal affairs.”

Chinese observers suggest that China does want to change and to reform, but “the process of China’s reform and opening has its own characteristics, and it is China’s own national interest that determines the speed and extent of China’s reform and opening, and it will not be determined or influenced by any outside forces.” Chinese authors seem to accept that the socialist model which China imported from the USSR might not

282 mei, 95-4, 20, Yuan Ming, Fan Shiming.
283 mei, 95-4, p.32, Zhou Qi; guo, 97-1, p.3, Wang Haihang
284 shi, 93-2, p.62, Qian Wenrong.
285 shi, 98-8, p.23, Su Ge.
be the right thing for China, but they argue that “People of every country have the right to make their own choice. Even if they have made a wrong choice, they can make the decision again, and nobody should impose their decision on another country.” This, according to Chinese scholars, is what “a real democratic spirit” should be.\textsuperscript{287} Chinese scholars indicate that China does not reject the US’s ideology and social system. One most liberal interpretation of socialism runs like this: “whatever approach can help China realize modernization, can help all the Chinese people to really get rich, we will adopt. This is the socialism of our understanding.”\textsuperscript{288} Thus, they argue that the US should not overemphasize human rights in its relations with China, because it will also hurt the US’s realistic national interest, and creates unnecessary international tensions.\textsuperscript{289}

3.3.3 Threat to China’s Economic Well-Being

3.3.3.1 Intellectual Property Rights

From the Bush administration in the early 1990s well into the Clinton administration in the first half of 1995, intellectual property rights was one of the most prominent topics

\textsuperscript{286} xian, 99-1/2, p.82, Ding Kuisong, Niu Xinchun
\textsuperscript{287} zhan, 97-5, 34, Liu Ji.
\textsuperscript{288} zhan, 97-5, 34, Liu Ji.
\textsuperscript{289} shi, 94-5, 57, Liu Liandi; shi, 95-2, p.46, Sun Hongchang; shi, 96-4, p.64, Yang Yuzhong; xian, 98-10, p.33, Zheng Baoguo
in US-China relations.\textsuperscript{290} The US was seriously dissatisfied with China’s efforts to protect “intellectual property rights” and adopts quite an unfriendly policy toward China regarding intellectual property rights.\textsuperscript{291} Washington often resorts to sanctions or threats of sanction to settle disputes over intellectual property rights,\textsuperscript{292} which Chinese observers see as trying to force China to behave according to the US’s interest.\textsuperscript{293} Some interest groups in the US often oppose extension of the MFN to China on the ground of China’s performance concerning intellectual property rights.\textsuperscript{294} Even advocates of engagement support US pressure on China over intellectual property rights.\textsuperscript{295} Sometimes the two countries were on the brink of a trade war over this issue.\textsuperscript{296}

Some scholars in the sample argue that the US’s policy toward China concerning intellectual property rights is unfair, unreasonable, or discriminatory.\textsuperscript{297} One scholar points out that “solving the China-US intellectual property rights problem should be based on relevant international conventions and treaties which the two countries have
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already participated in or are about to participate in, and should not be based on the US’s domestic laws.”

Another scholar argues that “to a great extent, disputes between China and the US concerning intellectual property rights reflect the different stages of development between the two countries ... After decades or perhaps over a century of efforts, developed countries have a whole set of laws for the protection of intellectual property rights,” while China has just begun making efforts in this direction. He thinks it is not helpful for the US to readily resort to sanctions on this matter.

Some Chinese scholars do not deny that China has not done well concerning intellectual property rights protection, but they at the same time argue that “imposing sanctions on China over this problem will often be counterproductive because China is extremely unbalanced in development, and has a quite immature market system.” Occasionally, Chinese authors complain that “if China makes too many concessions to the US concerning intellectual property rights, China will suffer heavy economic losses.” They say this is so because it has been the practice in developing countries to imitate a lot of products in developed countries. One author cites developing countries’ argument that “it was because of exploitation by suzerain states that resulted in the current backwardness of developing countries ... Developed countries which claim to help other countries to modernize should not limit their attention on the narrow scope of domestic laws in treating intellectual property rights problem, but put this problem in the broad

298 shi, 92-11, p.55, Li Changjiu
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historical context and international relations context.”

On the whole, intellectual property rights disputes are not as serious as more sensitive disputes such as those concerning human rights and Taiwan.

3.3.3.2 Annual MFN Debate

As human rights became central to the US’s China policy, MFN was a major problem between the two countries in the 1990s. It was sometimes considered by Chinese observers as more serious than the Taiwan problem. Beginning in the late 1980s during the Bush administration and continuing throughout the two Clinton administrations, various interest groups and anti-China elements in the Congress formed a powerful alliance trying to terminate China’s MFN arrangement, attach conditions to it, and later on deny the PNTR to China. The height of the dispute over the MFN came around 1993 when the Clinton administration announced that it was linking the MFN to China’s human rights record. However, even after President Clinton
announced de-linking the MFN and human rights, the annual MFN debate continued to trouble US-China economic relations.\(^{308}\)

Chinese observers feel that the US market is very important to China\(^{309}\) and that the annual MFN debate provides anti-China interest groups an opportunity to make trouble every year. The debate is seen as subjecting the economic relations between the two countries to “an extremely unstable macro environment” and as seriously affecting bilateral economic relations.\(^{310}\) For instance, AT&T is said by Chinese observers to have planned a big project in China and the annual MFN debate was one major factor affecting its final investment decision.\(^{311}\) Another way the annual MFN debate is seen as harming China’s economic interests is that the US uses it as an excuse to force more concessions from China.\(^{312}\)

From another Chinese perspective, the MFN debate is described as a manifestation of the conflict for power and interest between those in power and those aspiring for power in US politics and between various interest groups in the US.\(^{313}\) In this picture, usually the non-ruling party is seen as advocating a tough policy over the MFN so that it can
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“gain politically without feeling responsible for the failure of the US’s foreign policy.”\textsuperscript{314}

Chinese scholars resent the annual MFN debate. They think that the MFN is a mutually beneficial arrangement and that it is inappropriate for the US to politicize bilateral economic relations and end up in a lose-lose situation.\textsuperscript{315}

3.3.3.3 Obstruction of China’s WTO/GATT Membership

China has a strong desire to return to/enter GATT/WTO\textsuperscript{316} and it began its application in 1986.\textsuperscript{317} After more than a decade, China was still not a WTO member. In the process, the US according to Chinese observers had tried hard to obstruct China’s accession into the WTO.\textsuperscript{318} Chinese scholars considered the US’s repeated obstructionism as a major reason for China’s inability to be admitted into GATT/WTO.\textsuperscript{319} They complained that the US set unreasonable conditions for China’s
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entry.\textsuperscript{320} For example, they complained that the US “insists that China enter the WTO as a developed country,\textsuperscript{321}” intended to “completely occupy China’s huge domestic market,\textsuperscript{322}” forced China to accept imported goods from the US which are harmful to China such as diseased wheat,\textsuperscript{323} and influenced China’s fundamental economic policy.\textsuperscript{324} Besides, the US was said to raise demands on China from time to time forcing China to make bigger and bigger concessions.\textsuperscript{325} One Chinese scholar complains that the US once made a commitment to China that it would be flexible in China’s application for the WTO membership, but it reneged on its commitment.\textsuperscript{326} Another scholar points out that “the US in 1992 made the commitment to support China’s re-entry into the GATT, but even after most countries support China’s membership, the US is the only country that tries every means to obstruct China’s re-entry.”\textsuperscript{327} In order to press concessions from China, the US is said to play the “Taiwan card,” threatening to allow Taiwan to enter the WTO before China,\textsuperscript{328} which China cannot tolerate.
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The US’s obstruction of China’s WTO membership hurt China’s economic development.\textsuperscript{329} As China was not a WTO member, it lost a lot of benefits which most countries in the world enjoy, such as general preferential system,\textsuperscript{330} and using WTO rules and regulations to settle economic disputes with other countries, especially the US.\textsuperscript{331} One Chinese scholar cites Charles Krauthamer’s article to demonstrate that the US’s obstruction of China’s GATT/WTO membership was a part of the US’s containment strategy against China.\textsuperscript{332}

3.3.4 Threat to China’s National Prestige

3.3.4.1 Olympic 2000

In 1993, China applied to hold the 2000 Olympics in Beijing, but lost to Sidney in the third round by 2 votes. China attributed its failure to the US’s obstruction, because the US House of Representatives passed a resolution in 1993, “using human rights as an excuse” against China holding the 2000 Olympics, and the US actively lobbied against China in the IOC.\textsuperscript{333} Several Chinese authors in the sample mention this case, and all of them express resentment against the US’s obstruction. The US’s opposition to Beijing
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holding the 2000 Olympics, along with linking the MFN to human rights, Yinhe incident, increased arms sale to Taiwan, the sanction of China for allegedly providing M-11 missile parts to Pakistan, and the obstruction of China’s WTO application, is considered one of the most serious offenses the US had committed against China during the early period of the first Clinton administration.334 It is also considered by Chinese authors as one way the US put pressure on China, and obstructed China’s rise.335 This incident, together with some others mentioned in the above, reputedly aroused strong indignation of the Chinese people, since it “hurt the feelings of the Chinese people.”336

3.3.4.2 UN Human Rights Commission

The UN Human Rights Commission is one major international forum for intense confrontation between the US and China concerning China’s human rights. The US is seen by Chinese observers as the most active member of the Commission, trying to intervene in China’s internal affairs and to humiliate China through this forum. For most of the last decade, the US either put forward an “anti-China” bill condemning China’s human rights records or endorsed other countries in doing so. Chinese authors regularly
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regard such activities as anti-China and unfriendly. In all these conflicts, China defeated such bills and was perceived by Chinese observers as having “safeguarded China’s national sovereignty and respect.”

3.3.4.3 The US Media

China’s perception of the US media, as presented in the sample, is more negative than positive. In the sample, Chinese authors bitterly complain about the US media and its role in China-US relations.

Chinese observers argue that the US media is one of the major culprits in changing US public opinion from “idealizing” China in the 1980s to “demonizing” it in the 1990s. Chinese authors argue that the US media propagate the threat of China’s rise, oppose improvements in China-US relations, and advocate a tougher policy toward China. Chinese authors’ resentment of the US media is the result of their perception that the US media both help create and succumb to the fashion of China bashing, and they
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“refuse to tell the truth about China to the public,” either distorting facts about China or focusing only on negative aspects in China. They largely close their eye to “the profound changes in China since the reform and opening” began in 1979, “especially China’s great achievements in promoting democracy and rule of law.”341 One author cites Owen Harris’s article approvingly to the effect that the US should recognize that individual freedom in China has been greatly improved ... “If we look back over the past 150 years, the last two decades have undoubtedly been the best years for China and the Chinese people.”342 Occasionally, Chinese authors perceive “an atmosphere in the US media that leads US scholars who see China more comprehensively and more fairly to keep quiet and hesitate in uttering their genuine opinion about China,” for fear of suffering dearly in their personal career.343

Chinese authors argue that it is difficult for the American people to acquire sufficient independent information about China. The little they know about the country comes mainly from the media and they are, therefore, easily influenced by the media. As the media are seen as generally biased against China, antipathy toward China spread among a significant portion of the American public and China’s image is seriously tarnished.344
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They claim that “ordinary American people are friendly to the Chinese people,” but the media’s propaganda does arouse suspicion in them concerning China.\(^{345}\)

Chinese authors argue that negative reports of China in the US media outlets affect the US’s China policy, “constituting a big obstacle to the development of China-US relations.”\(^{346}\) One Chinese scholar complains that “to be always in such a public opinion environment, it is difficult for the US decision makers to implement a policy of actively developing US-China relations.”\(^{347}\)

China’s interest is hurt as a result of negative reports by the US media. Chinese observers say that is true because the media frame Americans’ thinking about China “making it difficult for them to treat some of China’s basic interest and basic national conditions reasonably.” The media’s negative reports “make the American people challenge the US’s China policy and challenge China’s core interests.”\(^{348}\)
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3.3.5 Threat to China’s Favored World Order

Chinese authors recognize that the US has become the sole superpower after the end of
the Cold War. The fundamental goals of the US’s global strategy are said to be to
maintain and strengthen the uni-polar structure of the world, lead the whole world, and
achieve world hegemony. According to one observer, the US “wants to be both the
world’s judge and policeman,” and “to pursue the leading position in the world in both
‘material’ and ‘spiritual’ aspects.”

Chinese observers say that in order to maintain its sole superpower status, the US’s
grand strategy is “to prevent the emergence of any force in either Europe or Asia that is
able to challenge the US’s hegemony.” Around the turn of the 1990s, Washington is
said to have regarded Japan and/or Germany, as developing a capability to challenge the
US. Now Washington is said to regard China and Russia as potential challengers.

The US’s Eurasian strategy is described as “pressing from both East and West wings
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toward the middle, trying to integrate the EU and Japan, another two potential polar powers, into the US’s unipolar hegemonic system, pressuring and containing Russia and China, controlling the vast central regions such as the Middle East, the Central Asia, and the Balkans which are strategically important and rich in resources, so as to realize the ‘American dream’ of dominating the world.”

The potential actors promoting multi-polarity of the world are said by Chinese observers to include Russia, China, Europe, and Japan. Quite a number of Chinese scholars do not accept the US as the leader of the world, regarding its leadership status to be self-proclaimed. One especially poignant comment put it this way: “Though the US is the undisputed leader in North America, however, in Europe and Asia, it is not a natural leader, but rather a guest insisting upon being a master.” Another author regards the US’s hegemonic ambition in the world as originating from the key feature of capitalism: monopoly, i.e. “to weaken others in order to enjoy an advantageous position alone.” Chinese observers notice that the US perceives China as one of the obstacles US hegemony in the world and in the Asia-Pacific region.
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China is described by Chinese observers as not entirely satisfied with the current international order, and as wishing to have an international order in which non-intervention in other countries’ internal affairs can be accepted as a basic principle, and a nation’s sovereignty can be more fully respected. China is said to be concerned that in a unipolar world order the hegemonic power would use excuses such as humanitarianism to practice the law of the jungle.361

China perceives the world in the 1990s and the next two or three decades ahead as in the process of a struggle between the US trying to establish world hegemony and other major powers such as China, Russia, France and developing countries trying to promote a multi-polar world.362 Russia and China are described as two active members of the current group opposing a unipolar world order and as advocating multi-polarity, because these two countries are said to be “under the most intense pressure from the hegemonism.” That is why Chinese observers say they oppose hegemonism and “advocate a more ‘fair’ and ‘reasonable’ world order.”363 To Chinese authors, a unipolar world order threatens China’s interests, because the unipolar power tends to disregard national borders and likes to intervene in other countries’ internal affairs.364
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Militarily, China “wishes to negotiate with the US concerning non-use of force between the two countries, especially the non-first use of nuclear weapons.” Chinese authors complain that “because of the US’s pursuit of interventionism and military hegemony, and because of the Taiwan factor, the US has no interest in talking about non-use of force with China.” China is said to oppose the US’s use of forces in international relations not only because of moral principles, but also because the US “in the past has used force or threat of force against China and intervened in China’s internal affairs.” Chinese authors are concerned that “the US may do so again in future.”

Chinese authors also perceive cultural pressure from the West, especially from the US. They perceive the conflict between the US and China centering on peaceful evolution and human rights as one between cultural hegemony and cultural sovereignty. “Human rights diplomacy represents the US’s ‘value superiority’ and ‘international prestige.’” And the root cause of such a conflict is the US’s hegemonic pursuit. The disputes between China and the US over human rights arise not just because of what Chinese observers call “superficial problems” such as the “Tiananmen incident in 1989, Tibetan religious freedom, birth control, and prison labor product etc.” US-Chinese differences are said to arise due to substantive differences of “intervention and anti-intervention,
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hegemony and anti-hegemony.”

The perception that China is rising rapidly as a regional power together with the perception that the US’s grand strategy is to prevent the emergence of any power in Eurasia capable of challenging its own hegemony adds to the Chinese authors’ apprehension of a unipolar distribution of power. Chinese authors point out, “Russia has already been greatly weakened, and is already in the process of being integrated into the Western world.” Just the same, the US in recent years is said to have not treated Russia as an equal partner, but as a failed adversary, and still “pushed Russia further and further.” Chinese observers are concerned that the US would treat China the same way. The major differences between the US and China concerning world order, in Chinese conception, can be summarized in the following table. It seems that the world order ideal to the US is not satisfactory to China, and the US’s efforts to strengthen a uni-polar world order is regarded as abridging China of its independence and sovereignty.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The US</th>
<th>China</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Goal</strong></td>
<td>strengthening and perpetuating a uni-polar world and ultimately achieving world hegemony</td>
<td>working for a multi-polar world and ultimately achieving democratization of international politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideal Status of Countries in the World</strong></td>
<td>the world to be made up of one country (the US) as the leader and all the other countries as followers</td>
<td>the world to be made up of sovereign equals with all countries, large or small, being equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention</strong></td>
<td>supporting intervention in other countries’ internal affairs by using excuses such as human rights</td>
<td>opposing power politics and intervention in other countries’ internal affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solution of International Conflicts</strong></td>
<td>use of military force when necessary</td>
<td>solution through dialogue, consultation, and cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Military Alliance</strong></td>
<td>strengthening military alliances</td>
<td>opposing military alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threat to Peace and Stability</strong></td>
<td>reluctance to submit to the world leader</td>
<td>hegemonism and power politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Strategy</strong></td>
<td>pressing in Eurasia from both the West and the East toward the Middle, integrating Europe and Japan under its leadership, and pressuring Russia and China</td>
<td>together with other countries especially other secondary powers, developing each country’s own capability and move the world toward multi-polarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Security</strong></td>
<td>absolute security of the US at the expense of other countries’ security</td>
<td>relative security of all countries at the expense of any country’s capability to intervene in another country’s internal affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Systems</strong></td>
<td>Americanized democracy being the ideal form of social system which the US has the right to help to spread to all the other countries</td>
<td>peaceful coexistence of all countries regardless of their social systems and each country having the right to decide its own social system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.5: Major Differences between the US and China Regarding World Order (Chinese Conception)**
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372 xian, 98-6, p.4-5, Chu Shulong; xian, 00-5, pp. 7-10, Chu Shulong; shi, 00-2, pp.53-54, Han Weidong, Han Yaodong; xian, 00-9, pp.3-4, Yuan Peng; xian, 98-10, 32, Zheng Baoguo;
This chapter focuses exclusively on the negative Chinese perception of the US. As mentioned earlier, to grasp the overall Chinese perception of the US, it is necessary to balance the perception of threat and opportunity, and take into consideration other major Chinese perceptions of the US, which will be done in the subsequent chapters.
CHAPTER 4

CHINESE PERCEPTION OF OPPORTUNITY FROM THE US

4.1 Methodology

Consistent with Chapter 3 on the perception of threat, in this chapter on the perception of opportunity I will adopt the same approaches: a. the same four rules listed in the beginning of Chapter 3, b. the same 182 articles as the sample, and c. the same quotation collection approach to gather materials. The two major questions I intend to address in this chapter are as follows: 1. whether China perceives opportunity from the US; and 2. what are the contents of the Chinese perception of opportunity from the US. Finally, I will balance the perception of threat and opportunity from the US to see whether the US presents more a threat or more an opportunity to China.
4.2 Whether China Perceives Opportunity from the US

Table 4.1 demonstrates the number of articles in the sample in which a perception of opportunity from the US has been mentioned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Number of articles in the Sample</th>
<th>Articles Expressing Opportunity Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guo Ji Wen Ti Yen Jiu</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shi Jie Jing Ji Yu Zheng Zhi</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mei Guo Yen Jiu</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wai Jiao Xue Yuan Xue Bao</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xian Dai Guo Ji Guan Xi</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhan Lue Yu Guang Li</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>182</strong></td>
<td><strong>162</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Number of Articles Expressing Perceptions of Opportunity from the US

From the above table, just as in Chapter 3 on the perception of threat, we can see that an overwhelming majority of articles in the sample perceive more or less an opportunity from the US. Consistent with the research in Chapter 3, opportunity in this chapter is

373 Articles in various journals not containing expressions of opportunity are as follows: mei, 97-4, 144-147, Bao Jiaquan. shi, 94-1, 56-61, Wang Chimin; shi, 94-4, 17-23, Guo Shixian; shi, 95-6, 14-?, Qin Liufang, Guo Shixian; shi, 95-11, 58-61, Chu Shulong; shi, 96-7, 25-27, Zhao Yongqing; shi, 96-9, 26-29, Yu Zhida; shi, 98-4, 53-57, Liu Shitian, Xia Shifa; shi, 98-10, 49-52, 71, Tang Yongsheng; shi, 99-5, 5-9, 20, Tang Yongsheng, Chen Zhuhua; shi, 99-9, 73-77, Dai Bing; shi, 00-1, 49-51, Shi Yinghong; shi, 00-2, 53-57, Han Weidong, Han Yaodong. wai, 98-4, 51-55, 96, Yang Jiemian; xian, 99-4, 16-18, Gu Wenyan; xian, 99-12, 22-24, Yan Julu; xian, 99-12, 31-33, Cao Fumiao; zhan, 97-5, 114-118, Wu xianbin; zhan, 97-6, 60-67, Peter
defined as anything the US has done to China to elicit positive comments from Chinese authors, either approval or appreciation. Again, this definition is not academically satisfactory, but just to serve the purpose of research in this chapter. According to Richard Herrmann, perception of opportunity in international relations includes two aspects: perception of opportunity for exploitation and perception of opportunity for cooperation. The former refers to a target country usually weaker than the source country, and the source country perceives an opportunity to take advantage of the target country’s weakness for its own interest. As this kind of perception is hardly present at all in the sample, in this chapter, I will focus only on the perception of opportunity for cooperation with the US.

4.3 The Contents of the Chinese Perception of Opportunity for Cooperation with the US

In this section, I will discuss opportunity for cooperation in two parts. One is the perceived opportunity for the US, and the other is the perceived opportunity for China. In the first part, I will discuss only some of the perceived opportunity in strategic and economic aspects, just to demonstrate that Chinese authors perceive a win-win game rather than a zero-sum game in China-US bilateral relations. The second part on perceived opportunity to China constitutes the bulk of this chapter. Again, for the
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Nolan, Wang Xiaoqiang.

purpose of academic consistency, I will adapt Nuechterlein’s interest matrix for the presentation of the second section.

4.3.1 Opportunity to the US

4.3.1.1 China is Strategically Important to the US

Chinese authors argue that China is important to the US in several ways, including strategically. Chinese authors often emphasize China’s strategic importance to the US, not only by their own arguments, but also by citing speeches of American politicians or scholars. As they do so approvingly, I in the following will treat such instances also as revelation of Chinese scholars’ own perceptions.

China is a big country, a permanent member of UN Security Council, and a nuclear power. It has important influence in the Asia-Pacific region and among developing countries. Consequently, China is strategically important to the US and the US needs China’s cooperation to deal with various international problems. Harry Harding points out that in many international problems, China can either make things worse or

---

375 shi, 93-10, 61, Zhang Minqian; wai, 92-3, 52, Xiong Zhiyong
376 shi, 93-10, 61, Zhang Minqian
377 wai, 99-1, p.46, Zhuang Qubing
378 shi, 93-1, 35, Fang Zhou; xian, 00-12, 6, Lu Qichang
better for the US.\textsuperscript{379} Former president Bush said, China could easily influence stability in the Asia-Pacific region, which would affect the peace and prosperity of the world.\textsuperscript{380}

Typically, Chinese authors perceive China’s strategic importance to the US in the following international hotspots or problems.

A. In the Asia-Pacific region, the Korean peninsula;\textsuperscript{381} the Taiwan problem;\textsuperscript{382} the Cambodia problem;\textsuperscript{383} the South China Sea;\textsuperscript{384} the Southeast Asia;\textsuperscript{385} and the Central Asia.\textsuperscript{386}

B. Maintaining balance of power in the Asia-Pacific region,\textsuperscript{387} restraining Japan,\textsuperscript{388} and balancing Russia.\textsuperscript{389} In the case of Japan, one Chinese author argues that the US wants to “use Japan to restrain China and at the same time use China to balance Japan.”\textsuperscript{390}

\textsuperscript{379} mei, 95-4, 42, Zhou Qi  
\textsuperscript{380} wai, 92-3, 52, Xiong Zhiyong (no quotation marks here because of translation from English to Chinese and then to English)  
\textsuperscript{381} shi, 93-1, 35, Fang Zhou; mei, 95-4, 42, Zhou Qi; xian, 98-10, 30, Zheng Baoguo; shi, 94-12, 4, Wang Shuzhong; zhan, 00-1, p.35, Zhai Xiaomin; zhan, 97-5, 111, Liu Jingsong; zhan, 94-6, p.75, Gao E; wai, 92-3, 52, Xiong Zhiyong  
\textsuperscript{382} mei, 95-4, 42-43, Zhou Qi; xian, 98-10, 30, Zheng Baoguo; zhan, 00-1, p.35, Zhai Xiaomin; zhan, 97-5, 111, Liu Jingsong  
\textsuperscript{383} shi, 93-1, 35, Fang Zhou; zhan, 94-6, p.75, Gao E; wai, 92-3, 52, Xiong Zhiyong; shi, 99-10, 33, Chen Demin  
\textsuperscript{384} xian, 98-10, 30, Zheng Baoguo; zhan, 00-1, p.35, Zhai Xiaomin  
\textsuperscript{385} shi, 94-12, 4, Wang Shuzhong; zhan, 97-5, 111, Liu Jingsong  
\textsuperscript{386} mei, 95-4, 43, Zhou Qi  
\textsuperscript{387} mei, 95-4, 42, Zhou Qi; zhan, 00-1, pp. 35, Zhai Xiaomin; zhan, 97-5, 111, Liu Jingsong; shi, 98-4, 59, Wang Yanjun  
\textsuperscript{388} shi, 93-2, p.61, Qian Wenrong; zhan, 97-1, 34, Tang Yongsheng; wai, 97-1, 53, Zhou Lin  
\textsuperscript{389} wai, 97-1, 53, Zhou Lin  
\textsuperscript{390} zhan, 96-5, 48, Jiang Lingfei
C. The Middle East, especially during the Gulf War in the early 1990s.391

D. Nuclear proliferation in general;392 nuclear problem in the South Asia;393 the North Korean nuclear program;394 missile control;395 the nuclear programs in Pakistan, Iran etc.396

E. Transnational problems such as environmental protection;397 drug trafficking;398 international terrorism;399 illegal immigrants;400 and international crime.401
F. China’s support in the UN Security Council.\textsuperscript{402}

Chinese authors point out that “whether the US’s Asia-Pacific strategy will be successful or not, to quite some extent depends on the state of China-US relations.”\textsuperscript{403} Since the US points to problems such as those in the above list as major threats to the US in the post-Cold War era, and China is considered as capable of playing a major role in contributing to the solution of many of the above problems, Chinese authors consider their country as strategically important to the US.\textsuperscript{404} But from a narrow security perspective, one Chinese author does agree with Robert Ross that there is an asymmetry between the US and China because the US does not depend on cooperation with China for its fundamental interest and the guarantee of its national security.\textsuperscript{405} Another Chinese author also points out that things like controlling international crime etc “do not enjoy strategic status.”\textsuperscript{406} But on the other hand, things may change unexpectedly, just as anti-terrorism which was regarded in 1997 as not enjoying a strategic status had since 2001 become the first priority in the US’s national security, because “the US has a far broader concept of national security than any other

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{401} wai, 97-1, p.36, Zhang Yiting; guo, 98-4, 9, Wang Haihang; shi, 98-4, 59, Wang Yanjun; shi, 97-3, p.80, Liu Liandi
\textsuperscript{402} mei, 95-4, 17, Yuan Ming, Fan Shimin; shi, 93-10, 61, Zhang Minqian; wai, 96-2, p.22, Su Ge; wai, 92-3, 52, Xiong Zhiyong
\textsuperscript{403} xian, 99-10, 4, Ding Kuisong; Zhou agrees with this argument, not using the exact language, wai, 97-1, 53, Zhou Lin
\textsuperscript{404} guo, 96-1, 2, Wang Jisi; zhan, 96-6, p.33, Shi Yinghong; shi, 96-10, 21-23, Zhang Ruhai; shi, 98-8, p.16, Jin Canrong
\textsuperscript{405} shi, 00-8, 25-26, Sun Jianhan. Double translations, so no quotation marks
\textsuperscript{406} zhan, 97-6, p.54, Wang Yi, Zhang Jiqiang, Wu Changhua, He Kebing
\end{flushright}
Chinese authors argue that China’s strategic importance to the US is more pronounced if viewed from a long term perspective,\(^{408}\) not just focused on the present but looking at Chinese-US relations facing the 21st century.\(^{409}\)

China and the US have already engaged in substantial cooperation regarding things in the above list important to the US.\(^{410}\) In the following, I will briefly discuss the US-China cooperation in the areas of non-proliferation and anti-terrorism.

4.3.1.1.1 US-China Cooperation on Non-Proliferation

Quite a few Chinese authors mention that one important area of cooperation between the US and China is to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction,\(^{411}\) which one scholar regards as constituting one of the new foundations of China-US bilateral relations.\(^{412}\) Both countries wish to promote non-proliferation.\(^{413}\) Some authors

\(^{407}\) shi, 00-8, 25-26, Sun Jianhan  
\(^{408}\) shi, 98-6, 37, Sheng Jiru  
\(^{409}\) guo, 98-4, 11, Wang Haihang  
\(^{410}\) shi, 98-8, p.16-17, Jin Canrong; guo, 96-1, p.1, Wang Jisi; shi, 94-12, 3, Wang Shuzhong; zhan, 97-5, 106, Liu Jingsong; xian, 00-12, 4, Lu Qichang  
\(^{411}\) shi, 99-10, p.36, Chen Demin; shi, 98-8, p.22, Su Ge; shi, 98-8, p.16, Jin Canrong; xian, 97-10, p.7, Chu Shulong  
\(^{412}\) xian, 97-11, p.5, Xi Laiwang  
\(^{413}\) shi, 00-7, 50-51, Chu Shulong; shi, 99-10, 36, Chen Demin; xian, 98-7, p.3, Liu Jiangyong; xian, 132
seem to suggest however, in this area, the US needs China’s cooperation more than China needs the US’s, since proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is currently a major threat to the US, but not so to China.\textsuperscript{414} One author cites Alexander Haig to the effect that even though China is not the complete answer to this problem, China is an important part of the solution\textsuperscript{415} and can help the US in this respect. The two countries in recent years, especially during the mutual visits by President Clinton to China and President Jiang to the US, have had extensive contact and dialogue regarding non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and have had some productive cooperation.\textsuperscript{416}

4.3.1.1.2 US-China Cooperation on Anti-Terrorism

Quite a few Chinese authors mention that fighting terrorism is an area in which the US and China share a common interest.\textsuperscript{417} This is a threat facing both the US and China,\textsuperscript{418} and “a problem which neither countries can solve by itself”\textsuperscript{419}

\textsuperscript{414} wai, 97-1, p.36, Zhang Yiting; guo, 98-4, 7, Wang Haihang; xian, 98-10, .30, Zheng Baoguo; mei, 95-4, 42-43, Zhou Qi
\textsuperscript{415} mei, 95-4, 43, Zhou Qi. Double translation, so no quotation marks.
\textsuperscript{416} shi, 98-8, 16, Jin Canrong; xian, 99-1/2, pp. 79, Ding Kuisong, Niu Xinchun; xian, 98-6, p.4, Chu Shulong; mei, 98-2, 101, Jia Qingguo
\textsuperscript{417} mei, 98-2, 101-102, Jia Qingguo; xian, 96-11, pp. 6, Chu Shulong; xian, 99-1/2, pp. 79, Ding Kuisong, Niu Xinchun; shi, 96-10, 21, 23, Zhang Ruhai; shi, 99-10, 36, Chen Demin
\textsuperscript{418} shi, 99-1, p.36, Liu Yongtao
\textsuperscript{419} shi, 99-1, p.36, Liu Yongtao; Sheng did not use the exact language, shi, 98-8, p.25, Sheng Jiru
The need for bilateral cooperation in this respect is greater than in the past, and the two countries actually already have had good cooperation in this respect. Threat of this kind promotes the formation of a collective identity between the US and China, and offers a good potential for bilateral cooperation. The improvement of bilateral relations will contribute positively to this common cause.

Just as in the case of non-proliferation, Chinese authors seem to believe that terrorism is more a threat to the US than to China, and consequently the US in this respect needs China more than China needs the US.

4.3.1.2 China is economically important to the US

Chinese authors argue that China is economically important to the US. Among other things, economic relations with China provide the US with increased employment, trade and investment opportunities, and enhanced competitiveness. In the following, I will discuss briefly the impact of China-US economic relations on the US’s job market and
According to Chinese authors, economic relations with China bring many benefits to the US, and one such benefit is the increase in jobs for Americans. Chinese authors are not quite certain about the exact impact on the US’s job market, but their consensus is that the impact is not negligible, perhaps even great.

For 1993, two authors mentioned that the US exports to China reached $8 billion, providing 150,000 jobs for Americans.\textsuperscript{427} Another author gave a somewhat different figure: 200,000 high paying jobs for Americans from exports to China in 1993.\textsuperscript{428} In 1995, one scholar pointed out that denying China’s MFN status would cost the US 170,000 jobs,\textsuperscript{429} which would include, among other things, MFN’s impact on both exports and imports, and on investment. In 1996, another scholar mentioned that the US’s trade with China was “relevant with 150,000 jobs in the US,”\textsuperscript{430} which at least should include the impact of both export and import. In early 1998, one scholar gave the most impressive figure in the sample: “According to estimates, US direct exports to

\textsuperscript{427} guo, 94-4, p.3, Pan Tongwen; shi, 94-12, 5, Wang Shuzhong
\textsuperscript{428} mei, 95-4, 43-44, Zhou Qi
\textsuperscript{429} shi, 95-9, 28, Xu Song
\textsuperscript{430} wai, 96-2, p.23, Su Ge
China alone provide 300,000 jobs, bilateral trade at least provides US industry and service industry about one million jobs.\textsuperscript{431}

Chinese authors also cited Americans’ own estimates to substantiate their argument. One instance is the testimony of the China-US Chamber of Commerce Chairman in the US House of Representatives in which he reportedly mentioned that interests brought forth from the China-US trade have permeated every corner of the US, demonstrated in tens of thousands of jobs, enhanced competitiveness, and affordable consumer products.\textsuperscript{432} Another instance is President Clinton’s comment on the Intellectual Property Rights Agreement between the US and China, in which he said this was “a very important agreement,” because it would mean tens of thousands of jobs for the US.\textsuperscript{433}

Chinese authors are without exception quite optimistic about the future prospect of China-US economic relations, and are confident that bilateral economic relations in future will provide many more jobs for Americans. As early as in 1994, one author cited President Clinton approvingly that in the 21st century, China would become the most important emerging market in the world, and therefore would be more important to the

\textsuperscript{431} shi, 98-1, 68, Yu Guobing
\textsuperscript{432} xian, 98-7, 41, Xiong Zhiyong. Double translations, so no quotation marks
\textsuperscript{433} shi, 95-9, 28, Xu Song
US economy. One author mentioned in 1997 that “in the remaining years of the 20th century, China’s cumulative imports could reach 1 trillion US dollars, which undoubtedly would provide the US an opportunity to expand export, create jobs, and speed up its economic growth.” For one instance, to meet China’s demand for nuclear power plants, according to the US Nuclear Association in Washington DC, in the next 25 years, “US suppliers can export to China annually $1.6 billion in technology and equipments. These export can guarantee 25,000 high tech jobs” for the US.

4.3.1.2.2 Trade

One article analyzes in detail the benefits to the US of trading with China. The author argues that inexpensive Chinese products entering the US market have the following benefits to the US. 1. They are quite beneficial to US consumers. To be more exact, US$ 25.68 billion of Chinese import into the US market in 1992 may mean US$ 25.68 billion earned for US consumers! Let us see how he reaches this interesting conclusion. According to him, in the US, the income from labor and capital account for 75% and 25% respectively (an assumption cited from Paul Samuelson’s Economics), while in China, labor and capital account for 50% respectively. If the price of a Chinese product is $100 ($50 for labor and $50 for capital), the same product made in the US would cost

434 guo, 94-4, 3, Pan Tongwen. Double translation, so no quotation marks
435 wai, 97-1, 52, Zhou Lin
436 zhan, 99-4, 23, Zhang Qingming
$200. Therefore, US import from China of $25.68 billion in 1992 means that the US consumers “saved $25.68 billion and enjoyed the same benefits.”\textsuperscript{437} The author points out that the calculation above is not quite accurate because he resorts to several assumptions, such as no price elasticity, no transportation cost, no custom duties, and all imports being consumer goods, but it is clear that the author thinks that the US reaps great benefits from its trade with China. Another scholar gave a more modest estimate: around 1995, without China’s imports, US consumers annually would have to pay an extra 14 billion dollars because of the higher tariff and replacement products from other countries.\textsuperscript{438}

2. Chinese imports help lower the US inflation rate. As China’s labor cost is about 1/65 of the US’s, Chinese products “can enter the US market at a very low price, thus can play a very positive role in lowering commodity price in the US, which in fact also increases American workers’ actual income.”\textsuperscript{439} One author predicts in 1995 that “without imports from China, the US’s annual inflation rate would increase at least 0.15%.”\textsuperscript{440}

3. Chinese imports help increase US saving and in turn promote US investment. The US savings rate has been very low in recent years, about 5%, totaling 212.6 billion US

\textsuperscript{437} mei, 94-1, 131-132, Wei Wei
\textsuperscript{438} shi, 95-9, 28, Xu Song
\textsuperscript{439} mei, 94-1, 132, Wei Wei
dollars in 1992. The author assume that US consumers save all the money because of the reduced cost of buying Chinese products, it means that about 7.5% of US saving in 1992 came from China’s imports.\footnote{mei, 94-1, 132-133, Wei Wei}

Over the years, China has become an increasingly more important trade partner for the US. In 1995, China was already the US’s sixth largest trade partner.\footnote{shi, 95-9, 28, Xu Song} In 1997, China became the fourth largest trade partner for the US, behind Canada, Japan, and Mexico.\footnote{xian, 98-6, 3, Chu Shulong; xian, 98-4, 20, Ma Jiali; xian, 98-10, 30, Zheng Baoguo} In 2000, China remains fourth and the volume of the bilateral trade keeps increasing.\footnote{xian, 00-10, 4, Xi Laiwang} One author mentions that “if China increases the number of telephones from 2 among every 100 Chinese to 40, the size of China’s telecommunication market would be the sum total of the US’s market in the last 100 years.” He adds somewhat resentfully, if the US is unfriendly to China, China would give parts of this market to its competitors.\footnote{shi, 95-9, 31, Xu Song}
4.3.2 Opportunity to China

4.3.2.1 Opportunity to China’s National Security

4.3.2.1.1 The US is Committed to Peace

As for China’s national security, Chinese authors in the sample perceive opportunity from the US mainly in three aspects. Firstly, the US is basically committed to peace in the Asia-Pacific region. Secondly, the US can serve as a counterweight to Japan. Thirdly, the US practices engagement policy toward China. The perceived role of the US in maintaining peace will be discussed in the section about opportunity from the US regarding China’s favored world order. In the following two sections, I will discuss the US’s perceived role as a counterweight to Japan, and its engagement policy toward China.

4.3.2.1.2 The US to Contain Japan

Chinese authors mostly perceive a potential threat from Japan and they regard the US as a counterweight to Japan. They argue that the two countries have a common interest in this respect, since neither is willing to see Japan again “becoming militaristic or
possessing nuclear weapons.”\textsuperscript{446} One author accepts that “US-Japan security relations may serve as a bottle cork to prevent Japan possessing nuclear weapons.”\textsuperscript{447} Another author points out that “if the US-Japan alliance collapses, Japan would adopt an independent defense policy and greatly increase its military capability, which would arouse concern and uneasiness among East Asian countries, and result in a regional arms race.”\textsuperscript{448} He further points out that “if the US and China can reach a consensus regarding Japan’s military power development and its role in regional political and security affairs, it will greatly reduce China’s concern over Japan.”\textsuperscript{449} The development of the China-US relations is perceived to have a positive effect on China-Japan relations, because it would constrain Japan’s relations with Taiwan.\textsuperscript{450}

4.3.2.1.3 The US’s Engagement Policy toward China

CHINESE SCHOLARS FAVOR ENGAGEMENT. China’s strategic goal is reform and opening, making every effort to develop economically, which should not change in the next 100 years, given China’s extremely low per capita GNP.\textsuperscript{451} A peaceful international environment and significant international cooperation are therefore essential to China.

\textsuperscript{446} xian, 98-7, p.5, Liu Jiangyong
\textsuperscript{447} wai, 96-4, 32, Liu Jiangyong
\textsuperscript{448} shi, 99-2, 21, Wu Xinbo
\textsuperscript{449} shi, 99-2, 23, Wu Xinbo
\textsuperscript{450} shi, 99-2, 23, Wu Xinbo
\textsuperscript{451} wai, 92-3, 49, Xiong Zhiyong; Wai, 96-2, p.21, Su Ge; Zhan, 97-5, p.35, Liu Ji; xian, 00-1/2, 93, Fu Mengzi
“As the US is the no. 1 power in the world, China-US relations are very important to China,” and “developing stable cooperative relations with the US on a long term basis conforms to China’s broadest strategic interest.” Since China and the US established diplomatic relations in 1979, “China has always tried to improve and develop relations with the US.” One of China’s motivations in developing economic ties with the US is that they help improve bilateral relations. In reacting to US leaders’ frequent speeches that China-US relations are one of the most important foreign relations for the US, one Chinese author points out that on our part, we would say that “China-US relations are China’s most important bilateral relationship.” One article puts it more bluntly: in China’s pursuit for modernization, “the US is the most significant external factor. It may be either the biggest cooperator or the biggest destroyer.”

After the Tiananmen tragedy in 1989, China’s paramount leader Deng Xiaoping said, “even though there are problems and differences of this and that kind, ultimately, China-US relations should improve.” Shortly after President Clinton was elected, Chinese president Jiang Zemin put forward a 16 character principle in guiding China’s relations with the US: “increasing trust, reducing trouble, developing cooperation, and avoiding

---

452 wai, 92-3, 49, Xiong Zhiyong
453 shi, 98-4, 60, Wang Yanjun
454 xian, 95-9, 2, Lu Qichang
455 shi, 98-9, 70-73, Wang Zhihong
456 mei, 97-2, 130, Li Shengzi
457 mei, 95-4, 26, Yuan Ming, Fan Shimin
458 wai, 96-3, p.18, Zhao Pingan, Li Xuebao, Guo Yuan; zhan, 97-5, p.31, Liu Ji. Liu uses a shorter
confrontation.\textsuperscript{459} In the mid-1990s when the China-US relations were beset by the serious Taiwan Straits crisis, Premier Li Peng told former US president Bush that “China is willing to maintain at least normal state-to-state relations with the US. It of course will be better if the two countries can develop their friendly cooperation.”\textsuperscript{460}

Virtually all Chinese scholars in the sample share the same opinion. Though Chinese authors have different opinions as to whether the US actually practices engagement or containment toward China, all of them prefer engagement to containment. One author argues that the US’s engagement policy has positive implications since “it leaves more room for the development of China-US relations.”\textsuperscript{461} Another mentions that China’s modernization depends on integration with the international community, and Chinese government has realized that China should “shift from a challenger to cooperator” in its relations with the current international regimes.\textsuperscript{462} The US’s engagement policy which aims at integrating China into the international community therefore is welcome.

ENGAGEMENT IS THE MAINSTREAM PREFERENCE IN THE US. Chinese scholars are aware of the two schools in the US regarding the China policy, the

\textsuperscript{459} wai, 96-3, p.23, Li Shouyuan; guo, 96-1, 6, Wang Jisi; zhan, 94-6, 75, Gao E; shi, 97-12, 52, Ke Juhan; uo, 97-1, 9, Wang Haihang; xian, 00-1/2, 94, Fu Mengzi
\textsuperscript{460} guo, 96-1, 6, Wang Jisi
\textsuperscript{461} shi, 00-8, 29, Sun Jianhan
\textsuperscript{462} mei, 95-4, 47-48, Zhou Qi
engagement school and the containment school. The two schools have been locked in intense debates for an extended period and finally, around 1996-1997, after the relaxation of the Taiwan Straits crisis in March 1996, perhaps with Clinton-Jiang Seattle summit as the landmark, engagement school emerged victorious and became, in Chinese eyes, the dominant school in the US’s China policy decision making.

The following according to Chinese scholars are manifestations that engagement has become the dominant school: frequent speeches by US decision makers advocating engagement, the US’s actual policy of engagement toward China, major decision makers in the Clinton administration supporting engagement, the support of most of former US presidents, former cabinet ministers etc. Chinese authors believe that engagement has won not only the support of the Democrats who control the White House, but also the support of the Republicans who control the Congress. They are pleased that as the 1990s progressed, China MFN, and later on PNTR, has won more and more support in the US, especially in the Congress. They point out that
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engagement is also the dominant school in US academia and among US opinion leaders.\textsuperscript{471}

As Chinese authors believe that US engagement policy is guided by realism,\textsuperscript{472} and engagement has become the mainstream position in the US, they argue that “this position will not easily change.”\textsuperscript{473} No matter who in the future will be elected, engagement will survive the US’s presidential elections. It is so in 1996, and again so in 2000.\textsuperscript{474}

For Campaign 2000, if Gore was elected, Chinese scholars had confidence that he would carry on Clinton’s “engagement” policy with China.\textsuperscript{475} Though Bush in his presidential campaign used “competitor” to describe China, Chinese authors still argued against excessive pessimism. One author points out that even though “Bush is not friendly toward China during his campaign, he definitely is not hostile to China either.” Besides, Bush even during his campaign was positive on some of the most important indicators of engagement, such as supporting China’s membership in the WTO, supporting China PNTR, and regarding it as important to maintain the engagement policy toward
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Chinese scholars perceive George W. Bush’s hard-line position toward China during the presidential campaign as more serving his campaign needs than serving the US’s interest, and they therefore predict that after he assumes office in the White House, Bush will return to the basic framework of late 1990s’ China policy.

A lot of Chinese authors to quite some extent agree that the US has a benign intention in its China policy. They are pleased with the US’s announcement that a stable, open, and successful China conforms to the US’s national interest, that the US wishes to maintain friendly relations with a powerful, stable, prosperous and open China, and that it is “more beneficial to the US for China to succeed in its reform than to fail.” They cited approvingly the speeches of President Clinton, and other senior US officials such as James Sasser, that an isolated China is unfavorable to the US and a China which plays an appropriate role in the world is good for the US. Though some scholars point out that the US-China relations would improve only when China is weak, a lot of Chinese scholars point out that it is the growth of the Chinese economy and
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comprehensive national power that helps the US to adopt an engagement policy.\textsuperscript{482}

4.3.2.2 Human Rights Disputes under Control

The US’s human rights policy toward China had been in a state of constant evolution during the 1990s. When Clinton first assumed office in the early 1990s, there had been serious disputes between the two countries over human rights.\textsuperscript{483} In 1993, President Clinton announced linking China’s MFN with human rights for the following year, an approach softer than what he advocated during the presidential campaign but nonetheless arousing significant controversy.\textsuperscript{484} According to Chinese scholars, US strategists, scholars, business circle, as well as almost all countries in Asia, strongly opposed the linkage policy.\textsuperscript{485}

In May 1994, Clinton finally decided to de-link human rights and MFN. After that, in the Chinese eyes, the status of human rights in the US’s China policy steadily declined and economic interest has become one of its major foundations.\textsuperscript{486}
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Toward the end of the 1990s, China-US confrontation over human rights was significantly relaxed.\(^{487}\) In October 1997 during talks with President Jiang, President Clinton for the first time said that he had an understanding of China’s perspective that the stability of domestic politics and the rights to development are the primary human rights.\(^{488}\) The US consequently adopted a less confrontational approach in promoting human rights in China. The two countries agreed to “open dialogue over China’s human rights, and establish a private human rights forum.”\(^{489}\) In 1998, the US State department’s Human Rights report for the first time praised China for improvement.\(^{490}\) In March 1998, the US for the first time in the 1990s gave up its hard line policy against China in the UN Human Rights Commission. It neither initiated nor endorsed an anti-China bill in the Commission.\(^{491}\) The US also adopts a more acceptable approach to improve China’s human rights such as exporting the US’s human rights ideal through the increase of bilateral economic interactions and making sure that human rights disputes would not spill over to affect overall bilateral relations.\(^{492}\)
China in its turn made quite a few human rights concessions to the US. For instance, during President Jiang’s visit to the US, China signed the first UN human right convention, and said it would consider signing the second human rights convention.\textsuperscript{493} Chinese government also released some prominent political prisoners in response to the US’s appeal.\textsuperscript{494}

In spite of relaxation over human rights toward the end of the 1990s, Chinese authors continue to regard human rights as one of serious sources of contention between the US and China.\textsuperscript{495} During Campaign 2000, China’s scholars were still concerned that Gore as Clinton’s possible successor might keep on pressuring China over human rights.\textsuperscript{496}

In my opinion, even though human rights during the 1990s caused significant upheavals in China-US relations, the US’s human rights policy by the end of the 1990s was no longer a serious threat to China, as the US had largely given up its hard-line policy, and adopted a more acceptable approach. To some extent, if the US handles bilateral differences over human rights with deftness, and tries to promote China’s human rights in a way that would convince China that the US means only to help China rather than to humiliate China and to destabilize China’s government and social stability, the US’s
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human rights policy should not be regarded as a threat to China but should perhaps even be regarded as an opportunity to China, since admittedly, China’s human rights conditions are not satisfactory, and improvement in this respect is desirable.

4.3.2.3 Opportunity to China’s Economic Well-Being

4.3.2.3.1 Complementarity

In talking about China-US economic relations, Chinese authors often mention the strong structural complementarities between the two countries’ economies. They argue that the two countries have comparative advantages in different areas, and economic cooperation will greatly benefit each of them. Chinese authors often summarize the great complementarities between the two countries by saying that the US is the largest developed country in the world while China is the largest developing country, and there is therefore a great potential for economic and trade cooperation between them. Because of the strong complementarities, some scholars suggest that China in fact is one of the most ideal partners for the US.
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They point out that the US’s comparative advantages are its capital, technology, and management skills, but labor costs in the US are too high, and China’s comparative advantages are its cheap and high-quality labor, and natural resources, but China is short of capital and advanced technology. Both the US and China have a huge market, but as the two markets are vastly different, the two markets still complement each other. The US market is considered highly important to China, and the Chinese market is also considered as very important to the US.\textsuperscript{500}

Different from the US’s economic relations with Europe and Japan, China-US economic interactions are being conducted on two different levels, and there are therefore “only complementarities and basically no competition between the two economies.”\textsuperscript{501} The US has high-tech products, while China is a huge market for high tech products.\textsuperscript{502} For instance, transportation, energy, communications etc are the US’s comparative advantage, while China’s huge market for infrastructural construction is China’s comparative advantage.\textsuperscript{503} China’s imports of high tech products from the US contributes greatly to “the US’s structural adjustment and to the maintenance of the
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US’s competitiveness in high tech area.” 504 China has a large quantity of inexpensive consumer products, and the US has a huge market for such products. 505 For instance, China makes low tech products such as “toys, shoes, electronic products which the US almost no longer produces,” and the US has a huge market for such products. 506 Around early 1995, “over 40% of toys in the US market are made in China, totaling about 4.7 billion US dollars.” 507

Chinese authors are pleased that the increased economic interactions between the two countries have deepened their complementarities and interdependence. 508 They argue that once the US’s comparative advantages are fully combined with China’s, the two countries will both benefit tremendously. And they say many people in US business circles share the same opinion. 509

Chinese authors also acknowledge that the interdependence between the US and China is asymmetrical. They accept that the US’s market is more important to China than China’s to the US. 510 China’s great dependence on the US’s market can be demonstrated by the fact that about 1/5 (China’s statistics before Hong Kong’s return to China) or 1/3
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(the US’s statistics) of China’s export in 1996 went to the US market, and ending China MFN would “cost the jobs of millions of (Chinese) workers.” Some Chinese scholars therefore candidly admit that “China is much more dependent on the US’s market than the US on China’s.” One scholar however disagrees. He suggests that as the US needs to “compete economically with Europe and Japan,” China is also very important to the US and that the idea that “China needs the US more than the US needs China” is no longer true.

4.3.2.3.2 Investment

Investments from the US are considered very helpful to China’s modernization. In order to attract foreign investments, the Chinese government tries hard to improve the investment environment. When China made big concessions to the US concerning intellectual property rights protection, Chinese scholars justified the concessions by arguing that it helps to attract more foreign investments.
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Since 1992, direct US investments in China have kept increasing, often by leaps and bounds. Around the end of 1992, “some 1,000 US companies made investments in China totaling over 4 billion US dollars.” Around the end of 1993, in the city of Shanghai alone, “there were over 80 transnational companies from the US.” By the end of the 1994, US investment in China reached over 16,000 projects, “with the cumulative investment of 7 billion US dollars.” Around 1995, the US had “over 8,500 investment projects in China totaling over 10 billion US dollars.” And in 1996, over 50 (or over 100) out of the 500 largest US businesses had made investments in China. “By the end of 1996, real US investment in China had reached 14.3 billion US dollars.”

Chinese scholars generally agree that the US is one of the largest investors in China. By the end of 1994, the US was considered the third largest investor in the Chinese mainland, behind only Hong Kong and Taiwan. By the end of 1996, the US was “the second in foreign investment in China.” By 1998, the US had became “the biggest
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foreign investor in China.” 527 And in early 2000, the US remained the largest foreign investor in China. 528

Besides investments in the Chinese mainland, the US also has large investments in Hong Kong. In the early 1990s, “US investments in Hong Kong were about 7 billion US dollars, and most investments were relevant with China trade.” 529 “By the end of 1996, US investment in Hong Kong reached over 14 billion, employing 250,000 Hong Kong people, accounting for 1/10 of the Hong Kong labor force.” Currently 37,000 Americans live in Hong Kong. 530

Besides their large amount and rapid development, US investments in China are also noticeable for some other features. They “cover broad sectors and are high in technology.” 531 In the beginning, they concentrated mainly in big cities and coastal areas, but in 1992 they began to spread out to areas all over China, and from service industry to manufacturing industry. 532 The biggest US companies cover “26 sectors such as agriculture, light industry, food, textile machinery electronics” etc. 533
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US businesses have been described as having high confidence in the Chinese market, and are especially active in making investments in China.\textsuperscript{534} In 1994-5, Chinese scholars cited the US Chamber of Commerce’s investigation of 1069 big companies to the effect that “63% of those that had not yet made investments in China intend to take action in the next five years, and 89% of those having already made investments in China intended to enlarge production and reinvestment in the next five years.”\textsuperscript{535} US investors are especially interested in investments in China’s infrastructure such as “electricity, telecommunication system, ports, railway, airport etc.”\textsuperscript{536}

The US government sometimes has been described as playing a positive role in promoting American investments in China.\textsuperscript{537} For several years, the US’s Department of Commerce “listed China as the no. 1 among the ten emerging markets in the world,” and wishes that American companies “can be a winner in the competition for China’s market.” The importance of the Chinese market to the US is occasionally described as affecting to a large extent whether the US economy will be successful.\textsuperscript{538}

Even though the US is considered one of the largest investors in China, quite a few Chinese scholars deplore that US investments in China are still too little, and the
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increase too slow,\textsuperscript{539} because the US’s actual investments in China are considered by far incompatible with its huge investment capability. During the 1979-1992 period, “big US transnational companies’ investments in China accounted for less than 1% of their overall oversea investment in 1992.”\textsuperscript{540} In 1992, direct investments in China by US manufacturing industry accounted for only 0.14% of its overall foreign direct investment. This figure rose very slowly in 1995 to 0.4%, and in 1996 to 0.55%.\textsuperscript{541}

Chinese scholars typically describe China as an attractive locus for foreign investments.\textsuperscript{542} They point out that 64% of British transnational companies intend to make or to increase investments in China; 80% of Japanese investors regard their investments in China as successful, and almost all US businesses regard China as an ideal locus of investment.\textsuperscript{543} They argue that making investments in China is more profitable than elsewhere.\textsuperscript{544} Important reasons why China is a good place for investment include the following: its high GDP growth rate, high foreign trade growth rate, and its huge market with over 1.2 billion consumers, in addition to low labor costs and preferential
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treatment for foreign businesses.\textsuperscript{545} China’s investment in infrastructure, 1,000 billion US dollars in 1998-2000, is considered highly attractive to Europe and the US.\textsuperscript{546} With the continued development of China’s economy, the passage of China PNTR, China’s entry into the WTO, and China’s efforts to protect intellectual property rights, Chinese authors are quite optimistic that China in future will provide an even bigger and better market for investments from the US and other countries.\textsuperscript{547}

4.3.2.3.3 Trade

All Chinese observers agree that the US is one of China’s major trading partners.\textsuperscript{548} When Hong Kong is considered as an external economic entity, especially before its return to China in July 1997, the US was often considered as either the second or the third most important trading partner to China.\textsuperscript{549} As Hong Kong is a part of China though enjoying a special status, the US therefore is usually either the first or the second trading partner to China.
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All Chinese scholars agree that the China-US trade has developed rapidly. According to Chinese statistics, “in 1990-1997 period, the average annual China-US trade growth rate had been 22.6%, surpassing the annual growth rate of 15.9% which had been China’s overall foreign trade growth rate. According to US statistics, in the 1990s, the average annual US-China trade growth rate was 16%, surpassing the US’s annual trade growth rate with Asia of 11%, and its annual growth rate of 7% in its trade with other regions in the world.”550 Other scholars report different growth rates for different years during the 1990s, and all data are impressive, with the highest annual growth rate being 28%, and the lowest over 16%.551

In terms of the absolute amount, in 1979, bilateral trade was a measly 2.45 billion US dollars.552 As late as in 1990, China-US trade was still quite modest (19.9 billion -- US statistics), accounting only for 2% of the US’s foreign trade.553 In 1992, it surpassed 25 billion.554 In 1994, it reached 35.4 billion.555 The bilateral trade was 40.8 billion US dollars in 1995.556 “According to US statistics, during the first Clinton administration, the volume of China-US trade increased from over 34 billion to over 63 billion US
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dollars.\textsuperscript{557}

Chinese scholars are optimistic about the continued substantial growth of China-US trade in the years to come.\textsuperscript{558} One author expects that in about 25 years, China-US economic and trade relations will “surpass US-Japan economic relations and become the most important bilateral economic relations in the Asia-Pacific region.”\textsuperscript{559}

4.3.2.3.4 Technology

Many Chinese authors mention that technology is an important area of cooperation between the US and China.\textsuperscript{560} As a developing country trying to improve the economic well-being of its people, China is very much interested in science and technology from the West, especially from the US.\textsuperscript{561} The US is perceived as representing the pinnacle of human achievements in science and technology, and one Chinese author argues that “for this reason alone, China should try to reach a historical reconciliation with the US.”\textsuperscript{562} One reason why China is particularly interested in the US investments is that they are

\textsuperscript{557} xian, 97-8, 13-14, Nai Zuji; shi, 98-1, 69-71, Yu Guobing
\textsuperscript{558} xian, 95-6, 8-9, Liu Wei, Gu Wenyan; xian, 00-1/2, 94, Fu Mengzi
\textsuperscript{559} mei, 97-2, 150, Huang Renwei
\textsuperscript{560} shi, 99-10, 36, Chen Demin; shi, 98-8, p.20, Su Ge; shi, 92-11, 56-57, Li Changjiu; guo, 96-1, 4, Wang Jisi
\textsuperscript{561} xian, 99-6, 15, Zhao Jingfang; guo, 97-1, 7, Wang Haihang; shi, 96-8, 39, Qin Fengmin
\textsuperscript{562} shi, 98-6, 41, Sheng Jiru
generally high in technology.\textsuperscript{563}

Chinese authors deplore that, the US government imposes severe restrictions on technology export to China, forbidding the sale of sophisticated technology to China.\textsuperscript{564} They argue that restrictions of this kind not only hurt China’s interests, but also the US’s. One way it hurts the US is that it weakens its competitiveness in technology trade and enlarges its deficit with China. In 1998, for instance, the US exported only US$ 8.9 billion of electronic products to China, much less than Japan (15.1 billion) and EU (14.8 billion), though Japan and EU are less competitive than the US in this area. One Chinese author argues that “if the US increases the proportion of technology exports to China to the normal ratio of such products in its overall exports, the US not only can make significant profit from such trade, but it can also greatly reduce the deficit in the China-US bilateral trade.”\textsuperscript{565}

US business circles are said by Chinese authors to realize the negative effects of the US’s over-sensitiveness in technology trade with China and complain about it.\textsuperscript{566} The US Technology Transfer Association exclaims that the US Congress’s investigation
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centering on Cox Report would cause disastrous consequences for the US exporters.  

As China is “one of the largest importers of technology,” US-China cooperation in technology can not only fulfill China’s needs for modernization but it also serves the US’s interest. In the case of technology trade, for instance, “the US currently has about 100 nuclear reactors generating about 19% of its electricity, and it has no more plan for additional nuclear stations,” but China intends to greatly increase its nuclear electricity capacity. It means that in the next 25 years, “US exports to China in commercial technology and relevant equipments can potentially reach 50 to 60 billion US dollars ... The US (nuclear technology) suppliers can annually export to China 1.6 billion dollars, which alone, would provide 25,000 high tech jobs for the US.”

In technology cooperation, China sometimes can be the provider. Cooperation in satellite launching is a case in point. “Launching one pound in the US would cost 10,000 to 12,000 US dollars, while China charges only 4,000 to 5,000 US dollars.” According to one estimate, “in the next ten years, the US will launch 1,200 commercial satellites, but the US’s launching capability cannot meet the need. Therefore, the China-US cooperation in this area alone will bring rich benefits to both countries.”

---
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In spite of the US’s restrictions, there still has been some cooperation in this area,\(^{572}\) and the US government sometimes slightly relaxes its restrictions on high technology cooperation with China.\(^{573}\) As the China-US technology exchanges and cooperation conforms to the fundamental interest of the two countries and the two peoples, some Chinese authors are optimistic about the prospects for greater bilateral cooperation in this area.\(^{574}\)

4.3.2.3.5 Intellectual Property Rights

It took a long time for China and the US to negotiate several interim agreements and reach a final agreement concerning intellectual property rights. Even though Chinese authors complained a lot in the process about the US’s tough demands, they seem to be satisfied with the final outcome, regarding it as a win-win conclusion capable of contributing to further development of bilateral economic relations.\(^{575}\)

---

\(^{572}\) guo, 96-1, 2, Wang Jisi

\(^{573}\) wai, 96-3, 16, Zhao Pingan, Li Xuebao, Guo Yuan; zhan, 97-5, 106, Liu Jingsong; zhan, 99-4, 22, Zhang Qingming; shi, 97-2, 23, Lin Jue

\(^{574}\) mei, 91-2, 33-36, Zhang Hanlin, Cai Chunlin; mei, 97-2, 146-147, Li Minde; shi, 98-10, 48, Li Changjiu; shi, 98-8, p.26-27, Sheng Jiru

\(^{575}\) shi, 92-11, 55-57; shi, 93-6, 38, Zhang Yebai; xian, 95-6, 8, Liu Wei, Gu Wenyan; shi, 95-9, 28, Xu Song; shi, 96-8, 37, Qin Fengmin; xian, 97-8, 12-13, Nai Zuji; xian, 98-4, 20-21, Ma Jiali; zhan, 97-3, 21, 27, Zhang Linhong
4.3.2.3.6 The WTO and PNTR

WTO negotiations between the US and China have been long and difficult because the two countries had a lot of differences.\textsuperscript{576} The 13 years of negotiation seems to be a period in which the US incessantly made more and more demands on China\textsuperscript{577} and China after stiff resistance invariably backed down. But after all, the US turns out to be indeed supportive of China’s WTO membership, and the two countries have made slow but steady progress toward agreement.\textsuperscript{578} In November 15, 1999, the two countries finally made a landmark breakthrough and reached a final agreement.\textsuperscript{579} In spite of the abundance of their complaints during the negotiations, Chinese authors again regard the final agreement as a win-win solution for both countries.\textsuperscript{580} They expect that China’s membership in the WTO will stimulate China’s economic development.\textsuperscript{581}

After China made big concessions to the US, the US agreed to grant China the PNTR, “permanently guaranteeing the entry of China’s commodities into the US’s market at the same low tariff as those of other countries.”\textsuperscript{582} Chinese authors appreciate the fact that the executive branch of the US government strongly supports China’s PNTR

\begin{footnotes}
\item[576] shi, 98-8, 16, Jin Canrong
\item[577] shi, 98-5, 60, Wei Xiaofeng
\item[578] xian, 97-8, 13, Nai Zuji; xian, 98-4, 20, Ma Jiali; shi, 97-6, 24, Li Jiang; shi, 98-8, p.22, Su Ge
\item[579] xian, 00-1/2, 91-92, Fu Mengzi
\item[580] xian, 00-1/2, 94, Fu Mengzi
\item[581] xian, 00-1/2, 94, Fu Mengzi; xian, 00-8, 11-14, Jiang Xingfu; xian, 00-9, 6-7, Jiang Yugu; xian, 00-10, 5, Xi Laiwang
\end{footnotes}
They notice that even George W. Bush who is perceived as less friendly to China during his presidential campaign supports it.\textsuperscript{584}

In the US Congress, the China PNTR bill was passed by a wide margin first by the House (237/197)\textsuperscript{585} and then by the Senate (83/15).\textsuperscript{586} The governments of both the US and China welcome the passage, regarding it as consolidating US-China relations.\textsuperscript{587} Chinese authors generally regard this passage as capable of comprehensively improving bilateral relations.\textsuperscript{588}

4.3.2.4 Opportunity to China’s National Prestige

4.3.2.4.1 The US Can Help Enhances China’s Status

Though somewhat resentful of the US’s manipulation of world affairs, especially its intervention in China’s internal affairs, Chinese authors nonetheless recognize the status of the US as the sole superpower, and recognize that the US’s approval and support are one way for China to enhance its international status. They wish that the US would

\textsuperscript{582} xian, 00-6, 40, Lu Qichang, Zhang Yanyu
\textsuperscript{583} xian, 00-3, 10, Lu Qichang, Zhang Yanyu, Wang Wenfeng; xian, 00-10, 1-3, Xi Laiwang
\textsuperscript{584} zhan, 00-6, 51, Shi Yinghong
\textsuperscript{585} xian, 00-6, 40, Lu Qichang, Zhang Yanyu; xian, 00-9, 6, Jiang Yuguo
\textsuperscript{586} xian, 00-10, 1, Xi Laiwang; xian, 00-12, 4, Lu Qichang
\textsuperscript{587} xian, 00-6, 40, Lu Qichang, Zhang Yanyu
\textsuperscript{588} xian, 00-10, 5, Xi Laiwang
respect China’s dignity more. Mutual criticism according to them is justified and necessary, but “should not be done in an arrogant and supercilious way.”\footnote{shi, 98-6, 37, Sheng Jiru}

They are glad that more and more people in the US agree that “China is a big country with a population of 1.2 billion, and should be accorded sufficient respect, and its importance recognized,”\footnote{mei, 96-4, 130, Yang Jieman} that quite a few influential US leaders and scholars support enhancing China’s status in the world,\footnote{mei, 96-4, 129, Yang Jieman} and that the US often says that it will “treat China as an equal,”\footnote{guo, 97-3, 17, Song Yimin} and will encourage China to “play an appropriate role in the world.”\footnote{xian, 97-11, 4, Xi Laiwang} They are glad to point out that the US often indicates that it “will not only ask China to abide by international rules and regulations, but will also encourage China to participate in the formulation of those rules and regulations.”\footnote{guo, 97-3, 17, Song Yimin; xian, 97-11, 4, Xi Laiwang} The successful conclusion of the WTO negotiations between the US and China is one case in point. China expects that participation in formulating WTO rules will “enhance China’s status in the international community.”\footnote{guo, 97-3, 17, Song Yimin; xian, 97-11, 4, Xi Laiwang}

As a result of benign interactions between the two countries, Chinese authors notice that for China to behave in a responsible way would win the US’s appreciation and enhance
China’s weight and status in international affairs. Chinese authors often mention its more or less altruistic approach toward the Asian financial crisis around 1997-98, and how the US regards it as an indication of China being a responsible country. In this instance, China’s insistence on not devaluing its currency reputedly contributed greatly to control of the financial crisis in the South East Asia.

4.3.2.4.2 US Media Can be Positive

The image of the US media in the sample is not uniformly negative. After the deep setback in the late 1980s/early 1990s, the US media turned to be more positive about China, concurrent with the slight improvement of US-China relations in general. After the Taiwan Straits crisis in the mid-1990s, the US media were described as urging the US government to adjust its China policy. Opinion leaders in the US use the media to advocate the improvement of US-China relations. Most of the positive presentations of the US media in the sample occurred around President Jiang’s visit to the US in 1997, and President Clinton’s return visit in 1998. President Clinton’s visit was presented
as particularly helpful in turning the US media in a positive direction with regard to
China, as he brought with him a large number of US correspondents, trying to present a
new image of China to the American public.\footnote{\textit{xian}, 98-5, 7, Xi Laiwang} And the US media responded
enthusiastically, running intensive and positive reports of this visit, and demonstrated
significant optimism about the US-China relations.\footnote{\textit{shi}, 98-8, 15, Jin Canrong} In the period leading to the
passage of the China PNTR, the US media were again portrayed as playing a positive
role, some urging the Congress to adopt the right approach: approving it as soon as
possible.\footnote{\textit{xian}, 00-10, 3-4, Xi Laiwang} The positive portrayal of China in the US media is perceived as
“contributing to the American people’s understanding of China,” and creating “a
favorable environment for the implementation of the policy of engagement with
China.”\footnote{\textit{xian}, 00-10, 3-4, Xi Laiwang}
4.3.2.5 Opportunity to China’s Favored World Order

4.3.2.5.1 Allies in Maintaining World and Regional Peace

Chinese authors point out that peace and development are the themes of the new era,\textsuperscript{607} and “the formulation of foreign strategy in both China and the US cannot deviate from this theme.”\textsuperscript{608} Most Chinese authors believe that world peace is beneficial for both the US and China.\textsuperscript{609} Both countries have made commitments to world peace and stability.\textsuperscript{610} Maintaining world and regional peace and stability is therefore perceived as one important common interest between the two countries.\textsuperscript{611} Some Chinese scholars identify maintaining world peace as the biggest common interest between the US and China.\textsuperscript{612} In this respect, Chinese scholars perceive a great potential for cooperation between the two countries.\textsuperscript{613}

\textsuperscript{606} guo, 98-4, 10, Wang Haihang
\textsuperscript{607} xian, 98-10, 32, Zheng Baoguo; zhan, 97-3, 27, Zhang Linhong; shi, 98-8, 20, Su Ge; shi, 00-7, 51, Chu Shulong; wai, 96-3, 22, Li Shouyuan; shi, 98-8, 25, Sheng Jiru
\textsuperscript{608} zhan, 97-3, 27, Zhang Linhong
\textsuperscript{609} wai, 96-4, p.28, Lu Naideng; guo, 98-4, 11, Wang Haihang; xian, 00-1/2, 94, Fu Mengzi
\textsuperscript{610} shi, 00-7, 52, Chu Shulong; xian, 99-1/2, pp. 79-80, Ding Kuisong, Niu Xinchun
\textsuperscript{611} wai, 96-3, p.17, Zhao Pingan, Li Xuebao, Guo Yuan; shi, 98-8, p.20, Su Ge; zhan, 94-6, 74, Gao E; wai, 97-1, 35-36, Zhang Yiting
\textsuperscript{612} shi, 00-7, 51, Chu Shulong
They argue that favorable bilateral relations between the US and China are good for the world, since their peaceful coexistence is a prerequisite for world peace. World peace and security therefore are perceived as an important new foundation stone of bilateral relations. The reasons why good relations between the two countries are important to the world are that both countries are permanent members of UN Security Council, and both are big countries with great influence in world affairs.

Consequently, Chinese scholars not only perceive a common interest for the two countries in maintaining peace and stability in the world and the region, but also they perceive a responsibility for the two countries to do so. One of the most forceful arguments runs like this: “China and the US as permanent members of the UN Security Council and two big countries in the world, in quite a few international issues they shoulder responsibility, and play an important role. For peace and development in the world, China and the US have the opportunity, conditions, responsibility, and obligation to engage in dialogue and consultation regarding a lot of international issues.”

---

613  shi, 99-10, p.36, Chen Demin; shi, 98-6, 40, Sheng Jiru
614  wai, 96-3, p.17, Zhao Pingan, Li Xuebao, Guo Yuan; xian, 00-9, 2, Yuan Peng; xian, 98-4, p.21, Ma Jiali; xian, 95-12, 9, Xi Laiwang
615  wai, 96-3, 22, Li Shouyuan
616  xian, 97-11, p.5, Xi Laiwang
617  wai, 96-2, p.25, Su Ge; shi, 99-1, p.36, Liu Yongtao; shi, 98-8, p.23, Su Ge
618  shi, 99-1, p.36, Liu Yongtao; shi, 98-8, p.23, Su Ge; xian, 97-11, 4, Xi Laiwang; xian, 97-10, p.7, Chu Shulong; shi, 98-10, 46, Li Changjiu
619  xian, 98-6, p.4, Chu Shulong
They point out that in order to maintain world peace and stability, the US and China already have had serious co-operations, such as in the Asian financial crisis, and the South Asia nuclear crisis. The constructive strategic partnership facing the 21st century between the US under the Clinton administration and China under Jiang Zemin was a serious attempt by the two countries to manage their bilateral relations in the interest of maintaining peace and stability in the world.

4.3.2.5.2 The US’s Role in World Politics

Regarding the US’s role in the international politics, Chinese authors differentiate between two concepts: dominant status and hegemonism. Chinese authors accept the US’s dominant status in world affairs, but oppose the US’s so-called hegemonism and power politics. They favor a multipolar world order, but at the same time recognize that it will take a very long time to achieve.

Chinese authors recognize that for a long time to come the US will remain the most powerful country in the world in terms of CNP (comprehensive national power). They accept that the US plays a very important role in promoting peace, stability, and

---

620 shi, 98-8, p.25, Sheng Jiru
621 shi, 98-7, 56, 60, Sheng Jiru; shi, 98-8, 24, Sheng Jiru; shi, 98-8, 20, Su Ge; shi, 97-12, 50, Ke Juhan; xian, 99-1/2, 80-81, Ding Kuisong, Niu Xinchun
622 shi, 98-10, 47, Li Changjiu
prosperity in the world. They point out with approval bordering admiration that “it was the US that played a leading role in defeating the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, and in bringing Israel/Palestine and Bosnia/Herzegovina to the negotiating table.” Even one of the staunchest nationalists in the sample, Chu Shulong, expresses appreciation for the US’s role in the Middle East peace process.

They at the same time have reservations regarding a unipolar world order because they are not comfortable with the US’s presumed monopoly of world affairs, its “self-proclaimed role as the world policeman, its habit of using US domestic law as international law, and forcing other countries to submit to the US’s will.” They argue that the US should do unto others what the US itself would like done unto it. But they also recognize that “the US is not like other dominant powers in history, since the US attaches extreme importance to regulations and procedure.” Chinese authors appreciate it that “the US would rather try to co-opt other countries by resorting to apparently universal values than pressure them with brute force.”

Though China opposes a unipolar world order, Chinese authors regard the difference between the US and China in this regard “not as a conflict or confrontation of the two

---
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countries’ national strategies but rather as the differences between the US and China in ideal, ideology, hope and principle.\textsuperscript{629} They argue that “China favors multipolarization only in theory, but in practice, in its relations with the US,” China recognizes the US’s superpower status, and regards China itself as only one of several secondary powers.\textsuperscript{630}

As for the US’s military presence in Asia, its military alliance with Japan, and the TMD, again, one of the staunchest nationalists in the sample, Chu Shulong, argues that China’s position would be more moderate if the US was “not targeting China and not trying to intervene in China’s internal affairs, and violating China’s independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity.” He also points out that “China’s opposition to any power stationing troops abroad does not mean that China would try hard to push the US out of Asia.”\textsuperscript{631} Another scholar proclaims that “China has no intention of challenging the US’s global strategic interests, but the US should fully respect China’s strategic interests.” He proposes that “China-US relations should be based on mutual respect, mutual trust, and mutual interest.”\textsuperscript{632} Yet another scholar points out that “some people in Beijing even recognize the positive aspect of the US’s military presence in Asia,”\textsuperscript{633} perhaps referring to the US’s role in containing possible Japanese militarism.

Regarding security in the Asia-Pacific region, Chinese authors argue that cooperation

\textsuperscript{628} shi, 98-8, p.18, Jin Canrong
\textsuperscript{629} shi, 00-7, 51, Chu Shulong
\textsuperscript{630} shi, 98-8, p.19, Jin Canrong
\textsuperscript{631} xian, 00-5, 9-10, 12, Chu Shulong
\textsuperscript{632} xian, 97-11, p.5-6, Xi Laiwang
with the US rather than confrontation is a better way for China to play a greater role in this region.\textsuperscript{634}

One Chinese author expounds at length that China and the US should both accept and support international norms, and by doing so form a certain kind of collective identity, against the threats facing normal states such as the proliferation of nuclear weapons, “international crime, drug trafficking, illegal immigration, international terrorism, and environmental pollution.” He argues that China in recent years has already tried hard to participate in various kinds of international arrangements.\textsuperscript{635}

4.4 Balancing the Perception of Threat and Opportunity

Chapters 3 and 4 demonstrate that Chinese scholars perceive both threat and opportunity from the US. One important question is whether the US presents more a threat or more an opportunity to China. Naturally, different people respond to threat and opportunity differently. In the following I will present my opinion regarding this question from the perspective of a Chinese person who has closely monitored US-China relations.

\textsuperscript{633} zhan, 95-1, 48, Wang Yizhou
\textsuperscript{634} shi, 94-9, p.12, Zhou Bolin
\textsuperscript{635} shi, 99-1, 35-36, Liu Yongtao
4.4.1 National Security

In terms of China’s national security, let us first explore the extent of the US threat to China. Chinese authors repeatedly argue that the most serious problem between the US and China is the Taiwan problem. We can therefore conclude that the most serious threat from the US, according to Chinese authors, is its role in frustrating China’s goal with regard to Taiwan. Reunification with Taiwan under a one country-two system formula (in which Taiwan would enjoy much greater autonomy than Hong Kong including military autonomy) could serve the following purposes for China. First, it would improve China’s security environment, ensuring that Taiwan would not be used as an “unsinkable aircraft carrier” against China. Second, it would satisfy China’s desire of to end its history of national humiliation at the hands of foreign powers beginning from the mid-19th century. On the other hand, Taiwan’s current status may also bring tangible benefits to China, especially to the current Chinese government. First, Taiwan’s current status contributes to China’s internal stability, as it reinforces the Chinese government’s image as the representative of China’s national interest (Interestingly, decades of US efforts resulted in the perception of many Chinese in the late 1980s that the US was more a representative of the Chinese people’s interest than the Chinese government. Such a perception led to the 1989 democracy movement which almost toppled the Chinese government). Second, Taiwan’s economic and political success provides an incentive for China to catch up. Third, Taiwan’s current status helps stimulate greater efforts on the part of Chinese to strengthen their country. Reunification with Taiwan economically is not very meaningful to the Chinese mainland as Taiwan currently is already one of China’s major investors and major trade partners. The temporary separation of Taiwan and the Chinese mainland therefore currently does not represent a very serious threat to China, so long as Taiwan is not moving
further away from China’s orbit. But of course, if Taiwan were in the near future to be fully incorporated into China, things would be different. In that case, China’s comprehensive national power would be significantly enhanced with the addition of Taiwan’s substantial wealth (but with China’s continued development, Taiwan will soon no longer be valued mainly as an economic powerhouse). As this scenario is unrealistic in the foreseeable future, and China’s goal for a long time to come remains the unification of Taiwan under the one country-two system formula, the threat to China of the US’s role regarding Taiwan can now be set as moderate. Other aspects of the perceived threat from the US to China’s national security can thus be set accordingly.

How to determine the extent of the Chinese perception of opportunity from the US in terms of the national security? As China is a very poor country in terms of per capita GDP, for a very long time to come, both the Chinese government and the Chinese people will be preoccupied with economic development and the improvement of people’s living standards. A peaceful environment in which China is able to remain focused on economic development therefore conforms to China’s greatest national interest. The US as the sole superpower which remains committed to peace therefore means the greatest opportunity to China. The US’s engagement policy toward China ensures peace between the two countries, and the US’s role in suppressing Japanese militarism further reduces China’s concern for its national security. As a peaceful environment is more important for China than the resumption of control over tiny Taiwan, even with other nuisances between the two countries such as the perception of encirclement of China etc, it is perhaps reasonable to say that in terms of the national security, the US represents more of an opportunity than a threat to China.
4.4.2. Political System and Internal Stability

Regarding China’s political system and internal stability, in the 1990s, there were constant disputes between the two countries over China’s human rights record, causing China severe headache. At one time, it seemed that the Chinese were concerned that the US’s human rights offensive would cause the country’s collapse just like the former USSR. The threat from the US during the first Clinton administration regarding China’s political system and internal stability was substantial. After delinking human rights and the MFN, and with the passage of the China PNTR, it seems that human rights no longer occupy a prominent position in the US’s China policy, and the US’s threat to China is in this respect greatly decreased. On the positive side, over one century, the Chinese on and off regard the US as a model of democracy. As demonstrated in Chapter 7, the Chinese nowadays again accept the American political model as admirable. Democratization in China therefore would just be a matter of when and how but not whether. If the US is able to handle human rights disputes with China in a more pleasant way, taking into consideration Chinese people’s sentiments and the predominant concern of the Chinese people in the present to maintain political stability for the purpose of economic development and improving people’s living standards, with the exemplary role of the US’s political system, and the US’s gentle prod for China to move toward political liberalization, the US would mean more an opportunity than a threat to China in this issue area. It seems that the US’s treatment of human rights under both the second Clinton administration and the George W. Bush administration is much more acceptable to the Chinese people than during the first Clinton administration. On the whole, I would rate more threat than opportunity to China during the first Clinton administration in this issue area and perhaps more opportunity than threat since the late 1990s.
4.4.3. Economic Well-Being

In terms of economic development, on the positive side, the US is one of China’s major trade partners, investors, and sources of technology and management skills. Even though the US probably is not indispensable to China’s economic development, as evidenced by the non-productive sanctions in the several years following the Tiananmen tragedy in 1989, the US does contribute importantly to China’s economic growth. On the negative side, US “trouble-making” in the 1990s regarding China’s economic development, such as the constant disputes and troubles over intellectual property rights, the MFN, and China’s WTO membership, did indeed cause China no small amount of headache. But troubles of this kind meant only the reduction from the substantial benefits China enjoyed from its economic relations with the US. Toward the end of the 1990s, serious economic and trade problems between the two countries had been solved one after another, and Chinese scholars generally are satisfied with the solutions, and regard them as win-win games between the two countries. We can conclude therefore that in terms of US-China economic relations, the US offers substantial opportunity and little threat to China.

4.4.4 National Prestige

As for China’s national prestige, the US as the sole superpower is in a position to either enhance China’s status or lower it. In the 1990s, the US media constantly criticized China, the US Congress “brought China to trial” every year over MFN, the US year in year out tried to condemn China in the UN Human Rights Commission, and the US contributed to the defeat of China’s bid to hold the 2000 Olympic Game. All these, according to Chinese authors, severely impaired China’s national prestige. But in the late 1990s, the US decided tentatively to establish a strategic partnership with China, and to facilitate China’s entry
into the world community. In this golden era of the US-China relationship, the US media ran articles touting the importance of the bilateral relations, and China’s progress in economic reform and human rights, the US Congress discontinued the annual ritual of China bashing, and the UN Human Rights Convention ceased to be a forum for castigating China. Chinese authors are pleased with the enhancement of their country’s national prestige as a result. Shortly afterwards, China won the opportunity to host the 2008 Olympic Games, and the US did not resist China’s bid. We can conclude therefore that with regard to China’s national prestige, for the most part of the 1990s, the US was more a threat than an opportunity to China, but in the late 1990s, it was more an opportunity than a threat to China.

4.4.5 World Order

With regard to China’s preferred world order, the majority of Chinese scholars regard the US as wanting to create a unipolar world system, though some Chinese scholars regard multipolarity of a certain kind as serving the US’s interests. As China, like other countries, values sovereignty and independence, it is understandable that China prefers a multipolar world order. The US’s presumed pursuit of a unipolar world order, should it be true, would constitutes more or less a threat to China’s preferred world order. On the other hand, as mentioned earlier, sustained peace in the world, especially in the Asia-Pacific region, conforms to China’s greatest interest. In this respect, the US, which was perceived by Chinese authors in the 1990s as committed to peace, constitutes an opportunity for China. If the US decides to pursue its presumed unipolar agenda regarding world order vigorously through military forces, especially in the Asia-Pacific region, the US in this respect perhaps constitutes more a threat than an opportunity. If the US on the other hand pursues its foreign policy goals through peaceful means, taking into consideration China’s strategic
interests, it would be more an opportunity than a threat to China.

With the discussion in the above, I would conclude that the US on the whole constitutes more an opportunity than a threat to China (see Table 4.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Interest</th>
<th>Balancing Threat and Opportunity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Security</td>
<td>perhaps more opportunity than threat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political System and Internal Stability</td>
<td>more threat than opportunity during the first Clinton administration, but perhaps more opportunity than threat since the late 1990s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Well-Being</td>
<td>definitely much more opportunity than threat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Prestige</td>
<td>more threat than opportunity during the most part of the 1990s, but more opportunity than threat in the late 1990s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred World Order</td>
<td>perhaps more opportunity than threat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Balancing Threat and Opportunity to China from the US
5.1 Methodology

5.1.1 Sources

This chapter will be based on all the articles in the six journals during the 1991-2000 decade whose titles suggest a focus on American power/capability. As the sample for this chapter is not as easily identified as in the other empirical chapters, the following 7 groups of terms are used as clues to select relevant articles (see Appendix B for the titles of these articles).

---

636 As in all the other empirical chapters, the titles of the articles constituting the sample (except those in Mei Guo Yan Jiu, all the articles in which are about the US) should specifically contain words such as the US, American, the names of American leaders etc.
1. “power,” “capability,” “might,” and “strength;”


3. “situation,” “status,” “trend,” “prospect,” and “economic cycle;”

4. “growth,” “development,” “success,” “take-off,” “revitalization,” “expansion,” and “prosperity;”

5. “hegemon,” “hegemonic,” “advantage,” and “dominance;”

6. “pole,” “polar(ity),” “multipolar(ity),” and “unipolar(ity),”

7. “test of strength,” “struggle,” “comparison” (of power/capability).

When the title of an article does not contain any of the above terms, but the title as a whole does offer an obvious indication of US power/capability, the article will be selected.637 When the title of an article does contain one or more terms listed in the

---

above, but the title as a whole obviously does not suggest any focus on American power/capability, the article will not be selected.\textsuperscript{638} There is some arbitrariness in the selection of articles for the sample. Given the fact that a relatively large number of articles across various journals over the decade have been included, and the fact that the analysis is done after the sample has been identified, we have reasons to believe that this chapter will to a great extent reflect Chinese perceptions of American power/capability. Table 5.1 lists the number of relevant articles in each journal constituting the sample.\textsuperscript{639}

\textsuperscript{638} One example is “The Constitution and Power of Committees in the US Congress -- Comments on New Institutionalism and Informational Theory” (wai, 95-4, 50-53, Qin Yaqin).

\textsuperscript{639} Some articles in the sample are not available at this point. They are: The US’s Sanction on Cuba Has Already Become Impotent (guo, 00-4, 38-40, Guo Xiangang); The US’s Global Strategy in the Cross-Century World Structure (guo, 00-?, 23-30, Yang Jiemin); An Analysis of ‘After Pax America: Benign Power, Regional Integration, and the Sources of Stable Multipolarity’ (mei, 99-3, 119-? Li Xiaohua); The Trend in the US’s Economic Development around the Turn of the Century (xian, 99-12, 5-8, Gu Wenyan); The Characteristics, Problems and Revelations in the US’s Economic Growth (xian, 00-3, 1-7, Li Changjiu); Internationalization of Euro and the Geo-Economic Struggles between Europe and the US (xian, 00-6, 13-16, Sun Xiaoqing); Clinton’s New Economic Plan Meets with Obstruction in the Implementation (shi, 93-11, 18-19-?, Wang Menghua).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guo Ji Wen Ti Yan Jiu</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mei Guo Yan Jiu</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shi Jie Jing Ji Yu Zheng Zhi</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wai Jiao Xue Yuan Xue Bao</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xian Dai Guo Ji Guan Xi</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhan Lue Yu Guan Li</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: Number of Articles in Each Journal on US Power/Capability

5.1.2 What to Perceive?

In terms of what to perceive regarding a state’s power/capability, different scholars usually have somewhat different lists of their major elements of national power. Morgenthau’s list include the following: geography, natural resources, industrial capacity, military preparedness, population, national character, national morale, the
quality of diplomacy, and the quality of government.\textsuperscript{640} For Kenneth Waltz, they are “size of population and territory, resource endowment, economic capability, military strength, political stability and competence.”\textsuperscript{641} Cline’s formula for calculating national power takes into consideration the following variables: population, territory, economic capability, military capability, strategic purpose, and the will to pursue national strategy.\textsuperscript{642}

In this chapter, I intend to explore the Chinese perception of American power in the following areas: economy, science and technology, military, and soft power. The military is an important dimension of national power because “armed strength as a threat or a potentiality is the most important material factor making for the political power of a nation.”\textsuperscript{643} The economy is important because, “military strength may not be able to obscure economic weakness,”\textsuperscript{644} while economic prosperity is “an absolutely essential means to” national power,\textsuperscript{645} a case persuasively demonstrated by the collapse of the USSR. Somewhat different from the majority of scholars, I regard science and technology as another important dimension of national power because they to a great

\textsuperscript{641} Waltz, \textit{Theory of International Politics} (1979), 131.
\textsuperscript{642} cited in “Power Analysis and World Politics: New Trends versus Old Tendencies” in \textit{World Politics} (1979) by David A. Baldwin, 172
\textsuperscript{643} Morgenthau, \textit{Politics Among Nations} (1978), 31
\textsuperscript{644} Waltz, \textit{Theory of International Politics} (1979), 130
\textsuperscript{645} Jacob Viner, “Power versus Plenty as Objectives of Foreign Policy in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries” in \textit{World Politics}, 10
extent determine the quality of a state’s economy and military. Without adequate sophistication in science and technology, the sheer size of a country’s economy and military does not constitute a source of significant power in international politics.

Incidentally, one recent *Foreign Affairs* article shares my selection of economy, military, and science and technology as the three most important elements of national power.646 The US’s capability to influence outcomes in international politics depends not only on the carrots and sticks it could deliver, but very often also on the attraction its values and systems represent, or on its ability to “shape the preferences” of other countries.

Consequently, in addition to the three aspects of hard power mentioned above, I will track the Chinese perception of American “soft power,” a concept developed by Joseph Nye and generally accepted by international relations scholars.647

Given the fact that the US has been widely regarded as the sole superpower, it would be reasonable to expect that the US would be more interested in the trajectory of its power than simply in its current status vis-a-vis other countries. In this chapter, I will therefore also explore Chinese scholars’ perception of the “American decline” thesis and

---

646 “American Primacy in Perspective” By Stephen G. Brooks and William C. Wohlforth, in *Foreign Affairs*, July/August, 2002

their position regarding unipolarity vs. multipolarity. Since the Vietnam War up to the mid-1990s, “American decline” had been a hotly debated issue in American academia, and since the collapse of the Soviet Union, the world has been regarded as in the process of transitioning into either unipolarity or multipolarity. Pillsbury’s *China Debates the Future Security Environment* is the only major work in the existing literature on the Chinese perceptions on these two topics. As Pillsbury draws mainly from Chinese works in the early 1990s, this chapter will to some extent update Pillsbury’s findings.

5.2 Chinese Perception of American Economic Capabilities

As the discussion of Chinese perception of the US’s economic performance in Chapter 6 contains an abundance of relevant information, I here will treat this topic briefly. With regard to the American economy, what deeply impresses the Chinese authors is its immense capability. Throughout the 1990s, the US was perceived as the number one economic power in the world, a dominant economic superpower enjoying great superiority over other countries. Even in the early 1990s when the US was perceived as having declined economically and suffering from a recession, Chinese authors did not fail to point out that the US was still the number one economic superpower, by far
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648 mei, 91-2, 17, 19, Zheng Weimin; wai, 00-4, 43, Zheng Baoguo; shi, 00-12, 7, Zhang Yijun
649 mei, 93-2, 35, Chen Baosen; mei, 95-4, 81, Wei Wei; guo, 95-1, 33, Wei Min
650 wai, 99-2, 5, Liu Wenzong etc; mei, 00-2, 31-43, Huang Weiping; mei, 00-1, 136, Wang Fan; mei, 00-1, 148-149, Zhang Liping; xian, 98-1, 5, Shi Ren
mei, 91-2, 17, 19, Zheng Weimin; mei, 92-1, 72-81, Li Changjiu; xian, 92-3, 14, Zhao Guilin;
stronger than any other country even when it was in difficulties,\textsuperscript{652} including its closest competitors Japan and Western European countries.\textsuperscript{653} The size of the US economy is so large that it is about the size of the combined total of over a dozen countries in the EU,\textsuperscript{654} which constitute the bulk of developed countries in the world, and that in the world of about 200 countries, the US’s GNP/GDP alone accounts for about 27-28\% of the world total.\textsuperscript{655} The fact that the US often provides substantial aid to other countries, and that the ups and downs of US economy affect that of many other countries reinforces the perception of the US’s tremendous economic power.\textsuperscript{656} During the 1990s, the US was perceived as particularly prosperous,\textsuperscript{657} doing much better than other developed countries,\textsuperscript{658} which further strengthens the Chinese perception of the US as the dominant economic superpower.

In Chinese perception, the US is not only the largest economy, but it is also a leader in many specific economic fields. For instance, it has a well-developed market economy\textsuperscript{659}
and the biggest market.\textsuperscript{660} It is number one in exports,\textsuperscript{661} number one in foreign trade,\textsuperscript{662} number one in oversea investment,\textsuperscript{663} number one in transnational companies,\textsuperscript{664} number one in the size of its service industry,\textsuperscript{665} and number one in service trade.\textsuperscript{666} Its industry is highly modernized,\textsuperscript{667} and highly competitive.\textsuperscript{668} It is the main engine of world economic development,\textsuperscript{669} and the best in economic productivity.\textsuperscript{670} It is superior to any other country in 4 out of the 5 stages of the value chain: research, development, production, sales, and service.\textsuperscript{671}

5.3 Chinese Perceptions of American Capabilities in Science and Technology

Throughout the 1990s, the US has been consistently perceived as leading the world in science and technology,\textsuperscript{672} enjoying absolute superiority\textsuperscript{673} with other countries lagging
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The US is perceived as being by far more sophisticated than China in science and technology. Ever since the establishment of US-China diplomatic relations, there has been the problem of how the US limits and regulates the transfer of technology to China. The US is also perceived as much more advanced than other developed countries in science and technology. Some Chinese authors argue that the US is about 10 years ahead of Europe and Japan in new high tech, and 20 years ahead of China in science and technology.

The US is perceived as having by far more research funding than any other country, and more than that of several major developed countries combined. In 1990 for instance, Japan’s R&D funding was only half as much as that of the US, and Germany’s was only 1/5 that of the US. In 2000, one review article cites an American source to the effect that the R&D funding of the G7 accounts for 90% of the world and the US’s R&D funding equals the combined total of the other 6 G7 countries.
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Chinese authors notice that the US has many more R&D personnel than other
developed countries. One source points out in 1995 that Japan has 510,890, Germany
has only 170,640, while the US has 959,300.\textsuperscript{681} Another source points out that the US
has more R&D personnel than the combined total of four most advanced countries:
Japan, Germany, Britain, and France.\textsuperscript{682}

Chinese authors point out that major inventions in the world usually originate from the
US.\textsuperscript{683} In 1995 for instance, 44\% of scientific research in the world was conducted in the
US, more than the combined total of Japan, Germany, France, and Britain.\textsuperscript{684}

The US is perceived as particularly strong in basic research and military research,\textsuperscript{685} but
its civilian technology is perceived as developing relatively slowly.\textsuperscript{686} Its military
technology is perceived as much more advanced than China.\textsuperscript{687} The US is perceived as
possessing absolute superiority in aerospace technology.\textsuperscript{688} And the US is perceived as

\textsuperscript{681} guo, 95-1, 33, Wei Min
\textsuperscript{682} shi, 95-4, 34, Gao Feng
\textsuperscript{683} shi, 94-10, 17-20, Qi Chaoying
\textsuperscript{684} wai, 98-2, 37, Liu Saili
\textsuperscript{685} guo, 92-4, 15, Wu Tianbo; shi, 94-10, 17, Qi Chaoying
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the only country capable of developing a missile defense system. The US is also considered as particularly strong in computer technology, and about 2/3 of computers in the world hooked up to the internet are in the US. Western countries, especially the US, are perceived as possessing monopoly over information technology.

In the early 1990s, other Western countries, especially Japan, were perceived as having become powerful competitors to the US in high technology, and was about to catch up with the US in many high tech areas. One author cites one Japanese source to demonstrate that among 8 important new technologies, Japan was ahead of the US in three (which Japan in future would maintain the lead over the US), comparable with the US in another three (which Japan in future would develop faster than the US), and the US was ahead of Japan only in two (which Japan in future would catch up with the US). Another author cites an American source to demonstrate that among 12 high technologies, the US was in the early 1990s either ahead of Japan or comparable with Japan, but in future, the US would either be comparable with Japan or behind Japan. A third author points out that Japan has been catching up with the US not only in civilian technology but also in military technology. Among 40 commercialized
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692 guo, 98-3, 46, Zeng Bingxi; xian, 98-1, 6, Shi Ren
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technologies, Japan was either comparable or ahead of the US in 36.\textsuperscript{695}

Toward the late 1990s, however, the US is perceived as having again strengthened its lead in science and technology over other countries. The Bush and Clinton administrations are perceived as having succeeded in strengthening the US’s capability in scientific research and as a result other countries lag further behind.\textsuperscript{696} One author points out that as the US was the first to enter the information era, it is in a good position to develop faster than other countries in sophisticated areas such as bio-engineering, medical science, aerospace, and new materials.\textsuperscript{697} One article cites an American source that in the 1990s, “the US has greatly increased its lead over Japan and Europe in information and communication technology, enjoys superiority in biology, medical science, agriculture and food industry, though Japan and Europe have caught up with the US in manufacturing industry and energy, and have moved closer to the US in environmental protection.”\textsuperscript{698}

\textsuperscript{695} mei, 92-1, 74-75, Li Changjiu
\textsuperscript{696} shi, 99-3, 56, Yu Yanchun
\textsuperscript{697} mei, 97-3, 15-16, Wang Jisi
5.4 Chinese Perception of American Military Power

5.4.1 Superiority in Military Power

Throughout the 1990s, Chinese authors recognized that the US is a military superpower enjoying vast superiority over other countries. Compared with other Western countries, the most salient superiority of the US is perceived to be its military advantage. Even when the US was perceived as declining as a political and economic superpower, its status as a military superpower was perceived as not at all declining. Chinese authors seem to accept the American assessment that the US enjoys surplus military power and at least before 2015, the US as a military superpower will remain unchallenged.

Chinese authors perceive that in the foreseeable future, the US will maintain its military superiority over other countries. They argue that the US seeks superiority in strategic nuclear forces, conventional forces, and also in military theory and the goal of its
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698 shi, 97-7, 67, Wu Yonghong
699 wai, 93-1, 30, Xie Deyuan; xian, 93-3, 3, Ke Juhan, Tao Jian, Gu Wenyan; shi, 00-3, 81, Zhou Li; mei, 00-1, 149, Zhang Liping; wai, 00-4, 43-46, 63, Zheng Baoguo; shi, 00-4, 72, Zhai Xiaomin
700 wai, 93-1, 31, Xie Deyuan
701 mei, 93-4, 13, Peng Guanqian; wai, 93-1, 32, Xie Deyuan
702 wai, 00-1, 53, 56, Wen Bing
703 mei, 93-4, 11, Peng Guanqian; guo, 98-4, 25, Song Yimin
military strategy is global dominance.\textsuperscript{704} The US seems to be able to maintain its superiority since it is able to turn out a new generation of weapon systems every 5 to 10 years.\textsuperscript{705} Even when the US was reducing its military expenditure during the early post Cold War years, the US was perceived as having enhanced its military capability through the accelerated development of military technology.\textsuperscript{706}

The following are the perceived evidence of the US’s military superiority. Firstly, its military expenditure is huge, accounting for more than 1/3 of the military expenditure of the whole world, more than the combined totals of some 8 other major military powers,\textsuperscript{707} about “two times that of its NATO allies, three times that of Russia, and over ten times that of China.”\textsuperscript{708} Yet, that was not the best the US can do, since during the post Cold War period, the US’s military expenditure accounts for only about 3% of its GNP, while during the Cold War, the US’s military expenditure usually accounted for about 6% of its GNP.\textsuperscript{709}

Secondly, the US is seen to have the capability to prevail in conventional warfare with any country. It has developed weapons to conduct “ultra-modern warfare,” it has the

\textsuperscript{704} xian, 92-3, 11, 13, Zhao Guilin
\textsuperscript{705} xian, 96-3, 5, Wen Weiji
\textsuperscript{706} mei, 97-3, 16, Wang Jisi
\textsuperscript{707} mei, 96-2, 16, Liang Gengcheng; guo, 99-4, 6, Yang Yonghong; wai, 00-1, 56, Wen Bing; shi, 00-2, 54, Han Weidong, Han Yaodong
\textsuperscript{708} mei, 97-3, 16, Wang Jisi
\textsuperscript{709} mei, 97-3, 16, Wang Jisi; mei, 00-1, 135, Wang Fan
only blue water navy in the world, its air force is unquestionably the number one, and it is the only country capable of conducting military operations in any corner of the world.  

The US is the nuclear power with no pare competitor. It maintains a large arsenal of nuclear weapons, its nuclear deterrence is such that no country dares to initiate a nuclear strike against it, it has the capability to fight a nuclear war until it finally prevails, and it is possibly the only country possessing a nuclear first strike capability against other countries.  

The US’s deployment of large numbers of troops abroad also contributes to Chinese perception of American military superiority. Chinese authors point out that though reduced from the Cold War level, the US still has a large military presence in foreign lands, particularly in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East. When necessary, the US is able to establish regional defense quarters in various corner of the world. As a result, the US is perceived as having the greatest capability for foreign intervention in the
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US military superiority is also manifest in its frequent use of forces abroad. During the post Cold War period, the US has deployed forces abroad over 25 times, covering areas in Europe, Asia, the Middle East, Latin America, and Africa. It was able to win the Gulf War with ease, and is able to bomb a regional military power (Iraq) at will.

5.4.2 US Military Power Compared with Russia’s

Chinese authors notice that Russia’s military capability has drastically declined following the end of the Cold War. When the US and USSR were having START I negotiation, the USSR was perceived as only slightly inferior to the US in military capability. The unequal reduction of nuclear weapons between the US and Russia agreed upon in START II established decisively the US’s superiority over Russia, and Russia’s acceptance of its strategic inferiority. Chinese authors expect that the US’s development of missile defense systems would further tilt the military balance between
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714 shi, 94-7, 64-69, Li Dongyan
715 guo, 99-4, 6, Yang Yonghong
716 mei, 97-3, 16-17, Wang Jisi
717 shi, 91-7, 39, Fang Xiaoguang
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the two countries in its own favor.\textsuperscript{721}

Chinese authors point out that after the end of the Cold War, Russia has been greatly weakened, its military capability having declined probably by 50\%.\textsuperscript{722} As a result, it is no longer possible for Russia to initiate a nuclear first strike against the US,\textsuperscript{723} while it might be possible for the US to initiate a nuclear first strike against Russia.\textsuperscript{724} NATO’s war against Yugoslavia, and its eastward expansion into Eastern Europe and the former USSR illustrate Russia’s impotence vis-a-vis US military might.\textsuperscript{725}

Nevertheless, throughout the 1990s, Russia was still considered a military superpower, second only to the US. It is perceived as possessing sufficient deterrence power to militarily confront the US. Its nuclear and missile capability is such that it could destroy the US in one all-out strike.\textsuperscript{726}

\textsuperscript{721} xian, 99-9, 18, Wu Xizhuo; shi, 00-2, 54, Han Weidong, Han Yaodong
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5.4.3 US Military Power Compared with China’s

The US is perceived as being militarily much stronger than China. It deploys large numbers of troops in Asia, potentially to deal with China. It is able to deter Chinese military action against Taiwan, even though Chinese authors regard it as illegitimate for the US to intervene in the Taiwan problem. Simply by transferring military technology to Taiwan, the US makes it very difficult for China to solve the Taiwan problem through military means.\(^{727}\)

Even though China has a limited number of nuclear weapons, it is impossible for China to initiate a nuclear strike against the US, since it would bring about disastrous nuclear retaliation,\(^{728}\) and the US’s development of a missile defense system would further neutralize China’s nuclear deterrence.\(^{729}\) One Chinese author points out that China should accept nuclear superiority by the US and Russia, but he insists that China should maintain a certain amount of nuclear deterrence of its own.\(^{730}\)

Even though the US is regarded by all Chinese authors as militarily superior over China, they nonetheless maintain that the US does not have the capability to comprehensively
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contain China.731

5.4.4 Limits of American Military Power

In spite of the fact that the overwhelming Chinese perception of the US is its superior military power, many Chinese authors also point out that there are limits to its military power. Chinese authors point out that the US’s economy is unable to support its excessive militarism, which in the long run will seriously affect the development of the American economy.732 Chinese authors believe that foreign military adventures are so costly to the US that Gulf War victory was possible only because of the extensive funding from the US’s allies around the world.733 They cite the lack of military personnel and equipments to illustrate that ‘the cost of the US trying to dominate the world may be too high for Americans to accept.’734 The American tendency to isolationism and its aversion to casualties are also considered a serious obstacle to the US’s military adventures abroad. Two authors in the sample point to the case in which the US withdrew from Somalia after suffering minor casualties there.735 Chinese authors also point out that the American people are more interested in domestic prosperity than in supporting the US’s world leadership, which should restrain the US’s military
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intervention abroad. Finally, Chinese authors point out that even though the US has the strongest military in the world, a lot of problems in the world are not to be solved by military might.

5.5 Chinese Perception of American Soft Power

Soft power is new to Chinese authors, and they very seldom resort to this concept for analytical purposes. The few scholars who do discuss America’s soft power generally agree, usually implicitly, that the US enjoys superiority in this respect. Some authors cite American scholars such as Nye and Huntington approvingly to the effect that the reasons why the West, headed by the US, is able to dominate the world is that it enjoys superiority not only in hard power but also in soft power. Hard power is defined as coercive power while soft power is defined as co-optive power, and both are equally important in order to shape the outcomes in international politics. Soft power tends to legitimize a state’s policy preferences so that it can mobilize support and reduce resistance in its effort to carry out its policy. Sometimes soft power can easily achieve results not attainable by the use of hard power. The former USSR’s concessions to, and cooperation with, the US in both its domestic and international policies is a salient
example of the successful application of the US’s soft power.\textsuperscript{739} Without the US’s great soft power, it would be inconceivable that the US could effectively control post-Taliban Afghanistan in its war against terrorism.

In a rare case one Chinese author explicitly accepts that the US enjoys superiority not only in hard power, but also in soft power, including its “culture, language, systems, values, and management capability.”\textsuperscript{740} Chinese authors do not dispute that the US has advantage in its political system, which constitutes a source of the American soft power. But they do often try to reject the imposition of American systems and values on other countries, including China. In doing so, they are not rejecting the American systems and values per se, but argue against the applicability of the systems and values transplanted to a country which, because of cultural tradition, economic development, and consciousness of the local population, is not yet ready to accept the American model.\textsuperscript{741}

Chinese authors in the sample recognize that current international organizations, laws, norms, regimes, rules of game etc have been founded basically in accordance with the US’s will and constitute a source of American soft power. A sophisticated international

\textsuperscript{739} shi, 91-11, 57-58, Pan Rui
\textsuperscript{740} shi, 94-7, 68, Li Dongyan
\textsuperscript{741} mei, 95-2, 134-138, Wang Xiaode; wai, 95-2, 47-49, Liu Wenzhong
financial regime help the US to compete with other countries.\textsuperscript{742} The arrangements such as free trade, intellectual property rights, nuclear non-proliferation, and IMF intervention in the economy of developing countries contribute to the US’s political, economic, and security interests.\textsuperscript{743}

Unlike the Chinese perception of the US’s capability in economy, military, and science/technology, Chinese authors do not uniformly accept that the US enjoys absolute superiority in soft power. Wang Jisi points out that the US suffers from problems such as poor education and weak social cohesiveness because of racial conflicts, a high crime rate, broken families, political scandals etc. As a result, the US’s weakness is not in its hard power, but in its soft power.\textsuperscript{744}

When the US resorts to human rights, democracy etc in its foreign policy toward developing countries, Chinese authors agree that this approach can indeed put developing countries on the defensive, and produce effects which cannot be accomplished by the use of hard power, but they also point out that because of the resistance of developing countries, the effect of this approach is limited.\textsuperscript{745} In the case of

\textsuperscript{742} shi, 00-3, 33-34, Zhou Sanming
\textsuperscript{743} mei, 97-3, 24, Wang Jisi; xian, 99-8, 29-30, Li Desong, Xu Lisun
\textsuperscript{744} mei, 97-3, 18-24, 34, Wang Jisi. Strictly speaking, what Wang Jisi refers to are not soft power as defined by most American scholars. As Wang specifically uses “soft power” for the description of those phenomena, and as they do affect the American power yet not to be included in the categories of economy, military, or science and technology, I decide to discuss them here.
\textsuperscript{745} xian, 95-5, 19-22, Hong Guoqi, Wang Xiaode; wai, 95-2, 47-49, Liu Wenzhong
developing countries, one author concedes that they usually have too little soft power, and cannot compete with countries with great soft power (implicitly referring to the US), but he also points out that in the case of Asian countries, their culture, traditional values and development pattern can potentially endow them with greater soft power than they currently enjoy.\textsuperscript{746}

5.6 Chinese Perception of the “American Decline” Thesis

5.6.1 Perceived American Decline in the Early 1990s

In the early 1990s, many Chinese authors perceived an American decline. They claimed that the US had been declining economically for the previous several decades.\textsuperscript{747} For instance, they point out that in 1960, the US accounted for 52.59\% of the GNP of the West and by 1990, this figure had dropped to 33.2\%.\textsuperscript{748}

They predicted that the US would suffer a further decline in the 1990s, in its place in the world economy,\textsuperscript{749} and in its international influence.\textsuperscript{750} Some authors point out that

\textsuperscript{746} zhan, 97-2, 51, Pang Zhongying
\textsuperscript{747} wai, 93-1, 27, Xie Deyuan; wai, 95-4, 54-55, Liu Shuguang; guo, 91-4, 17, Pan Tongwen; guo, 92-4, 15, Wu Tianbo; shi, 95-11, 61, 62, 65, Zhao Ziyu; mei, 91-3, 90, Xu Xin?; mei, 92-1, 72-75, Li Changjiu; mei, 92-1, 112-115, Du Houwen, Zhang Qiang; xian, 96-11, 11, Wu Jiong; xian, 92-3, 9-15, 15, 8, Zhao Guilin; xian, 93-3, 35, Huang Hong
\textsuperscript{748} xian, 92-2, 13-19, Jin Dexiang
\textsuperscript{749} shi, 91-3, 48, Wang Huaining
the US by the early 1990s had not yet found any effective way to arrest its decline, and the trend would continue over the 1990s.

The following are the perceived symptoms of the American decline: reduced competitiveness, weakened manufacturing industry, less attraction as the major locus of foreign investment, shift from the biggest creditor nation to the biggest debtor nation, lower status in the world banking system, and decreased investment in foreign countries. Other symptoms of the American decline were said to include the following: a low productivity growth rate, low fixed capital investment, low infrastructure investment, a high trade deficit etc.

But Chinese authors did not fail to point out that the US had not suffered an absolute decline, but a relative one. And in the early 1990s it was still by far stronger than
other major countries in the world economy.\textsuperscript{762}

5.6.2 The Rise of Europe and Japan

Just as Chinese authors in the early 1990s perceived an American decline, in the same period they also perceived the rise of Japan and Europe. Chinese authors’ argument of a relative American decline was mostly based on a comparison between the US on the one hand and Japan\textsuperscript{763} and Europe, especially Germany, on the other.\textsuperscript{764}

In the early 1990s, Chinese scholars thought that Japan was gradually evolving into a powerful competitor of the US in many areas, such as in high technology,\textsuperscript{765} in the status of the Japanese yen as compared with the US dollar,\textsuperscript{766} and in competitiveness.\textsuperscript{767} Chinese authors regarded Japan as capable of economically surpassing the US soon.\textsuperscript{768} They also perceived a faster economic growth in Europe than in the US over the 1990s.\textsuperscript{769} The euro was perceived as constituting a serious threat

\textsuperscript{762} mei, 92-1, 112, Du Houwen, Zhang Qiang
\textsuperscript{763} shi, 95-6, 15, 18, Qin Liufang, Guo Shixian; mei, 92-1, 10, 14-15, 19-20, 22, 26-27, Xiao Lian; mei, 92-1, 72-81, Li Changjiu; mei, 94-4, 115, Jia Shaofeng, Meng Xiangjing; xian, 94-8, 19, Guo Shixian
\textsuperscript{764} mei, 91-3, 84, Xu Xin; mei, 92-1, 110-119, Du Houwen, Zhang Qiang; mei, 93-4, 13, 19, Peng Guanqian; mei, 92-3, 10, 12, Chen Baosheng; xian, 92-2, 13-19, Jin Dexiang; mei, 92-1, 88-90, Sun Haishun
\textsuperscript{765} shi, 94-10, 17, Qi Chaoying; mei, 92-1, 31, Ding Haojin
\textsuperscript{766} shi, 95-6, 18, Qin Liufang, Guo Shixian
\textsuperscript{767} mei, 92-1, 32-33, Ding Haojin
\textsuperscript{768} guo, 92-4, 23, Wang Haihan
\textsuperscript{769} shi, 94-4, 20, Guo Shixian
to the US dollar. They argued that Europe and Japan might soon emerge into another
two economic poles in the capitalist world, posing a serious challenges to the US as
the economic superpower.

Chinese authors pointed out that by 2020, Japan, Germany, Austria, France, and
Norway would all surpass the US in per capita GNP. The US’s lead over Japan and
Europe in technology would dwindle and disappear over the 1990s. EU integration
was considered a factor contributing to the relative decline of the US in the world
economy.

Countries like Germany and Japan were perceived as competing with the US not only
economically, but also politically, and the US would face challenge from them in its
effort to dominate Europe and the Asia-Pacific region. Europe and Japan were
perceived as having the desire to be more independent, including militarily.

---

770 shi, 95-6, 18, Qin Liufang, Guo Shixian
771 shi, 92-2, 32, Xue Da, He Liangqiao
772 wai, 93-1, 30, 32-33, Xie Deyuan
773 shi, 92-3, 76, Xiao Lian
774 mei, 92-1, 31-32, Ding Haojin
775 mei, 92-1, 33, Ding Haojin
776 shi, 95-4, 60, Wang Guang; shi, 95-11, 64, Zhao Ziyu
5.6.3 Multipolarization would be the Trend

With the perceived relative decline of the US and the expected rise of Europe and Japan, many Chinese authors predicted that the future trend of the world would be multipolarization.\textsuperscript{778} They often cite Americans authors to support their argument for multipolarization. As a matter of fact, the Chinese argument for multipolarization has been strongly influenced by Nixon’s five-pole thesis advanced in the 1970s.\textsuperscript{779}

According to them, Western Europe would emerge as a new pole in the world, and Japan quite likely would also become a pole. As a result, Europe and Japan have been moving toward becoming equal partners to the US,\textsuperscript{780} trying to share the leadership of world affairs with the US.\textsuperscript{781} Because of multipolarization, one Chinese author predicted that the entire 21st century might not remain an American century.\textsuperscript{782} For one instance, in international monetary system, a tripolarity between the US dollar, the Japanese yen, and the deutsche mark was predicted to emerge as early as around 2010,\textsuperscript{783} and the euro

\textsuperscript{777} xian, 92-3, 15, Zhao Guilin
\textsuperscript{778} guo, 91-4, 26, Pan Tongwen; mei, 91-3, 43, Zhang Yebai; mei, 93-4, 7, 13, 19, Peng Guanqian; xian, 91-, 8, Xi Runchang
\textsuperscript{779} xian, 91-1, 3, Xi Runchang. mei, 95-4, 32, Zhou Qi, shi, 97-6, 39, Li Changjiu. Mostly based on my reading of Chinese articles in the 1980s.
\textsuperscript{780} xian, 91-1, 8, Xi Runchang
\textsuperscript{781} xian, 92-2, 18-19, Jin Dexiang
\textsuperscript{782} guo, 99-3, 49, Zeng Bingxi
\textsuperscript{783} shi, 93-6, 16, Guo Shixian
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would inevitably weaken the US’s capability to dominate world affairs.\textsuperscript{784}

In addition to Europe and Japan, Chinese authors perceived an important role in the world for other powers, especially Russia and China. And they also notice the rise of India, Indonesia, ASEAN, South Korea, South Africa and Brazil.\textsuperscript{785} One author argues that a semblance of the future multipolar structure would emerge as early as around 1995.\textsuperscript{786} And in terms of the Southeast Asia, a multipolar structure was perceived as already in existence in the early 1990s.\textsuperscript{787}

5.6.4 In the Late 1990s, Chinese Authors Modify the “American Decline” Thesis

Over the course of the 1990s, Chinese authors noticed that the US economy had been doing remarkably well. The success of the US economy began to dawn on Chinese authors toward the mid-1990s.\textsuperscript{788} Quite a few authors marveled at the sustained development, and sometimes its brilliant performance,\textsuperscript{789} and were generally optimistic about its future performance.\textsuperscript{790}

\textsuperscript{784} xian, 99-1/2, 22, Lu Qichang, Fu Mengzi, Yuan Peng
\textsuperscript{785} mei, 97-3, 31, Wang Jisi; shi, 95-4, 60, Wang Guang; shi, 00-12, 8-9, Zhang Yijun
\textsuperscript{786} xian, 91-1, 4, 8, Xi Runchang
\textsuperscript{787} mei, 91-3, 82, 86-89, Xu Xin
\textsuperscript{788} xian, 94-8, 21, Guo Shixian; xian, 94-8, 21, Guo Shixian
\textsuperscript{789} shi, 97-7, 58, Zhang Jikan; xian, 98-1, 5, Shi Ren; shi, 98-3, 21-22, Song Yuhua; shi, 00-1, 27, Chen Baosen
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Chinese authors generally point out that in the 1990s the US economy has been doing much better than its major competitors such as the European countries and Japan. As a result, Chinese authors point out that the US not only has not declined, but has also increased the lead over other countries. They point out that the US's hegemonic position in the world has been strengthened, it has now become more a superpower, and it enjoys much greater superiority over other countries than ten years ago.

In the mid-late 1990s, the US was perceived as having either solved the problems which presumably beset the US economy in the early 1990s, or was perceived as able to keep those problems under control, such as its trade deficit. Or they would argue that things earlier regarded as symptoms of American decline were in fact exaggerated. Now the US was considered safely the no. 1 in foreign trade, and it has strengthened the lead over other countries in science and technology. Its economy was now much more competitive than before.

Toward the end of the 1990s, many Chinese authors predicted that the US would not decline, and would maintain its status as the sole superpower, enjoying significant
advantage over other countries. Some of the more cautious would make such a prediction for the next 5-10 years, but many others predicted for a longer period of time. Some scholars argued that the US in many ways had not declined at all, not even in the 1980s and in the early 1990s.

One optimistic estimate is that unipolarity, with the US as the sole hegemon, would last for at least several decades. Another scholar shares the presumably dominant opinion in the US and tends to predict that the US’s economic expansion may continue endlessly. A more cautiously optimistic scholar predicted that the US would not lose its status as a superpower though its capability to dominate the world is somewhat limited. Several Chinese scholars point out that the US has positioned itself for continued economic dominance in the world, by developing economic relations in the Asia-Pacific region, by transferring undesirable factories to other countries, and by achieving a safe lead in areas such as computer, information and communication, which are regarded the keys to competitiveness over the 21st century.

---

796 shi, 95-4, 32-40, Gao Feng; shi, 97-7, 65-68, Wu Yonghong
797 xian, 98-1, 7-8, Shi Ren
798 xian, 98-1, 6-7, Shi Ren; shi, 97-7, 68, Wu Yonghong; guo, 99-3, 45, Zeng Bingxi
799 mei, 97-3, 33, Wang Jisi; mei, 97-3, 101, Song Yuhua, Lu Huajun
800 mei, 00-1, 143, Wang Fan
801 shi, 98-10, 68-69, Sun Shilian
802 mei, 97-3, 33, Wang Jisi
On the other hand, with the perceived rise of the US in the second half of the 1990s, Chinese authors now perceive the decline of Japan and Europe relative to the US. They are rather pessimistic about the economic development of Japan and Europe in the 1990s. They point out that Europe and Japan are obviously not as competitive as the US, and their economic growth lags behind that of the US. They notice that the economies of Japan and Europe had serious problems in the 1990s. One most pessimistic account went so far as to compare Japan to a processing factory for the US. Some Chinese are also pessimistic about China’s development. One author argued that as developed countries monopolized information technology, it would be very difficult for developing countries to succeed in the so-called information economy.

In spite of the general optimism toward the end of 1990s among Chinese scholars regarding US economy, a minority of them continued to be cautious about the US’s economic performance. Some claim that the prosperity of the US economy was propped up by the large inflow of foreign capital, and the economic bubble would
explode sooner or later. Somehow, even when the US was perceived as having entered a period of sustained economic growth in the mid to late 1990s, Chinese authors continue to argue that multipolarization would be the future trend of the world. One author points out in the mid 1990s that the excellent performance of the US economy in the 1990s would strengthen the US and enhance its status as the sole superpower, but multipolarization and the US’s relative decline would be irreversible. As late as in 2000, some Chinese authors continue to predict that multipolarity is inevitable.

Table 5.2 summarizes the Chinese perception in the sample of the US’s relative decline and rise. Articles containing relevant information are coded as follows.

- strong: an image of the US as strong;
- weak: an image of the US as weak;
- limited: an image of the US as strong, but with limits in (the exercise of) its capability;
- up: an image of the US as strengthening its lead over one or more other countries;
- down: an image of the US as losing its lead over one or more other countries;

810 zhan, 98-4, 31-37, Wang Jian; shi, 00-3, 80, Zhou Li
811 guo, 95-1, 37, Wei Min; shi, 95-4, 60, Wang Guang; shi, 95-11, 61, 62, Zhao Ziyu; zhan, 96-5, 47, 49, Jiang Lingfei; zhan, 98-2, 101, Zhang Wenmu; guo, 98-1, 7, Song Yimin
812 shi, 95-4, 35, 40, Gao Feng; xian, 99-1/2, 22, Lu Qichang, Fu Mengzi, Yuan Peng
813 shi, 00-6, 52, Zhang Lihua; shi, 00-12, 5, 6, 8, 9, Zhang Yijun
814 As can be seen in Table 5.2, the US is never presented in the sample as weak, though it is often presented as limited in (the exercise of) its power.
better: an image of the US doing well without comparing it with other countries;

worse: an image of the US not doing well without comparing it with other countries;

no decline: an image of the US to maintain its superpower status;

multi: the world is multipolar, is moving toward, or will move toward multipolarity;

uni: the world is unipolar, is moving toward, or will move toward unipolarity.

Sometimes, an article might contain somewhat different or even contradictory information. For instance, some parts of the article might argue that the US is weak, or is declining, and other parts might argue that it is strong, or is not declining. I would code such articles more than once, for instance as both “weak,” or “limited” and “strong,” or as both “down” and “no decline.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year</th>
<th>economy</th>
<th>military</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>soft power</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>strong 5 worse 5 up 1 down 7 no decline 1</td>
<td>strong 2 limited 1</td>
<td>strong 3</td>
<td>strong 1 up 1</td>
<td>multi 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>strong 13 up 1 down 15 better 1 no decline 1</td>
<td>strong 2 up 2</td>
<td>strong 5 down 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>strong 4 better 2 down 5 up 2 down 2 better 3</td>
<td>strong 3 up 1 limited 1 strong 1</td>
<td>strong 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>multi 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
<td>strong 1</td>
<td>strong 2 down 1</td>
<td>strong 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>strong 9 up 4 down 5 better 1</td>
<td>strong 2 limited 1</td>
<td>strong 5 up 1 strong 3 limited 1</td>
<td>multi 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>strong 2 up 1 down 3 better 2</td>
<td>strong 7 limited 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>multi 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>strong 3 up 4 down 3 better 5</td>
<td>strong 3 up 2 limited 1</td>
<td>strong 4 up 2 strong 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>strong 7 better 10 up 6 down 3</td>
<td>strong 2 up 1</td>
<td>strong 10 up 1</td>
<td>multi 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>strong 6 better 2 up 3 down 1</td>
<td>strong 7 up 2 limited 1</td>
<td>strong 9 up 3 strong 1</td>
<td>multi 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>strong 11 better 1 up 2 down 2</td>
<td>strong 12 up 1</td>
<td>strong 9</td>
<td>strong 3 multi 5 uni 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>strong 60 better 27 worse 5 up 24 down 46 no decline 2</td>
<td>strong 43 up 8 limited 6</td>
<td>strong 47 up 7 down 4 strong 11 up 1 limited 1</td>
<td>multi 18 uni 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: The Trajectory of Perceived American Power
The Chinese perception in the 1990s of first an American decline and then a rise can be seen more clearly when Table 5.2 is broken down into two five-year periods (see Table 5.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year</th>
<th>economy</th>
<th>military</th>
<th>science</th>
<th>soft power</th>
<th>polarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1991-1995 | strong 31 better 7 up 8  
up 8 no decline 2  
worse 5 down 34  
strong 29 better 20 up 16  
no decline 0 worse 0 down 12 | strong 10 up 3  
limited 3 | strong 16 down 4 up 1 | strong 5 up 1  
limited 1 | multi 9 |
| 1996-2000 | strong 29 up 6  
up 6 limited 3 | strong 32 down 0 up 6 | strong 6 | multi 9  
uni 2 |

Table 5.3: The Chinese Perception of the American Decline and Rise in the 1990s

In Table 5.3, we can see that when Chinese scholars talked about the American decline in the first half of the 1990s, it did not refer to the US’s military power and its soft power, but it referred mainly to the US’s economic power and its technological power, especially the former. In the case of its economic power, even when it was widely perceived as having seriously declined, it was still regarded as an unambiguous
superpower (as indicated by the 31 “strongs” in cell row 2 cell 2). The perceived decline is noticeable when we examine the ratio of positive and negative codes in cell row 2 cell 2:

\[
\frac{7 + 8}{5 + 34} = \frac{15}{39}
\]

And a perceived American rise in the second half of the 1990s is evident when we look at the same ratio in cell row 3 cell 2:

\[
\frac{20 + 16}{12} = \frac{36}{12}
\]

The “strong” in Tables 5.2 and 5.3 indicates the US’s status as a superpower in various aspects. It is not included in the above two equations and in the following calculations as it is regarded more or less as a constant.

Similarly, 4 “downs” and 1 “up” in the first half of the 1990s indicates a perceived relative American decline in science and technology and 6 “ups” and 0 “down” indicates a perceived relative rise in the second half of the decade.
No negative coding in the American military power and its soft power indicate no perceived decline of the American power in these two aspects. However, the data do suggest that in the second half of the decade the US’s status in these two aspects has been somewhat improved over the first half.

The equal number of “multi” in the two periods indicates the persistence of Chinese authors’ belief in multipolarity, but the two “unis” in year 2000 (see both Tables 5.2 and 5.3) suggest that Chinese authors are beginning to think more seriously than before about unipolarity as a possibility in world politics.815
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815 One of the sources is a review of Wohlfarth’s article “The Stability of a Unipolar World,” mei, 00-
6.1 Shambaugh’s Presentation of the Chinese Perception of US Economy

Shambaugh’s chapter on Chinese perceptions of the US economy is the only work in existing literature which deals with this subject in a comprehensive and in-depth manner. Shambaugh discusses the Chinese perception before the 1990s. What was the Chinese perception of US economy during the 1990s? Have there been any changes after his Beautiful Imperialist was published? Shambaugh’s work therefore is a good place to start the discussion in this chapter.

Shambaugh’s chapter includes discussions of four different Chinese perceptions of the US economy: the evolution of monopoly and state monopoly capitalism in the US; debates on economic crises in the US; the US economy during the Carter years; and the US economy during the Reagan years. The first two parts are from a Chinese Marxist 

1, 133-146, Wang Fan
perspective, and the second two from a non-Marxist perspectives. These four parts combined, according to Shambaugh, “offer a fairly comprehensive assessment” of the Chinese perceptions of the American economy. In the following, I will briefly summarize Shambaugh’s findings.

The concept of economic crisis, according to Shambaugh, is one major component of Chinese Marxists’ interpretations of the US economy. Shambaugh considers one fundamental issue related to economic crises in capitalist countries: “why have the frequent crises that afflict the American economy not led to its collapse?”

Prior to 1979, China’s American watchers were mainly university-based and Marxist in orientation. They at that time, according to Shambaugh, painted a uniform picture of capitalist economies “on the verge of collapse.” By 1979, scholars in key research institutes had come to present a different perception. There were two opinion groups among Chinese Marxists. One group argued that all crises in the US since the World War II have been “periodic” or “cyclical” (zhouqixing). The other group argued that “some crises had been ‘intermediate’” (zhongjianxing). According to the “cyclical” scholars, crises had become more and more serious, and would ultimately lead to a “general
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817 Shambaugh, p. 86.
818 Shambaugh, p. 109
819 Shambaugh, p. 110
820 Shambaugh, pp. 110-111
crisis,” bringing about “the total collapse of the capitalist system.” According to “intermediate” scholars, the process leading to the general collapse of capitalism was long and full of fluctuations. The US was able to recover temporarily from intermediate crises “through government intervention in the economy.”\textsuperscript{821} On the whole therefore, Marxists painted a bleak picture of the US economy before the 1990s. They either regarded US economy as passing through a series of more and more severe crises until capitalism finally collapses, or regarded capitalism as doomed to failure, though there were some temporary recoveries in the process before the total collapse.

Non-Marxists were mainly in various major research institutes. They usually focused on current or recent events and were thus less ideological. They were “not necessarily more positive than the Marxists about the prospects for the American economy,” and tended to dwell on many of its negative aspects in US economy.\textsuperscript{822} Shambaugh presents non-Marxists’ perceptions by analyzing their works on US economy during the Carter and Reagan years.

For non-Marxists, the dominant perception during the Carter years was that US economy was in an on-going process of recession, beset by both stagnation and inflation, an unprecedented combination. Occasional successes were but “sham prosperity,” oil shortages exacerbated the US’s economic woes, the economic prospects

\textsuperscript{821} Shambaugh, pp. 110-115

\textsuperscript{822} Shambaugh, pp. 110-115
were bleak and the chances of recovery slim. Repeated attempts at recovery by the
Carter administration were all in vain.\textsuperscript{823}

Their assessment of US economy during the Reagan years was not much better. During
the first two years of this administration, they were full of doubt and pessimism
regarding the US economy. When it recovered and registered strong growth, their
perception became somewhat more positive, but many of them were cautious about its
long term prospects. They thought it difficult for Reagan to “fundamentally cure the
chronic malady of the US economy,” and emphasized the heavy price the US had to pay
for its temporary growth. The one salient bright spot in their perception of the US
economy was the new technological revolution in the US, but their acknowledgement of
the US’s economic renewal and technological renovation was made begrudgingly. On the
whole they regarded Reaganomics as a failure, and maladies such as “high fiscal and trade
deficits, high interest rates, bankruptcies” etc “more than offset any cosmetic gains from
Reaganomics.”\textsuperscript{824}

Thus, the Chinese perceptions of the US economy before the 1990s, as presented by
Shambaugh, were quite bleak, even the record breaking peace time economic expansion
during the Reagan administration failed to impress Chinese authors. Is this still the case

\textsuperscript{822} Shambaugh, p. 115
\textsuperscript{823} Shambaugh, pp. 116-121
during the 1990s? In what way can a study of Chinese perceptions of the US economy shed light on our understanding of China’s foreign policy orientation toward the US? This chapter will try to address these two questions.

6.2 Methodology

6.2.1 Sources

This chapter on the Chinese perceptions of the US economy will be based on all the articles on the US economy, as indicated by the titles, in the six journals in the 1991-2000 decade. Table 6.1 indicates the number of articles in each of the six journals constituting the sample (see Appendix C for the titles of these articles).

824 Shambaugh, 121-135
825 As in all the other empirical chapters in this dissertation, the titles of articles in the sample should specifically contain words like the US, American, or the names of its leaders, except those in Mei Guo Yan Jiu, all articles in which focus on the US.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Number of Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mei Guo Yan Jiu</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhan Lue yu Guang Li</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wai Jiao Xue Yuan Xue Bao</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xian Dai Guo Ji Guan Xi</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guo Ji Wen Ti Yan Jiu</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shi Jie Jing Ji yu Zheng Zhi</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: Number of Articles in Each Journal on the US Economy

The articles in Table 6.1 can be further divided into two categories: those on the overall economy and those on its specific fields. The former refers to articles reflecting the overall condition of the US economy and the latter refers to discussion of one or more of its specific aspects. Table 6.2 lists the number of articles in each category in the six journals.

---

826 The following are some examples: “Is the US Economy Declining or Reviving?” (mei, 91-2, pp. 7-20, Zheng Weimin), “A Comparison of the Role of State Intervention in the Economic Development of the US and Japan” (zhan, 95-3, pp. 16-23, Li Li), “The Historical Experience of the Take-off of the American Economy” (wai, 94-3, pp. 55-64, Su Ge),

Table 6.2: Number of Articles in Each Journal on Overall US Economy and on Specific Aspects in US Economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Overall Economy</th>
<th>Specific Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mei Guo Yan Jiu</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhan Lue yu Guang Li</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wai Jiao Xue Yuan Xue Bao</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xian Dai Guo Ji Guang Xi</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guo Ji Wen Ti Yan Jiu</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shi Jie Jing Ji yu Zheng Zhi</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.2 What to Perceive Regarding US Economy?

In studying Chinese perceptions of the American economy, one important question is to decide which perceptions are the most meaningful for the presentation. One effective way is to look at the major differences between the US and China in terms of economic system, which obviously is: market economy vs. planned economy. It is therefore essential to study Chinese perceptions of the market economy system.
To see Chinese authors’ perception of market economy, besides looking into what they say about this economic system, it would be more illuminating to see whether they perceive the economy as actually working well. Justifiably, Shambaugh in his study focuses emphatically on the US’s economic performance in Chinese eyes, and this chapter will update Shambaugh’s description of the Chinese perception of the US’s economic performance.

One important link between perceptions of an economic system and its economic performance is whether Chinese authors attribute the success or failure of US economy to the economic system, which therefore will be the third aspect this chapter is going to explore.

As will be explained shortly afterwards, the exploration of the above three aspects may shed light on China’s foreign policy orientation regarding the US. The answers to another two questions may also contribute to this effort. They are: whether Chinese authors regard it as desirable to learn from the US in economic management and whether the US is perceived as playing a positive or negative role in the world economy. Table 6.3 lists the aspects of the Chinese perception of US economy this chapter is going to explore.
1. What is the Chinese perception of the market economy system?

2. Whether the US economy is perceived as doing well?

3. What accounts for the success or failure of the US economy?

4. Whether Chinese authors regard it as desirable to learn from the US in economic management?

5. What role is the US perceived to play in world economy, especially with relevance to China?

---

Table 6.3: What to Perceive Regarding American Economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What is the Chinese perception of the market economy system?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Whether the US economy is perceived as doing well?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What accounts for the success or failure of the US economy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Whether Chinese authors regard it as desirable to learn from the US in economic management?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What role is the US perceived to play in world economy, especially with relevance to China?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.3 Inferences

Inferences about China’s foreign policy orientation can be made from the study of the various aspects of the Chinese perceptions of the American economy listed in Table 6.3, to be presented in Tables 6.4 and 6.5.
## Facets of Perception

### Chinese perceptions of a market economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If</th>
<th>Inferences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A market economy is perceived as a desirable approach in economic management</td>
<td>Differences in economic systems does not constitute a source of conflict between the two countries, and the convergence of China’s economic system on the American model is possible though not inevitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A market economy is perceived as an unsatisfactory approach in economic management</td>
<td>Differences in economic systems may be a source of conflict between the two countries, and the convergence of China’s economic system toward the American model is less likely.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chinese perception of the performance of US economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If</th>
<th>Inferences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The US economy is perceived as doing well</td>
<td>It would be more likely that China would accept a market economy as a viable form of economic management and the economy may well be a source of cooperation between the two countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The US economy is perceived as not doing well</td>
<td>It would be less likely that China would regard a market economy as a viable form of economic management and less likely for the economy to be a source of cooperation between the two countries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chinese perceptions of the reasons for the US’s economic success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If</th>
<th>Inferences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The reasons for success are perceived as related to the economic system,</td>
<td>It is more likely that a market economy would be regarded as a scientific approach of economic management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reasons for success are perceived as not related to the economic system,</td>
<td>Convergence of China’s economic system on the American model need not necessarily take place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6.4: Inferences from the Chinese Perception of the American Economy

(continued)
Table 6.4: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese perceptions of the reasons for the US’s economic failure</th>
<th>If the reasons for failure are related to the economic system</th>
<th>If the reasons for failure are not related to the economic system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it is more likely that a market economy is regarded as an erroneous approach to economic management.</td>
<td>it is less likely that market economy would be viewed as an erroneous approach to economic management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whether China should learn from the US in economic management</th>
<th>If Chinese authors argue for learning from the US</th>
<th>difference in economic systems could be a source of cooperation between the two countries.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If Chinese authors argue for system-related learning</td>
<td>convergence of the Chinese economic system on the American model is likely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If Chinese authors argue for non-system related learning</td>
<td>convergence of China’s economic system on the American model would not necessarily occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If Chinese authors argue against learning from the US</td>
<td>differences in economic system may, but not necessarily, be a source of conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If Chinese authors argue against system-related learning</td>
<td>convergence of China’s economic system on the American model is less likely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If Chinese authors argue against non-system related learning,</td>
<td>it would be uncertain as to whether the convergence of China’s economic system on the American model would occur.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>China’s response to the US’s economic performance</th>
<th>If the US is perceived as playing a positive role in world economy</th>
<th>it would be more likely that China would try to further integrate its economy with that of the US’s.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the US is perceived as playing a negative role in world economy</td>
<td>the economy could be a source of conflict between the two countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Perception of the American Economy</td>
<td>Negative Perception of the American Economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>market economy is perceived as a laudatory form of economic management</td>
<td>market economy is perceived as a non-viable form of economic management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US economy is perceived as doing well</td>
<td>US economy is perceived as not doing well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the reasons for US economic success are perceived as related to its economic system</td>
<td>the reasons for US economic failure are perceived as related to the economic system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese authors argue for learning from the US, especially in system-related aspects</td>
<td>Chinese authors argue against learning from the US, especially in system-related aspects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the US perceived as playing a positive role in the world economy, especially in the development of the Chinese economy</td>
<td>the US perceived as playing a negative role in the world economy, especially in the development of the Chinese economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the economy is more likely to be a source of cooperation between the two countries, difference in economic systems is less likely to be a source of conflict, and the convergence of China’s economic system on the American model is more likely</td>
<td>the economy is less likely to be a source of cooperation between the two countries, the difference in economic system is more likely to be a source of conflict, and the convergence of China’s economic system on the American model is less likely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.5: Summary Inferences in Chinese Perceptions of the American Economy
6.3 Chinese Perception of American Economy

6.3.1 Chinese Perception of Market Economy System

In the sample, Chinese authors very seldom directly compare capitalism with socialism in terms of economic management, but they seem to have accepted capitalism as the mainstream of the world economy and as enjoying an unchallenged status. And the option for China is to join the mainstream.\(^\text{828}\)

Different from the portrayal in the 1980s, capitalism is described as being full of vitality, and not at all moribund.\(^\text{829}\) Chinese authors generally agree that the US’s economic system encourages competitiveness and is conducive to robust economic development.\(^\text{830}\) One author suggests that the American economic model is actually one institutional foundation of US economic hegemony in the world.\(^\text{831}\)

Chinese authors seldom display ebullient enthusiasm over capitalism itself, but they are not hesitant in heaping lavish praises on the various underpinnings of capitalism. They

\(^{828}\) guo, 95-1, 33-37, Wei Min; shi, 97-7, 65-68, Wu Yonghong

\(^{829}\) shi, 98-8, 5-9, Dong Fuquan


\(^{831}\) shi, 98-4, 30-31, Lang Ping
are particularly positive about free trade. Chinese authors have generally accepted the merits of institutions and practices closely associated with capitalism, such as the US’s federal reserve system, its currency market, its social security system etc. They argue that the US’s almost perfect legal system constitutes an important source of the US’s sustained economic development. Positive evaluation of sub-level management practices can be regarded as cumulative affirmation of the macro-level system.

Some aspects of market economy, severely denounced in earlier decades, were viewed in a positive light in the 1990s. Thus, annexation was not regarded as a cruel approach for the strong to take advantage of the weak, but as an effective and healthful approach in business development. The rich were presented as philanthropists rather than as exploiters of the poor.

Chinese authors often do find problems in the US economy. One notable problem is the cyclical crises which are perceived as inherent in the system. But more often, Chinese authors do not associate problems in US economy with the capitalist economic system.

---

832 mei, 91-4, 18-22, Li Yalian; sha, 96-1, 50-51, Li Jun; sha, 96-1, 52, 14, Du Xijiang; sha, 96-6, 40-42, Zhang Linjun
833 sha, 96-10, 65-68, Li Shujie
834 sha, 97-3, 38-40, Ye Xiangsong
835 sha, 97-4, 57-60, Deng Dasong
836 wai, 94-3, 55-64, Su Ge; mei, 95-3, 67-89, Xiao Chen
837 sha, 92-10, 27-36, 67, Gao Shaobo
838 sha, 95-3, 75-78, Liu Penghui
839 sha, 98-8, 49, 76, Yang Hongling; sha, 91-3, 46-49, Wang Huaining; sha, 91-11, 7-8, Chu Yukun
itself,\textsuperscript{840} such as the US’s relative decline,\textsuperscript{841} the weakened US dollar,\textsuperscript{842} or the trouble in the “long term capital management.”\textsuperscript{843} Instead, it seems to them that most of the problems with US economy can be solved within the capitalist system.\textsuperscript{844}

Chinese authors sometimes described some socialist elements in US economy, such as agricultural cooperatives and Tennessee Valley Authority.\textsuperscript{845} It seems to them that socialist elements can co-exist comfortably in the context of the dominant capitalist economic system, and can also be quite successful.

On the whole, Chinese authors’ evaluation of the American economic model in the 1990s was quite positive. They not only had a generally favorable image of the market economy system, but many of them also advocated adopting various aspects of the system in China’s economic management, which will be discussed in the section on whether China should learn from the US.

\textsuperscript{840} shi, 93-8, 12-16, Ke Juhan, Tao Jian, Gu Wenyan
\textsuperscript{841} xian, 92-2, 13-19, Jin Dexiang
\textsuperscript{842} shi, 95-6, 14-19, Qin Liufang, Guo Shixian
\textsuperscript{843} shi, 99-4, 33-35, 45, Zhang Tianwei
\textsuperscript{844} guo, 91-2, 6-8, Xie Yao; shi, 97-3, 46-47, Zhang Xuesong
\textsuperscript{845} shi, 96-7, 64-67, Ye Xiangsong; shi, 97-9, 65-67, Chen Dejun; mei, 91-4, 36-43, Liu Xuyi
6.3.2 Chinese Perceptions of the Performance of US Economy

6.3.2.1 Overall Picture of the US’s Economic Performance

To explore the Chinese perceptions of the performance of US economy, we may look most importantly at articles on the overall US economy. The following table indicates the number of articles in each journal conveying a positive or negative perception as to the performance of the US economy. An article is coded as positive when it presents the US economy as more successful than problematic, and it is coded as negative when the US economy is presented as more problematic than successful. When it is difficult to decide whether it is more positive or negative, it is coded as neutral.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive-Negative Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mei Guo Yan Jiu</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhan Lue Yu Guang Li</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shi Jie Jing Ji Yu Zheng Zhi</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guo Ji Wen Ti Yan Jiu</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wai Jiao Xue Yuan Xue Bao</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xian Dai Guo Ji Guan Xi</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.6: Chinese Perception of the Performance of the US Economy (1)

From the above table, it is obvious that most articles on the overall US economy in each of the six journals regard the US economy as quite successful, and thus are in striking contrast to the perceptions before the 1990s as presented by Shambaugh.

---

846 focusing only on articles on overall US economic performance
To repeat the process regarding articles on specific fields in US economy, we have Table 6.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive-Negative Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mei Guo Yan Jiu</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhan Lue Yu Guang Li</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shi Jie Jing Ji Yu Zheng Zhi</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guo Ji Wen Ti Yan Jiu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wai Jiao Xue Yuan Xue Bao</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xian Dai Guo Ji Guan Xi</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.7: Chinese Perception of the Performance of the US Economy (2)\(^{847}\)

When we look at articles on specific fields in US economy, the picture is quite different from Table 5.3. In one journal (Guo Ji Wen Ti Yan Jiu), US economy was presented as simply negative, and in another three (Zhan Lue Yu Guang Li, Wai Jiao Xue Yuan Xue Bao, and Xian Dai Guo Ji Guan Xi), it was presented as neutral. As too few relevant articles in these four journals are available in the sample, I would say the image of US economy in these articles is non-representative. If we combine all the articles across

---

\(^{847}\) focusing only on articles on US economic performance in specific fields
various journals, we may still find that an overwhelming number of articles convey a positive rather than a negative perception of the performance of the US economy in various specific fields. If we further combine articles on the overall US economy and those on specific fields of it, we may conclude that a great majority of articles in each of these journals, except *Guo Ji Wen Ti Yan Jiu*, still convey a perception of a prosperity (see Table 5.8). This conclusion is supported by the reasoning that in evaluating the Chinese perception of the US’s economic performance as a whole, articles focusing on the overall economy should be regarded as carrying more weight than articles on specific fields.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Specific</th>
<th>positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>positive / negative ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mei Guo Yan Jiu</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhan Lue Yu Guang Li</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shi Jie Jing Ji yu Zheng Zhi</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guo Ji Wen Ti Yan Jiu</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wai Jiao Xue Yuan Xue Bao</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xian Dai Guo Ji Guan Xi</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>95/32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.8: Chinese Perception of the Performance of the US Economy (3)
To better understand the Chinese perception of the performance of the US economy, it is advisable to go into further details. In the following, I will firstly present the positive Chinese description of the US’s economic performance, then the negative one, and finally combine the two for an overall assessment. The following analysis will be based only on articles on the overall US economy.

6.3.2.2 Detailed Description of the US’s Economic Performance

Looking further into the content of Chinese articles, we will find that the majority of Chinese authors in the sample paint a highly rosy picture of the US economy. In the following, I will present the picture in two ways: 1. how Chinese authors perceive the success in various aspects of the US economy and, 2. how Chinese authors compare the US economy with that of other countries.

Regarding the overall performance of US economy, Chinese authors observe that the US has made great progress in economic structural reform in the 1990s, thus providing a relaxed macro environment for economic activity.848 What strikes Chinese authors the most is its sustained and strong growth in the 1990s. As the decade progressed, their description of US economy became more and more enthusiastic. In 1994, some Chinese

---

848 shi, 95-4, 33-34, Gao Feng; shi, 98-3, 22, Song Yuhua
scholars noticed steady and moderate economic growth.\textsuperscript{849} In 1995, “rapid growth” was used to describe the US economy.\textsuperscript{850} In 1997, scholars in the sample pointed out that US economic growth was not only stable but also that the growth rate had steadily increased.\textsuperscript{851} One scholar remarks that US economic growth is also a high-quality one, with high interest rates and a low inflation rate.\textsuperscript{852} In 1998, Chinese scholars began to notice the unusual duration of the economic growth.\textsuperscript{853} They point out that the continued growth in the US economy had greatly lengthened the economic cycle, and that the present cycle had become one of the longest in US history.\textsuperscript{854} They marveled that after such a long period of growth, the US economy was able to maintain its strong momentum and show no sign of slowing down.\textsuperscript{855} And finally in 2000, Chinese scholars remarked that such sustained economic growth was quite rare and broke the growth record in US history.\textsuperscript{856}

Conforming to the rosy picture of the overall US economy, the Chinese description of various aspects of the US economy is also tinted with enthusiasm and optimism. In the following, I will present the various parts that make up the overall rosy picture of US

\textsuperscript{849} xian, 94-1, 6-7, Tao Jian, Gu Wenyan, Ke Juhan  
\textsuperscript{850} shi, 95-4, 32, Gao Feng  
\textsuperscript{851} shi, 97-2, 58, Ke Juhan; shi, 97-7, 66-67, Wu Yonghong; shi, 97-10, 8, Wang Yungui  
\textsuperscript{852} shi, 97-1, 71, Zhang Xiaotang  
\textsuperscript{853} shi, 98-4, 28-30, Lang Ping; shi, 98-8, 46, Yang Hongling  
\textsuperscript{854} guo, 98-1, 21, Chen Dezhaio; xian, 98-6, 7-8, Gu Wenyan; shi, 98-2, 16-17, Song Yuhua  
\textsuperscript{855} shi, 98-8, 5, Dong Fuquan  
\textsuperscript{856} xian, 00-3, 1, Li Changjiu; shi, 00-1, 27, Chen Baosen
economic performance.

1. The US’s achievements in science and technology have long been the object of Chinese admiration, and it continued to fascinate Chinese scholars in the 1990s. They point out that the US’s lead in science and technology had increased in the 1990s, and it now leads other countries by far in this area. For instance, “the US’s computer software accounted for 59% in the world in 1985, and 70% in 1992.”

2. Regarding traditional industries like automobile, steel etc, Chinese authors observe that the US in the 1990s has fully recovered its competitiveness. Japan had already lost its leading position in manufacturing, and “the US’s production rate in this field was higher than Japan’s and Germany’s by 17% and 21% respectively. At the same time, its labor cost at the same time were lower than these two countries by 20% and 30% respectively.”

3. US achievements in agriculture were also regarded as extraordinary, since “the US was able to feed its entire population with mere a 2.6% of its labor force. In China over 1/3

---

857 shi, 95-4, 33-34, Gao Feng; shi, 97-7, 66-67, Wu Yonghong
858 zhan, 95-3, 16, Li Li; shi, 97-1, 71, Zhang Xiaotang
859 shi, 95-4, 33, Gao Feng
860 zhan, 95-3, 16, Li Li
861 shi, 95-4, 33, Gao Feng
of the labor worked in the agricultural sector.862

4. In investment, the US was not only perceived as having greatly increased its investments in fixed assets especially in information technology equipment,863 but was also perceived as the world’s no. 1 in foreign investment.864 Company profit in the US has also increased.865

5. Several authors mention the remarkable achievements of the US in promoting employment. It is perceived as having kept unemployment low, and its employment rate was higher than what economists term “full employment.”866

6. At the same time that employment increased, US labor’s production rate also increased,867 and again became the no. 1 in the world.868

7. The US’s remarkable successes in exports did not escape Chinese authors’ attention either. They point out that the US’s “national export strategy” had proved to be quite

862 mei, 95-4, 74, Wei Wei
863 shi, 98-3, 22, Song Yuhua
864 shi, 97-7, 66, Wu Yonghong
865 shi, 97-2, 58, Ke Juhan
866 xian, 94-1, 7, Tao Jian, Gu Wenyan, Ke Juhan; shi, 97-2, 58, Ke Juhan; shi, 98-2, 16-17, Song Yuhua; shi, 98-4, 28-30, Lang Ping; shi, 98-8, 46, Yang Hongling
867 shi, 97-2, 58, Ke Juhan
868 xian, 94-1, 7, Tao Jian, Gu Wenyan, Ke Juhan
successful, and the US’s “foreign trade deficit had markedly decreased.” Its exports increased rapidly, growing much faster than Japan’s, Germany’s, etc, and the US was now the unchallenged no. 1 exporting country in the world.

8. A lot of Chinese scholars mention the remarkable achievements of the US in finance. They point out that in the 1990s, “the US’s financial deficits were greatly reduced.” The US was able to keep inflation low. Its stock market was strong. Interest rates were low and steady. The US’s “financial status continued to improve,” and “it had again become the leading country in international finance,” while Japan had lost its leading status. “The US’s share of world stock value had increased from 29% in 1988 to 37% in 1993 ... again assuming the leading position in international finance.”

Chinese authors in the sample often compare the US’s economic performance with that of other countries and quite a few Chinese scholars regarded US economy as doing much
better than Europe and Japan.\textsuperscript{880} One scholar points out that in micro, medium, and macro levels, the US economy surpasses all other developed countries.\textsuperscript{881} A major reason the US economy is considered as doing better than other major Western countries is its growth rate. Chinese authors repeatedly emphasize that the US growth rate had obviously been higher than that of other major Western countries, often higher than all the other major Western countries, and occasionally surpassed only by one of the major Western countries.\textsuperscript{882} Taken the 1990s as a whole, the US growth rate is perceived as much higher than Japan and Europe.\textsuperscript{883}

Another important area in which Chinese authors perceive a better performance of the US economy than that of other countries is its competitiveness. Chinese authors point out that the US greatly improved its international competitiveness in the 1990s.\textsuperscript{884} Several of them mention that the US was either obviously more competitive than other major industrialized countries or actually the most competitive country in the world.\textsuperscript{885} “Its production rate had always been the highest among developed countries.”\textsuperscript{886} And in the economic competition among Western countries, the US led in almost every major

\textsuperscript{880} xian, 98-6, 7, Gu Wenyan
\textsuperscript{881} shi, 98-2, 17, Song Yuhua
\textsuperscript{882} xian, 94-1, 7, Tao Jian, Gu Wenyan, Ke Juhan; shi, 95-4, 33, Gao Feng
\textsuperscript{883} shi, 97-1, 71, Zhang Xiaotang
\textsuperscript{884} shi, 97-7, 66-67, Wu Yonghong; shi, 97-10, 8, Wang Yungui
\textsuperscript{885} guo, 95-1, 34, Wei Min; shi, 98-2, 17, Song Yuhua; shi, 95-4, 33-34, Gao Feng
\textsuperscript{886} shi, 97-6, 35, Sun Jingshui
Occasionally Chinese authors would include non-Western countries in the comparison, claiming that the US’s economic performance sometimes “made even emerging markets, which were full of vitality in the early 1990s, look pale by comparison.”

As a result of the great success of the US economy, Chinese scholars point out that the gap in overall CNP (comprehensive national power) between the US and other major Western countries widened. “The US re-established its leadership position in the global economy,” and “had become more obviously a superpower in the world economy.” The future of the US economy was also perceived as quite rosy, since the US enjoyed absolute leadership status in the three area decisive in economic competition: technology, quality of workers, and system.

Chinese scholars summarize the great success of the US economy in various ways. One scholar puts it as “1 steady and 3 lows:” “steady economic growth; low unemployment, low inflation, and low interest rates.” Another scholar puts it as “3 highs and 2 lows:”
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887 guo, 95-1, 33-34, Wei Min
888 xian, 99-1/2, 18, Lu Qichang, Fu Mengzhi, Yuan Peng
889 shi, 95-4, 33-34, Gao Feng
890 shi, 97-10, 8, Wang Yungui
891 shi, 98-2, 17 Song Yuhua
892 shi, 98-4, 30-31, Lang Ping
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high economic growth rate, high labor production rate, and high enterprise efficiency; low unemployment, and low inflation.894 A third scholar summarizes it as “3 highs and 3 lows:” high economic growth rate, high comprehensive competitiveness, and high enterprise profit; low unemployment, low inflation, and low financial deficit.895 And a fourth scholar presents a summary of 3 highs, 3 lows, and 3 increases: high stock market, high consumer confidence, and high dollar exchange rate; low financial deficit, low unemployment, and low inflation; increased export, increased profit, and increased international competitiveness.896 So successful is the US economy in Chinese eye that several scholars enthusiastically evoke a same Chinese proverb to compare US economy in the world to “the only flower in the garden that is blossoming.”897 One scholar simply uses “wonder” to describe it.898

Only 14 articles in the sample present the US economy more negatively than positively.899 They were mostly written in 1991-93 about the brief recession during the first Bush administration.
These articles mention that in the early 1990s, the US economy fell into recession: “the red light turned on in various economic indicators.” Industrial production greatly declined, unemployment rate rapidly rose, and there are serious dangers in the banking system. Economic growth slowed down, and workers’ living standards suffered. Some argue that this recession in some respects is more serious than those in the past, since it did not follow an overheated economy but followed a period when the market was already weak. The service industry which in the past was largely immune to recession this time also suffered. Real estate which suffered little in the past from recession and which generally has a different cycle this time not only fell into recession, but also occurred at the same time as the general economic recession. One author summarizes the woes in US economy during this period as 3 highs and 3 lows: high financial deficit, high trade deficit, and high national debt; low saving, low accumulation, and low investment. But some others point out that this was just a moderate recession.
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Baosen; mei, 96-2, 93-109, Chen Baosen.
900 shi, 91-1, 4, Yu Kexing
901 shi, 91-11, 8-11, Chu Yukun
902 shi, 91-11, 6, Chu Yukun
903 xian, 92-6, 10, Wang Huihong
904 guo, 91-2, 2-5, Xie Yao
905 guo, 92-4, 15, Wu Tianbo
Some Chinese authors were pessimistic about the prospects for a quick recovery from this recession. They pointed out that the two traditional approaches to dealing with recession may not work well this time. Interest rates were already too low to be lowered any further; and a high national debt made it difficult to stimulate the economy through increasing government expenditure.\textsuperscript{907}

When the US economy began to recover from the recession, some Chinese authors were not optimistic about its prospects. One points out that “20 months after the recession ended, the US economy was still no good; unemployment was still increasing,” and the economy went up and down.\textsuperscript{908} Another points out that it was a recovery without increase in employment, and the US government faced serious difficulties in the management of the macro economy. US economic structure was in urgent need of adjustment. There were more and more trade disputes with foreign countries, and the US’s competitiveness in manufacturing industry was declining.\textsuperscript{909}

Some scholars related this recession to the famous US decline thesis: the US’s superiority kept lessening, in GNP, per capita GNP, economic growth rate, foreign trade, foreign reserves, status as a creditor/debtor nation, and in science and

\textsuperscript{906} xian, 92-6, 9, Wang Huihong
\textsuperscript{907} shi, 91-11, 11-12, Chu Yukun; shi, 93-10, 7, Ji Wei
\textsuperscript{908} guo, 93-3, 20, Xie Yao
\textsuperscript{909} shi, 93-10, 6-8, Ji Wei
technology. The US was declining, and Japan was an emerging economic big power, with adequate capital, and sophisticated applied science and technology. “The US’s share of GDP in the Western world declined from 52.59% in 1960 to 33.2% in 1990,” and it “turned from the largest creditor country to the largest debtor country.” As late as 1995, one scholar still argued that the process of relative decline in US economic power will continue on a long term basis, even though he also mentioned that the US is now still a sole superpower, and will remain so into the foreseeable future.

When we consider the Chinese perceptions of the US’s economic performance as a whole, we may conclude that the dominant Chinese perception is that US economy is doing very well. Firstly, as demonstrated in Tables 5.3 and 5.5, many more articles are optimistic than are pessimistic about the US economy. Secondly, articles optimistic about US economy cover the most part of the 1990s while articles pessimistic about it cover mostly only the brief recession in the early 1990s. Besides, articles optimistic about US economy tend to use highly enthusiastic terms to describe the success of US economy while articles pessimistic about US economy often use moderate terms to describe the recession.
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6.3.3 Accounting for the US’s Economic Performance

As the dominant picture of the US economy for the Chinese was highly positive, in this section, I will present only the Chinese explanations of why US economy has been so successful and ignore their interpretations of the US’s economic problems in the early 1990s. In accordance with the inferential logic in Tables 6.4 and 6.5, the discussion can be divided into two categories: a. reasons not closely associated with capitalism and, b. those closely associated with capitalism. I will base the discussion in this section only on articles on the overall performance of US economy.

A. Reasons not closely associated with capitalism. In explaining why the US economy has been so successful, Chinese authors often point to things not closely associated with the US’s capitalist system. Their explanations tend to fall into the following four categories.

1. The US’s great emphasis on science and technology.\textsuperscript{914} They point out that the US respects knowledge,\textsuperscript{915} emphasizes the importance of education,\textsuperscript{916} encourages
invention, technological innovations and scientific development,\textsuperscript{917} and manages to attract talent from other countries.\textsuperscript{918} The US has made substantial investments in information technology and developed an information super highway,\textsuperscript{919} and has thus been able to upgrade from being industrial economy to being information economy.\textsuperscript{920} In developing high technology, it relies not only on big businesses and the government, but also on venture capital and small businesses.\textsuperscript{921}

2. Economic relations with foreign countries. Chinese authors point out that globalization is an important reason for the US’s economic success.\textsuperscript{922} The completion of GATT negotiation,\textsuperscript{923} the formation of NAFTA,\textsuperscript{924} and the enhanced Asia-Pacific economic cooperation\textsuperscript{925} have all contributed to the US’s economic prosperity. Depreciation of US dollar\textsuperscript{926} and the implementation of strategic trade policy\textsuperscript{927} have promoted US exports. And the greatly increased exports contributed significantly to the

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{917} shi, 98-3, 22, Song Yuhua; shi, 97-6, 35, Sun Jingshui
\textsuperscript{918} guo, 95-1, 33, Wei Min; shi, 97-6, 35, Sun Jingshui
\textsuperscript{919} shi, 98-8, 38-39, Wang Hao, Xing Daoyong; shi, 98-8, 46-47, Yang Hongling; shi, 95-4, 34-35, Gao Feng
\textsuperscript{920} guo, 98-3, 44-45, Zeng Bingxi; shi, 98-3, 22, Song Yuhua
\textsuperscript{921} shi, 97-10, 6-8, Wang Yungui
\textsuperscript{922} shi, 98-8, 39, Wang Hao, Xing Daoyong; shi, 98-8, 48, Yang Hongling; xian, 98-6, 9-10, Gu Wenyan xian, 99-12, 6-7, Gu Wenyan;
\textsuperscript{923} shi, 95-4, 34, Gao Feng
\textsuperscript{924} shi, 98-8, 48, Yang Hongling
\textsuperscript{925} shi, 95-4, 34, Gao Feng;
\textsuperscript{926} shi, 95-4, 35, Gao Feng; shi, 97-7, 67, Wu Yonghong
\textsuperscript{927} shi, 97-10, 6-7, Wang Yungui
\end{footnotesize}
US’s economic prosperity.928

3. Management of the US economy. Quite a number of Chinese observers gave President Clinton credit for the prosperity of the US economy.929 They point out that the US’s macro management was an important reason for the success in the US economy.930 They argue that the US was able to achieve scientific management through management reform or renovation.931 The US’s successful management of its economy includes adjustment of its overall economic structure,932 adjustment in specific industries,933 and micro level enterprise reform, re-organization, innovation, improving working equipments etc.934 Big business annexations and economies of scale,935 better government-enterprise cooperation,936 coordination of various sectors in the national economy937 are considered as among the reasons contributing to the US’s prosperity. The US’s appropriate financial and monetary policy and its industrial development

928 shi, 97-2, 59, Ke Juhan; xian, 98-6, 8-10, Gu Wenyan.
929 shi, 98-8, 47-48, Yang Hongling; mei, 93-2, 29-44, Chen Baosen; xian, 94-1, 9-10, Tao Jian, Gu Wenyan, Ke Juhan;
930 zhan, 95-3, 16-22, Li Li; guo, 95-1, 34, Wei Min; guo, 98-1, 25, Chen Dezhaoh; xian, 98-6, 8, Gu Wenyan; shi, 97-2, 59, Ke Juhan; shi, 97-7, 67, Wu Yonghong; shi, 98-4, 28-30, Lang Ping; shi, 98-8, 38-39, Wang Hao, Xing Daoyong.
931 shi, 97-6, 35, Sun Jingshui; guo, 98-1, 24, Chen Dezhaoh; shi, 98-3, 22, Song Yuhua.
932 guo, 95-1, 33-34, Wei Min; guo, 98-1, 24-25, Chen Dezhaoh; shi, 98-8, 5-6, Dong Fuquan;
933 xian, 98-6, 8-9, Gu Wenyan; shi, 98-8, 41, Li Bing; shi, 97-10, 6-8, Wang Yungui.
934 shi, 98-8, 39, Wang Hao, Xing Daoyong; guo, 95-1, 34-35, Wei Min; guo, 98-1, 24, Chen Dezhaoh; shi, 98-4, 28, Lang Ping; shi, 97-6, 35, Sun Jingshui.
935 shi, 97-10, 8, Wang Yungui; shi, 98-11, 52-53, Zhang Zongbin; shi, 97-6, 35, Sun Jingshui
936 guo, 98-1, 25, Chen Dezhaoh; xian, 98-6, 8, Gu Wenyan.
937 wai, 94-3, 59-64, Su Ge
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policy are also regarded as having contributed to the US’s economic success.938

4. Others. In addition to the above three major categories, quite a few Chinese authors point to peace dividends -- reduction in military expenditure after the end of the Cold War -- as an important explanation.939 Other explanations include the result of the economic cycle,940 hard working,941 always having a sense of crisis,942 “supporting medium and small enterprises, protecting agriculture, improving infrastructure,”943 and rich natural resources.944

B. Reasons closely associated with capitalism. In explaining the US’s economic success, some authors also point to things closely associated with capitalism. They include mainly a free and sophisticated market system,945 little state intervention in economy,946 and a legal system supporting the functioning of its market system.947 More details regarding system-related reasons accounting for the US’s economic prosperity will be discussed in the section below on learning from the US in economic

938 xian, 99-12, 6, Gu Wenyan; xian, 98-6, 8-9, Gu Wenyan; shi, 98-8, 47, Yang Hongling; shi, 97-6, 35, 38, Sun Jingshui.
939 shi, 95-4, 34, Gao Feng; shi, 97-7, 67, Wu Yonghong; shi, 98-4, 28, Lang Ping; guo, 95-1, 35, Wei Min; guo, 98-1, 25, Chen Dezha; xian, 98-6, 8, Gu Wenyan.
940 shi, 97-7, 67, Wu Yonghong.
941 guo, 98-1, 24, Chen Dezha.
942 xian, 00-3, 6, Li Changjiu.
943 shi, 97-6, 35, Sun Jingshui
944 wai, 94-3, 56-57, Su Ge.
945 shi, 95-4, 35, Gao Feng, shi, 97-6, 35, Sun Jinshui; wai, 94-3, 63, Su Ge.
946 shi, 95-4, 35, Gao Feng.
management.

6.3.4 Whether to Learn from the US in Economic Management

6.3.4.1 The US as a Model

An exploration of Chinese perceptions of the US economy quickly presents to readers an image of the US as a model. In the sample, 19 articles specifically mention that China should learn from the US in economic management; 8 articles point out that China should learn selectively from the US; 4 articles strongly suggest that China should learn from the US though they did not specifically say so. Sometimes, Chinese authors suggest that China should draw lessons from the US’s lack of better results. Occasionally, Chinese authors argue that China should not learn from the US. On the
whole, the overall enthusiastic portrayal of the US’s economic success can be regarded as an implicit endorsement of learning from the US. Let us probe into details to see what Chinese authors accept or reject regarding the US’s economic management and its economic system. In the following, I will focus mainly on aspects related with the US’s economic system.

6.3.4.2 System-Related Learning

Among the 33 articles on the US economy more or less touching specifically on the topic of whether China should learn from the US, 14 articles contain information regarding Chinese authors’ assessment of the capitalist system. They can be grouped under four broad categories: market system, private property, legal system for a capitalist economy, and other trappings of capitalism.

Chinese authors have generally accepted the merit of the market economy system. In explaining why the US was able to achieve great success in economic development, Su Ge argues that the market economy system is one reason. Similarly, Wang Hao and Xing Daoyong explain that it is the sophisticated market that leads to continual breakthroughs in science and technology and new productive forces which ensure the sustained growth of the US economy. They argue that “it is especially important for
China to establish and bring to perfection a market economy system.” In discussing the performance of the US economy in specific fields, Chinese authors also often reveal their preference for a market economy system. Guan Li and Liu Ruling attribute the rapid development of the US’s risk investment, among other things, to a consummate market environment. In discussing the US’s IRA and reform of the retirement system in China, Xiao Chen suggests turning the retirement problem over to the society rather than having the government taking care of it, thus moving from a socialist to a more capitalist problem solving approach. Wei Wei remarks with admiration that “the US has a most sophisticated market economy, actually a model market economy, and China should learn from the US in some aspects of its economic system.” Chinese authors’ attribution of US economic prosperity to its capitalist market system also reveal themselves in quite a number of other articles in the sample.

Property rights. One key feature of a socialist economic system is state ownership of the means of production, while one key feature of a capitalist economic system is the private ownership of them. To advocate protection of property rights in China therefore can be regarded as advocating moving away from a socialist approach to a capitalist
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approach. In the limited sample of articles calling for learning from the US, several Chinese authors emphasize the need to respect property rights. One author argues that the industrialization of the US and Japan has been quite successful, and one of the bases of their industrialization is a clearly-defined system of property rights, and it should also be a sine qua non for China.959 Through analysis of the evolution of the US’s banking system and problems in China’s banking system, Ma Hongxia argues that one fundamental problem to be solved is “the reform of property rights in the banking system.”960 Guan Li and Liu Ruling argue that risk investment has made an important contribution to the development of the US economy, and one of the reasons for its success is a sophisticated property rights market.961

Chinese authors’ preference for moving away from the planned economy can also be seen in their discussion of the legal background of the US economic development. Su Ge argues that the development of the US economy took place against the background of a legal system that has been continually perfected and the US’s market economy system is formalized through a national constitution.962 Li Li argues that US economic development does not follow an anarchic pattern. And it is a whole series of laws, including the 77 major laws concerning competition, business ethics, environmental protection, and labor protection that provide order to the development of the US
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The most enthusiastic and thorough discussion of the legal basis of US economic development is Xiao Chen’s article which discusses how the US legal system ensures national economic efficiency. It argues that the checks and balances in the US’s legal system is capable of turning out “an automatic mechanism for efficiency,” and “an automatic mechanism for correcting mistakes.” The US’s social and legal systems encourage each individual to reveal his preferences, generously reward anyone who has made contributions, and encourage productive rather than distributive efforts. The US’s legal system protects cooperation and market competition. And the author regards the market mechanism as the most outstanding achievement of the human race. And the US government has also been designed to ensure efficiency in the function of the government itself and of the society.

Regarding the other trappings of the US economic system, Chinese authors in the sample mention the following as worth learning: business annexation, which Chinese scholars, especially Marxist scholars, regarded as a key feature of capitalism leading to monopoly, investment funds, stock (share) system etc.
6.3.4.3 What not to Learn

In the above discussion, we can see that the overwhelming Chinese preference is to move away from a socialist toward a more market-oriented economic system. This perception, ironically, is also present when Chinese authors argue that in some respects China should not learn from the US.

When they sometimes argue that China should not copy US practice exactly, the reason is usually not because they regard the US practice as unsatisfactory, but because China is not yet in the position to adopt the US model. Regarding, for example, whether China should copy the US’s IRA, one Chinese author laments that China cannot yet adopt this approach because IRA “sets strict requirements on a country’s market environment, financial environment, the quality of tax-payers, and the quality of the public authorities.”971

China’s current social and economic systems have also been mentioned as reasons why China cannot copy US practice exactly, for instance, in the management of state-owned enterprises,972 and in the management of the central bank.973 But in the case of the latter,  
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Chinese authors also point out that US practice is the direction in which China should move: changing China-style direct control into US-style indirect control. Again, China is not yet able to do so only because conditions are not yet ripe.\textsuperscript{974} In another article about commercial banking, the author points out that because all the commercial banks in the US are private, China cannot exactly copy the US pattern. The author however also points out a middle ground for China’s state to manage the economy in a more market-oriented way: through shares owned by the state.\textsuperscript{975} In one article, the author does mention the different economic and political systems in China and the US as a reason why China cannot copy exactly the US approach. But as the author mentions nothing about why China should stick to its own system, it gives an impression that the author just wants to take China’s local conditions into consideration, not because of any merit in China’s existing system itself.\textsuperscript{976}

Some authors point out aspects of the US which China should never copy whatever the change in China’s domestic conditions such as internal exploitation and oppression and foreign aggression, etc.\textsuperscript{977} Here we see remnants of Marxist thinking among some Chinese observers.

\textsuperscript{973} shi, 96-10, 65-68, Li Shujie
\textsuperscript{974} shi, 96-10, 68, Li Shujie
\textsuperscript{975} shi, 95-1, 28, Ma Hongxia
\textsuperscript{976} shi, 96-7, 66, Ye Xiangsong
\textsuperscript{977} wai, 94-3, 63, Su Ge
On the whole, when Chinese authors argue that China should not learn certain US economic practices, they do not reject the US economic system per se. They still regard the US practice as the direction in which China should move. When they mention that China should not learn from the US in some respects, they more often deplore China’s not being in a position to adopt US practice than they reject the US approach for its own sake. Throughout the sample, little evidence can be found for the supposed superiority of the planned economy system, and abundant evidence is available about how China should learn from the US. We may thus conclude that the overwhelming majority of Chinese authors have accepted the arket economy system. Perhaps one reason why Chinese authors have not yet rejected out of hand China’s original economic system is that they prefer incremental change to a shock-therapy approach to bringing about change.

6.3.5 Affective Response to the US’s Economic Performance

In exploring Chinese perceptions of the US economy, one important question is how Chinese observers react to its ups and downs. In other words, do they welcome US economic prosperity or do they resent it?
As can be seen in the section about US economic performance, the profusion of enthusiastic terms in Chinese observers’ description of the great prosperity of US economy demonstrates their significant admiration of the country’s economic vitality. A further question is how they perceive the relevance of US economic performance to the well-being of other countries, including China.

6.3.5.1 The US as a leader

An exploration of relevant materials indicates that the US is perceived as a leader in the world economy. Firstly, the US is seen as a leader in promoting world prosperity. When the US economy does well, other countries benefit.\(^\text{978}\) When the economy of other countries is not doing well, the US is perceived as a leader to play the role of stimulating world economy.\(^\text{979}\) For instance, the US is perceived as having played this role successfully in 1993,\(^\text{980}\) as well as in 1998.\(^\text{981}\) Sometimes, the US is perceived even as an altruistic leader: its increased trade deficit was regarded as an strategy not only to promote US economic expansion but also to promote world economic recovery. In the case of 1993, the US’s greater trade deficit is perceived as having contributed

\[^{978}\] xian, 98-6, 11, Gu Wenyan
\[^{979}\] shi, 93-8, 15, Ke Juhan, Tao Jian, and Gu Wenyan
\[^{980}\] xian, 94-1, 10, Tao Jian, Gu Wenyan, Ke Juhan
\[^{981}\] shi, 00-1, 32, Chen Baosen
significantly to the recovery of the world economy, even at the expense of slowing down its own growth rate by 0.5%.$^{982}$

Secondly, the US is seen as a leader in trade liberalization. Global trade liberalization is perceived to be the US’s persistent objective. One author argues that, in a relatively long time to come, no other country can substitute for the US in this respect. He perceives the US’s trade strategy as “helping to relax the tense atmosphere in international trade, and promoting further trade liberalization.”$^{983}$

Thirdly, the US is seen as a leader in setting the future direction of the world economy. The “new economy” originated in the US in the 1990s and is perceived as representing the direction the rest of the world will follow.$^{984}$ One author cites President Clinton’s speech approvingly: the US’s “New Economy” symbolizes the future direction of world economy, and will have a profound influence on the world economy.$^{985}$ The author points out that the significance of the information revolution can be compared to that of the industrial revolution several hundred years earlier.$^{986}$ It is perceived as being beneficial not only to Western countries but also to developing countries. In the case of China, the US’s new economy is perceived as offering an approach and an opportunity
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$^{984}$ shi, 98-8, 42, Li Bing; guo, 98-3, 45-46, Zeng Bingxi
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$^{986}$ shi, 98-4, 30, Lan Ping
for China to maintain sustained economic growth into the 21st century.\footnote{987}

6.3.5.2 The Relevance of the US’s Economic Prosperity to Other Countries

Consequently, most Chinese authors in the sample having made relevant observations seem to welcome the US’s economic prosperity rather than the otherwise.

When US economy is prosperous, one author points out, it provides the biggest market for the East Asia and other countries in the world.\footnote{988} Another author shares the same opinion: moderate growth in the US economy is “helpful for maintaining the relative stability of the Western and world economy, and the stability of international commodity and capital markets. It is also favorable to China to expand export and promote economic growth.”\footnote{989} The US-Mexico Free Trade Agreement is perceived as quite beneficial to the US economy. Its impact on the world economy is perceived as positive: it will “urge the greater European market to attract participation from developing countries,” and promote cooperation in developed and newly developed countries in the Asia-Pacific region.\footnote{990} Chinese authors perceive increasing interdependence between the US and other countries in the Asia-Pacific region. When
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the US economy is doing well, other countries in the region benefit.\footnote{991}

But when the US economy is not doing well, other countries’ economies also suffer. One author points out that if the US stock market falls, it deals a heavy blow to the East Asian and European markets as well.\footnote{992} Quite a number of authors associate the size of the US trade deficit with the well-being of other countries. It is the US’s huge trade deficit which made the US impose sanctions on other countries, especially countries in the Asia-Pacific region.\footnote{993} Chinese authors do not like the US’s greater protectionism in the 1990s. They point out that the US bargained harder and harder in this respect in the 1990s, not only with developed countries such as Japan, France, Germany etc, but also with developing countries, which they regard as demonstrating a lack of good manners on the part of the US as a sole superpower. They nonetheless contributed such a phenomenon to the great increase of the US’s trade deficit.\footnote{994} Because of the US’s huge trade deficit, developing countries including China suffer as a result.\footnote{995}

The status of the US dollar is also often associated with the well-being of other countries. Chinese authors argue that the relative stability of the US dollar is undoubtedly beneficial to the world economy. One author argues that one reason why

\footnotesize{\begin{itemize}
  \item \footnote{991} xian, 94-1, 10, Tao Jian, Gu Wenyan, Ke Juhan
  \item \footnote{992} xian, 98-6, 11, Gu Wenyan
  \item \footnote{993} xian, 93-7, 9-12, Ke Juhan, Tao Jian, and Gu Wenyan
  \item \footnote{994} shi, 93-10, 8, Ji Wei; shi, 96-1, 51, Li Jun
  \item \footnote{995} shi, 96-1, 51, Li Jun; shi, 96-12, 38, Zhao Lingdi and Hu Yanjing
\end{itemize}}
the world economy was so prosperous in the 1960s was the stable exchange rate
between the US dollar and other major Western currencies, and the successive dollar
crises in the 1970s invariably exerted a negative impact on the world economy. When
the dollar was stable in the 1980s, the world economy registered 8 years of sustained
growth. The author predicts therefore that the dollar crisis in mid-1990s will
undoubtedly depress in world economic growth.\textsuperscript{996} The stability of the US dollar is
associated with the expansion of world trade, since it is the most important currency for
international trade.\textsuperscript{997} Chinese authors argue that the stability of the US dollar is
important not only to developed countries but also to developing countries. If the US
dollar depreciates, developing countries will suffer heavy losses in their foreign
reserves.\textsuperscript{998} The US dollar crisis in the mid-1990s again caused heavy losses to China
because it has heavy debt in Japanese yen. Chinese authors deplored that in 1986-1994
period, whenever there was a dollar depreciation, China suffered losses. varying from
one billion to several billions. The authors expect that the dollar crisis in the mid-1990s
would cost China at least US$ 10 billion.\textsuperscript{999}

On the whole, the overwhelming majority of Chinese authors making relevant
observations welcome economic prosperity in the US, regarding it as beneficial not only

\textsuperscript{996} xian, 94-8, 20, Guo Shixian
\textsuperscript{997} shi, 93-6, 15, Guo Shixian
\textsuperscript{998} xian, 94-8, 21, Guo Shixian
\textsuperscript{999} shi, 95-6, 16-17, Qin Liufang and Guo Shixian
to other countries in the world, but also to China. Some Chinese authors in the sample, however, also perceive the growing importance of Europe in the world economy as a positive development. One author points out that the emergence of the euro might lead to change in international currency system, is favorable to the stability of international currency exchange rates, and may balance the hegemony of US dollar. But he is quick to point out that if the euro can compete with the US dollar, the US “might give up dollar depreciation as an approach to balance its trade deficit, and resort to other approaches. And if the new approaches are strongly protectionist, it might arouse imitation in other countries.” Such a scenario is considered unfavorable to China’s efforts to participate in international economic competition.¹⁰⁰⁰

6.4 Conclusion

To see what conclusion we can draw from the evidence presented above, let us firstly summarize the findings in this chapter. In terms of the Chinese perception of the market economy, evidence presented this chapter indicates that most Chinese scholars have enthusiastically embraced the market economy not only as the main stream of world economic practice, but also as a highly successful approach to economic management. Chinese scholars not only have a positive assessment of the market economy system as

¹⁰⁰⁰ xian, 98-9, 21-22, Zhou Xin
a whole, but they are also quite positive about the sub-level practices of the system. Even though they regard the US economy as not without problems, they seem to agree that most of the problems can be solved within the framework of the system.

As for their assessment of US economic performance, many more articles focus on the US’s economic success than on failures. The US is perceived as not only having achieved sustained growth in the 1990s, but also as being much more competitive than other countries, especially comparable economies in Europe and Japan. The evidence in this chapter represents a sharp departure from the perception before the 1990s, as presented by Shambaugh. It might be significant to point out that during the Reagan administration, the US’s economic success was comparable to that during the Clinton administration in the 1990s. Thus, it is quite likely that the difference between the perception presented by Shambaugh and what is presented in this chapter indicates much more a change in the perceiver (Chinese authors) than a change in the perceived (the US’s economic performance).

Chinese authors attribute the US’s great economic success to both the US’s economic system and to factors not closely related with that system. Some scholars regard the US’s market economy system as having played an important role in the success story, but many more scholars focus on non-system related factors, which include mainly the
US’s great emphasis on science and technology, its effective management of economic relations with other countries, the successful management of US economy by the US government and businesses, and other factors such as peace dividends and Americans’ hard work.

Many Chinese scholars advocate straightforwardly learning from the US in economic management. They do not hesitate to advocate adopting US practices closely related with the capitalist economic system, especially the market, property rights, the legal background of market economy, and other practices such as annexation, stock system etc. Many scholars also advise against proceeding too rapidly in adopting US economic practices. In doing so, however, they usually do not denigrate the US’s economic practices as problematic, but more often deplore that China’s local conditions are not yet ripe for hasty acceptance of the US’s approach.

Chinese scholars on US economy usually welcome US economic prosperity. They have an image of the US as a leader in world economy, playing a vitally important role in promoting world prosperity, economic liberalization, and setting the direction of the future world economy. They agree that when US economy is prosperous, other countries, including China, benefit, and when US economy is in trouble, other countries, including China, suffer.
An exploration of Chinese perceptions of US economy may shed light on China’s foreign policy orientation toward the US. According to the inferential logic spelled out in Tables 6.4 and 6.5, given the evidence presented in this chapter summarized in this section above, we may conclude that economy is quite likely to be a source of cooperation between the US and China and difference in economic system does not constitute a source of conflict between the two countries, and it is quite likely that convergence of China’s economic system on the American model would occur.
CHAPTER 7

CHINESE PERCEPTION OF AMERICAN POLITICS

7.1 Shambaugh’s Presentation of the Chinese Perception of the American Politics

Again, Shambaugh’s presentation of Chinese perceptions of American politics is the only piece in the existing literature which offers a systematic and in-depth analysis of this subject. It is especially admirable because of its extensive coverage of the relevant Chinese literature. As Shambaugh focused on perceptions before the 1990s, the present chapter intends not only to address the subject of China’s foreign policy orientation, but also to build on and update Shambaugh’s presentation. First of all, let me summarize Shambaugh’s findings.\footnote{Shambaugh, 1991, pp. 165-225.}

Shambaugh examines the following facets in the Chinese perceptions of American politics. 1. Marxist perspectives on American politics; 2. non-Marxist perspectives on American politics; 3. nongovernmental actors in the American policy process; and 4. US
electoral politics.

Marxists among China’s America watchers focus mainly on caituans (monopoly financial groups) in the US and how these groups influence government and political life. These Marxists basically argue that political institutions such as the government and political parties in the US serve the interest of monopoly capitalists. “Wall Street rules Washington” is their model of American politics. Each US administration is perceived to come to power because of support from various financial groups and in turn uses its power to serve the interests of its masters.1002

The non-Marxist school is non-ideological in its interpretation of American politics. Depending on the actors covered, this school is further divided into statist and pluralist sub-schools. The statist sub-school studies the executive branch of the US government, including various positions in it, the personal character of leaders in it, the policy-making process, factions and opinion groups in various administrations etc.1003 The pluralist school tend to focus on the Congress, non-governmental actors (think tanks, interest groups, etc.), and the electorate. They are interested in examining the liberal-conservative orientation in American politics, and how a shift from liberalism to conservatism or vice versa affects the US domestic or foreign policy.1004

1002 Shambaugh, 1991, pp. 166-175
1003 Shambaugh, 1991, pp. 176-182
1004 Shambaugh, 1991, pp. 182-199
According to Shambaugh, Nongovernmental actors for the Chinese description include caituans (financial groups), think tanks, interest groups, etc. Shambaugh explores both the Marxist and non-Marxist analysis of these groups, with the Marxist approach focusing on caituans’ connection with other actors (such as political parties, media, schools) thought to be influential in the policy making process, while non-Marxist groups focus on more substantive issues such as the policy orientations of various think tanks, interest groups, etc.\textsuperscript{1005}

With regard to electoral politics, the Marxist school claims that elections are but futile exercises, examples of “sham democracy,” because both parties serve monopoly capitalists. The non-Marxist approach to studying American electoral politics tends to follow the ups and downs of election campaigns and the different platforms of the candidates, voters’ preferences and so on. As time goes by, Chinese authors are seen by Shambaugh as becoming more and more sophisticated in their coverage of political campaigns in the US. By the end of 1980s, very little Marxist commentary appeared in the Chinese press regarding elections in the US.

\textsuperscript{1005} Shambaugh, 1991, pp. 191-199
7.2 Methodology

7.2.1 Sources

This chapter explores Chinese perceptions of American politics by examining all the articles on American politics published in the 1991-2000 decade in the six mainstream Chinese journals on international relations discussed in Chapter 2. Table 7.1 lists the number of articles in each journal on American politics constituting the sample (see Appendix D for the titles of these articles).

\[1006\] As in all the other empirical chapters, the titles of all the source articles in the sample should specifically mention the US or its political leaders.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guo Ji Wen Ti Yan Jiu</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mei Guo Yan Jiu</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shi Jie Jing Ji Yu Zheng Zhi</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wai Jiao Xue Yuan Xue Bao</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xian Dai Guo Ji Guan Xi</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhan Lue yu Guan Li</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1: Number of Articles in Each Journal on American Politics

7.2.2 What to Perceive Regarding American Politics?

In studying Chinese perceptions of American politics, one important question is to decide what facets of these perceptions are the most meaningful for presentation.

Shambaugh’s purpose was to summarize the contents of the extensive relevant Chinese literature, while the main purpose of this chapter is to explore China’s foreign policy orientation through an analysis of the Chinese image of American politics in a limited sample. This chapter therefore has to adopt an approach different from Shambaugh’s.
One approach is to look at the major differences between the US and China in terms of their political systems. These are: 1. democracy vs. non-democracy; and 2. separation of powers among various branches of the US government vs. concentration of power in the hands of the ruling party in China. From the two major differences, we can see that it would be meaningful to explore the Chinese perception of American politics in the following aspects. Firstly, what Chinese scholars’ perceptions of democracy are? As democracy has been almost universally accepted, and China’s traditional reservations regarding Western democracy are that it is not genuine democracy,¹⁰⁰⁷ we can explore whether Chinese scholars in the 1990s still regarded the American democracy as sham democracy.

For this purpose, we can look into the Chinese perception of both the process and the outcome of American democracy. Regarding the process, we can explore how American leaders are elected according to Chinese scholars’ presentations, and as for the outcome, we can explore, in the eye of Chinese observers, what kind of leaders are elected and whose interests the political system serves.

As for the second major difference between the two countries’ political systems, we can examine the checks and balances in the American political system are perceived. In other

¹⁰⁰⁷ see Shambaugh’s presentation
words, does it work well or is it problematic?

Finally, it is important to explore whether the overall perception of American politics as positive or negative, and whether Chinese authors regard it as desirable to learn from the US political system. Table 7.2 lists the aspects of the Chinese perception of American politics this chapter is going to explore.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. What is the Chinese perception of democracy?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. What determines the outcome of elections in the US?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What kind of people emerge victorious in American elections?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Whose interests does the American political system serve?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What is the Chinese perception of checks and balances?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What is the overall Chinese perception of the American political system?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Whether Chinese authors regard it as desirable to learn from the US political system?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2: What to Perceive Regarding American Politics
7.2.3 Inferences

Inferences concerning China’s foreign policy orientation can be made from studying each of the facets of the Chinese perception of American politics listed in Table 7.2, to be presented in Tables 7.3 and 7.4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACETS OF PERCEPTION</th>
<th>IF</th>
<th>INFERENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What is the Chinese perception of democracy?</td>
<td>If Chinese scholars regard democracy as an desirable form of governance, If Chinese scholars regard democracy as a problematic form of governance,</td>
<td>it is less likely that differences in political system would be a source of conflict between the two countries, and convergence of China’s political system on the American model is possible, though not inevitable. it is likely that differences in political system would be a source of conflict between the two countries, and convergence of China’s political system on the American model is unlikely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What determines the outcome of elections in the US?</td>
<td>a: If election outcome is considered to be determined mainly by money, or by the influence of the rich and the powerful, b: If election outcome is considered to be determined mainly by voters’ will,</td>
<td>the US’s political system is perceived to represent mainly a handful of elites rather than the broad masses, and American democracy works more to deceive voters than to serve them. the American political system is considered likely to be a fair one, and American democracy is considered to be genuine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What kind of people emerge victorious in American elections?</td>
<td>If Chinese scholars perceive more negative than positive traits in most major American politicians, If Chinese scholars perceive more positive than negative traits in most major American politicians,</td>
<td>it is more likely that China regards the American political system as unacceptable, or repulsive. it is more likely that they regard the American political system as acceptable, or laudatory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.3: Inferences from the Chinese Perception of American Politics (continued)
Table 7.3: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACETS OF PERCEPTION</th>
<th>IF</th>
<th>INFERENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Whose interests does the American political system serve?</td>
<td>If the American political system is regarded as serving the interests of only a handful of the rich, a ruling class etc,</td>
<td>the system should be regarded as unfair, repressive, and undesirable, and such a system may well be a source of conflict between the perceivers’ state and the target state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the American political system is regarded as serving the interests of most people in the country rather than only of a handful of elite, or ruling class,</td>
<td>the system should be regarded as fair, desirable, and perhaps imitable, and such a system is less likely to become a source of conflict between the perceivers’ state and the target state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What is the Chinese perception of checks and balances in the American political system?</td>
<td>If checks and balances are perceived as working well,</td>
<td>convergence of China’s political system on the American model is likely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If checks and balances are perceived as problematic,</td>
<td>convergence of China’s political system on the American model is unlikely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What is the overall Chinese perception of American politics?</td>
<td>If the overall perception of American politics is positive,</td>
<td>political system is unlikely to be a source of conflict between the two countries and convergence is possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the overall perception of American politics is negative,</td>
<td>political system is likely to be a source of conflict and convergence is unlikely;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Whether Chinese authors regard it as desirable to learn from the US political system?</td>
<td>If Chinese authors argue for learning from the US in political system,</td>
<td>convergence is likely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If Chinese authors argue for not learning from the US in political system,</td>
<td>convergence is unlikely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Perception of the American politics</td>
<td>Negative Perception of the American Politics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese scholars regard democracy as an ideal form of governance</td>
<td>Chinese scholars do not accept democracy as an ideal form of governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election outcome perceived as determined mainly by voters’ will</td>
<td>Election outcome perceived as determined mainly by money or the influence of the rich and powerful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese scholars perceive more positive than negative traits in most major American politicians</td>
<td>Chinese scholars perceive more negative than positive traits in most major American politicians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American political system perceived as serving the interests of people in general</td>
<td>American political system perceived as serving mainly the interests of the elite, the rich, and the ruling class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checks and balances perceived as working well</td>
<td>checks and balances perceived as problematic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall perception of American politics is positive</td>
<td>overall perception of American politics is negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese scholars argue for learning from the US in politics</td>
<td>Chinese scholars argue for not learning from the US in politics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergence of China’s political system toward the American model quite likely, and difference in political system not likely to be a source of conflict between the two countries</td>
<td>Convergence of China’s political system toward the American model not likely, and difference in political system likely to be a source of conflict between the two countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.4: Summary Inferences in the Chinese Perception of American Politics
7.3 Chinese Perceptions of American Politics

7.3.1 Chinese Perceptions of Democracy

In the sample, Chinese authors very seldom make a direct assessment of democracy itself, but when they do so, their assessments are generally positive. Zhou Qi has a highly positive perception of democracy, especially American democracy. He points out that “representative democracy in essence is to recognize that all men are equal and that everyone, regardless of his family background, has the equal right to decide the system of the state, and the management of the state,” which Zhou regards as “a great step forward in human history.”1008 Ji Hong discusses the enhanced status of African Americans, as demonstrated in their increased political participation. She appreciates the fact that democracy provides equal rights even to minorities.1009 And Ren Feng approvingly discusses the idea of a social contract between the government and the people.1010

Interestingly, all the critics of American politics in the sample make positive comments about democracy, and some of the most enthusiastic eulogies of democracy in the

---

1008 mei, 94-4, 57, Zhou Qi
1009 mei, 00-2, 109-142, Ji Hong
1010 xian, 98-2, 45, Ren Feng
sample were actually made by these critics. In one of the most vehement critiques of the American political system in the sample, Huang Zhaoyu acknowledges that “the essence of democratic politics is that everyone enjoys equal political rights, and the state is governed by the people or their representatives, in accordance with people’s will, on the principle of fairness, openness, and justice, and for the interest of the greatest majority of people.” The worst he could say about the American political system is that it is “not perfect.” In a critique of the American political system as sham democracy, Li Zhidong nonetheless agrees that “elections are an important way for people to express their political will, and are the main approach for the realization of democracy.” In an enthusiastic portrayal of Thoreau’s political thought, Thoreau is presented as quite dissatisfied with the existing American political system, but the author also points out that Thoreau “has accepted almost all the basic ideas of modern Western democracy,” such as social contract, popular sovereignty, separation of powers, parliamentary democracy, human rights etc. The author argues that Thoreau’s criticism of the existing system is done “on the basis of general acceptance” of the system itself. It is significant to note that one author in the sample has discussed a most sensitive topic in China: anti-communism in the US, with overall fairness and sometimes even in sympathetic terms. He claims that the reasons why the US is strongly anti-communist include the following: opposing radicalism, safeguarding freedom, democracy, and

1011 xian, 00-12, 21, Huang Zhaoyu
1012 mei, 97-2,120, Li Zhidong
1013 mei, 93-4, 118-128, Ni Feng
individualism, and mistakes by socialist countries such as Soviet expansionism and Stalinist atrocities in domestic politics.\textsuperscript{1014}

Several authors have not hesitated to suggest that democracy represents the right direction of political development. With great interest and admiration, Su Pengfei discusses local autonomy in the city of Berkeley, and how local people elect their leaders and supervise those leaders. Though he points out that the democracy in Berkeley is far from perfect, undoubtedly, he regards democracy as a desirable form of governance.\textsuperscript{1015} Through discussion of the 14th Amendment of the American Constitution, Cui Ziyuan approvingly presents his understanding of the essence of the amendment: “both the local and the central governments should safeguard the basic rights of citizens and should both be democratized.”\textsuperscript{1016} In discussing the historical significance of democratic practice in the US, Zhou Qi claims that the US had “pointed out a bright future for the European people: democracy is irresistible” (italics mine). By citing other Western authors, Zhou Qi demonstrates that the US in developing its representative democracy “won a foothold not only for itself, but also for the whole world,” the American political system really ensures “a government of the people,” and it has set an example for other countries.\textsuperscript{1017}

\textsuperscript{1014} mei, 00-2, pp. 85, 91, 93-94, 107-108, Liu Jianfei
\textsuperscript{1015} mei, 99-3, 81-92, Su Pengfei
\textsuperscript{1016} mei, 97-3, 126, Cui Ziyuan
\textsuperscript{1017} mei, 94-4, 58-59, Zhou Qi
Obviously, Chinese authors have generally accepted democracy as a desirable form of governance. The reason why they often criticize the Western political system is that they often do not regard Western, usually American, democracy as genuine. It was often the case before the 1990s as Shambaugh presented. Was it still the case in the 1990s? To see whether Chinese authors in the 1990s regarded the American democracy as genuine, let us look into their perception of both the process and the outcome of the American democracy.

7.3.2 What Determines the Outcome of US Elections?

Among the 85 articles in the sample on US politics, 47 articles more or less discuss how US leaders are elected. Some articles focus exclusively on this topic, and others provide unambiguous information regarding their position as to the determinants of the election outcome. According to Chinese authors in the sample, the rich and powerful can affect election outcome in the US in three ways. Firstly, top elites can often help increase voters’ support for a candidate and sometimes they can influence a candidate’s inclination to carry on the campaign. Secondly, the rich and powerful could influence election outcome through campaign contributions. Thirdly, the rich enjoy greater voting
convenience than the poor. But materials in the sample also indicate that the extent of top elites’ influence depends largely on whether the top elites themselves are popular among voters, and voting convenience for the rich constitutes only a minor source of injustice. The greatest source of injustice, according to the authors in the sample, comes from the role of money in election campaigns.

Three positions are possible as to the role of money in US elections. First, election outcomes are determined mainly by money. Second, both money and voters’ will play an important role. And thirdly, money plays a limited role in US elections and it is mainly the voters’ will that determines the outcome of US elections. Table 7.5 lists the number of articles among the 47 holding each of the three different positions.
Table 7.5: Articles Holding Different Positions Concerning the Determinants of Election Outcome in the US

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mainly By Money</th>
<th>Mainly By Voters’ Will</th>
<th>By Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Articles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appear In Journals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appear in Years</td>
<td>92, 96, 00.</td>
<td>91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 00.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table, we can see that among the 47 relevant articles, 4 hold that US election outcomes are determined primarily by money, 12 suggest that they are determined by both money and the voters’ will, and the overwhelming 31 articles suggest that they are determined mainly by the voters’ will. The fact that articles holding different positions appear relatively evenly across the 1991-2000 decade in different journals indicates that

\[\text{Table 7.5: Articles Holding Different Positions Concerning the Determinants of Election Outcome in the US}^{1018}\]

\[\text{The 4 articles holding “by money” position are: shi, 92-12, 41-45, Gong Weijing; xian, 00-9, 11-14, Tang Hao; xian, 00-12, 21-25, Guang Zhaoyu; mei, 96-3, 41-62, Zhou Qi. 31 articles holding “by voters” position are: wai, 96-2, 49-53, Fan Ying; wai, 00-3, 57-61, Dong Xiuli; guo, 91-2, 15-20, Pan Tongwen; guo, 93-1, 1-5, Pan Tongwen; guo 95-1, 18-22 Pan Tongwen; shi, 91-1, 60-63, Zhao Shenggang and Lu Qichang; shi, 92-4, 45-47, Zhang Xingping; shi, 96-11, 40-43, Jin Canrong; shi, 97-8, 67-70, Lin Hongyu; shi, 00-7, 43-47, Luo Yunli; xian, 92-4, 15-22, 36, Zhao Shenggan; xian, 94-12, 26-32, Lu Qichang and Zhao Shenggan; xian, 97-5, 17-19, Gao Huandong; xian 97-9, 7-10, Lu Qichang; xian, 98-12, 22-24, Lu Qichang and Zhang Yanyu; xian, 99-1/2, 17-22 Lu Qichang, Fu Mengzi, and Yuan Peng; xian, 99-12, 29-31, Chen Xiangyang; xian, 00-7, 9-13, Lu Qichang; xian, 00-8, 39-41, Lu Qichang; mei, 92-4?, 30-51, Chen Yujun; mei, 92-4?, 52-65, Jiang Jingsong; mei, 93-2, 45-75, Jia Hao; mei, 93-3, 53-76, Jiang Jingsong; mei, 94-4, 55-72, Zhou Qi; mei, 95-1, 7-28, Jin Canrong; mei, 95-1, Fang Xiaoguang; mei, 96-2, 110-132, Zhang Liping; mei, 97-3, 121-136, Cui Zhiyuan; mei, 99-3, 81-92, Su Pengfei; mei, 00-2, 7-30, Jin Canrong; mei, 00-2, 81-108, Liu Jianfei; mei, 00-2, 109-142, Ji Hong. 12 articles holding “by both” position are: wai, 93-2, 68-75, Ren Xiaoping; wai, 93-3, 15-19, Jiang Chengzhong; guo, 00-1, 34-38, Jin Junhui; xian, 92-6, 3-8, Zhao Shenggang; xian 97-9, 7-12, Lu Qichang. mei, 95-1, 111-120, Zhou Qi; mei, 95-1, 145-148, Jin Canrong; mei, 97-2, 105-124, Li Zhidong; mei, 98-3, 71-89, Xiong Zhiyong; xian, 00-6, 40-44, Lu Qichang, Zhang Yanyu; xian, 00-7, 9-13, Lu Qichang; xian, 00-12, 21-25, Guang Zhaoyu.}\]
each of the three positions is not an occasional occurrence by some idiosyncratic authors in a particular journal in a particular time period. Thus with regard to the process of elections in the US, an overwhelming majority of Chinese authors in the 1990s regard the US democracy as genuine democracy, rather than sham democracy as presented by Shambaugh when he described the Chinese perception especially in the early 1980s. In the following, I will briefly discuss each of the three positions concerning the outcome of US elections.

7.3.2.1 Outcome Regarded as Determined Mainly by Money.

Four articles attribute success in American elections mainly to money. As two of them discuss the role of money very briefly, I will discuss the arguments of the other two at some length. One of them actually focuses exclusively on this subject, as is evident from its title: “American Elections on the Basis of US Dollars”. It argues that success in elections requires a huge amount of money, for advertisements, all kinds of propaganda, including “TV series, movies, newspaper space, hiring people to write articles in one’s own favor or against the opponent” etc. More sensationally, money is regarded as occasionally needed in the election process to “hire thugs to disrupt opponents’ conventions,” or even to hire assassins to undermine or to get rid of opponents. On the supply side of the equation, the author points out that monopoly
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1019 mei, 96-3, 58, Zhou Qi; xian, 00-9, 11, 12, 13, Tang Hao
capitalists regard contributions to political candidates as profitable investments, “just as their investments in banks or in other industrial/commercial enterprises.” The mechanism here is that “if you contribute to my campaign, after I am elected, I will work to promote your interests.” To strengthen his argument, the author argues that in most elections in US history, whoever has more campaign funds usually wins the election.

Eight years later another article in a different journal lambasted the US election system through analyzing Campaign 2000\textsuperscript{1021}. It argues that the American election system itself is against democratic principles. Firstly, the election process is such that only 50.7% eligible voters participated in this election. Secondly, the process is complicated and confusing resulting in quite a number of invalid votes, thus “violating some citizens’ voting rights.” Thirdly, the electoral college system might result in the ridiculous consequence of a candidate not winning in an election even though he might have won the popular vote. In addition to the above “flaws” in American democracy, the article argues that the role of money to a great extent corrupts the election. Two instances are mentioned to illustrate the corruption. One natural gas company contributed $500,000 to George W. Bush, and “Bush compensated the company by reducing the limitation on harmful gas emissions.” As one petroleum company was one of Gore’s principal
contributors, “Gore ignored objections from others and gave permission to the company for the use of 21 hectares of state-owned land.”

7.3.2.2 Outcome Regarded as Determined by Both Money and Voters’ Will.

Twelve articles in the sample argue that election outcomes in the US are determined by both money and the will of voters. This position in one article is obvious from the three reasons the author gave for explaining why Clinton had been elected president in 1992. First, Clinton’s platform satisfied voters’ strong desire for change. It explained that US economic growth under President Bush was only 1.3%. Voters were therefore quite dissatisfied with the incumbents, and wished to have a change. Second, Clinton was able to strengthen unity in Democratic Party, and formed a new coalition including AFL-CIO, women, black, lower-middle class, and some conservative white middle class voters. Third, Clinton also won the support of many financial groups (caituans), including Morgan, Boston, Du Pont, Jews, and a number of Rockefeller, and other local caituans in the south, West, and other places. As these caituans wanted to end economic recession, they were quite positive about Clinton’s promises of increasing investments in infrastructure and increasing employment.
If the article mentioned in the above regards the support of voters as somewhat more important than that of the rich, another article regards the support of the rich as somewhat more important than that of ordinary voters.\textsuperscript{1023} It argues that congressmen are indeed elected by winning most voters’ support, but it also points out that it is money that enables them to be elected. They may serve ordinary voters, but more often they serve the rich.

Another article of this genre is about Campaign 2000.\textsuperscript{1024} On the one hand, it cites approvingly Americans’ saying that “money is mother’s milk in politics,” and the quotation of one presidential candidate that “money has distorted the process of American democracy.” On the other hand it points out that American voters are satisfied with the health of the US economy, and voters’ satisfaction has been translated into the advantage for the Democratic candidate, Al Gore. The almost equal importance of money and voters’ will has been dramatically illustrated by author’s conclusion of the two candidates’ approximately equal chance of being elected. Al Gore’s strong point is the strong economy and people’s satisfaction. George W. Bush’s advantage is the support of big companies and the rich.

\textsuperscript{1022} xian, 92-6, 3-8, Zhao Shenggan.
\textsuperscript{1023} wai, 93-3, 15-19, Jiang Chengzhong
\textsuperscript{1024} guo, 00-1, 34-38, Jin Junhui
7.3.2.3 Election Outcome Regarded as Determined Mainly by Voters’ Will

But undoubtedly the overwhelming majority of articles on US politics in the sample suggest that it is mainly the voters’ will that determines the outcome of elections. As can be seen in Table 7.5, of the 47 articles containing information about how US leaders are elected, 31 articles hold this position, as compared with 4 holding the position that it is money which plays a vitally important role in the US elections, and 12 holding the position that both money and voters play an important role. Among the 31 articles holding this position, many do not mention the role of money at all.

These articles suggests that the voters’ will is the most important factor determining the outcome of US elections, and the most effective way of winning elections is to serve the voters well. This includes, most importantly, managing the economy well, but also improving education, health care, crime control, etc. In the majority of articles, not only are the rich not considered important in determining the outcome of election, but the authors in several articles also specifically point out that association with the rich and the powerful not only does not help in winning elections, but it harms the chance of being elected. In discussing the 1990 midterm election in the US, three authors in two articles point out that Republicans did not do well because the party was perceived as serving mainly richmen’s interests.1025 In yet another article on the 1992 presidential election, the author points out that the candidate regarded as serving the interests of the

1025 guo, 91-2, 15-20, Pan Tongwen; shi, 91-1, 60-63, Zhao Shenggan and LuQichang.
rich or as belonging to the powerful is considered unlikely to be elected.\textsuperscript{1026}

7.3.3 What Kinds of People Emerge Victorious in US Elections

In this section, I will explore the descriptions of major American politicians, defined as various presidents and presidential candidates, in the sample.\textsuperscript{1027} Somewhat detailed information about the following politicians are available: 2 articles about Bob Dole,\textsuperscript{1028} 12 about Bill Clinton,\textsuperscript{1029} 3 about George W. Bush,\textsuperscript{1030} 4 about Al Gore,\textsuperscript{1031} and 1 about Bill Bradley.\textsuperscript{1032}

Dole is portrayed as a dull, old man, mediocre in public speaking, and unable to inspire voters’ enthusiasm. But Chinese authors’ perception of Dole is generally more positive than negative, since he is also recognized as having extensive experience in politics, widespread influence and profound political foundation. What is more, according to Chinese authors, Dole is untainted in character, is free from any scandals, and is “one of

\textsuperscript{1026} xian, 92-4, 15-22, 36, Zhao Shenggan.
\textsuperscript{1027} Scant information about other American politicians is available in the sample.
\textsuperscript{1028} shi, 96-6, pp. 23-25; Bi Yunhong; shi, 96-11, pp. 40-43; Jin Canrong.
\textsuperscript{1029} shi, 96-6, pp. 23-25; Bi Yunhong; shi, 96-11, pp. 40-43; Jin Canrong; shi, 00-7, pp. 43-47; Luo Yunli; xian, 92-6, pp. 60-62; Sheng Zhixun; xian, 98-2, p. 45; Ren Feng; mei, 93-2, 45-75, sporadically. mei, 95-1, 7-28, 7-11, 20-23, Jin Canrong; mei, 95-1, 111-120, 118, Zhou Qi; mei, 95-1, 125-126, Fang Xiaoguang; mei, 95-1, 146-147, Jin Canrong; mei, 96-3, 63-84, Zhu Shida; mei, 98-1, 138-140, 139, Jin Canrong
\textsuperscript{1030} xian, 99-8, pp. 33-35, Lu Qichang; guo, 00-1, pp. 34-38; Jin Junhui; xian, 00-7, pp. 9-13; Lu Qichang.
\textsuperscript{1031} xian, 00-8, pp. 39-41; Lu Qichang; guo, 00-1, pp. 34-38; Jin Junhui; xian, 00-7, pp. 9-13; Lu Qichang. mei, 93-2, 45-75, 69, Jia Hao
the very few respectable politicians in US politics." Thus on the whole, Dole is perceived as having mediocre capability but outstanding character.

Clinton is described as the opposite of Dole. He is young and energetic, with good manner and oratory talents. Chinese scholars tend to marvel at Clinton’s remarkable capabilities. As a student, he attended the best schools in the world and excelled there. As a governor, he was not only one of the youngest in the US, but also one of the best. As a politician, he is flexible and pragmatic, and is able to accommodate various groups with competing interests. As a candidate, he is a highly skillful campaigner, and his electoral college votes were way above those of his competitors. As a president, he managed the US economy so well that the US under his administration enjoyed the longest prosperity after the Second World War, and European leader rushed to the US to learn from him. As a humanist, he believes in racial harmony and a just society, is sympathetic to the poor and minorities, and is hugely popular among them. And as a fighter, he has a strong will, and again and again is able to survive the most severe crisis.

Again different from Dole, Clinton is described as heavily involved in scandals, more as a factor affecting his political career than as an unpardonable defect in his character. Not a single Chinese author took advantage of him as an opportunity to revile at the US
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1032 guo, 00-1, pp. 34-38; Jin Junhui.
1033 shi, 96-6, 25, Bí Yunhong. This quotation the author cites is from an American source.
political system for allowing such a scandal-ridden politician to succeed. Instead, they
tended to downplay Clinton as an unfaithful husband, and to focus on him more as a
successful president.

George W. Bush is described as somewhat like the combination of Dole and Clinton.
When he was young, he had Clinton’s character and Dole’s capabilities. At that time, he
liked mischief, indulged in drinking, parties, and girls. And he was engaged in various
jobs with unimpressive records. After he grew older, he seemed to have completely
changed, and to have Dole’s character and Clinton’s capabilities. Now he is a devout
Christian, faithful to his wife and true to his words. He has been one of the most
successful governors in the US, and he is hugely popular among not only elites but also
poor people and especially Hispanic minorities. And he is so popular that he collected
more funding for his presidential campaign than any other politicians in US history.

Al Gore has been described as quite a positive political figure, and his whole career is
somewhat like that of George W. Bush minus Bush’s early years. He has good family
values, and a perfect marriage. He is trustworthy and hardworking. He has great loyalty
and a strong sense of responsibility. He is a perfectionist and strictly follows rules and
regulations. He has had an illustrious career, serving two terms as a US senator, and two
terms as the vice president of the US. Different from other US presidential politicians,
he is also a remarkable scholar, having keen insights for many issues of the new century.
And he has even authored a book of his own on environmental protection. His only
defects are that he lacks the charisma of a great leader, is occasionally dull, and was
involved in a campaign finance scandal.

Bill Bradley is least like a politician in Chinese eyes. In his university days, he was a
nationally famous basketball star. In the US Senate, he was a maverick and often voiced
different opinions. As a politician, he is unskillful in communicating with ordinary
people and lacks understanding of them.

With the exception of Bill Bradley, Chinese perception of all the other US presidential
politicians, either Republican or Democrat, are much more positive than negative, and
sometimes hugely positive. They are not saints with spotless characters and
superhuman capabilities, but they are all admirable political figures. In the case of Bill
Bradley, about whom only one article discusses at some length, on the one hand, he was
not elected as a president, and on the other, he is still described perhaps slightly more
positively than negatively.

One quotation from the sample perhaps may serve as a useful summary of Chinese
scholars’ perceptions of US political system through their descriptions of top American
politicians. “In an election system in which candidates have to face voters directly, we can hardly imagine that a politician with flaws in his character, with no remarkable achievements, and advocating policies against voters’ will, will be nominated or ultimately elected as a governor, a member of the Congress, or a president. It would be even harder to believe that a candidate who is mediocre at his job and corrupt would be re-nominated and re-elected. Looking back at the US’s election history, we may find that those elected, including presidents, may possibly not be the most capable, but in the least their character has been accepted by most voters. Elections provide politicians with an opportunity to demonstrate their outstanding character and excellent capabilities, and elections are also a process for weeding out corrupt politicians.”

7.3.4 Whose Interest the American Political System Serves

In terms of the outcome of elections, another important way to evaluate a political system is to see whose interests it serves. According to Shambaugh’s presentation, in the eye of the Chinese Marxists, the American political system mainly serves the interests of the rich, especially the monopoly capitalists. Is it still the case with the Chinese perception of American politics in the 1990s? Shambaugh mentions that toward the late 1980s, Chinese observers of American politics had become less ideological, but he had not addressed the question of whose interest the American political system
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1034 shi, 94-8, p. 42, Zhang Mingqian
serves according to China’s non-Marxist America watchers. In the following, I will explore how China’s America watchers answered this question in the 1990s.

Chinese answers to this question run the whole spectrum from serving the interests of only the ruling class to serving the interests of mainly ordinary people. At one end of the spectrum is the opinion that the American political system serves only the interest of a handful, the ruling class. One author argues that ostensibly, US presidents represent the interests of the whole nation,1035 but in fact, they represent “the interests of the most powerful capitalist groups,” and the strengthening of presidential power means “the strengthening of the monopoly status of big capitalist groups over the country’s politics and economy.”1036 Another author holds a similar opinion: “in implementing the foreign policy, both the president and the department of state serve the fundamental interests of the ruling class” in the US. Even though different parties and groups have different interests, “they also share common interest, i.e. the overall interest of the ruling class.”1037

Moving away from this extreme position, many more authors argue that even though the American political system serves the interests especially of the rich, or the ruling class, it also has not completely ignored the interests of ordinary people. In an article about

1035  mei, 92-3, 109, Yuan Ruijun
1036  mei, 92-3, 115, Yuan Ruijun
the US upper class, the author argues that it is the small group of people who actually control the power of the state, and “their family members automatically belong to the pool from which the elite of the state are selected.” But the author also points out that oftentimes what is beneficial for big businesses will also be beneficial for the state, and in turn even poor people will benefit from the policy serving the interests of the rich.\textsuperscript{1038}

In another article about the US Congress, the author argues that Congress men and women indeed work hard to serve the interest and wishes of voters, but as a matter of fact, Congress members more often serve the interest and wishes of the rich, and it is the rich that “enjoy the decisive say” in this system.\textsuperscript{1039} Several other authors share the opinion that the US political system serves the interests more of the rich than of the poor.\textsuperscript{1040} And the rich and interest groups have disproportionate influence in this system.\textsuperscript{1041}

Moving further away from the above position, some authors are of the view that the US political system serves the interests of both the rich and the poor, with the Republicans more inclined to serving the interests of the rich and Democrats more sensitive to those of the poor.\textsuperscript{1042}

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1037} wai, 92-1, 65-66, Su Ge
  \item \textsuperscript{1038} mei, 96-3, 51, 53,59, Zhou Qi
  \item \textsuperscript{1039} wai, 93-3, 17-19, Jiang Chengzhong
  \item \textsuperscript{1040} mei, 95-1, Fang Xiaoguang; xian, 00-12, 21-25, Guang Zhaoyu; shi, 91-1, pp. 60-63, Zhao Shenggan and Lu Qichang; shi, 92-12, pp. 41-45, Gong Weijing; wai, 91-2, 44, Tang Xiao
  \item \textsuperscript{1041} xian, 97-9, pp. 7-12, Lu Qichang
  \item \textsuperscript{1042} guo, 00-1, pp. 34-38, Jin Junhui; wai, 96-2, 49-53, Fan Ying
\end{itemize}
In the sample of 85 articles, with the exception of 13,\textsuperscript{1043} most articles have provided information relevant to the question of whose interests the US political system serves. Quite a number of authors present an image that the US’s political system serves the interests of the US as a whole. One article argues that the goal of the US’s Founding Fathers in designing the political system was to promote democracy in the country and prevent the monopoly of power by any particular group.\textsuperscript{1044} In an article comparing the platforms of George W. Bush and Al Gore, the author argues that both of them aim at maintaining economic prosperity, promoting education and high technology, enhancing the US’s CNP, and strengthening national security.\textsuperscript{1045} In yet another article about Clinton’s victory in the 1992 presidential election, the author points out that domestically Clinton would focus on solving economic problems, and in foreign policy, he would try to promote the US’s leadership role and American values in the world.\textsuperscript{1046} Quite a number of other articles take the similar position that the US political system serves the interests of the US as a whole.\textsuperscript{1047}

\textsuperscript{1043} mei, 92-4, 7-29; mei, 94-4, 39-53, Zhu Shida; mei, 95-1, 106-110, Yang Dazhou; mei, 95-1, 121-124, Jin Junhui; mei, 96-2, 40-58, Zhao Lin; mei, 96-4, 128-134, Yang Jiemian; mei, 97-2, 105-124, Li Zhidong; mei, 00-2, 81-108, Liu Jianfei; mei, 00-3, 114-131, Bai Xuefeng; xian, 94-10, pp. 29-32, Lu Qichang; shi, 97-5, pp. 40-44, 60, Song Shiming; shi, 97-8, 67-70, Lin Hongyu; wai, 93-2, pp. 68-75, Ren Xiaoping.

\textsuperscript{1044} mei, 93-3, 57-58, Jiang Jingsong

\textsuperscript{1045} xian, 00-10, 26-28, Lu Qichang

\textsuperscript{1046} guo, 93-1, 4-5, Pan Tongwen

\textsuperscript{1047} mei, 95-3, 67-89, Xiao Chen; xian, 92-6, pp. 3-8, Zhao Shenggang; xian, 92-6, pp. 60-62, Sheng Zhixun; xian, 93-2, pp. 15-17, Ding Kuisong and Sheng Zhixun; xian, 93-4, pp. 6-11, Zhao Shenggang; xian, 93-7, pp. 37-41, Peng Yan; xian, 93-8, pp. 20-23, 19, Qian Chunyuan, Lu Qichang, and Tao Jian; xian, 99-12, 29-31, Chen Xiangyang; xian, 00-6, 40-44, Lu Qichang, Zhang Yanyu; wai, 92-4, pp. 29-31, Liu Wenzhong.
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In a similar vein, several articles present the image that the American political system is to serve the interests of the American people. Su Pengfei explains with great admiration how the system of local autonomy in the US makes sure that local governments closely follow the wishes of local residents.\textsuperscript{1048} Zhang Minqian argues that the US political system is such that corruption is very difficult and government officials are more likely to be public servants than overlords.\textsuperscript{1049} Cui Zhiyuan, Ren Feng, Lu Qichang, etc take a similar position.\textsuperscript{1050}

For the greatest number of articles, the American political system is seen as serving the interests of voters. According to Zhou Qi, popular sovereignty is the guiding principle of the US as a state, and it is voters who are the masters of the state.\textsuperscript{1051} Wang Guang demonstrates that voters’ wishes as revealed in the 1994 mid-term election forced Clinton to adopt some of the conservative policies of the republican party, while at the same time attend to “the wishes of the Union, the poor, minorities, and women.”\textsuperscript{1052} Bi Yunhong claims that politicians care a lot about messages from voters, which made Clinton more conservative regarding welfare, abortion, the size of the government, etc.

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{1048} mei, 99-3, 81-92, Su Pengfei
\textsuperscript{1049} shi, 94-8, 38-43, 32, Zhang Minqian
\textsuperscript{1051} mei, 94-4, 55-72, Zhou Qi
\textsuperscript{1052} xian, 97-1, 10-11, Wang Guang
and also made Dole accept some Republican conservatives’ opinions, and at the same
time become more moderate regarding abortion. Articles by Jiang Jingsong, Zhou Qi,
Lu Qichang, Zhang Xingping etc can be classified under this category.

Chinese authors notice that the American political system not only serves the interests
of the majority of people, it is also careful in protecting the interests of minorities,
especially women and blacks. Thinkers such as Thoreau and Hayek who
emphasize the importance of individualism consolidate the belief that in the US political
system, everyone’s interests will be respected and protected. Some authors present
an image that the US political system more often serves the interests of the poor and
ordinary people than of the rich and privileged.

1053 shi, 96-6, 24, Bi Yunhong
1054 mei, 92-4?, 30-51, Chen Yujun -- A Taiwanese; mei, 92-4?, 52-65, Jiang Jingsong; mei, 93-2, 45-75, Jia Hao; mei, 95-1, 7-28, Jin Canrong; mei, 95-1, 111-120, Zhou Qi; mei, 95-1, 145-148, Jin Canrong; mei, 98-1, 138-140, Jin Canrong; xian, 94-2, pp. 2-5, Lu Qichang, Zhao Shenggang, and Tang Leilei; xian, 94-12, pp. 26-32, Lu Qichang and Zhao Shenggang; xian, 96-10, pp. 10-13, Lu Qichang; xian, 97-2, pp. 2-5, Lu Qichang; xian, 97-5, 17-19, Gao Huandong; xian, 98-2, pp. 2-5, Shi Ren; xian, 98-12, pp. 22-24, Lu Qichang and Zhang Yanyu; xian, 00-1/2, pp. 34-38, Lu Qichang; xian, 00-7, 9-13, Lu Qichang; xian, 00-8, 39-41, Lu Qichang; guo, 91-2, pp. 15-20, Pan Tongwen (Republicans for rich voters); guo, 95-1, pp. 18-22, Pan Tongwen; shi, 92-4, pp. 45-47, Zhang Xingping; shi, 96-11, pp. 40-43, 12, Jin Canrong; shi, 98-4, pp. 73-76, Jiang Xinxue; wai, 00-3, 57-61, Dong Xiuli.
1056 mei, 96-2, 110-132, Zhang Liping; mei, 96-2, 109-142, Ji Hong
1057 mei, 93-4, 107-128, Ni Feng; Mei, 96-1, 7-35, Zhong Wenfan
1058 guo, 93-4, pp. 8-11, Pan Tongwen; shi, 93-3, pp. 57-60, Wen Yan.
As discussed in the above, regarding the question of whose interest the US’s political system serves, Chinese authors have given a wide variety of answers. But what is the dominant perception? Table 7.6 lists the number of articles holding each of the positions discussed in the above.
Position: Serving Whose Interest? | Number of Articles
---|---
1. US as a whole | 14
2. Voters | 26
3. American People | 9
4. more for ordinary people than for the rich | 2
5. respecting women’s interest | 2
6. respecting black’s interest | 2
7. individuals | 2
8. Republicans more for the rich and Democrats more for the poor | 2
9. more for the rich than for the poor | 4
10. people, but cannot violate the interest of the ruling class | 1
11. interest groups including foreign interest groups | 3
12. voters, but money and interest groups have disproportionate influence: | 1
13. ruling class but in turn the people | 1
14. voters but especially the rich | 1
15. big businesses | 1
16. ruling class | 1
17. committee members or the whole Congress | 1
18. Not Coded | 13

Table 7.6: Whose Interest the American Political System Serves?
As the coding has been done inductively, following no strict coding scheme, some categories in Table 7.6 are similar to one another. Generally speaking, Rows 1 through 8 can be regarded as falling into Group I: the American political system serving the interests of the American people as a whole, rich and poor included, some times more for the ordinary people than for the rich; Rows 9 through 14 as Group II: serving more the interests of the rich than the poor; and Rows 15 and 16 as Group III: serving only the interests of the rich. The article in Row 17 discusses the operation of the US Congress. It is unique in that it does answer the central question of this section: serving either committee members or the whole Congress, but it does not address the question of serving the interest of the people vs. the rich. Row 18 refers to articles which do not contain information relevant to the central question of this section. To see Chinese authors’ dominant perception of the US’s political system, we should therefore compare Group I with Groups II and III. As Group I has 57 articles, while Groups II and III combined have only 13 articles, we may conclude that the dominant perception among Chinese authors is that the American political system mainly serves the interests of the American people as a whole rather than that of only the rich and privileged.
7.3.5 Checks and Balances in the American Political System

The second of the two major differences between the US’s political system and China’s is the division of powers in the American political system and the concentration of power in the hands of the ruling party in China. Just as one Chinese author puts it, “the principle of checks and balances is the most important feature of the American political system.”\(^{1059}\) It therefore would be desirable to study how Chinese authors perceive this feature in the American political system.

Chinese observers notice the checks and balances among the different branches of the American government. They find out that, unlike the political system in China, the Congress in the US has substantial power, not only in domestic affairs but also in foreign affairs.\(^{1060}\) Most relevant articles in the sample offer information about the checks and balances between the executive and the legislative branches,\(^{1061}\) but occasionally some authors also discuss the role of checks and balances by the judicial branch.\(^{1062}\) They often point out that the system of checks and balances seems to tie the
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\(^{1059}\) mei, 92-3, 113, Yuan Ruijun

\(^{1060}\) mei, 98-3, 71-89, Xiong Zhiyong; xian, 00-7, 12-13, Lu Qichang

\(^{1061}\) mei, 95-1, 106-109, Yang Dazhou; mei, 95-1, 147-148, Jin Canrong; mei, 96-2, 111-113, Zhang Liping; shi, 91-1, 63, Zhao Shenggang, Lu Qichang

\(^{1062}\) mei, 97-3, 121-136, Cui Zhiyuan; shi, 94-8, 38-43, 32, Zhang Minqian
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hands of government leaders, \(^{1063}\) making decision making quite difficult, \(^{1064}\) sometimes even impossible. \(^{1065}\)

As for the overall assessment of the US checks and balances system, Chinese authors point out that this system has both merits and defects. Quite a few authors argue that checks and balances induce more moderate policies by the government. Gao Huandong points out that the pattern of divided government reflects the American people’s preference for moderate policies against radical political changes. \(^{1066}\) Lu Qichang etc mention that though President Clinton is a Democrat, he takes care to move away from the Democratic Party’s traditional liberal policies and accept many Republicans’ policies regarding tax reduction, abortion, welfare, etc. \(^{1067}\) Jin Canrong notices that Clinton after 1995 was more receptive to some Republicans’ policies that were popular among the people, and as a result, the policies of the two parties have converged. \(^{1068}\) Pan Tongwen explains that Clinton made concessions to the Republicans mainly because the Republicans had become the majority party in Congress. \(^{1069}\)

\(^{1063}\) mei, 98-1, 139, Jin Canrong

\(^{1064}\) xian, 94-2, 2-3, Lu Qichang, Zhao Shenggang, and Tang Leilei; xian, 94-10, 30-32, Lu Qichang; xian, 94-12, 26-32, Lu Qichang, Zhao Shenggang; xian, 98-2, 2, Shi Ren; shi, 96-6, 24, Bi Yunhong

\(^{1065}\) xian, 98-2, 3, Shi Ren

\(^{1066}\) xian, 97-5, 17, Gao Huandong

\(^{1067}\) xian, 98-6, 12, Lu Qichang; xian, 00-1/2, 34, Lu Qichang; xian, 94-12, 30, Lu Qichang, Zhao Shenggan

\(^{1068}\) mei, 98-1, 139, Jin Canrong
Another perceived advantage of the checks and balances system is that it provides opportunities for more people to be involved in the decision making process. In the case of the establishment of US-China diplomatic relations, because of a law-suit by Senator Goldwater etc, all the three branches of the government were involved in the decision making.\footnote{1070} A more salient case is the passage of the China PNTR, which drew into the process not only the executive and legislative branches, but also an unprecedented number of interest groups across the nation, resulting in a final decision reflecting the wishes of the nation as a whole.\footnote{1071} Because of checks and balances, the US government is forced to be more attentive to people’s preferences. Several scholars point out that as a result of the growing influence of the Republicans in Congress, Clinton had to improve the image of the Democratic Party, and consolidate its support among workers, the blacks and women.\footnote{1072} Clinton’s greater efforts to cooperate with the Republicans after the 1994 mid-term election were also perceived as catering to voters’ wishes.\footnote{1073}

Most importantly, however, checks and balances is perceived as enhancing the quality of decision making. The main mechanism is that the Congress’ supervision helps avoid mistakes.\footnote{1074} The Congress is perceived as helping to “sharpen the decision makers’ thinking,” so that they consider things more thoroughly, and more comprehensively.

\footnote{1069} guo, 95-1, 20-21, Pan Tongwen \footnote{1070} wai, 92-1, 61-67, Su Ge \footnote{1071} xian, 00-6, 40-44, Lu Qichang, Zhang Yanyu \footnote{1072} xian, 94-2, 4, Lu Qichang, Zhao Shenggang, and Tang Leilei \footnote{1073} xian, 94-12, 26-32, Lu Qichang, Zhao Shenggang; mei, 95-1, 120-121, Zhou Qi
When the same party controls both the White House and the Congress, the executive branch’s decision making is less careful.\textsuperscript{1075}

Chinese authors also notice that checks and balances system has serious problems. It seems to be strong in obstruction and weak in construction.\textsuperscript{1076} The biggest problem is that it affects government efficiency in that it makes it very difficult to reach decisions and to implement policies.\textsuperscript{1077} One Chinese author basically regards the checks and balances system as a failure, complaining that the Congress in the US is so powerful and the checks and balances system so problematic that the US government has almost lost the ability to make decisions.\textsuperscript{1078} The worst example of this inefficiency is government shutdown,\textsuperscript{1079} which in mid-1990s lasted almost one month, and at one time 1.05 million federal employees were unable to go to work.\textsuperscript{1080} Too much checking and balancing is also perceived as making it difficult to fill numerous important government positions in time for the normal operation of the government.\textsuperscript{1081}

But most Chinese scholars in the sample seem to regard the checks and balances system in much more positive than negative light. They point out that “the US political system
has its internal mechanism and rigor to maintain its vitality” and, unlike the pessimistic view mentioned in the last paragraph, they do not think that checks and balances cause serious efficiency problems for the government.\footnote{1081} One author points out that the executive branch has a lot of ways to bypass the problem of inefficiency. One way is for the president to resort to executive orders rather than going to the Congress for a law.\footnote{1083} The presidential staff system is also considered an effective way of enhancing the efficiency of the government, since the staff is responsible only to the president and is beyond the Congress’ supervision.\footnote{1084} Though the Congress tried very hard to seize the war-making power, the president can almost always succeed in launching a war when he deems it necessary.\footnote{1085}

Besides, Chinese authors point out that as the two parties in the US, or the executive and the legislative branches, have basically similar interests, and their policy platforms are not much different from each other. They therefore often have a strong incentive to cooperate so that checks and balances, though real, do not seriously affect government efficiency.\footnote{1086} Pressure from voters also forces leaders from different branches of the

\footnote{1081} xian, 93-8, 20-21, Qian Chunyuan, Lu Qichang, and Tao Jian
\footnote{1082} mei, 95-1, 120-121, Zhou Qi
\footnote{1083} xian, 00-1/2, 35, Lu Qichang
\footnote{1084} mei, 92-3, 111-112, Yuan Ruijun
\footnote{1085} mei, 92-4, 7-29, Yang Jian
\footnote{1086} wai, 93-3, 18, 19, Jiang Chengzhong; xian, 93-4, 10-11, Zhao Shenggang; xian, 97-5, 18, Gao Huandong; xian, 97-2, 4-5, Lu Qichang
government to keep checks and balances itself from getting out of control.1087

As a matter of fact, some Chinese authors actually perceives real efficiency in the checks and balances system. One especially enthusiastic admirer of the American political system argues that checks and balances are actually the “automatic mechanism of efficiency,” since it makes it very difficult for a bad idea to become a policy or law,1088 which he regards as real efficiency because a wrong policy would be much more costly than slow decision making.1089 He also argues that when it comes to vital national interests, checks and balances almost never prevent the US government from making remarkably wise decisions, such as Louisiana purchase, the Monroe Doctrine, etc, all of which have brought unbelievably huge benefits to the American people.1090 Checks and balances are also perceived to prevent lazy, corrupt or incompetent officials from getting into important positions,1091 which again is socially efficient. What is more, checks and balances are regarded as helpful in promoting the political stability and preventing the misuse of power.1092 Moreover, political stability is probably the greatest efficiency for the country.1093

1087 xian, 98-6, 14, Lu Qichang
1088 mei, 95-3, 70, Xiao Chen
1089 mei, 95-3, 70-71, Xiao Chen
1090 mei, 95-3, 70-71, Xiao Chen
1091 mei, 95-3, 84, Xiao Chen
1092 mei, 00-3, 114-131, Bai Xuefeng
1093 shi, 94-8, 40, Zhang Minqian
Thus, on the whole, the dominant Chinese perception of the system of checks and balances in the American political system is more positive than negative. It is perceived as having several major advantages, such as inducing moderate policies, making decision makers more sensitive to people’s interests, and improving the quality of decision making. Its only major perceived defect is lack of efficiency, but many Chinese authors either regard the American political system as vigorous enough to keep this problem under control, or regard checks and balances as actually increasing rather than reducing efficiency.

7.3.6 Overall Perception of American Politics and Whether to Learn from the US

7.3.6.1 Whether China Should Learn From the US

Unlike articles on Chinese perceptions of the American economy, only two articles specifically argue for learning from the US in political system terms. One of them is about the 14th Amendment of the US Constitution. With great admiration, the author discusses three theoretical problems regarding the 14th Amendment: 1. federal government vs. state government; 2. judicial review vs. democracy; 3. due process vs. equal protection. The author argues that the US experience provides useful lessons for

---

1094 mei, 97-3, 121-136, Cui Zhiuan
China’s constitutional reform. The fact that the author actually is a Chinese professor teaching in MIT reduces the representativeness of this article in reflecting the Chinese perception, even though the fact that it appears after all in one of China’s most authoritative journals does indicates some acceptance by the Chinese scholars of the views expressed therein. Another article, however, is a highly positive evaluation of the US political system.1095 The author seems to almost completely accept the US’s political system since he argues that checks and balances among the three branches of the government, legal supervision, election and media supervision, and reward and punishment in the government system all inhibit corruption and the misuse of power, which in turn ensure economic prosperity for the US.1096 And the author straightforwardly argues for learning from the US in terms of political system.

In quite a few other articles, Chinese authors’ inclination in doing so is obvious in spite of the fact that they make no specific appeal in this regard.1097 To see whether there will be convergence in China’s political system toward the American pattern, an exploration of Chinese scholars’ overall perception of the American politics as positive or otherwise can also be revealing.

---

1095 shi, 94-8, 38-43, 32, Zhang Minqian
1096 shi, 94-8, 38-43, 32, Zhang Minqian
1097 Examples include the following: mei, 00-3, 114-131, Bai Xuefeng; xian, 98-12, pp. 2-5, Ou Bingmei; mei, 95-3, 127-132, Huan Yahong; mei, 93-4, 107-128, Ni Feng
7.3.6.2 Overall Perceptions of the American Political System

Finally therefore, let us look at the overall picture of American politics in the sample. Table 7.7 lists the number of articles presenting a positive, neutral, or negative image of American politics. An article is coded positive when it mainly conveys an image of American politics as fair, efficient, serving people’s interests or wishes, promoting economic development and social stability, making progress in the above direction, and American political figures as capable, honorable, and moderate. An article is coded negative when it conveys an image of American politics opposite to those mentioned in the above. And when it is difficult to decide whether an article should be coded as positive or negative, it is coded as neutral.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive/Negative Ratio</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mei Guo Yan Jiu</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17/5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xian Dai Guo Ji Guan Xi</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19/4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guo Ji Wen Ti Yan Jiu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shi Jie Jing Ji yu Zheng Zhi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wai Jiao Xue Yuan Xue Bao</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3/1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhan Lue yu Guan Li</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>45/16</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.7: Number of Articles in Each Journal Conveying a Positive, Neutral, or Negative Image of American Politics
The articles of each category are listed in the footnote. From the above table, it is clear that the overall Chinese perception of American politics is quite positive. Among the five journals having articles on American politics, three journals published many more positive articles than negative ones (Mei Guo Yan Jiu, Xian Dai Guo Ji Guan Xi, and Wai Jiao Xue Yuan Xue Bao). In the other two journals, there are equal number of positive and negative articles, but these two journals published far fewer articles on

1098 **Positive**: mei, 92-4, 30-51, Chen Yujun (A Taiwanese); mei, 92-4, 52-65, Jiang Jingsong; mei, 93-4, 107-128, Ni Feng; mei, 94-4, 39-53, Zhu Shida; mei, 94-4, 55-72, Zhou Qi; mei, 95-1, 111-120, Zhou Qi; mei, 95-3, 31-47, Wang Enmin; mei, 95-3, 67-89, Xiao Chen; mei, 95-3, 127-132, Huan Yahong; mei, 95-3, 133-136, Zhang Ye; mei, 96-2, 110-132, Zhang Liping; mei, 97-2, 105-124, Li Zhidong; mei, 97-3, 121-136, Cui Zhiyuan; mei, 98-1, 138-140, Jin Canrong; mei, 99-3, 81-92, Su Pengfei; mei, 00-2, 109-142, Ji Hong; mei, 00-3, 114-131, Bai Xuefeng; xian, 92-6, pp. 3-8, Zhao Shenggang; xian, 92-6, pp. 60-62, Sheng Zhixun; xian, 93-2, pp. 15-17, Ding Kuisong and Sheng Zhixun; xian, 93-4, pp. 6-11, Zhao Shenggang; xian, 94-2, pp. 2-5, Lu Qichang, Zhao Shenggang, and Tang Leilei; xian, 96-10, pp. 10-13, Lu Qichang; xian, 97-2, pp. 2-5, Lu Qichang; xian, 97-5, 17-19, Gao Huandong; Xian, 98-2, p. 45, Ren Feng; xian, 98-6, pp. 12-15, Lu Qichang; xian, 98-12, pp. 2-5, Ou Bingmei; xian, 98-12, pp. 22-24, Lu Qichang and Zhang Yanyu; xian, 99-8, pp. 33-35, Lu Qichang; xian, 00-1, pp. 34-38, Lu Qichang; xian, 00-6, 40-44, Lu Qichang, Zhang Yanyu; xian, 00-7, 9-13, Lu Qichang; xian, 00-8, 39-41, Lu Qichang; xian, 00-10, 26-29, Lu Qichang; xian, 00-12, 21-25, Guang Zhaoyu; guo, 93-1, pp. 1-5, Pan Tongwen; guo, 93-4, pp. 8-11, Pan Tongwen; shi, 93-3, pp. 57-60, Wen Yan; shi, 94-8, pp. 38-43, 32, Zhang Minqian; shi, 96-11, pp. 40-43, 12, Jin Canrong; shi, 98-4, pp. 73-76, Jiang Xinxue; wai, 91-2, pp. 40-53, Tang Xiao; wai, 92-1, pp. 61-67, Su Ge; wai, 93-3, pp. 15-19, Jiang Chengzhong; 

**Neutral**: mei, 92-3, 97-117, Yuan Ruijun; mei, 92-4, 7-29; mei, 93-2, 45-75, Jia Hao; mei, 95-1, 7-28, Jin Canrong; mei, 95-1, 106-110, Yang Dazhou; mei, 96-1, 7-35, Zhong Wenfan; mei, 96-3, 41-62, Zhou Qi; mei, 96-3, 63-84, Zhu Shida; mei, 98-3, 71-89, Xiong Zhiyong; mei, 00-2, 81-108, Liu Jianfei; mei, 93-8, pp. 20-23, 19, Qian Chunyuan, Lu Qichang, and Tao Jian; xian, 93-7, pp. 37-41, Peng Yan; xian, 94-12, pp. 26-32, Lu Qichang and Zhao Shenggang; xian, 97-9, pp. 7-12, Lu Qichang; xian, 99-1/2, pp. 17-22, Lu Qichang, Fu Mengzhi, and Yuan Peng; xian, 99-12, 29-31, Chen Xiangyang; xian, 00-9, 11-14, Tang Hao; guo, 00-1, pp. 34-38, Jin Junhui; shi, 92-4, pp. 45-47, Zhang Xingping; shi, 97-8, 67-70, Lin Hongyu; wai, 92-4, pp. 29-31, Liu Wenzhong; wai, 93-2, pp. 68-75, Ren Xiaoping; wai, 95-4, pp. 50-53, Qin Yaqing; wai, 00-3, 57-61, Dong Xiuli.

**Negative**: mei, 93-3, 53-76, Jiang Jingsong; mei, 95-1, 121-124, Jin Junhui; mei, 95-1, Fang Xiaoguang; mei, 95-1, 145-148, Jin Canrong; mei, 96-2, 40-58, Zhao Lin; xian, 92-4, pp. 15-22, 36, Zhao Shenggang; xian, 94-10, pp. 29-32, Lu Qichang; xian, 97-1, pp. 6-12, Wang Guang; xian, 98-2, pp. 2-5, Shi Ren; guo, 91-2, pp. 15-20, Pan Tongwen; guo, 95-1, pp. 18-22, Pan Tongwen; shi, 91-1, pp. 60-63, Zhao Shenggan and Lu Qichang; shi, 92-12, pp. 41-45, Gong Weijing; xin, 96-6, pp. 23-25, Bi Yunhong; shi, 97-5, pp. 40-44, 60, Song Shiming; wai, 96-2, 49-53, Fan Ying.
American politics than the other three, especially Mei Guo Yan Jiu and Xian Dai Guo Ji Guan Xi. Overall, there are almost three times as many positive articles as negative ones. It is quite likely that a different coder may code these articles somewhat differently, but, because of the large gap between the two categories, the conclusion will remain the same that in the authoritative Chinese journals, there are many more positive articles on American politics than negative ones.

7.4 Conclusion

What conclusions can be drawn from the evidence presented in this Chapter? Let us first of all summarize the findings. Regarding the Chinese perception of democracy, evidence presented in Section 7.3.1 indicates that Chinese scholars have generally accepted democracy as an laudable form of governance, representing the right direction in human political development. Some observers enthusiastically embrace democracy, regarding it as inevitable, while others, though with some reservations as to actual practices of

---

1099 I wish to mention a few points as a caveat. 1. In this chapter, I have not explored every aspect of the Chinese perception of the American politics. It is possible that other scholars looking at different aspects present in the source materials may see something not consistent with the overall image presented in this chapter (for instance, trying to use the same source materials to address the question of “whether American people are satisfied with their government?”). 2. The inferential logic spelled out in Tables 7.3 and 7.4 should be regarded as suggesting likelihood rather than law-like relationship. For instance, positive descriptions of a certain Chinese leader in American media does not mean that American authors accept China’s political system. 3. In coding articles as positive or negative, I focus only on the performance of the American political system itself. It is possible that an article would be coded as positive even though it at the same time conveys an image of the US threatening China’s interests, so long as the article presents an image of the American political system as working well. In spite of the above reservations, the conclusion of this chapter is still valid, since it is quite limited.
democracy, have nonetheless accepted its basic ideas.

As for whether democracy in the US is genuine or not, this chapter has explored the Chinese understanding of how American leaders are elected, what kind of politicians emerge victorious in the American political system, and whose interests the American political system serves. Chinese scholars agree that money does play an important role in American politics, but their dominant perception is that it is mainly the voters’ will that ultimately determines the outcome of elections in the US. Chinese scholars on the whole have a much more favorable than unfavorable image of political leaders elected in the US, regarding them as quite capable in managing the country, and their character is acceptable to most voters. According to some Chinese authors, the US’s political system serves the interest of the ruling class, but most Chinese scholars agree that this system serves the American people as a whole, rich and poor included.

As for the efficiency of the American political system, i.e. the mechanism of checks and balances, though some scholars regard it as too inefficient in decision making, but more of them perceive many more advantages than disadvantages in the system, including inducing moderate policies, encouraging greater participation of various groups in the society, and improving the quality of decision-making. Some scholars even perceive real efficiency in the checks and balances system.
There are many more positive than negative articles in the sample regarding the overall perception of the American political system. Though only a few articles specifically argue for learning from the US in terms of the political system, quite a few implicitly endorse the idea, and the overall positive presentation of the American political system suggest that Chinese authors have again, as in the early 20th century, assumed the position that the American political system has offered a viable model for China to emulate.

As mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, the purpose in exploring Chinese perceptions of the American political system is to understand China’s foreign policy orientation regarding the US. According to the inferential logic spelled out in Table 7.3 and 7.4, we can conclude therefore that it is quite likely that China’s political system will converge toward the American model, and in the Chinese eye, difference in political system between the US and China does not constitute a source of conflict between the two countries. But the rarity of instances in the sample arguing specifically for the Chinese learning from the US in political system indicates that the process of convergence may not be quick.
CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

We are now in a position to draw together the findings in various chapters and address the fundamental research question of this dissertation: what is China’s motivation vis-a-vis the US. As discussed in Chapter 2, a state formulates its policy toward another state mainly on the basis of two considerations. One is the consideration of national interest, and the other is the consideration of the character of the target state. Interest is usually the more important consideration. When substantial interest is involved, a state is willing to do business with another state even though it might find the character of the target state repulsive. The US-USSR alliance during the Second World War is a case in point. And a state often would not have much problem supporting a regime led by a “son of a bitch” so long as he is “our son of a bitch.” But when no substantial interest is involved, the character of the target state would be the paramount consideration in a state’s formulation of the policy regarding a target state.
To explore China’s foreign policy motivation regarding the US therefore, this
dissertation is essentially divided into two parts. The first part, consisting of Chapters
3, 4 and 5, explores the interest involved in the formulation of China’s policy toward the
US. And the second part, consisting of Chapters 6 and 7, explores Chinese scholars’
perception of two key national characters of the US, namely, its economic and political
systems.

With the research findings in the various chapters, we can probe into China’s motivation
toward the US through the following approaches. One approach is to explore China’s
motivation in two parts. The first part is to see how consideration of national interest
affects the formulation of China’s policy toward the US. And the second part is to see
how China’s perception of key characters of the US affects China’s foreign policy
orientation toward the US. Another way is to summarize the dominant Chinese images
of the US and through that try to find out China’s motivation toward the US. As this
dissertation is an effort to test the supposed China threat, I will use the findings of this
research to address the question of to what extent China is a threat to the US. And
finally, we will be able to see how US-China relations could be characterized.
8.1 How Consideration of National Interest Affects China’s Motivation?

According to the findings in Chapter 5, Chinese scholars accept that the US is superior over China in almost every major dimension of national power. The US economy is multiple times larger than China’s, the US is decades ahead in science and technology, and its military equipments enjoy the advantage of several generations. Even in soft power, most Chinese authors acknowledge US superiority.

The findings in Chapter 3 demonstrate that the US is perceived as sometimes using its superior power in the way that harms China’s national interest. The US’s massive arsenal of nuclear weapons hangs like a sword of Damocles over other countries, and the development of its NMD threatens to make thinner the string which holds the sword. US involvement in the Taiwanese affairs severely affects the reunification of Taiwan and the mainland. The security arrangements of the US with countries around China is like the gentle tightening of a noose. The US’s lecturing about China’s human rights is perceived as a serious intervention in China’s internal affairs, and at one time such lecturing is perceived to almost cause complete chaos in China. The US is also perceived as sometimes affecting China’s economic development, and denigrating China’s reputation both in the US and on the international stage.
The implication of the research in Chapters 3 and 5 is that Chinese are more or less resentful of US intervention in China’s internal affairs, and such resentment often reveals itself in the Chinese media. As a result, while Chinese authors are resentful of China bashing in US media and think tanks, they often themselves are not very restrained in America bashing in the Chinese media either. It is laudable to note that the image of the US in the Chinese publications in the 1990s was much more positive than in the 1980s, not to mention the 1970s and earlier, but there is still room for an even better understanding of the US by Chinese scholars.

The more important behavioral implication of the research is that China would on the whole adopt an appeasement approach toward the US, hoping that it would lead to restraint in its China policy. Usually only cases perceived as intolerable would prompt China’s measured response. It is understandable that China is aware of its weakness, and is apprehensive that the US would take advantage of its weakness. To prevent the US’s “abuse” of its power, it might be conceivable for China occasionally to resort to strong responses. But the findings in Chapters 3 and 5 indicate that on the whole appeasement would be one of China’s predominant policy inclinations toward the US.

On the other hand, as revealed in Chapters 4 and 5, the US is also perceived as having employed its superior power in the way that promotes China’s national interest. The
US’s commitment to peace and its engagement policy ensure a peaceful environment for China. The vast American market provides an important outlet for China’s mostly labor-intensive products, a tiny percentage of the US’s overseas investment would mean to China a significant inflow of foreign capital, and occasional relaxations in technology transfer could boost the quality of China’s economy. Besides, assistance from the US facilitates China’s entry into the world community, and enhances China’s status as one of the major powers in the world. With the steady development of US-China relations, the US has been perceived as increasingly more important to China’s pursuit for modernization.

The implication of the research in Chapters 4 and 5 is that Chinese scholars are also appreciative of the US role in promoting China’s national interest, especially its role in facilitating China’s economic development. If the drastic change in Chinese perceptions of the US from the 1980s to the 1990s is any indication, it would be predictable that such appreciation would engender an increasingly more positive image of the US in China, and cultivate new generations of pro-American Chinese.

The behavioral implication of China’s perception of opportunity from the US is that promoting cooperation would be another of China’s predominant policy inclinations toward the US, in the hope of gaining greater benefits from the bilateral relations.
Obviously, when Chinese perceive opportunity from the US, the US’s superior capability is no longer a target of resentment but one of appreciation.

Thus, from the perspective of national interest, China’s dominant inclinations in its policy toward the US would be appeasement and cooperation. Brooks and Wohlforth\(^{1100}\) are correct that in China’s perception of the US, there are both elements of resentment and fear, and elements of appreciation and admiration. Both of these elements determine that reducing troubles and promoting cooperation would be the dominant orientation in China’s policy formulation regarding the US. The exploration of the national interest involved in the US-China relations suggests therefore that to be a status quo country would be China’s rational policy preference.

8.2 How Consideration of Key Characters of the US Affects China’s Motivation?

Chapters 6 and 7 explore Chinese perceptions of the US economy and politics, two of the defining characteristics of the international community represented by the US. This dissertation finds that, compared with the perception in the 1980s and earlier, the Chinese perception of the US economy has undergone a fundamental change. In the 1990s, Chinese authors generally accepted that market economy was an ideal form of

economic management. They had discarded the degenerate image of US economy prevalent during the most of the PRC era, and regarded US economic performance as highly successful. They acknowledged the US’s leadership status in world economy, and often expressed an earnest desire to learn from the US in economic management. The evidence presented in Chapter 6 suggests strongly that convergence of China’s economic system on the American model is quite likely and differences in economic system between the US and China do not constitute a source of conflict between the two countries.

As for American politics, Chinese perception in the 1990s also represented a significant departure from that of the 1980s and earlier. Democracy again, just as in the early 20th century, became a revered form of governance. Usually implicitly, but occasionally explicitly, Chinese authors accept that the US’s political system represents more a genuine democracy than a sham one. One of its defining features, checks and balances, is generally perceived as working very well. The overall perception of the American politics is more positive than negative and some authors in authoritative Chinese journals occasionally appeal directly for learning from the US in political system. Thus, the evidence presented in Chapter 7 suggests that China would move gradually toward the American political model, and differences in political system would not constitute a serious core of contention between the US and China.
Thus, the findings in Chapters 6 and 7 indicate that, when national interest is not directly involved, the great differences between the US and China in economic and political systems will not necessarily lead to conflict between the two countries. Indeed, the differences provide a basis more for cooperation between the two countries than for conflict. Exploration of Chinese perceptions of key characteristics of the US suggests therefore that China has been moving toward joining the international community. Progress has been more rapid regarding the economic system and more slowly but still steadily regarding the political system.

8.3 How China’s Images of the US Reveal China’s Motivation?

Another way to explore China’s foreign policy motivation regarding the US is through understanding China’s images of the US. In the following, I will firstly identify the dominant Chinese images of the US, and then try to explain how these images reveal China’s motivation regarding the US. The research for this dissertation indicates that the dominant Chinese images of the US in the 1990s include the following: a partner image, a model image, and an imperialist image. The degenerate image was salient in the early 1990s, but it was replaced by an image of preponderant America in the second half of the 1990s. I will discuss each of these images in some detail.
8.3.1 What are the Dominant Chinese Images of the US?

8.3.1.1 Partner Image

A review of the existing image works indicates that the partner image has long been in existence in Chinese perceptions of the US. During the late Qing Dynasty, Chinese officials already entertained the idea of establishing a partnership with the US in the area of commerce.\(^{1101}\) In the early 20th century, China thought about offering its market to the US in exchange for US capital and goods, and for its “strategic counterpoise” to imperialists threatening China’s security.\(^{1102}\) China-US cooperation during World War II almost elevated the Chinese image of the US from a potential partner to a virtual patron, with American aid perceived as “divine wind” and the GI’s fighting in China against the Japanese invasion as “glorious angels.”\(^{1103}\)

Following the Korean War, however, the partner image of the US almost completely vanished even though Mao had long thought about improving relations with the US.\(^{1104}\)


\(^{1102}\) Hunt, p. 12

\(^{1103}\) Tu, Wei-Ming “Chinese Perceptions of America” in Michel Oksenberg and Robert Oxnam (eds.), *Dragon and Eagle*, p. 96

As China-USSR relations deteriorated, China began more seriously to seek improvement of relations with the US and to establish trade relations with it. But throughout the history of the China-US contact up to the end of the 1980s, the partner image of the US in the existing literature remains flimsy and largely latent.

It was in the 1990s that “partner” became one of the major images in the existing literature on Chinese perceptions of the US. The most prominent portrayal of this image is by Wang/Lin, who regard it as one of the three major images of the US. These authors argue that Chinese scholars of this school perceive bilateral relations “in terms of interdependence rather than a zero-sum game,” with China accepting the US as playing a positive role in the world and the US accepting China’s development as befitting the US’s interest. Saunders also presents the partner image as one of the major Chinese images of the US in the 1990s. He however distinguishes a liberal school of Chinese scholars who perceive mainly mutual benefits in China-US cooperation from a realist school which reluctantly accepts interdependence with the outside world and at the same time is “keenly aware of the political vulnerabilities interdependence creates.”
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1105. Liu, Yawei, p. 199
1107. Wang/Lin, pp. 912-915
The research of this dissertation, especially Chapter 4, indicates that partner image was indeed one of the major Chinese perceptions of the US in the 1990s. Chinese scholars generally agree that China-US cooperation is mutually beneficial. Some Chinese scholars also accept that the interdependence between the two countries is asymmetrical, with China being dependent on the US more than the US on China. The partner image is especially salient in the area of economic cooperation. By the end of the 1990s, most of the serious problems in the two countries’ bilateral economic cooperation had been resolved, such as intellectual property rights disputes, MFN/PNTR, and China’s WTO membership. Thus, in economic relations, Chinese scholars perceive mainly mutual benefits and little threat from the US. In terms of security relations between the two countries however, some Chinese scholars perceive mainly a conflict-management type of cooperation rather than strong security needs in both countries to cooperate in order to deal with an overwhelming common threat as in the Cold War period. As China’s strategic goal for a long time to come is to develop its economy and to improve Chinese people’s living standards, and the China-US economic relations conform strongly to China’s national interest, the partner image is one dominant Chinese image of the US in the 1990s.
8.3.1.2 Model Image

the model image was once a salient Chinese image of the US. In the history of the US-China relations, the first predominant Chinese image of the US is the model image.

Science and democracy were considered as the “defining characteristics of American society,” US foreign policy was considered qualitatively different from the “unmitigated expansionism” of imperial powers such as Japan and the European countries, and the US’s political system reminded Chinese of their own “legendary golden age.” At the beginning of the 20th century, the great aspiration of Chinese intellectuals was to create a new society in China with the US as its model. Tu Wei-ming divides the history of the Chinese perception of the US into four periods, and the first is the period of admiration.1109

Jerome Ch’en’s lengthy article on Chinese perceptions of the West is mainly a presentation of the model image, especially of the US. In explaining the rapid change of the Chinese image of the West after initial contact, one famous Chinese scholar Wei Yuan lamented “They are extraordinarily talented and should be considered as our good friends. How can they be called ‘barbarians’?”1110 Perhaps the best presentation of the model image was by another well-known scholar, Hu Shih, who once studied philosophy at Columbia University under John Dewey: “We are not yet qualified to

---

1109 Tu, pp. 92-96, 1973
criticize other people’s (the Westerners’) shortcomings. We should do well to notice only their strength. ... “Hu’s model image was somewhat qualified by his sense of etiquette, but Professor Wen I-to sputtered forward this model image without such a concern: “Compare Chinese and Western styles? What do you have to compare Western styles with? Are you good enough for any comparison? In spite of your mealy mouth and silver tongue, you cannot conceal your smallness, vulgarity, cowardice, and hypocrisy; nor can you hide your greed, stealth, selfishness, and other ugly characteristics ... What else do you have to compare with the West?” According to Ch’en’s presentation, many Chinese often attribute the best to almost everything American. American women are “the most lovely and admirable,” American political system ensures “the most virtuous man at the helm of power,” American foreign policy is “almost altruistic,” and the American economic system helps its people to “pursue their enterprises with success.”

Jerome Ch’en’s and Tu Wei-ming’s articles are the only pieces in the existing literature on the Chinese perceptions of the US to devote significant attention to the model image of the US, but they both describe the image as reflecting Chinese perceptions before the PRC period. In other relevant image works, the model image has been largely absent.

1110 Ch’en, Jerome “China’s Image of the West” in China and the West, 1979, p. 61
1111 Ch’en, p. 70
1112 Ch’en, p. 89
1113 Ch’en, pp. 76-82
This may reflect the fact that during the PRC period up to the end of the 1980s, the Chinese usually did not think it desirable to learn from the US. Works published during the 1990s pay scant attention to this image too. This may be the result of selective information processing, as people tend to pay more attention to dramatic events such as the Tiananmen tragedy, the Taiwan Strait crisis, and the Chinese embassy bombing, to the neglect of non-dramatic but momentous change in the Chinese people’s perception, such as the revival of the model image.

The research of this dissertation indicates that the model image has been prevalent in the Chinese perception of the US in the 1990s. As demonstrated in Chapters 6 and 7, Chinese authors have generally accepted that the American economic model is worthy of emulation, and the model image in this respect is prevalent, strong, and explicit. As for the Chinese perception of the American political model, Chapter 7 indicates that Chinese authors have also accepted the merits of democracy and often agreed that the American political model works very well in the US. They sometimes even acknowledge that convergence on the American political model should be the direction of China’s political reform. But they seldom advocate immediate and unconditional acceptance of this model in China. As demonstrated in Chapter 3 regarding the perception of threat to China’s government and political stability, they seem to prefer a go-it-slow approach regarding political reform, moving toward the American model. Chinese perceptions of
the model image in this respect therefore tentative, moderate, and usually implicit.

Chapter 4 also provides evidence supporting the model image of the US, especially regarding learning from the US in terms of science and technology. A cursory review of articles in the six journals on the Chinese perception of the American culture (not discussed in detail in this dissertation) seems to indicate that the model image is present in this area as well. We can conclude therefore that the model image has again become one of the dominant images in Chinese perceptions of the US in the 1990s.

8.3.1.3 Imperialist Image

According to the existing literature, “the imperialist” is one of the most salient and persistent images in the Chinese perception of the US. It runs all the way from the late 19th century to the present time. As early as the late Qing Dynasty, some Chinese were already concerned that the US was as covetous as other imperialist powers and China might fall prey to its expansionist foreign policy.\textsuperscript{1114}

During the Republican period in the early 20th century, more Chinese perceived the US as oppressing and exploiting them.\textsuperscript{1115} The US’s “illegitimate ambition” over China at

\textsuperscript{1114} Hunt, pp. 4-5; David L. Shambaugh “Anti-Americanism in China” in Thomas Perry Thornton (ed.) \textit{Anti-Americanism: Origins and Context}, May 1988, pp. 144, 145, 147, 154
\textsuperscript{1115} Hunt, pp. 10-15
that time was mainly exemplified in its support for the corrupt Guomindang regime.\footnote{Shambaugh, David L. “Conflicting Chinese Images of America During the People’s Republic of China” in Michael Hunt et al (eds.) Mutual Images in U.S.-China Relations, June 1988, pp. 21-22.}


During the Maoist period, especially in the 1950s, the Chinese distaste for the US reached its zenith.\footnote{Hunt, pp. 14-15} The US was accused of resorting to germ warfare during the Korean War, and of trying hard to “prey upon China’s weakness.” The American treatment of China is one of subjugation, aggression, exploitation, and suppression of China’s development.\footnote{Iriye, Akira Across the Pacific-- An Inner History of American-East Asia Relations, 1967, pp. 300-305,} It was perceived as a “greedy and violent nation,” trying to “control the world’s natural resources,” supporting the “worst enemy of the Chinese people,” and obstructing China’s development.\footnote{Tu, p. 104} The Chinese complained that their backwardness was due in no small part to the US’s embargo.\footnote{Shambaugh, pp. 21-22, June 1988} The Chinese regarded the US as being ready to use forces to satisfy its selfish pursuit for power and wealth at other nations’ expense. The US-USSR rivalry was considered one for global hegemony, and the US’s relations with third world countries was for the exploitation of them. The
US was considered the major source of instability in the world.1122

Chinese authors accuse the US of interfering in China’s internal affairs, particularly in the case of Taiwan,1123 and of trying to isolate China and encircle China with military bases. And they perceived the US as a chronic aggressor, invading other countries one after another.1124

As late as in the 1990s, imperialist image of the US was still salient. The US was perceived as trying to contain China’s rise, obstruct China’s economic development, tarnish China’s international image, and subvert China’s government and political system. It is interested in world hegemony rather than democracy.1125 It is a selfish and unfriendly country, and likes to intervene in other countries’ internal affairs for its own interest.1126

1122 Shambaugh, May 1988, pp. 144, 145, 147, 154
1124 Liu, Yawei, 1998
The research of this dissertation, especially the evidence presented in Chapters 3 and 5, supports the imperialist image described in the existing literature. In Chapter 5, the US is described as much superior over China in various major dimensions of power, and in Chapter 3, the US is presented as having used its superior power in the way that harms China’s national interest. What is unique in Chapter 3 is that this chapter tries to systematically describe the Chinese perception of threat from the US, while each work in the existing literature usually focuses only on a few aspects of this imperialist image. According to this chapter, the US is perceived as constituting more or less a threat to China’s national security, political stability, international prestige, economic development, and China’s preferred world order. But the imperialist image as presented in Chapter 3 is not as serious as those describing the Chinese perception of the US before the 1990s, especially before the China-US rapprochement. This image of the US to a great extent is diluted in the overall Chinese perception of the US when we take into account the Chinese perception of opportunity from the US described in Chapter 4 and other aspects of the Chinese perception presented in Chapters 6 and 7.

8.3.1.4 Degenerate Image?

Several scholars in the existing literature present more or less a degenerate image of the US held by Chinese perceivers. In Tu’s 1973 article, the degenerate image of the US is
but one of many facets of the US presented. The degenerate image itself receives
sketchy attention, reflecting more of China’s lack of understanding of the US as a result
of sustained isolation than of an informed assessment of the US. The US was described
as a paper tiger, “with utter chaos at home and extreme isolation abroad,” unable to meet
challenges facing the nation.1127

In a lavish portrayal of a dominant model image, Jerome Ch’en inserts a few passages
describing the US’s degeneration: its educational system on the verge of collapse,1128
corruption in politics, the severity of economic problems, and the poverty of the
underprivileged.1129

The most systematic studies of the degenerate image of the US held by Chinese
perceivers were done by Shambaugh and Pillsbury. In Shambaugh’s study of the
Chinese perception of the American economy,1130 Chinese scholars were described as
trying to support and flesh out the classic Marxist arguments that capitalism had been
beset with insoluble contradictions which would inevitably lead to a general crisis, and
the capitalism was on the last legs. But toward the late 1980s, Chinese authors are
presented as having somewhat revised their prediction of the American economy and

1127 Tu, pp. 104-106
1128 Ch’en, p. 77
1129 Ch’en, pp. 80-81
1130 Shambaugh May 1988, 1991
they claimed that capitalism still had some vitality and was not “in danger of dying any time soon.”

The predominant image presented in Pillsbury’s China Debates the Future Security Environment is the degenerate image. According to Pillsbury, Chinese authors argue that the American decline is inevitable, and multipolarity will be the future trend of the world. Pillsbury focuses mainly on the US’s military power, and he described an image of a declining America. The US will fail to implement the RMA (revolution in military affairs), its logistics is unable to support its military ambition, its aircraft carriers are like sitting ducks waiting to be sunk, its allies are becoming more independent, and a small country like North Korea is capable of defeating the US.1131

This degenerate image of the US has been somewhat supported by the research of this dissertation, in the section “Perceived American Decline in the Early 1990s” (Chapter 5). Major differences between Pillsbury and this author include the following. 1. Pillsbury claims that the dominant Chinese perception of the US in the 1990s was the American decline, while I maintain that, in terms of the Chinese perception of the American power, the American decline was indeed a salient feature in the first half of the 1990s, but in the second half of the 1990s, the more salient Chinese perception was the American rejuvenation. 2. Pillsbury seems to suggests that a perception of the American
rejuvenation reappeared in China because of the American military clout, such as the
American bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade, while I maintain that the
Chinese perception of the American vitality was based mainly on a perception of the
American economic prosperity. 1132 3. Pillsbury claims that multipolarity was
proclaimed by a Chinese author in 1986, while I maintain that China’s multipolarity
thesis dated much earlier than 1986, and the most significant source of this thesis is
President Nixon’s five-pole statements in the early 1970s. 1133 4. Pillsbury describes a
perception of decline in the American military power, but the research of this
dissertation indicates that the US’s military power suffers no perceived decline at all,
even when the American (economic) decline was a salient image among Chinese scholars
in the early 1990s.

The most salient difference between the degenerate image in the early 1990s presented in
this dissertation and the one in the 1970s-1980s presented by Shambaugh is that
Shambaugh’s degenerate image is absolute, while in this dissertation, the US suffers only
from a relative decline. Even when the US was perceived as having suffered from a

1131 Pillsbury, Michael China Debates the Future Security Environment, 2000, especially pp. 63-105
1132 This difference may partly be attributed to the fact that Pillsbury focuses mainly on security while I
more often focus on economy.
1133 This argument is based mainly on this author’s reading of Chinese articles in the 1980s, which
have not been included in the sample for this dissertation.
sustained decline up to the early 1990s, Chinese authors nonetheless agree that the US would remain the sole superpower for a very long time to come.

It seems that the degenerate image has been persistent in the Chinese perception of the US. In the early China-US contact, this image received sketchy support, far from being the dominant Chinese perception of the US. It became the dominant Chinese image of the US during the Maoist period, supported not only by the dominant Marxist theories but also by a lack of understanding of the US because of China’s isolation. During the 1980s, as presented by Shambaugh, the degenerate image of the US continued to be a dominant image of the US as Marxism continued to be the orthodox theory in China. In the early 1990s, however, this image was salient, but based more on empirical studies of the US, especially the American economic performance. In the late 1990s, mainly because of the remarkable performance of the American economy, the degenerate image ceased to be the dominant perception in terms of the Chinese perception of the American power, but it nonetheless remains an important perception.

8.3.2 Exploring China’s Motivation from China’s Images of the US

PARTNER IMAGE China’s partner image of the US indicates that China often perceives the bilateral relations in win-win terms. It perceives a substantial opportunity
for mutual benefits, and wishes the two countries could make full use of such opportunities. China’s partner image of the US demonstrates its desire to integrate itself into the international community, and it thus supports the proposition that China is a status quo country.

MODEL IMAGE China’s model image of the US indicates that there are elements of admiration in China’s perception of the US. It means that China not only take note of many things in the US which are superior over China, and China also wishes to learn from the US in important ways. Model image carries the implication that China not only does not regard differences between the two countries as sources of conflicts, but regards them as offering opportunities for cooperation between the two countries. China’s model image of the US implies a strong desire on the part of China to integrate itself into the international community represented by the US. This image therefore also supports the proposition that China is a status quo country.

IMPERIALIST IMAGE China’s imperialist image of the US indicates that there are some elements of resentment and conflict in China’s policy toward the US. But the image also indicates that when China resorts to confrontation, it is usually done in a defensive and reactive way. China recognizes the superior power of the US in various aspects, and would be generally reluctant to have conflicts with the US. The imperialist
image also carries the implication that the US is perceived as trying to exploit China’s weakness. In the Chinese eye therefore, confrontation between the two countries would usually occur when the US is trying to intervene in China’s internal affairs. The supposedly defensive and reactive nature of China’s policy toward the US suggests that China is a status quo country, or at least it wants to be one.

DEGENERATE IMAGE China’s degenerate image of the US in the early 1990s contains mostly a descriptive dimension trying to present an image of the US in decline. Chinese scholars perceive mainly a relative decline rather than an absolute decline, and as they perceive the decline, they nonetheless believe that the US for a long time to come would still remain a superpower much stronger than any other countries in the world. As a result, they do not perceive an opportunity for exploitation. Consequently, if the degenerate image of the US in the early 1990s does not support the idea that China is a status quo country, it does not support the idea that China is a non-status quo country either. It needs to point out, as demonstrated in Chapter 5, Chinese authors have largely revised their image of the relative American decline in the second half of the 1990s.

On the whole, all the three dominant Chinese images of the US (partner, model, imperialist) suggest that China is a status quo country, having a strong desire to cooperate with the US and integrate itself into the international community. The
The degenerate image of the US prevalent in the early 1990s does not support the proposition that China is a status quo country, but it does not support the idea that China is a non-status quo country either. In the second half of the 1990s, the image of the relative American decline was replaced by the image of the American rejuvenation, further supporting the proposition that China is a status quo country.

8.4 To What Extent China is a Threat?

As this project is a test of the supposed China threat, before the end of this dissertation, I would like to address the question of to what extent China is a threat to the US. To answer this question, we need to explore whether there are things which the two countries both want and which they cannot both have. As in Diagram 8.1, if the US wants A, while China wants B, and the two countries do not have overlapping claims, neither country is a threat to the other.1134

---

But when the two countries have overlapping claims, the two countries are more or less a threat to each other. The more the overlapping claims, the more serious the threat (see Diagrams 8.2 and 8.3).
Diagram 8.3: Serious Threat

As it is impossible for two big countries in the world not to have any conflicting interests, it is unrealistic to say that one big country presents absolutely no threat to another. Thus, Europe could be a threat to the US because it is potentially capable of evolving into a pole more powerful than the US. As a matter of fact, perhaps World War I and especially World War II could be construed as wars between Europe and the US. One 2002 article points out that “it is time to stop pretending that Europeans and Americans share a common view of the world, or even that they occupy the same world. On the all-important question of power — the efficacy of power, the morality of power, the desirability of power — American and European perspectives are diverging.” Russia could be a threat to the US because it could destroy the US if Russian leaders were crazy enough to do so. Obviously, the Cold War was between the

US and Russia. One recent study of the Russian attitudes toward America mentions that today “almost all (Russian) elites, including liberals, are hostile toward the United States,” even though “the masses have mixed feelings on this subject.”1136 Japan could be a threat to the US because it is capable of developing “thousands of nuclear warheads at short notice.”1137 The US-Japan duel constituted one major component of the World War II. One scholar argues that “many (Japanese) on the right are ready to assert more independence from the United States, relying more on Japan’s own armed forces.” And he warns that “Americans anxious about China may lend support to Japanese nationalism without realizing its long-term damage. Chinese anxious about the United States may some day do the same.”1138 India could be a threat to the US because, with its huge population, steady economic development, and its nuclear and space programs, it is undoubtedly one major rising power.1139 India’s potential of dominating the Indian Ocean might in time become one major concern for the US. Brazil could be a threat to the US, because, if a “pro-Castro candidate is elected president of Brazil, the results could include a radical regime in Brazil re-establishing its nuclear weapon and ballistic missile programs, developing close links to state sponsors of terrorism such as Cuba,

http://www.policyreview.org/Jun02/kagan_print.html

Iraq and Iran, and participating in the destabilization of fragile neighboring democracies. This could lead to 300 million people in six countries coming under the control of radical anti-U.S. regimes and the possibility that thousands of newly indoctrinated terrorists might try to attack the United States from Latin America.\textsuperscript{1140} Saudi Arabia could be a threat to the US, because, according to a Rand analyst, “the Saudis are active at every level of the terror chain, from planners to financiers, from cadre to foot-soldier, from ideologist to cheerleader,” and fifteen of the nineteen Sept. 11 hijackers were Saudis.\textsuperscript{1141} US defense secretary Donald Rumsfeld refused to disagree with the Rand analyst’s finding that Saudis are enemies of the US.\textsuperscript{1142} Even small and friendly countries could often be a threat to the US, for instance, in rebuffing the US’s seat in the UN Human Rights Commission, in weakening the legitimacy of the US’s support for Israel, and in denying immunity to Americans in the International Criminal Court.\textsuperscript{1143} In testing the China threat thesis, it is more realistic therefore to ask to what extent China is a threat to the US than whether China is a threat to the US.

To what extent China is a threat to the US? We can answer this question by exploring the overlapping claims by the two countries. The findings in Chapter 3 may serve this

\textsuperscript{1141} Ricks, Thomas E. “Briefing Depicted Saudis as Enemies,” The Washington Post, August 6, 2002.
purpose. It demonstrates that China and the US do often have conflicting interests (see Table 8.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>China</th>
<th>The US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The US should refrain from intervention in China’s internal affairs such as Taiwan, Tibet; etc.</td>
<td>1. The US will do whatever necessary to defend Taiwan; and will continue to show interest in Tibet, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The two countries should make arrangements regarding the non-use of force including the non-use of nuclear weapons.</td>
<td>2. The US will maintain military including nuclear deterrence with regard to China.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The US’s encirclement makes China uneasy.</td>
<td>3. The US will insist on strong security ties with countries around China.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China should decide its own political system and China’s human rights are basically China’s internal affairs.</td>
<td>China should move faster than now toward democracy and the US has the right to show concern for China’s human rights situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The US should not press for too much economic concessions from China.</td>
<td>The US will vigorously defend its economic interests in its relations with China.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The US should refrain from tarnishing China’s image either on the international stage or in the US media.</td>
<td>The US will judge China as it sees fit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China wants to have a world in which no country should impose its will on another.</td>
<td>The US needs to defend its interest around the globe.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.1: Conflicting Interests between the US and China
The findings in Chapter 3 as summarized in Table 8.1 demonstrate that the US and China do have conflicting interests. But do the findings indicate that China is a serious threat to the US? We may resort to three concepts to discuss the extent of China threat to the US. The first is relative threat, the second is absolute threat, and the third is relative tolerance.

From the perspective of relative threat, it is possible for China to argue that in Rows 1 and 2 in Table 8.1, the conflict of interests between the two countries result mostly from the US’s efforts to intervene in China’s internal affairs.

Row 3 is no longer a serious problem between the two countries because the major causes of contention such as MFN/PNTR, WTO have already been removed.

Regarding Row 4, from the Chinese perspective, even though both the US and China have the right to express opinions regarding the other’s behaviors, the US’s criticism of China nonetheless carries much greater threat to China than China’s criticism of the US. US media have a world-wide reach while Chinese media can reach basically only Chinese audience. More importantly, the US’s criticism of China carries much more serious behavioral implications than China’s criticism of the US. As the US is much stronger
than China in almost every respect (see Chapter 5), the US has the capability to turn its verbal criticism of China into concrete actions against China, while China’s criticism of the US serves mostly the function of psychological satisfaction. As demonstrated in the recent clashes between the two countries, the US could easily cause the accidental death of Chinese personnel either in a Chinese embassy or in a Chinese airplane, while China’s resentment of the US could just result in the smearing of the US’s embassy in China and in holding US pilots as reluctant but lavishly treated guests for over 10 days.

As for Row 5, if the US indeed has a world-wide ambition, China’s preference for a multipolar world may constitute more or less an obstacle to the US. But as mentioned in Chapter 4, multipolarization for China is rather an ideal and hope than a strategy in foreign policy. Thus, regarding the US’s frequent use of force abroad, China usually just expresses some disagreement, and has not made any efforts to balance the US. Verbal objections after all mean only very limited threat. While it is China’s wish that the US would guard against a self-fulfilling prophecy in any talk about a China threat, Chinese scholars should also guard against the self-fulfilling prophecy in their criticism of the US’s hegemonism. Traditionally the US has been a live-and-let-live country.

From the perspective of relative threat therefore, it is understandable for Chinese scholars to argue that China not only is not a threat to the US, but also suffers from
serious deficit, and the US is not only not threatened by China but also enjoys substantial surplus. Some Chinese therefore are likely to concur with Christopher Layne that “a hegemon is a threat to the security of others simply because it is so powerful.”

If the US actually enjoys substantial surplus threat, why is it that some Americans persistently advocate the China threat thesis? Besides factors such as parochial self-interest, the concepts of absolute threat and relative tolerance of threat may also explain parts of the story.

If two countries have conflicting interests, one presents more or less an absolute threat to the other. Table 8.1 demonstrates that the US and China do have some conflicting interests, it is understandable to say that China does present more or less an absolute threat to the US. But as the US has only limited claims on China, and China in recent decades has more or less accommodated the US’s wishes, the mutual absolute threat therefore is limited (see Table 8.2).

---

1144 For instance, Chinese premier Zhu Rongji in his visit to the US in 1999 implicitly expressed such an idea.
The US China

1. Taiwan problem should be resolved peacefully, and the US supports the one-China policy.
2. The US will maintain military including nuclear deterrence regarding China.
3. The US will maintain strong security ties with countries around China.

1. China will try hard to solve the Taiwan problem through peaceful means. China will accept Taiwan’s status quo so long as current Taiwan leaders, as in the past, accept that Taiwan is a part of China.
2. China can accept the US’s nuclear superiority so long as the US would not use its nuclear weapons against China.
3. China will not try to push the US out of Asia, and China sometimes even accepts the positive role of US military presence in Asia.

It is desirable for China to move toward democracy and show more respect for human rights.

China accepts the merits of democracy and is gradually moving toward democracy, though at a pace more consistent with China’s local conditions. China’s human rights situation has been steadily improving over the last two decades.

The US will vigorously defend its economic interests in its relations with China.

China will play win-win games in its economic relations with the US.

The US in recent years has been more careful in its media reports about China.

Chinese resentment regarding “China bashing” in recent years has been significantly reduced.

The US sometimes needs to practice unilateralism, but more often multilateralism.

China appreciates the US’s multilateralism and it opposes the US’s unilateralism, but only verbally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The US</th>
<th>China</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Taiwan problem should be resolved peacefully, and the US supports the one-China policy.</td>
<td>1. China will try hard to solve the Taiwan problem through peaceful means. China will accept Taiwan’s status quo so long as current Taiwan leaders, as in the past, accept that Taiwan is a part of China.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The US will maintain military including nuclear deterrence regarding China.</td>
<td>2. China can accept the US’s nuclear superiority so long as the US would not use its nuclear weapons against China.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The US will maintain strong security ties with countries around China.</td>
<td>3. China will not try to push the US out of Asia, and China sometimes even accepts the positive role of US military presence in Asia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is desirable for China to move toward democracy and show more respect for human rights.</td>
<td>China accepts the merits of democracy and is gradually moving toward democracy, though at a pace more consistent with China’s local conditions. China’s human rights situation has been steadily improving over the last two decades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The US will vigorously defend its economic interests in its relations with China.</td>
<td>China will play win-win games in its economic relations with the US.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The US in recent years has been more careful in its media reports about China.</td>
<td>Chinese resentment regarding “China bashing” in recent years has been significantly reduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The US sometimes needs to practice unilateralism, but more often multilateralism.</td>
<td>China appreciates the US’s multilateralism and it opposes the US’s unilateralism, but only verbally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.2: Claims and Accommodation between the US and China
The above table indicates that even though the two countries have conflicting interests, they have been able to worked out accommodations largely acceptable to both. Although China makes a lot of accommodations to the US, China often does so more or less voluntarily, because, after all, the Chinese often accept the universal values embodied in some of the US’s claims, such as peace, democracy, human rights, mutual benefits, etc. Consequently, even in terms of absolute threat, China’s threat to the US is limited. Besides, as discussed in Chapters 4, 6, and 7, China’s perception of threat has been greatly counterpoised by a perception of opportunity, and China’s model image of the US further enhances the image of the US more as an opportunity than as a threat.

To gauge the extent of the China threat to the US, it may also be helpful to bring in the concept of relative tolerance. Table 8.3 lists factors which contribute to the differences between the two countries in relative tolerance of threat.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>China</th>
<th>the US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>much weaker than the US in almost every aspect of national power</td>
<td>much stronger than China in almost every aspect of national power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a long history of national humiliation</td>
<td>a long history of triumph in most wars with other countries, large or small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economically and technologically much more dependent on the US than the US on China</td>
<td>economically and technologically much less dependent on China than China on the US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lower international prestige than the US</td>
<td>higher international prestige than China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a long history of involvement in China’s internal affairs</td>
<td>no history of involvement in the US’s internal affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generally reactive posture in its foreign policy</td>
<td>sometimes proactive posture in its foreign policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identity as a regional power concerned mainly with changes in the regional distribution of power</td>
<td>identity as a global power concerned with changes in the global distribution of power</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.3: Relative Tolerance of Threat
Table 8.2 indicates that China might have greater tolerance of foreign threat than the US. Thus, when India and Pakistan as China’s neighbors turned nuclear, China does not perceive much threat and is ready to accommodate them,\textsuperscript{1146} while the US perceives much threat from a distant Iraq, which might have the potential in future to develop a small arsenal of nuclear weapons without means to deliver them. One Chinese author argues that China should not overreact to the US’s overwhelming number of nuclear warheads targeting China if the US demonstrates a sincere intention not to actually use them against China.\textsuperscript{1147} One of the reasons why Chinese scholars enthusiastically applaud the constructive-strategic-partnership relationship between the US and China during the late 1990s is that such a relationship reduces China’s threat perception from the US, and therefore reduces China’s resentment which in turn would also reduce the supposed China threat to the US.\textsuperscript{1148} In exploring the extent of the US-China mutual threat therefore, we should not only look at the relative threat, but also take into consideration the absolute threat and the different relative tolerance of threat between the two countries. Ideally, the US should pay more attention to the relative threat, while China should consider more the US’s less tolerance of threat. One laudable example is China’s low-key handling of Chen Shui-bian’s provocative speech about Taiwan.


\textsuperscript{1147} shi, 98-7, pp. 59-60, Sheng Jiru

\textsuperscript{1148} shi, 98-8, pp. 15-19, Jin Canrong; shi, 98-8, pp. 20-23, Su Ge; shi, 98-8, pp. 24-27, 71, Sheng Jiru; xian, 97-11, pp. 2-6, Xi Laiwang; xian, 98-5, pp. 2-7, Xi Laiwang; xian, 98-7, pp. 2-7,
independence in August, 2002 and the US’s pressure on Taiwan. Chinese authors should be careful that their criticism of the US’s intervention in China’s internal affairs may well be construed by some Americans, because of less tolerance, as evidence of threat. Americans, on the other hand, should perhaps perceive Chinese criticism in their media more as resentment because of unrequited love than as genuine anti-US sentiments. By looking at the mutual threat more from the other’s perspective, the US and China could make greater efforts to promote mutual benefits and avoid playing a lose-lose game between the two countries.

8.5 How to Characterize US-China Relations?

Throughout this dissertation, I have been concerned mainly with presenting the Chinese perception of the US. A relevant question is how the US-China relations should be defined. I will firstly summarize what China is and will be, and what it wants, and then will address this question.

What China is? China is country full of contradictions. It is a very large country, but a very underdeveloped one. It has a huge population, over 20 times that of a medium

Liu Jiangyong; xian, 99-1/2, pp. 79-83, Ding Kuisong, Niu Xinchun.


country like the United Kingdom, but the overall size of its economy is smaller than that of the United Kingdom. Its economy is developing steadily but scholars are seriously suspicious of the statistics of its growth. It is supposedly a rising power, but is also regarded as on the verge of collapse.1151

It is considered one of the major powers in the world, but it is still not able to achieve the national unification, not even a symbolic one. It has the largest military in the world, but its military expenditure is less than 1/10 of the US’s. Some scholars describe it as one of the most conflict-prone powers in the world, but since the founding of the PRC over fifty years ago, it has been rarely involved in international military conflicts, and for over two decades, it has never fought a war beyond its own borders. It is afraid of being encircled, but it is sometimes singled out as a threat.

It is not a democracy, but its scholars, even in official journals, have generally accepted democracy as an ideal form of governance. It does not yet have a market economy system, but it is moving vigorously in that direction.

If it does not collapse, China’s economy in future will continue to grow, but even at the current (doubtful) official rate of its growth, many decades will elapse before its aggregate economy will come near the size of the US’s economy around the turn of the 21st century, and by that time its per capita GNP will still remain well below that of developed countries. Even after many decades when the overall size of its economy approaches the US’s level, the quality of its economy, its military capability, and its science and technology will remain far behind those of the US. In the process, China will continue to undergo reform in its economic and political systems. As demonstrated in Chapters 6 and 7, China’s economic reform will be far ahead of its political reform, and before very long, an economic system similar to that of the US will emerge in the Chinese mainland. Though its political reform lags far behind its economic reform, democracy in the 1990s had already been accepted not only by the general populace, but also in China’s authoritative publications, and elections had begun to be practiced in the grass-root level. With a solid market economy system, and the general acceptance of democracy by the Chinese people, a political system somewhat similar to that of the US will eventually come into existence. The research of this dissertation indicates that the strategy of “peaceful evolution” initiated by American leaders in the 1950s and vigorously promoted by the Bush and Clinton administrations in the 1990s have already begun to bear fruit in the Chinese land.
What China wants? Because of the very low per capita GNP, and because of the embarrassing underdevelopment in its economy, military, and science and technology, for a very long time to come, China will concentrate on developing its economy and improving the living standard of its people. For this purpose, it needs a peaceful international environment, especially in the Asia-Pacific region, and wishes to make friends with every country in the world, especially developed countries whose partnership can contribute significantly to China’s efforts for modernization, and neighboring countries whose cooperation can extend China’s economic potential. It does not want to be a threat to other countries, especially to the US, but it does not want to see other countries using force against China either, including using nuclear weapons against China. Because of benefits, admiration, and fear, China wishes to be the US’s friend, partner, perhaps even ally, and at the same time, it insists on being the master of its own house.

Given what China is and will be, and what it wants, how could the US-China relations be defined? In the following, I will offer my understanding.

Firstly, neighbors in the global village. In spite of whatever has happened in the past and whatever will happen in future between the two countries, because of the advances of
technology and globalization, the two countries will remain neighbors in the increasingly smaller global village. Given the size of either country, each will have to take into consideration the interest and concern of the other, and it would be highly costly for either country to be viewed as an implacable adversary by the other. It is even more so for China than for the US because of the latter’s decidedly superior power than the former.

Secondly, not Adversaries. As China is committed to improving relations with the US, the fact that China is equally committed to remaining the master of its own house does not constitute an adequate ground for an adversarial relationship. Even though the China-US confrontation would be highly detrimental to China’s national interest, and would go against Chinese people’s enthusiastic preference for friendly US-China relations, development in that direction would also be quite costly for the US. Unlike the case of US-USSR rivalry, most countries in the world perceive more an opportunity than a threat in their relations with China. If the two countries were to become adversaries, the US not only could not expect assistance from other countries in dealing with China, but has to expend a large amount of resources to bribe every relevant player to prevent them from conducting normal cooperation with China. Besides, if one country’s normal development is the justification for another to become confrontational, such a posture would make many countries in the world feel threatened. Other
secondary and tertiary powers such as Russia, Japan, India, Europe and many others would feel that they might be the next in the list of the US’s targets. To prevent the emergence of a powerful anti-hegemonic coalition, much more resources would be needed. Since China is enthusiastic in improving relations with the US and since it does not serve the US’s interest to turn China into an adversary, we can conclude that adversaries, competitors etc are not the appropriate terms to define the China-US relations.

And thirdly, partners. The research of this dissertation demonstrates that the US and China have both conflict of interest and common interest. Upon closer reading of Chapters 3 and 4, one can find that while the common interest between the two countries keeps steadily increasing, the conflicts of interest between the two countries can either be reduced and eliminated or they can also be inflated and exasperated. Generally speaking, the US’s threat to China is massive but potential, especially in its not impossible move to separate Taiwan from China and in its improbable use of nuclear weapons against China, while the US’s opportunity to China is substantial and concrete, especially in its implementation of the engagement policy and its economic cooperation with China. As discussed in Chapter 4 on balancing threat and opportunity, if the status quo in the US-China relations since the second half of the 1990s is maintained, the US in my opinion presents much more an opportunity than a threat to
China. Consequently, the US is a valuable partner to China.

On the other hand, China has been able to provide the US with a substantial opportunity to enhance its interest. With the development of China’s economy, the US will gain more and more benefits from its relations with China. Thus we may say that China is also a valuable partner to the US, and it will be more and more a valuable partner to the US in the days to come.

As China for a very long time to come will be inferior to the US in almost every dimension of national power, especially in terms of military power, for a very long time to come therefore, China will not constitute a threat to the US. Indeed, because of the tremendous cost to both countries in a confrontational relationship and the great benefits to both in a friendly relationship, the US-China relations should be defined in terms of partnership. Jointly, the two countries, together with others, can help promote peace, stability, and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region and in the world. The two countries can both benefit greatly from economic cooperation and a peaceful international environment. Just as discussed earlier, the two countries are at the minimum neighbors in the increasingly smaller global village, with some inevitable but reconcilable conflicts of interest attendant with a neighborly relationship, and a great opportunity for mutual benefits if the two neighbors can manage to cooperate with each other rather than to
confront each other. It is rational to define the bilateral relationship as one of partnership.
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