THE TAMING OF THE RED DRAGON:
THE MILITARIZED WORLDVIEW AND CHINA'S USE OF FORCE, 1949-2010

BY

XIAOTING LI

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Political Science
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2014

Urbana, Illinois

Doctoral Committee:

Professor John Vasquez, Chair
Professor Paul Diehl
Associate Professor Carol Leff
Associate Professor Xinyuan Dai

Abstract

This dissertation explores the impact of China's integration into the international society upon its propensity to use force in interstate disputes. Drawing on various insights from international relations theory, I argue that China's proverbial violence proneness—that is, its propensity to use force—was historically a product of its militarized or Hobbesian worldview, developed during Mao's reign, when Beijing acted as a challenger against the international system. Due to this worldview, the challenger tends to overestimate the threats to its security, and places a premium on preparing for and engaging in violence against real or perceived enemies.

Since Mao's death, however, China has been increasingly integrated into the international system. As a result, Beijing has experienced a Lockean turn in its worldview, which now sees cooperation and compromise as the main themes of international relations. This ideational transformation reduces the erstwhile challenger's dependence on force as an instrument of foreign policy, and softens its predilection for violence accordingly. Using both large-N statistical analysis and detailed case studies, I demonstrate that this evolution of China's militarized worldview, rather than its increasing relative power, played the foremost role in driving Beijing's resort to force between 1949 and 2010.

Theoretically, this dissertation thus challenges the conventional wisdom of realist theory that sees states' relative capabilities as the primary source of their security behaviors. Instead, it highlights the role of worldviews in shaping states' perceptions of their security situation, defining their security interests, and regulating their security behaviors. The findings of this dissertation also attest powerfully to the importance of a strategy of constructive engagement with China.

Acknowledgments

I thank all my dissertation committee members for their positive encouragement and timely guidance in the writing process. It was a great pleasure to work with these very fine people in the last six years. My thanks go foremost to John Vasquez and Paul Diehl, whose classes on international conflict broadened my intellectual horizons greatly and provided me with the necessary methodological training before writing this dissertation. I also benefit, needless to say, from the classes taught by other faculty members at the Department of Political Science at the University of Illinois, who are both distinguished scholars and innovative teachers.

My fellow graduate students, especially Christina Alvarez, Evangeline M. Reynolds, Gennady Rudkevich and Konstantinos Travlos, are a source of warm and collegial support. I will always cherish the memories of our time together. I also thank the Department's staff, especially Brenda Stamm, for their efficient and tireless professional service, without which it would have been impossible to pursue my studies and research smoothly during the past six years.

Finally, my heartfelt thanks to my parents, Henian Li and Aiping Ding, whose moral and intellectual guidance proves invaluable at every critical juncture in my life. I love you forever, Mom and Dad!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

In 1994, James Rosenau, former president of the International Studies Association in the United States, expressed concern with a peculiar blind-spot in the discipline of International Relations (IR). "A great deal is known about China, its history, resources, and culture, and much is also grasped about the dynamics of IR, but how the two go together, how they account for the collective role played in global life by a quarter of the world's population, is far from clear" (Rosenau 1994: 528). In his opinion, one possible way of connecting China to international relations theory is to research how the giant nation's integration into the international system helps to change its behavior: "For all its uniqueness, China has long been an actor in the international system and has thus been subject to the same dynamics and controls that are inherent in the system and that condition all states" (Ibid., 524).

With Rosenau's suggestion in mind, this study examines one of the most crucial and controversial issues in contemporary international relations—that of China's rise and its impact on international security. Indeed, since Mao Zedong's famous announcement in October 1949 that "China has stood up," a specter has haunted international politics—the specter of a rising China poised to destabilize the world order. In the 1950s and 1960s, the People's Republic of China (PRC) was often seen as the Red Dragon, irreconcilable and mordantly aggressive, with the pronounced goal of transforming the world through revolution and violence. Since the early 1990s, the dragon is alleged to have reawakened from its slumber, reviving old fears of an implacable "China threat." Will the PRC become a "responsible stakeholder" in the international system, or will it use its burgeoning power aggressively and turn into a source of global and regional tension? This question, known as "whither China" (Zoellick 2005), has attracted growing attention from the media, policy, and scholarly communities nowadays.

In essence, to ask "whither China" is to ask whether and to what extent an erstwhile challenger state,[1] after years of integration into international society, has acquired a stake in the stability of the international system,[2] as well as in the peaceful resolution of disputes. Theoretically, there are two approaches, one materialist and the other ideational, to the question. Following the first approach, we may concentrate on exploring the material incentives that help to increase or decrease a challenger's propensity to settle disputes by violent means. Prime examples of the material incentives usually include the concerned state's relative power position, its economic and trade linkages with the outside world, or its associations with international governmental organizations. Exogenous in origin, these incentives may alter the once challenger's cost-benefit analyses and compel it to think twice before resorting to force.

Alternatively, we may proceed with the second approach and investigate the beliefs and ideas that motivate a challenger to adopt a cooperative or conflictual position toward international society. These beliefs and ideas are often grouped into three categories, including identity, strategic culture, and norms.[3] Endogenous in origin (with the exception of norms), these ideational factors cause a challenger to interpret its security situation and national interests in particular ways, especially regarding the prospects for managing disagreements and conflicts without the use of force. The varying interpretations, in turn, give rise to different behaviors.

---

[1] In this study, I define the challenger as a state that not only contests actively the legitimacy of the existing international order, but seeks to revise or overthrow it through diplomatic maneuvers or military actions.

[2] Conceptually, the international society and the international system may not be one and the same thing (see Bull 1977[1995]: 9-15). However, Hedley Bull himself regarded the modern international system as an international society (Bull 1977[1995]: 15, 39-41). Thus, in this study, I use the two terms interchangeably.

[3] For a pithy discussion of these three concepts, see Friedberg (2005: 34). For empirical studies of the role of ideas in shaping states' security interests and policies, see, among others, Johnston 1995; Legro 1995; various authors in Katzenstein 1996; Rosen 1996; Kier 1997; Berger 1998; Hopf 2002; Legro 2005; Johnston 2008.

I believe, however, that the material and ideational determinants of behavior are linked together through social interaction between states in the international system. Conceptually, like human society, the existence of international society fosters stability, security, and manageability of disputes without recourse to war. Thus, integrating into this propitious social environment will likely change the normative characteristics of an erstwhile challenger in the long run. At the outset, for example, the anticipation of—and confidence in—the tangible and intangible benefits of integration might induce the challenger to accept the social restraint on violence (i.e., accepting the norms) and hence to act with increasing responsibility. As its behavioral preferences change over time, the challenger has also to reconsider its underlying perceptions of itself in relation to others (i.e., reconsidering its identity). This reconsideration would in turn alter its beliefs about the basic character of the international system and about the best ways of safeguarding its security (i.e., altering its strategic culture). In this process, material incentives do matter, but ideational changes have the final say in redefining the challenger's approach to international society.

This study, then, centers around a hitherto little explored issue in international relations theory—i.e., how does integration into international society change the ideational basis of a challenger's behavior, especially its notorious violence proneness (i.e., its propensity to use force)? This issue is particularly relevant to the question of "whither China," because, in the prolific literature on China's rise (as I will show shortly), the PRC is often described as having moved in a more peaceful and cooperative direction over the last two decades. But, the key question is: Does this behavioral change rest upon an ideational transformation induced by China's integration into international society? If, after a careful and comprehensive examination,

our answer is yes (even if a tentative yes), then it is hopeful that the future of China will follow a smoother and more constructive course.

By seeking to bridge the gap between IR theory and the China scholarship, I aim to make three contributions:

First, I hope to use China as a critical case that could deepen the *general* understanding of the working of international society. As observed by Armstrong (1993: 10), the concept of international society involves manifold theoretical and empirical dimensions, yet only a few of these have been explored. In particular, we know little about how and to what degree states feel obliged as members of international society to renounce their more blatant realpolitik proclivities, especially the typically realpolitik practice of using force to settle disputes. For further theoretical development, if it can be shown that even an erstwhile challenger like China could mellow through integration, then it becomes easier to make a case for the overall capacity of international society for providing states with notions of duty and obligation, and for discouraging them from unlimited use of power. In so doing, I also hope to demonstrate the intellectual possibilities of advancing IR theorizing by paying greater attention to East Asia, as recently called for by Johnston (2012).

Second, I hope to construct a *specific* theory about where China's proverbial violence proneness comes from and, more intriguingly, why it could moderate over time. Regarding the question of "whither China," a theory is indispensable for several purposes. It helps to identify patterns of behavior over a prolonged period of time. It helps to sort out the complex dynamics of change, selecting some dimensions as important and dismissing others as trivial. It aims at forecasting the occurrence (or nonoccurrence) of a specific phenomenon, instead of merely offering *post hoc* explanations for it. In short, without a theory, it may be possible to explain

China's use of force on a case-by-case basis, but quite impossible to grasp the long-term dynamics underlying Beijing's behavioral change.

Third, by testing the explanatory power of my theory against competing explanations of Chinese behavior, I seek to identify what factors are important in inducing China to use force, or, alternatively, what factors are important in keeping it from doing so. This empirical knowledge helps not only to reduce uncertainties about Chinese behavior, but also to improve crisis management techniques in the event of future foreign policy crises involving the PRC. Thus, this study has both theoretical and policy significance.

The remaining sections of this introductory chapter are organized as follows:

In the first section, I review the puzzling phenomenon that, despite dire predications of an emerging "China threat," the PRC has actually shown signs of moderation in its foreign policy and security behavior over the past decades. I consider various realist explanations of China's violence proneness, and demonstrate their limitations in accounting for the above puzzle.[4]

In the second section, I outline an alternative, constructivist approach to the puzzle, and identify the militarized or Hobbesian worldview as the ideational basis of the PRC's past predilection for violence. This militarized worldview, endemic to all avowed challengers against the international system, is characterized by extreme threat perceptions as well as an overemphasis on the utility of force for conflict resolution. However, as a challenger state is increasingly integrated into international society, it will experience a Lockean turn in its worldview, which increases its interest in cooperation and decreases its violence propensity accordingly. The story of China, as detailed in this study, is a case in point.

---

[4] I start with realist explanations of Chinese behavior because realism claims the distinction of being able to explain established and recurrent patterns of realpolitik behavior, especially in regard to great powers. And much of the "China threat" literature, as will be seen, is based on realist assumptions and premises.

In the third and last section, I provide a concise summary of the contents of the following eight chapters.

The China Threat, or the China Puzzle?
Realist Explanations and Their Limitations

Since the early 1990s, talk of an emerging "China threat" has never ceased in the literature on Chinese foreign policy. Historically, rising powers are apt to "challenge territorial boundaries, international institutional arrangements, and hierarchies of prestige that were put in place when they were relatively weak" (Friedberg 2005: 19). Nowadays, we are told, China is "an unsatisfied and ambitious power whose goal is to dominate Asia"; and its growing economic and military strength, "linked to the nation's ambitions and to its xenophobic impulses, are making it more rather than less aggressive" (Bernstein and Munro 1997: 4, 11). As such, the PRC is bound to become an implacable peer competitor of the United States, and a struggle for hegemony would inevitably ensue between the two countries (Mearsheimer 2001: 397-400).

This "China threat," however, has appeared elusive to this day. Instead, there is much evidence to suggest that the PRC has acted increasingly like a status quo power in the international arena (Johnston 2003a). In the Asia-Pacific region, Beijing has demonstrated a willingness to seek security through consultation, cooperation, and engagement with other states (Shambaugh 2004; Gill 2007; Shirk 2007; Qin and Wei 2008). Meanwhile, a key component of official Chinese discourses is to "participate in and uphold commitments to status quo international economic and security institutions" (Johnston 2008: 205), with a view to establishing Beijing's reputation as a respectable and indispensable international actor (Goldstein 2005: 29-30).

As a result, Chinese behavior has grown "largely peaceful, multilateral, and cooperative" (Kang 2007: 102), as well as "more consistent with international norms, regional expectations,

6

and U.S. interests" (Gill 2007: 1-2). According to prominent PRC scholars and policy experts, this pattern of "peaceful rise" or "peaceful development" will continue to characterize Chinese foreign policy for the foreseeable future (Zheng 2005; Wang 2005). Despite signs of Chinese diplomatic truculence in 2009-2010, most PRC leaders and elites apparently still believe that China's broader interests are better served by a peaceful and cooperative approach in international affairs (Dai 2010; Bader 2012: 122-123).

In fairness, that the "China threat" has yet to materialize does not in itself refute the "China threat" theory, which purports foremost to explain why China would eventually come to overturn the status quo, *not* why Beijing would accept it for the time being. Admittedly, even the Chinese themselves sometimes look uncertain of why the PRC maintains an integrationist approach toward the prevailing international system.[5] In other words, the plausibility of the "China threat" theory depends not so much on its (in)ability to explain why the Chinese dragon seems to be tamed temporarily, as in its ability to explain that the dragon will always be the dragon.

In this connection, fears of a lurking "China threat" are not entirely baseless. For a long time, the PRC was believed to be a decidedly realist *and* violent actor. China, we are told, "might well be the high church of realpolitik in the post-Cold War world" (Christensen 1996a: 37). It allegedly "thinks in very realpolitik fashion" and "assumes that relations among states involve spheres of influence, the balance of power, and struggles for domination" (Bernstein and Munro 1997: 29). Moreover, despite its advocacy of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence, China

---

[5] Wang Yizhou, one of the PRC's foremost international relations scholars, observes that China's official Marxist discourse offers no explanation about why Beijing has sought to integrate into the international system and to strengthen cooperation with the West in the past three decades. Fundamentally, Marxism demands the negation as well as the revolutionary transformation of the capitalist global order; Beijing's advocacy of a long-term and cooperative relationship with the West, however, clearly contravenes this Marxist principle (Wang 2006: 8-9).

was known to be susceptible to extreme threat perceptions, which often led Beijing to respond violently to real or perceived security threats (Whiting 1975; Gurtov and Hwang 1980; Whiting 2001). Until fairly recently, compared with other major powers, the PRC appeared more likely to use force to resolve a foreign policy crisis or an interstate dispute (Johnston 1996 and 1998a).

Scientifically, in order to predict whether a certain phenomenon would recur, we must investigate why it occurred in the first place. Similarly, before predicting whether the famed Chinese assertiveness would revive, we need to explore the question of where Beijing's violence proneness comes from. Drawing inspiration from the prevalent realist theory, the "China threat" drumbeaters often attribute the PRC's predilection for violence to three possible sources, namely, power expansion, territorial disputes, and a desire to restore China's past imperial grandeur. Regrettably, under closer scrutiny, none of these explanations provides a sufficiently consistent and generalizable account of Beijing's propensity to use force.

To begin with, let us consider the oft-repeated argument that China's burgeoning power capabilities would induce it to act in an increasingly conflictual manner. Obviously, this argument echoes the classical realist thesis that all states seek "either to keep power, to increase power, or to demonstrate power" (Morgenthau 1948[1978]: 42). Since the proof of power lies foremost in its display for a coercive purpose, all states presumably tend to act coercively toward other states; the more capabilities a state has, the more coercive its behavior will be.

China's violence proneness, viewed in this light, results not only from the universal struggle for power, but also from its relative power position. Indeed, some scholars contend that there is not a "China threat" yet, "not because China is a benign status quo power, but rather because it is too weak to challenge the balance of power in Asia" (Ross 1997: 34). Others believe that China's current peaceful development reflects only its relatively weak power position vis-à-

vis the United States; as soon as it accumulates sufficient capabilities, Beijing would shift to a more confrontational approach (Wang 2010: 208).

This realist explanation, however, is problematic on two counts. First, since no realist analysis specifies, ex ante, the exact correlation between power expansion and the growth of aggressiveness, it is a theoretically dubious practice to infer intentions from capabilities. To do so, as Vasquez (1993: 94-95) cautions, is to commit the error of confusing possibility with causality. Second, to be logically consistent and generalizable, a realist exposition has to maintain that "the greater the capabilities, the greater the aggressiveness," but *not* that "power breeds aggressiveness only at certain times," and certainly not that "lesser capabilities could lead to greater aggressiveness." Interestingly, so far as China is concerned, it is virtually impossible to strive for such logical consistency: for, by all accounts, Maoist China (1949-1976) was materially much weaker, but far more addicted to violence, than contemporary China.

Under Mao's reign, the PRC had twice fought the United States, in Korea openly and in Indochina covertly.[6] It had periodically bombarded the offshore islands held by Chiang Kai-shek's Republic of China (ROC), at the risk of precipitating a major war in the region. It had actively aided communist and national liberation movements worldwide, in order to debilitate the "imperialistic" West and its allies. In stark contrast, contemporary China, as noted earlier, has behaved with growing restraint and responsibility in world affairs, despite the phenomenal expansion of its economic and military power. Acknowledging this contrast, even the most

---

[6] Official PRC military historians have long revealed that Beijing played more than a supporting role in the Vietnam War. Between August 1965 and February 1969, China dispatched its best antiaircraft artillery troops to defend Hanoi and other strategically important targets in North Vietnam. Totaling over 150,000 men, these military units reportedly engaged in 2,153 operations, shot down 1,707 American warplanes, and took 42 American pilots as prisoners of war (Deng Lifeng 1994: 331-333). From March 1969 to November 1973, Beijing also deployed antiaircraft artillery troops (totaling over 20,000 men) in Laos, where those units engaged in 95 operations and shot down 35 American warplanes (Ibid., 359-360).

articulate "China threat" theorists sometimes hesitate to describe the PRC as moving inexorably toward aggression and expansion.[7]

Of course, to say that China has become remarkably more peaceful does not mean that it would remain so indefinitely. Still, the above-noted contrast between Maoist China and contemporary China presents a major anomaly for the realist conventional wisdom. It suggests, above all, that relative power alone cannot explain the ups and downs in Beijing's violence proneness, over a long period of time and until at least a fairly recent moment in history.[8]

Another classical realist assumption would have helped to salvage the "China threat" theory at this point. In principle, while seeing the struggle for power as a probable cause of states' resort to violence, realism also "considers prudence—the weighing of the consequences of alternative political actions—to be the supreme virtue in politics" (Morgenthau 1948[1978]: 11). Brandishing a big stick, needless to say, is not always a prudent option. Instead, whether states resort to armed force or not depends on the nature of the issue(s) under contention: when national territory is in dispute, for example, states are far more likely to fight each other (Mansbach and Vasquez 1981; Diehl 1992; Vasquez 1993; Hensel 1996; Senese 1996; Vasquez and Henehan 2001; Hensel and Mitchell 2005; Senese and Vasquez 2008). China's violence proneness,

---

[7] Bernstein and Munro (1997), for instance, predict famously the "coming conflict with China." But they also declare their belief that "the chances of actual military conflict [are] small, and we can be thankful for that." This is because "China does not seek to use military force to occupy the territory of neighboring countries or to attack the United States." And Beijing "has none of the messianic impulses that made the Soviet Union more threatening" (Bernstein and Munro 1997: 18). In short, the two authors appear to believe that the PRC seeks neither to expand its control beyond the existing borders, nor to export its way of life to other countries. Why this seemingly self-contained China is considered an "unsatisfied and ambitious power," or, more importantly, why a conflict is inevitable given that there may be no actual military conflict at all, is left unexplained in their book.

[8] Despite China's alleged assertiveness in the South China Sea since 2010, it should be noted that Beijing has not yet militarized the disputes with other claimants, but reacted more strongly to the latter's moves to assert their rights in the area unilaterally (for details, see Chapter 7).

viewed in this light, might result from the underlying contentiousness of the issues besetting Beijing's foreign relations since 1949: the more those issues involve its vital interests (say, territorial integrity or regime survival), the more likely China would use force to settle them.

Many "China threat" theorists might think that here they hold a firmer clue as to the PRC's predilection for violence—China, so to speak, has "bloody borders" (Mosher 2000: 59). The PRC, after all, has the second longest land borders in the world, after Russia's. Most of these borders were not demarcated when Mao proclaimed the PRC in 1949; thus, border security and territorial integrity constituted a central concern of China's leaders in a number of foreign policy crises (Whiting 1975: 199-200). Since the 1950s, territorial disputes have led Beijing into armed conflict (and sometimes full-scale wars) with Burma, India, the Soviet Union, and Vietnam. Moreover, to this day, the PRC has engaged in an internecine struggle with the ROC on Taiwan, which Beijing considers its own sovereign territory. Past crises in the Taiwan Strait, which brought Beijing and Washington to the brink of war several times, testify to the high potential for conflict over this contentious issue.

On closer examination, however, territorial disputes seem to have no uniform impact on China's propensity to use force. Instead, as Fravel (2008: 68) observes, the PRC often sought to settle boundary problems through compromise, even when it enjoyed the clearest military advantages against its smaller neighbors. While some disputes remain unresolved to this day, Beijing repeatedly pledges to strive for a negotiated settlement through peaceful and friendly consultations (for details, see Chapter 3 and Chapter 7). Furthermore, despite its refusal to renounce force against Taiwan, Beijing has apparently long abandoned the idea of reunifying the island any time soon; rather, since 2004, the PRC has readjusted its policy to emphasize its

interest in promoting peace and stability in the Taiwan Strait over the long term (for details, see Chapter 7).

But we have not exhausted the explanatory possibilities of the "China threat" theory yet. China, we are informed, "is resentful that [it] has lost its traditional place as the Central Kingdom and [is] determined to recover it" (Mosher 2000: 13). Thus, by using force, Beijing may not only establish a reputation for resolve and toughness, but also deter its opponents in other disputes (for a review of the reputation and deterrence literature, see Huth 1997). Conversely, excessive self-restraint would only invite contempt and attack from the adversaries (Morgenthau 1948[1978]: 90). Furthermore, prior to 1949, China had gone through what official PRC historiography calls "the century of humiliation," in which the once proud Celestial Empire suffered countless deprivations at the hands of various imperialist powers. The PRC, however, is the New China that has stood up; what could be a better means to validate this resurgent self-esteem than acting aggressively toward others?

Plausible as it seems, this logic has two weaknesses. First, there is much evidence to suggest that the PRC leadership perhaps has been far less interested in reestablishing China's imperial supremacy than usually alleged. Rather, Chinese diplomacy has attached great importance to a tradition of "imperial humility." As early as 1952, PRC premier Zhou Enlai had exhorted the PRC's diplomats to renounce "great-power chauvinism" and to take heed of the Confucian wisdom that "it is virtuous for the strong to deal with the weak with humility [*renzhe yi da shi xiao*, a famous quotation from the Confucian sage Mencius]" (Cheng 1992: 192). Zhou's remarks were targeted against a PRC ambassador who showed signs of haughtiness toward his host country (Yun 1996: 21). Similarly, when receiving the Burmese prime minister in December 1954, Mao opened the conversation by apologizing for Imperial China's invasions

12

of Burma in the distant past (Mao 1998a: 136). Later, In September 1956, Mao even described

the PRC's economic aid to Mongolia as compensation for Imperial China's oppression of the

Mongolians (Mao 1992, Vol.6: 213-214).[9]

Second, if the said logic indeed holds, then we should expect Beijing's violence

proneness to remain unchanged until its sense of historical humiliation fades away. China

specialists, however, often suggest that the PRC has kept that sense forever fresh and alive.[10] In

other words, as an explanatory variable, the "historical memory" seems to be a constant. As such,

it is equally unable to explain the appreciable contrast, as noted earlier, between contemporary

China and its Maoist predecessor.

In sum, the realist conventional wisdom provides at best an incomplete explanation of

China's prominent violence proneness. Unable to account for Beijing's perplexing behavioral

change, this explanation possibly obscures as much as it reveals, misinterpreting China's past as

well as misconceiving its present. To claim that "just wait until the China threat emerges" might

be rhetorically useful to explain away objections and ignore contradictory evidence, but

rhetorical usefulness is not a mark of scientific research. As a rule, all scientific theories are

---

[9] For Zhou Enlai's personal role in establishing the said tradition in Chinese diplomacy, see Cao (2006: 248-256). Tang Jiaxuan, foreign minister and state councilor of the PRC (1998-2008), illustrates China's continued commitment to this tradition by a vivid account of his first meeting with Indonesian foreign minister Ali Alatas in April 1998. Acknowledging his interlocutor's seniority and experience, Tang opened the conversation with the remark: "You are like a professor and I a new student; so I come to learn from you." Tang's sincerity apparently won over Alatas and the two developed a close working relationship thereafter (Tang 2009: 89-93).

[10] Kristof (1993: 72), for example, observes that contemporary China still harbors "the sense of wounded pride, the annoyance of a giant that has been battered and cheated by the rest of the world" dating back to the Opium War 150 years ago. Gries (2005) demonstrates that apart from an official nationalism, there exists a genuine popular Chinese nationalism fed on the die-hard memory of historical indignities. Recently, in surveying China's "century of humiliation," Bickers (2011:10) notes that "the past is unfinished business" in China and old historical wounds have not healed yet.

required to specify what evidence would falsify them. Evidently, the "China threat" theory has not yet met this requirement.

The Militarized Worldview and China's Violence proneness:
A Constructivist Approach

If realism cannot adequately explain China's predilection for violence, what else can? An important clue, long suggested by China specialists, lies in perceptions or worldviews. Whiting (1975: xv), for example, observed that the PRC's response to a foreign policy crisis was "mediated by the perceptions of [its] policy makers." In particular, he identified "exaggerated threat perceptions" as the primary motivating factor in China's use of force (Whiting 2001: 108). Similarly, Christensen (2006: 52) notes that the PRC tended to read the worst into its security situation, which led Beijing to use force frequently either against a much stronger adversary and/or its allies, or against a weaker but immediately threatening rival.

Why, however, was the PRC so prone to feel threatened and thereby predisposed to use force? Another clue was pointed out by Gurtov and Hwang (1980: 12), who contended that "Chinese behavior in international politics is at bottom the external form of domestic political values and objectives." As far as Maoist China was concerned, Chinese foreign policy was driven foremost by Beijing's commitment to a fundamental transformation of the structure of the international system (Ibid., 14). This commitment, in turn, led Maoist China to harbor grave concerns with its survival as a revolutionary state in what it perceived as a hostile international environment; hence its habitual use of force to protect its security (Wang 2008: 16).

Contemporary China, of course, differs markedly from its Maoist past, in that it no longer believes that "its future depends on overturning the fundamental order of the international system" (Zoellick 2005). Instead, "to the extent that one can identify an international community on major global issues, the PRC has become more integrated and more cooperative within

14

international institutions than ever before" (Johnston 2003a: 49). Correspondingly, contemporary China tends to downplay the utility of military force as a foreign policy instrument and emphasize the prospects for cooperative security: "War and confrontation can only lead to a vicious cycle of violence-begetting-more-violence; dialogue and negotiation are the only effective and reliable means of conflict resolution. [States] should seek peace through cooperation, pursue security through cooperation, settle disputes through cooperation, and promote harmony through cooperation."[11]

Implicitly, this suggests that integration into international society has helped not only to mellow the PRC's threat perceptions, but to decrease its violence propensity as well. Through integration, the key ideational cause of China's predilection for violence—i.e., the Chinese worldview, or Beijing's basic orientation to the international system—has changed fundamentally, leading the PRC to act more peacefully and cooperatively. Regardless of whether the PRC has become a genuine status quo actor or not, its current worldview is undoubtedly more compatible with commonly held perceptions of what is good and appropriate behavior in the international society.[12] Theoretically, how do we account for the taming of the Red Dragon at this ideational level?

For purposes of scientific inference, it is best to investigate a particular event by studying "systemic patterns in similar parallel events" (King, Keohane, and Verba 1994: 43). My attempts at understanding the Chinese worldview, therefore, starts with a generalizable empirical

---

[11] Quotations from the white paper, entitled *China's Road of Peaceful Development*, issued by the Information Office of the PRC State Council, September 6, 2011. Available at: http://politics.people.com.cn/GB/1026/15598626.html (Accessed August 15, 2012).

[12] For a comprehensive study of how participation in international security institutions has socialized Chinese diplomats and strategists in certain non-realpolitik norms and practices, see Johnston 2008.

observation: historically, each and every avowed challenger against the international system, from Wilhelmine Germany to Stalinist Russia to Maoist China to today's North Korea, clings to a militarized or Hobbesian worldview that overestimates the threats to its security and extols force as the primary means for safeguarding its national interests.[13]

Despite these states' very different political, economic, and cultural backgrounds, I contend that this militarized worldview is based on their common belief in the essential incompatibility between their political goals and values and those embodied in the existing order. Because the international system and its main actors are perceived as the collective enemy, the challenger naturally lives in constant fear of encirclement and subversion. Consequently, it has a tendency to prepare for and engage in violent confrontations. In this sense, the militarized worldview constitutes the ideational basis of the prominent violence proneness of all challengers, including Maoist China.

The modern international system, however, may be conceptualized as a Lockean system, wherein states generally recognize the norm of sovereignty and limit their violence against each other (Wendt 1999: 323-324).[14] A challenger may temporarily disregard the canons of acceptable international behavior, but it rarely desires to live in hostile isolation forever. As a challenger sometimes also wants stable and less antagonistic interactions with the outside world, it cannot long remain oblivious of the fact that the Lockean system, for all its alleged injustices (which motivate the challenger to adopt a confrontational posture in the first place), provides for the

---

[13] For broad analyses of the militarized worldview held by Wilhelmine Germany, Stalinist Russia, and North Korea, see, respectively, Snyder 1984; Tucker 1990; and Buzo 1998.

[14] Bull used the term "Grotian" to describe the modern international system, but in a way similar to Wendt's. In Grotian international society, states are "limited in their conflicts with one another by common rules and institutions," as well as by economic and social intercourse between them (Bull 1977[1995]: 25). Neither Wendt nor Bull, however, gave a full and systematic exposition of the normative implications of a Lockean system for the foreign policy and security behavior of states. I attempt to provide such an account in Chapter 1.

moderation of conflicts through a certain social restraint on violence. Accepting this restraint, all feel secure; flouting it, none feels safe. In this sense, the challenger's predilection for violence becomes both self-fulfilling and self-defeating. Feeling insecure and ascribing the worst motives to others, the challenger is prone to resort to violence for the settlement of disputes; yet, in so acting, it heightens others' sense of insecurity and provokes belligerent reactions, thereby making itself all the more insecure and violence prone.

To break this vicious cycle, the challenger has no alternative but to integrate into the Lockean system, instead of rejecting and undermining it. In essence, integration implies the creation of common interests and participation in the working of common institutions. This process, I argue, would help to decrease the erstwhile challenger's fear and animus toward others, reduce its dependence on force as an essential tool of foreign policy, and increase its confidence in and adherence to peaceful resolution of disputes. Conceivably, the deeper the integration, the more likely the challenger will pursue security through constructive exchanges and mutual forbearance, rather than by flexing its muscles unilaterally. This would in turn give the once challenger a growing stake in maintaining the stability and well-being of the Lockean system.

Ideally, at a certain point, the erstwhile challenger would thereby assume a Lockean worldview that differs significantly from the militarized worldview. Instead of regarding peace as transitory and war inevitable, it now considers peace to be durable and war avoidable. Instead of extolling the utility of force for conflict resolution, it now regards restraint and compromise as possible and advisable. Force, therefore, will now be employed only as a last resort. As will be detailed in this study, this transformation of the militarized worldview is the underlying cause of the amelioration of China's violence proneness.

Outline of the Study

The following eight chapters of this study are summarized as below:

In Chapter 1, I present a theoretical framework for understanding the ideational basis of the challenger's foreign policy and security behavior. Specifically, I address three interrelated questions: (1) how the militarized worldview misdirects the challenger's quest for security; (2) how the existence of international society creates inherent incentives for the amelioration of the militarized worldview; and (3) how integration into international society helps to soften the challenger's predilection for violence, by transforming the militarized worldview into a Lockean worldview. Afterward, I put forth some general expectations about the relationship between the Chinese worldview and China's violence propensity. I also outline the research methodology—a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods—to be adopted for testing these expectations.

In Chapter 2, I provide a historical overview of the evolution of the militarized worldview and its broad impact on Chinese foreign policy and security posture under Mao's reign. Consistent with my expectations, when the militarized worldview predominated, the PRC leadership was intrinsically welded to the belief that the international system was hostile to China and a major war was thus inevitable. As a result, Beijing placed a premium on the use of military force or confrontational strategies as the best means of safeguarding China's security. However, for a short period (1954-1959), the PRC did adopt an integrationist approach toward international society, which helped to increase its interest in peaceful coexistence and decrease its violence proneness accordingly.

In Chapter 3, I proceed to examine the transformation of the militarized worldview in the post-Mao era. Due to this historic transformation, the PRC leadership sees China's national

interest as residing in maintaining the stability and well-being of the international system, not in challenging or undermining it. Correspondingly, Beijing expends a greater effort in seeking friendly and constructive relations with others, while downplaying the role of confrontation and violence in the settlement of disputes. In sum, the historical overview presented in Chapters 2-3 suggests a causally important linkage between the evolution of the Chinese worldview and the PRC's shifting violence propensity.

In Chapter 4, I provide an initial test of the aforementioned linkage, by using simple descriptive statistics to identify the basic changes in Chinese violence proneness between 1949 and 2010, based on the best available data. I examine the broad patterns in the scope, frequency, and intensity of China's use of force during various periods in the evolution of its militarized worldview. To develop a sense of perspective, I also compare and contrast the conflict behavior of the PRC and other major powers in some key aspects and during the same periods. The findings show that there has been an appreciable reduction in the frequency and intensity of China's use of force over the past decades, especially since the decisive Lockean turn in the Chinese worldview in the mid-1980s.

In Chapter 5, I employ large-N statistical analysis to conduct a more nuanced and systematic test of my theory. Primarily, I am interested in investigating when China might use military force against another state (i.e., any state) in the international system, as well as the factors that could increase or decrease the probability of Beijing's resort to force. Again, due to the data availability, the temporal domain is 1949-2010. The quantitative test produces strong evidence that the evolution of China's militarized worldview, rather than the expansion of its relative power, played the foremost role in driving Beijing's use of force during the said period.

In Chapter 6, I investigate the cases of (1) the Sino-Soviet rupture in the 1960s, and (2) China's mishandling of the 1967 Hong Kong crisis. As both the Soviet Union and Britain maintained close and mutually beneficial relations with the PRC prior to the crises, these two cases represent some "least likely" cases in which one expects the militarized worldview to have little impact on Chinese policy toward the two said countries. In both cases, however, I demonstrate that the militarized worldview led Beijing to develop inflexible and zero-sum perceptions of the adversary, to become unwilling to compromise, and to adopt a confrontational strategy that inflamed the disputes and led inexorably to conflict.

In Chapter 7, I investigate the cases of China's generally peaceful approach toward the issues of Taiwan and the South China Sea since the late 1970s. As both issues relate directly to China's sovereignty and territorial integrity, for which Beijing had come into armed conflict with other countries in the past, these two cases also represent some sort of "least likely" cases in which one expects little changes in China's security behavior regardless of the transformation of its worldview. In both cases, however, I demonstrate that the Lockeanized Chinese worldview plays a key role in ameliorating Beijing's violence propensity, by encouraging the PRC to reconsider its national interest in the context of its integration into international society, to strive for regional peace and stability, and to explore ways of resolving disputes through compromise and cooperation.

In Chapter 8, I summarize the findings and enunciate their implications for the advancement of international relations theory and the debate on the rise of China. I also contemplate the domestic and international constraints on the reemergence of the militarized worldview in contemporary China. I wind up with a discussion of how to apply the analytical framework of this study to other spheres of international relations theory.

Chapter 1

The Challenger in International Society:
From the Militarized Worldview to the Lockean Worldview

As a rule, social science theory aims to be both general and specific; that is, "it should tell us something about classes of events as well as specific events at particular places" (King, Keohane, and Verba 1994: 43). Before dwelling upon China, therefore, it is instructive to contemplate, in a generalized way, where the militarized worldview comes from and how it could change. In this chapter, I present a theoretical framework for understanding not only the ideational basis of the challenger's violence propensity, but also the probable incentives inhering in international society that may induce the challenger to mellow. In brief, my argument proceeds as follows:

First, I contend that due to its transformative ambitions, the challenger is haunted by a deep sense of insecurity, which produces the militarized worldview. This worldview misdirects the challenger's quest for security and compels it to prepare for and engage in violence constantly, thereby making the challenger all the more insecure. Once the challenger recognizes this posture harms rather than advances its long-term interests, it may seek alternative ways of enhancing its security, especially through tentative engagement with international society;

Second, I conceptualize the modern international society as a Lockean system, which provides inherent incentives that limit violence and encourage cooperation among states. Meanwhile, international society induces states to form non-zero-sum perceptions of each other and seek the resolution of their disputes through compromise. These incentives appeal to the challenger as well, because they help to ensure its long-term security and development;

Finally, I argue that integration into international society thus has a plausible effect in softening the challenger's violence propensity. The effect is achieved primarily through

21

mechanisms that work to increase trust and mutual benefit between the challenger and the rest of the world. Ultimately, the erstwhile challenger experiences a Lockean turn in its worldview, which leads it to act with greater responsibility and restraint, with a view to maintaining and contributing to the well-functioning of the Lockean system.

Afterward, I elaborate on how to connect this theory with China, followed by a discussion of the research methodology for ascertaining the relationship between the Chinese worldview and Chinese behavior.

The Challenger and the Militarized Worldview

Historically, a challenger is often a rising state, but not all rising states turn out to be challengers. So long as a newcomer acknowledges the legitimacy of the existing order and its basic "rules of the game," it could be peacefully and collaboratively accommodated (e.g., the United States from the late nineteenth century to 1945). The trouble arises only when a rising state attempts to "change the rules governing the system" (Gilpin 1981: 187), or to "redraft the rules by which relations among nations work" (Organski and Kugler 1980: 23), usually by employing military force (Schweller 1994: 105). Although IR scholars differ in their interpretations of the origins of these transformative ambitions (or revisionist intentions), many—especially those in the school of defensive realism—tend to attribute the source of the problem to certain "domestic pathologies," such as the concentration of power in the hands of parochial ruling groups (for a review of this literature, see Rynning and Ringsmose 2008).[15]

---

[15] Offensive realism, on the other hand, contends that that all great powers are revisionists because they are compelled by anarchy to maximize power and to think and act offensively toward other states (Mearsheimer 2001). However, in order to explain why some major states showed little enthusiasm for expansion (e.g., the United States until the late nineteenth century), offensive realism is similarly forced to bring in domestic-level variables (see Rynning and Ringsmose 2008).

This domestic-level explanation, however, falls short in one critical aspect: until fairly recently, liberal democracies constituted but a minority in international society; in other words, most states had been suffering similar "domestic pathologies" in one way or another. Why, then, did only a handful of challengers emerge from among them? Evidently, the challenger must have a more fundamental reason, a *raison d'être*, which compels it not only to question the legitimacy of the prevailing system, but to challenge it with force. At the most basic ideational level, I argue, this *raison d'être* results from the challenger's belief in the essential incompatibility between its own values and those embodied by the system and its main actors.

Indeed, while all states may be egotistic actors, the challenger is apparently more so than others. For, in turning against the international system, the challenger is fortified by two convictions, namely: (1) it is too strong and independent-minded to be bound by the existing rules of the game; and (2) the new rules it intends to establish are right and proper, because they are more commensurate with its values and represent the wave of the future (hence the challengers' near-universal ambition to replace the prevailing international order with a "new order" based on their preferences and values). Intrinsically, therefore, the challenger must be a state with an unshakable faith in the superiority of its own values. But vainglory alone does not necessarily galvanize a state into adopting a confrontational posture toward the outside world. The seventeenth-century Japan, similarly convinced of its own spiritual superiority, chose instead to withdraw into near-total seclusion.

To add fuel to the flame, a second motivating factor must be at work in the emergence of a challenger state. That is, the challenger tends to perceive the whole world as united in opposition to its transformative ambitions, as well as in plotting the extinction of the very values it holds near and dear. Among all challengers, North Korea manifests this siege mentality in the

23

most extreme form. Its official discourses, for example, are wont to depict the Korean nation as the "purest, child-like race" positioned in a hostile environment and threatened unremittingly by imperialism and its lackeys. In this official view, North Korea needs also to keep a wary eye on its corrupt and apathetic neighbors, including the PRC, which are contaminated by Western influences (for an insightful analysis of this North Korean mindset, see Myers 2010).

Thus, the challenger lives in constant fear of encirclement and subversion, perceives the main actors and their collaborators in the system as the collective enemy. "If the world is seen as invariably hostile, the nation with a siege mentality will behave accordingly" (Robins and Post 1997: 59). Gripped by paranoia, the challenger concludes that the best way of ensuring its own security obviously cannot be to play the ostrich and impose a splendid isolation on itself. Strategically, a more sensible and effective option would be to counter the external threat with resolute and, if necessary, military action, for the purpose of establishing a reputation for toughness and deterring the potential aggressor.

In essence, the challenger's extreme threat perceptions, its determination to fight fire with fire, and its belief in the efficacy of military means constitute the core elements of the militarized worldview. Conceptually, I define the militarized worldview as an integrated set of beliefs, as below:

—The world is divided between "us" and "them." Because "they" are cunning, numerous, and bent on "our" destruction, the security situation is one of extreme threats and constant tensions;

—Given "their" unmitigated hostility toward "us," war might break out anytime. Thus, "we" must remain on guard and prepare for the worst;

—Even short of war, the struggle with "them" is continuous and unrelenting. In order to demonstrate "our" resolve and deter "their" adventurism, "we" must show a willingness to engage in violence. Hence, the use of force is a legitimate and essential foreign policy instrument.[16]

In constructivist terminology, the militarized worldview thus reflects a Hobbesian culture of anarchy, which views the world darkly as a jungle-like arena dominated by a kill-or-be-killed logic. Specifically, it reflects the belief that the Self faces an inimical Other (or Others) who "(1) does not recognize the right of the Self to exist as an autonomous being, and therefore (2) will not willingly limit its violence toward the Self" (Wendt 1999: 260). Under the circumstances, the Self naturally tends to perceive the future in worst-scenario terms, overestimate the prospect of war, and accept the legitimacy of violence (Ibid., 262).

In a mutually reinforcing way, these proclivities provide the ideational basis for the challenger's tendency to place a premium on preparation for and engagement in the use of force. In this self-styled life-and-death struggle, compromises are almost of necessity temporary and undesirable for the challenger, for they threaten to upset well-laid plans and mix all the cards.[17] Moreover, the militarized worldview could have adverse and unintended consequences. For example, suspecting constant intrigues and machinations against itself, the challenger may resort

---

[16] This definition is largely based on the aforementioned literature on such archetypal challengers as Wilhelmine Germany, Stalinist Russia, and North Korea. Admittedly, some states (e.g., Israel) may have a militarized worldview for complex reasons and without being a challenger. I focus on the challengers because they represent the best known cases of the militarized worldview and its pathological effects. For theory development, if it is possible even for the challenger to mellow through integration into international society, then it becomes easier to show that states in general could leave the militarized worldview behind and coexist peacefully in a Lockean system.

[17] Consider, for instance, North Korea's prevarication and ultimate refusal to carry out its 1994 agreement with the United States on nuclear nonproliferation. For a comprehensive review of the North Korean stratagem, see Cha 2012, especially chapters 6-7.

to violence regardless of whether the adversary is a clearly identified enemy, for two reasons. First, the challenger is prone to believe that "whoever crosses me is an enemy," as well as to see the implicit threat of subversion in the slightest manifestation of disagreement.[18] Second, when one's favorite tool is a hammer, every problem may look like a nail. At minimum, with the challenger constantly tensed for combat, clashes are inevitable. The militancy of Welhelmine Germany, the Soviet Union under Stalin, and North Korea, speaks for itself when viewed in this light.

In so acting, the challenger is caught in a security dilemma of its own making. Its belligerence, as said earlier, is based on the assumption that the system and its main actors are bent on its destruction, which may or may not be true.[19] Nonetheless, in adopting an uncompromisingly hostile posture, the challenger diminishes its own maneuvering room and destroys the potential goodwill others might harbor toward it, thereby making enemies where there could have been none. To reverse the logic of Wendt (1999: 263), Others are thus forced to mirror back the representations that the Self has attributed to them, and to become its enemy, in

---

[18] In fact, it was not unusual for the challenger to turn upon erstwhile "friends" with identical political systems and ideologies. In theory, this is because the Self may perceive the closest Other as the most threatening Other, "closest in the sense of being able to replace the Self more easily than any alternative" (Hopf 2002: 8). A case in point, as detailed in Chapter 6, is the ideological and political rupture between Maoist China and the Soviet Union in the 1960s. Similarly, since the late 1990s, North Korea has engaged in several militarized disputes with China, which is ironically regarded by the international community as Pyongyang's most important protector. Internally, North Korean propaganda often makes unflattering remarks about the PRC.

[19] For example, prior to and after the establishment of the PRC, Mao and his comrades had grossly exaggerated the danger of American intervention in the Chinese civil war (Christensen 1996, chapter 5; Sheng 1997, chapter 8). Similarly, North Korea has persistently regarded the United States as unalterably hostile to its survival, despite formal and informal assurances to the contrary issued by successive U.S. administrations (Cha 2012, chapters 6-7). My point here is not that Maoist China or North Korea had absolutely nothing to fear from the United States; rather, it is that by acting with persistent bellicosity toward Washington, they might have missed some opportunities of improving their security situation through engagement with the United States.

order to survive. Consequently, however justifiable from its own standpoint, the challenger is demonstrably unwise in pursuing a policy of security through force, because force could only breed enmity and deepen the challenger's sense of isolation and insecurity.

Conceivably, once the challenger realizes that such a posture harms rather than advances its long-term interests, it will reconsider, no matter how hesitantly at the beginning, the prior assumptions that undergird its counterproductive behavior. Provided that a challenger is also a rational actor, it must share the same mundane but vital national interests that concern all states—survival, security, and development, to name but three.

In the long run, these vital interests are better served by constructive engagement with the rest of the world, rather than by total and hostile isolation. Thus, ironically, the same fear of the precariousness of its sovereign independence, which produces the militarized worldview, might also impel the challenger at some point to seek alternative ways of enhancing its security, especially through tentative engagement with international society. Substantively, this often takes the form of some initiatives on the part of the challenger to pursue common or cooperative security, or at least to keep its frictions with others at manageable levels.[20]

To overcome its conflict proneness, however, the challenger needs to develop a profound faith in the capacity of international society for placing a social restraint on violence. That is, it has to be convinced that international society induces states at large to prefer peace to war, so that others will likely act reasonably and less antagonistically toward the challenger itself, instead of taking advantage of its temporary moderation. Only with such a conviction, could the challenger reach the conclusion that it does not have to live as if on knife-edge, now that its

---

[20] Examples include the Soviet Union's attempts in the early 1930s to return to international respectability by promoting the concept of collective security, or the PRC's advocacy of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence in 1954-1959 (analyzed later in Chapter 2).

willingness to accept the restraint on its freedom of action would most likely be reciprocated by others.

This conviction, as will be shown in the next two sections, will grow most likely as a result of the challenger's integration into international society, which can be conceptualized as a Lockean system that provides inherent incentives for limiting violence and promoting cooperation among states.

International Society as a Lockean System: A Tentative Exposition

Fundamentally, both Locke and Grotius regarded peace as normal and recourse to violence undesirable in society, be it a society of humans or of states.[21] In a philosophical sense, the maintenance of peace and the prohibition on aggression constitute the "moral core of the Lockean culture" (Ward 2006: 694). At a minimum, the principal goal of any society, including the society of states, has always been the limitation of violence (Bull 1977[1995]: 18). Judged on this basic criterion, as I argue below, the formation and progress of the modern international system has been characterized to a large extent by a Lockean culture.

Theoretically, since the advent of the Westphalia system in the seventeenth century, the Hobbesian culture of anarchy has given way to a Lockean culture of anarchy, wherein states "expect each other to act as if they recognize their sovereignty, their 'life and liberty,' as a right,

---

[21] Locke (1690[1980]: 15) regarded the state of nature as "a state of peace, good will, mutual assistance and preservation." To be worthy of such a lofty beginning, members of later societies presumably could and should hang together through mutual forbearance and good will; otherwise, human society would simply disintegrate into warring appetites and factions. Similarly, Grotius described peace as the normal condition of the international system; even when states do go to war, they should keep their sights on "the unabated desire, and invariable prospect of peace, as the only end for which hostilities can be lawfully begun" (Grotius 1625[1979]: 417-418).

and therefore not to try to conquer or dominate them" (Wendt 1999: 324).[22] Within this Lockean

or Grotian system, the resort to war is socially constrained in multiple ways; as a result, the Self

may expect Others to use violence sometimes to settle disputes, but to do so only in a self-

limiting way (Bull 1977[1995]: 25, 182; see also Wendt 1999: 281). In such a system, a state

may still feel insecure, but it is hardly rational to remain wedded to a kill-or-be-killed logic.

Furthermore, since the early twentieth century, the international system has shown more

signs of Lockeanization. The Covenant of the League of Nations, for example, not only placed a

binding obligation on all member states to submit their disputes to arbitration or judicial

settlement, but explicitly envisaged the application of sanctions against any member state's

unilateral resort to war.[23] In the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928, more than 60 states, including

Germany and Japan, went a step further, proclaiming that "they condemn recourse to war for the

solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in

their relation with one another."[24] Even when some states violated these rules afterward, they

invariably attempted to justify their behavior, not on the grounds that the rules were wrong, but

by interpreting the terms of the rules in such a way as to serve their own special interests. At any

rate, after the Nuremberg trials in the wake of World War II, few would contest the Grotian

thesis that unjust or aggressive war is morally evil, consequently criminal, and therefore no

longer tolerable in the international system (Bosch 1970, especially chapter 3).

---

[22] Bull (1977[1995]: 66-67) used the term "rules of coexistence" to describe this feature of
international society. By following these rules, states accept the restriction on the use of violence
in world politics, as well as the duty to respect the sovereignty of each other.

[23] This document is available at the Avalon Project of Yale Law School
(http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/leagcov.asp#art16). Accessed November 15, 2012.

[24] This document is available at the Avalon Project of Yale Law School
(http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/imt/kbpact.htm). Accessed November 15, 2012.

To be sure, the Lockean system has *not* delegitimized the threat or use of force altogether. Rather, to paraphrase Bull (1977[1995]: 17), it merely assumes that the peaceful resolution of disputes is the normal condition of relations among member states, "to be breached only in special circumstances and according to principles that are generally accepted." When states do go to war, the Lockean system seeks to control the scope and intensity of the conflict by imposing restrictions on the way in which war is conducted (Legro 1995; Finnemore 1996; Price and Tannenwald 1996). It also seeks to contain the geographical spread of war through laws of neutrality, and to delimit the reasons or causes for which states may legitimately resort to war (Bull 1977[1995]: 182). Thus, the persistence of armed conflict in the Lockean system does not in itself constitute evidence that "falsifies" the prevalence of Lockean norms: for, like international law, norms grow by trial and error, and what matters in this tortuous process is the general trend of progress, not the attendant twists and turns.

In theory, if the modern international society can be conceptualized as a Lockean system, several probable incentives may then be said to inhere in this social environment, encouraging states to act less violently and more cooperatively toward each other.[25] First, the prevalence of peace and restrictions on war should make states much less afraid of each other. In a Hobbesian system plagued by "enmity, malice, violence and mutual destruction" (Locke 1690[1980]: 15), the Self has a natural tendency to regard the Other with suspicion, because the Other might well turn out to be its nemesis, and any accommodation with the Other is therefore potentially

---

[25] Here I demonstrate merely the logical plausibility of these normative incentives; I do not assert that they are influencing state behavior in any and all circumstances, or that they have acquired the status of moral, customary, or operational rules in international politics. This is why this section is entitled a "tentative exposition" of the Lockean system and its inherent incentives. To expound the origins and full implications of these incentives would require a mastery of knowledge in political philosophy, sociology, and social psychology, which is beyond the scope of this study.

30

dangerous and likely to jeopardize the Self's survival in the long run. Under the Lockean system, the Self-Other relationship, while still oppositional, need not be so hopelessly inimical, because it is unnecessary for the Self to ascribe the worst of motives to the Other in order to ensure its own long-term survival.

Second, the establishment of the "right to survival" as a systemic norm should provide states with much greater room for engagement and cooperation with each other. As soon as Self and Other cease to regard one another as single-mindedly antagonistic, they would also downplay the utility of confrontational tactics in their interactions, and explore instead the possibilities of resolving their conflicts through negotiation and compromise. More significantly, the cumulative experience of settling conflicts in a peaceful and mutually acceptable way will cement the basis of trust and understanding, however fragile at the beginning, between Self and Other. At a minimum, it helps the two sides to build effective mechanisms for communication and consultation, which may prove essential to keeping their future conflicts within controllable bounds. Besides, the existence of this *modus vivendi* creates an additional incentive for both sides to maintain the hard-won peace, as well as to deepen exchanges to their mutual benefit. In short, free from the Hobbesian fear of mutual annihilation, even old enemies could turn into new partners under the Lockean system (e.g., France and Germany after World War II).

Third, bound by the systemic norm that even the strong cannot bludgeon the weak into submission at will, states will have much less reason to resort to violence on the pretext of feeling uncertain of each other's motives. To date, it has been a cardinal belief of realist scholars that as rational security seekers, states will always calculate on the basis of the potential of others to do them harm in the future; and the perceived probabilities of such worst-case scenarios, given

uncertainty, will often be high (Copeland 2000: 201-206). This realist logic, however, obscures the distinction between possibility and probability in the Lockean system:

For example, one might reasonably assume that China and the United States have drawn certain contingency plans lest the other side wage aggressive war in the future. But it would be a gross exaggeration to assume that Beijing and Washington are thus secretly and constantly acting on worst-case calculations about those rather remote contingencies. To act this way is not rational, but paranoiac. Indeed, available evidence suggests that the notion of fostering contingent cooperation with America continues to enjoy widespread support among China's leaders and elites, despite their lingering doubts of US intentions (Goldstein 2005, chapter 8; Friedberg 2011, chapter 5; Sutter 2012, chapter 6). For its part, the consensus view of the U.S. government "sees the prospect for both Beijing and Washington to adopt policies that lead to the type of long-term relationship that one expects to characterize ties between two basically cooperative major powers. …The current U.S. attitude is thus one that believes it is feasible and desirable to develop a basically constructive relationship over the long-term with a rising China" (Lieberthal and Wang 2012: 20). Obviously, both sides' faith in the possibility of a nonzero-sum relationship is crucial in sustaining the thin red line between rational and paranoiac planning.

Finally, and as a logical deduction from the foregoing propositions, states are less likely to fall prey to a vicious cycle of power expansion and competition, now that changes in relative capabilities no longer assume a life-and-death significance under the Lockean system. At least, given the growing emphasis on mutual restraint and compromise as a systemic norm, states' concerns about their relative power, though unlikely to vanish, will cease to be the fundamental causal variable in their resort to violence. Rather, whether states fight each other depends increasingly on the nature of the issue in dispute, especially on the absence/presence of territorial

disputes among them (Gochman and Leng 1983; Diehl 1992; Goertz and Diehl 1992; Vasquez 1993; Senese 1996; Hensel 2000; Vasquez and Henehan 2001; Ben-Yahuda 2004; Hassner 2006/2007; Senese and Vasquez 2008).

In fairness, the territorial explanation of states' dispute-proneness does not in itself refute the realist claim that the struggle for power breeds conflict. A possible realist rejoinder, for instance, might be that territorial disputes are simply a proxy of the clash of states' insatiable cravings for power; moreover, the existence of such disputes provides states with a perpetual, convenient, and self-righteous pretext for using their power aggressively against each other. Nonetheless, if this realist rejoinder holds, then two hypotheses would logically follow: (1) states would invariably prefer protracted disagreement to peaceful settlement regarding territorial disputes, since such a settlement would proscribe their future options of expanding power as well as their opportunities of demonstrating it; and (2) even after states settle their territorial disputes peacefully, they would sooner or later enter into conflict again, since the struggle for power is allegedly a predominant characteristic of international relations. Neither of these hypotheses, as shown below, is borne out by the findings of contemporary empirical research.

As a matter of fact, most dyadic territorial Militarized Interstate Disputes (MIDs) between 1816 and 2001 did not escalate into war (Senese and Vasquez 2008, chapter 6). Instead, most territorial disputes, or territorially sparked international crises, result in more peaceful settlements than in militarized conflict (Hensel 2001; Ben-Yahuda 2004; Hensel and Mitchell 2005; Hensel et al. 2008). Psychologically, this phenomenon suggests that, precisely because of the intrinsic salience—and hence high domestic costs—of territorial disputes, decision-makers would try to adopt all sorts of strategies, peaceful and non-peaceful alike, in an effort to resolve them (Allee and Huth 2006a, 2006b; Vasquez 2009, chapter 10). In other words, states do not

succumb to the will to power in any and all circumstances of territorial disputes. Rather, it is those territorial issues with greater salience (e.g., natural resources, strategic location, historical possessions, important homelands, or identity ties) that tend to produce more frequent and severe MIDs (Hensel 2001; Hensel and Mitchell 2005; Hensel et al. 2008).

Moreover, there is accumulating empirical evidence that the resolution of territorial disagreements between states has a remarkably pacifying impact on their subsequent relations (for a summary of this literature, see Vasquez 2009, chapter 10). Kocs (1995) finds that war among states is largely a function of the legal status of their boundaries: after neighboring states settle their boundaries by legal (and thus mutually acceptable) means, the probability of war between them declines appreciably. This finding is confirmed by Huth (1996) as well as Gibler (1996, 1997), who demonstrate that after states settle their territorial disputes, they tend not to overturn the previously signed agreement, thereby averting the prospect of war.

More recently, drawing on the data from the Western Hemisphere and Western Europe, Hensel (2006) provides further evidence that once a territorial claim is settled, the likelihood that the concerned states would have a MID—no matter what kind—in the future decreases precipitately. Indeed, all neighbors—democratic or nondemocratic—seem content with a peaceful coexistence after resolving their border disputes (Gibler 2007; Owsiak 2012). Thus, contrary to realist expectations, there appears to be a definitive limit to states' conflict propensity if and when their territorial boundaries are legally and securely established in the Lockean system, regardless of future fluctuations in their relative power positions.

Theoretically, the militarized worldview thus seems an anomaly (or a superfluity) in the international system or international society, which, be it called Lockean or Grotian, works in essence to promotes peace, compromise, and cooperation among states. In this social

34

environment, states do not have to perceive each other in the darkest colors, but ought to regard peace as sustainable and conflicts as avoidable or at least manageable without recourse to war.[26] This would in turn erode the belief that force is the most efficacious means of resolving disputes, a key notion that buttresses the militarized worldview. Within this context, even adversaries may feel at least encouraged to explore the possibility of peaceful coexistence and constructive exchanges with others.

Thus, as soon as a challenger begins to reconsider the wisdom of its posture, it ought to feel, too, that its survival and security is best guaranteed by integrating into the Lockean system, not by rejecting and undermining it. After the challenger adopts an integrationist approach toward international society, I argue that its fear and animosity toward others will gradually decrease, and so will its dependence on violence as a principal tool of foreign policy. The end result would be the transformation of the militarized worldview into a Lockean worldview, which diminishes the erstwhile challenger's violence proneness correspondingly. How this process might unfold is described in the next section.

<div align="center">Integration and the Transformation of the Militarized Worldview</div>

In treating paranoia (whose manifestations bear a striking resemblance to the militarized worldview), psychiatrists and clinical psychologists note an interesting phenomenon. That is, a patient who seemingly "acts out" on the basis of her delusion does not necessarily hold her belief with 100 percent conviction. Instead, she might think that "It *must* be true but I wish it wasn't." Under the circumstances, the best way of treating the patient is to introduce her into a social

---

[26] Here I draw inspiration from Johnston (1996: 223, footnote 15), who suggests that a nonzero-sum view of the adversary is inherently associated with the belief that war is an aberrant or at least preventable event. Following this logic, I argue that as the challenger begins to perceive the others' nonthreatening intent, it would also perceive conflicts as by and large negotiable without resort to violence.

network, wherein a process of enculturation may induce her to generate counterarguments against her initial belief of her own volition (Chadwick 1992: 142-143).

Similarly, for the challenger to question its old ways and develop a faith in internationally held norms, such as common or cooperative security and peaceful management of disputes, it has to be persuaded of their applicability through its own experience of integration. Because integration implies the creation of common interests and participation in the working of common institutions (see Bull 1977[1995]: 13), the experience is likely to prompt the erstwhile challenger to perceive its relations with others in less and less inimical and zero-sum terms, as well as to contribute to the maintenance of order and stability on a mutual and reciprocal basis. In essence, there may be three mechanisms for integrating the challenger into international society, namely, trade, international institutions, and diplomatic recognition. My reasoning is as follows.

Traditionally, trade is the first and foremost indicator of a state's interconnectedness with international society. Indeed, since the era of Adam Smith and Immanuel Kant, a key tenet of liberal thought has been that the expansion of economic and trade linkages promotes peace among states. Through dense and growing networks of economic interdependence, trade helps to deepen interstate understanding and create a strong common interest in preserving good interstate relations, thereby dampening the prospects for conflict and war. In the contemporary scholarship, many empirical studies provide support for this liberal thesis (e.g., Oneal and Ray 1997; Oneal and Russett 1997; Oneal and Russet 1999; Russett and Oneal 2001; Gartzke and Li 2003).[27] Presumably, the challenger is not immune to the magnetic pull of trade. That is, the greater its dependence on trade, the more reluctant it becomes to upset the applecart of stable,

---

[27] To be sure, some other studies have produced results that are mixed, weak, and even contrary to liberal expectations (e.g., Barbieri and Levy 1999; Barbieri and Schneider 1999; Barbieri 2002; Mansfield and Pollins 2003; Rowe 2005).

constructive exchanges with other states, and the more likely it will exercise some self-restraint when a dispute arises.

The second well-known mechanism of integration is participation in the working of international institutions, including intergovernmental organizations, regimes, and conventions. That these institutions play a key role in promoting cooperation and trust among nations is a familiar theme of neoliberal institutionalism. Through sanctioning and rewarding mechanisms, institutions embed states in an international social environment that encourages communication, reduces uncertainty, and facilitates credible commitments (Keohane 1984). By engaging with international institutions, states become increasingly integrated into the international system, which helps to reorient their identities, preferences, and interests toward commonly accepted standards of appropriate behavior (Finnemore 1996; Keck and Sikkink 1998; Risse, Ropp, and Sikkink 1999; Russett and Oneal 2001).

Furthermore, international institutions "often have corporate identities, traits, missions, normative cores, and official discourses at odds with realpolitik axioms" (Johnston 2008: 30). In particular, some arms control institutions advocate an ideology "where, interalia, multilateral transparency is normatively better than unilateral non-transparency; disarming is better than arming as a basis of security; common security is better than unilateral security; and evidence of the potential for cooperative, joint gains in security in the international system is greater than evidence that the environment is a fixed, conflictual one" (Ibid., 30). Participation in those institutions therefore helps to socialize the former challenger in counter-realpolitik norms and practices, including those conducive to peaceful management or resolution of disputes.

Through sustained participation in international institutions, the erstwhile challenger could also develop a reputation for "credibility, trustworthiness, and cooperation" (Johnston and

Evans 1999: 237), which in turn creates a sense of mutual identification between itself and other

members of international society. Predictably, the stronger this sense grows, the less insecure the

challenger feels, and the less likely it would revert to the old habit of settling disputes by violent

confrontations. With the passage of time, therefore, the erstwhile challenger might acquire a

stake in continued participation and, by implication, continued adherence to shared norms and

rules of international society. At a minimum, it would find it costly and difficult to extricate itself

from the accumulated and manifold common interests that promote cooperation and dampen

conflict.

Finally, a third and relatively less explored mechanism of integration is diplomatic

recognition. While all states are apt to seek higher status in the international arena, rising powers

are perhaps more sensitive to the lack of an appropriate status, and thereby prone to exact

recognition by force (Wallace 1971, 1972; Midlarsky 1975; Gochman 1980. For more recent

elaborations, see Volgy, Corbetta, Grant, and Baird 2011). Conversely, when the avenues of

upward mobility within the system are plentiful, the occurrence of interstate violence is found to

diminish in general (Volgy and Mayhall 1995). Due to the challenger's violence proneness, other

states are rather more likely to keep it at a distance than to accept it as one of the family. Until

1970, for example, there were still more foreign ambassadors stationed in Taipei (capital of

Chiang Kai-shek's Republic of China) than in Beijing. The United States recognized the PRC as

the sole legal government of China only in 1979, and some regional powers (e.g., Indonesia,

South Korea, and South Africa) did not establish official relations with Beijing until the 1990s.

Thus, despite the PRC's admission into the United Nation in 1971 (and despite its occupation of

the Security Council seat thereafter), the lack of diplomatic recognition remains an important

obstacle to Beijing's full-scale engagement with international society.

Persistent non-recognition, however, aggravates the challenger's siege mentality and sharpens its conflict propensity. To break this vicious cycle, other states usually need to take the initiative in signaling to the challenger a degree of acceptance and respect; and the prospect for establishing formal diplomatic relations could be just the alluring if incipient signal:

For the challenger, more diplomatic recognition from the international society implies that not all Others are unalterably hostile; ergo, the system is not necessarily united in single-minded opposition to its survival. In this connection, the desire for diplomatic recognition on the challenger's part may lead it to try to make as many friends as possible, instead of viewing all and sundry with suspicion. This consideration also motivates the challenger to reassess the utility of its prior, confrontational ways, as happens even in the case of North Korea, according to the vivid memoirs of a former Swedish ambassador to Pyongyang (Erik 2002).

For their part, the states that extend formal recognition to the challenger have presumably done so both in expectation of encouraging the challenger to act more responsibly, *and* because the challenger has shown signs of meeting their expectations in some respects. Through this process, both sides are reassured about the other side's potential goodwill and reasonableness. Conceivably, the more diplomatic recognitions it receives, the more likely the once challenger would appreciate the non-threatening intent of others, and the less likely it would act violently to resolve disagreements, because such behavior could only poison the emerging atmosphere of amity and alienate current and prospective friends. Moreover, the political necessity to allay the concerns of its diplomatic friends may lead the challenger to moderate its foreign policy behavior in other aspects as well, as happened in Chinese diplomacy in the mid-1950s (for details, see Chapter 2).

After the establishment of official relations, the challenger has further incentives to engage other states in more and more status-enhancing activities, including leadership summits, high-level dialogues, and strategic partnerships. Again, such activities may help to strengthen the bond of reciprocal benefits between the two sides. For the once challenger, these activities indicate the willingness of others to recognize its more positive identity and status, as well as the possibility of obtaining a greater degree of respectability within international society. For other states, these activities provide them with additional opportunities to enlist the support of the erstwhile challenger for maintaining the prevailing order, while persuading it to move continually in a direction of becoming a responsible and constructive partner. Predictably, as its feelings of being accorded a proper place in the existing order grow, the challenger's sense of dissatisfaction with the international system will inevitably decrease, and so will its propensity to challenge the system's legitimacy or undermine its stability.[28]

As a matter of fact, even informal dialogues between the challenger and other states are useful for facilitating communication and clarifying misunderstanding, thereby preventing crises or managing crisis escalation. In the 1950s and 1960s, for example, the United States was engaged in protracted and seemingly fruitless ambassadorial-level talks with the rambunctious Maoist China. Unbeknownst to most observers, however, these talks actually provided a backdoor channel for Beijing and Washington to avert a major crisis in the Taiwan Strait in 1962, when Chiang Kai-shek was itching for a large-scale invasion of the Chinese mainland. After enlisting tacit U.S. support in keeping the situation under control, Beijing acknowledged for the first time that American intentions toward the PRC were not necessarily aggressive, and that

---

[28] Here I draw inspiration from Larson and Shevchenko (2010), who provide an insightful analysis of how to use status incentives to induce rising states to contribute to the maintenance of world order.

Washington might even play a positive, if conditional, role in maintaining peace in the region (Huang and Li 2010: 67-71). A similar case could be made of U.S.-North Korean dialogues too: from 1984 to the present, even the recalcitrant Pyongyang tended to exercise some self-restraint and refrain from fresh provocations during major and ongoing negotiations with the United States (Cha 2012: 457-459).

In sum, owing to the above three mechanisms of integration, the security and welfare of the once challenger would be increasingly bound up with the stability and well-being of the international system. The deeper its integration, the more likely it will pursue security through constructive exchanges and mutual forbearance, and the less likely it will choose to settle disputes by flexing its muscles unilaterally. The militarized worldview, in other words, evaporates little by little through this process. Ideally, at some point, the once challenger would therefore assume a Lockean worldview that differs significantly from the militarized worldview:

—Instead of reading the worst into the intent of Others, it assumes that Others observe certain norms and rules to limit the use of violence against the Self;

—Instead of regarding peace as transitory and war inevitable, it considers peace to be lasting and war avoidable;

—Instead of extolling the utility of force for conflict resolution, it regards mutual restraint and compromise as possible and advisable. Force, therefore, should be employed only as a last resort.

Conceptually, however, there must be an intermediate stage of development between the militarized (Hobbesian) and Lockean worldviews. At this transitional stage, the challenger develops a less inimical view of the international system, creates initial linkages of common interest and mutual identification with others, and acquires an embryonic stake in the stability of

the status quo. Correspondingly, I suggest that the challenger would also perceive war as delayable and peace as possibly sustainable at this stage. This is not just a semantic change: as said earlier, perceiving war as inevitable implies the primacy of force in conflict resolution, whereas perceiving war as avoidable implies the devaluation of violence as a foreign policy instrument. Logically, perceiving war as postponable thus represents an intermediate stage in the challenger's shifting perceptions of the utility of force: that is, if war can be delayed, it is also preventable and eventually avoidable; lasting peace, under the circumstances, becomes a greater possibility, and resort to violence a less pressing necessity. In other words, perceiving war as delayable implies not only that the erstwhile challenger begins to hold a less Hobbesian view of its security situation, but also that it develops a greater interest in preserving peace than in preparing for war.

In conclusion, Table 1.1 summarizes the distinctive beliefs and their behavioral implications at various stages of the transformation of the militarized worldview.

Connecting Theory with China: Expectations and Research Methodology

Obviously, my main arguments above follow a constructivist approach in several critical aspects. Instead of treating states and state interests as an immutable given, I posit that states are continually evolving through social interaction, and so are their conceptions of national interests. Instead of espousing a materialist—i.e., power- or capability-driven—theory of state behavior, I emphasize the role of ideational forces in structuring states' images of the world, molding their strategic preferences, and constraining their policy choices. In particular, I subscribe to the constructivist insight that "many national security interests depend on a particular construction of self-identity in relation to the conceived identity of others" (Jepperson, Wendt, and Katzenstein 1996: 60); therefore, a change in the identity or basic character of a state will likely change its

42

interests and preferences fundamentally. Focusing on China, I aim to add fresh, cumulable empirical evidence to this robust and thriving research program.

But demonstrating the power of ideas in influencing state—in this case, Chinese— behavior is only half of my goal. The other aim of the project is to investigate the potential capacity of international society for weaning states away from certain realpolitik norms and practices, such as settling disputes by force. For constructivists, it is almost a self-evident truth that the international system (or international society) can change state actions by changing what states want (Finnemore 1996: 5-6). Few constructivist accounts, however, have explored the question of whether the existence of international society, even if a conceptual one, creates any plausible incentives for states to act less violently and more cooperatively toward each other.

Yet, the question is vitally important in and of itself. For, if the answer is yes (even if a very tentative yes), then we may conclude that the member states of international society are likely to acquire, over time, an abiding interest in seeking security through cooperation. In the long run, therefore, the international society may indeed provide a measure of universal amity as well as freedom from wanton aggression. Surely this normative possibility is worth theoretical and empirical exploration. Without producing an explanation of the normative incentives inhering in international society for peaceful resolution (or management) of disputes, constructivists cannot refute the realist claim that the struggle for power is a perennial and predominant feature of international politics, or that "international society" is but a shield for states' endless pursuit of power, instead of being an end in itself.

Some may dismiss the existence of normative incentives, if any, as irrelevant, on the grounds that states tend to pay lip service to international society while disregarding it in reality. But the issue at stake here, to paraphrase Hedley Bull, is that an international system in which a

state often considers it necessary to provide its peers with an explanation of its conduct and in terms of rules they accept, is radically different from one in which no such political necessity exists. Moreover, the norms and rules of behavior in the modern international system, especially those related to the right of states to resort to violence against each other, are not "infinitely malleable and do circumscribe the range of choices of states which seek to give pretexts in terms of them" (Bull 1977[1995]: 43). This should constitute a good starting point for conceptualizing international society as a more secure and less violent social environment than it would otherwise be.

To posit that a normative international society exists, of course, does not explain or ascertain its effects. To test for such effects, a strong case can be made by looking at China. That is, to the extent that integration into international society induces any changes in the normative characteristics of states, such changes ought to be easiest to observe in a state that is at once an erstwhile challenger and an allegedly archetypal realist actor—which is, in this case, none other than the PRC. In this connection, this single-country study need not be seen as something that stands apart from mainstream IR scholarship. On the contrary, it intends to use China to generate new insights and explanatory hypotheses about an issue with broader and significant implications for international relations theory.

To begin with, based on the above theoretical framework, I posit four broad sets of plausible empirical expectations concerning China, as below:

—When the militarized worldview predominates, the PRC leadership would consistently express a belief that China and the existing international system are intrinsically antagonistic toward each other, and that a major war is the inevitable outcome of this mutual antagonism. As

44

a result, Beijing would place a premium on the use of military force or confrontational strategies as the best means of safeguarding China's security and overthrowing the existing system;

—After the militarized worldview softens, the PRC leadership would move closer to the belief that there is much room in the international system for peaceful coexistence, and that a major war is thus delayable and peace may endure for some time. Therefore, Beijing would expend a greater effort in contributing to the maintenance of world peace and stability, as well as in pursuing amity and cooperation with other states. Meanwhile, it would also demonstrate a willingness to downplay the role of confrontation and violence in the settlement of disputes;

—After the militarized worldview is transformed into a Lockean worldview, the PRC leadership would consistently proclaim a faith that a major war is avoidable and peace lasting, and that China's fundamental interests reside in maintaining the international system, not in challenging or undermining it. Consequently, Beijing would place a high valuation on establishing friendly and constructive relations with all states, including erstwhile enemies and potential adversaries. Meanwhile, it would attach greater importance to peaceful resolution or management of disputes, stress the utility of mutual restraint and compromise, and reserve the option of use of force only as a last resort;

—Finally, a key factor in the change of the Chinese worldview would be the PRC leadership's assessment of the normative characteristics of the international society. In particular, upon the PRC's deepening integration into the international system, we should expect to see China's leaders express the views that most states desire peace, not war, in international society; that such an environment makes it possible for the PRC to seek engagement and cooperation more actively, instead of acting from fear and distrust; and that conflicts can be resolved by and large through constructive exchanges and peaceful consultations, without resort to violence.

These views should not only show up in the deliberations or arguments of China's leaders, but also play an observable role in determining Chinese foreign policy and security posture in ways consistent with my earlier arguments. In other words, China's integration into international society should have some observable causal impact upon the change of the Chinese worldview and, relatedly, Chinese behavior.

To investigate whether and to what extent these expectations hold true, I use both quantitative and qualitative methods. Nowadays, quantitative methods play an increasingly important part in IR scholarship. Based on numerical measurements and statistical analyses, quantitative research often proves useful in uncovering patterns and trends in social, political, and economic phenomena. Nonetheless, in the crucial field of Chinese foreign policy and security behavior, very few scholars have attempted to use quantitative methods.[29]

In my view, quantitative research can make a critical contribution to the debate on China's rise and its impact on international security, by producing systematic and scientifically cumulable evidence about Chinese behavior. To date, the literature on Chinese foreign policy has produced many interesting hypotheses about the possible determinants of Chinese security behavior. However, "[a]ll hypotheses need to evaluated empirically before they can made a contribution to knowledge" (King, Keohane, and Verba 1994: 16). Otherwise, they are indistinguishable from informed speculations, making it difficult to draw definitive causal inferences.[30] A commonly accepted way of empirical evaluation is through quantitative research, which is easily interpretable and replicable by other researchers.

---

[29] Scobell (2003: 205, footnote 58) was able to identify only two quantitative studies in this field. As of this writing (in July 2013), only two more quantitative studies have been added to the list—Kastner and Saunders (2012), and Li (2013).

[30] For example, China scholars often disagree as to whether the transformation of the PRC from a revolutionary state to a status quo actor has decreased Beijing's proclivity to use force. While

However, while quantitative tests are necessary for determining *whether* some factors matter more than others in causing a certain phenomenon, qualitative studies are often useful for determining *why* this is so. Detailed investigations of Chinese foreign and security policy motivations, therefore, are of utmost importance to a full and in-depth understanding of the relationship between the Chinese worldview and Chinese behavior. To better illustrate this relationship in certain key cases, I will also employ the much valued method of structured, focused historical comparison.

As advocated by Alexander George (1979: 61-62), this method "deals selectively with only certain aspects of the historical case" while employing general, standardized questions to investigate causes and effects in each case intensively. In this way, researchers demonstrate the uniqueness of a hypothesized causal variable in some depth and identify a variety of different causal patterns, but their findings are generalizable in a way that contributes to the scientific cumulation of knowledge about the phenomenon in question. Meanwhile, this method offers a greater degree of relevance to real policy problems, because the standardized questions provide policymakers with a useful template for diagnosing specific situations and for making certain "contingent predictions" about the way a situation would possibly develop, given the presence or absence of various conditions or factors (George and Smoke 1974: 96-97).

---

some believe this to be the case (e.g., Zhao 1996: 42), others assert that there are no significant changes in the frequency and intensity of China's resort to force (e.g., Scobell 2003: 16, 38). In his pioneering study, Johnston (1998a) explores quantitatively the patterns of the PRC's involvement in militarized interstate disputes between 1949 and 1992; but he does not deal with China's use of force per se. Li (2013) provides a systematic and quantitative test of the issue for the first time, which produces strong evidence that the PRC's violence proneness has moderated significantly as a result of its identity change.

With an eye to policy relevance, I choose four important cases that used to have, or still will have, significant impact on Chinese foreign relations and international security. These include:

(1) The Sino-Soviet rupture in the 1960s, which led the two countries to the verge of war in 1969;

(2) The 1967 Hong Kong crisis, in which China displayed surprising belligerence toward Britain, despite the basically constructive relationship between the two countries since 1949;

(3) China's gradualist and generally peaceful approach toward Taiwan since 1979;

(4) China's relative self-restraint in the South China Sea up to very recent years.

The first two cases are chosen because they are, in a sense, the "least likely" cases, or cases in which one expects least that the militarized worldview would misguide Chinese foreign policy behavior at the time. Given the PRC's then enduring rivalry with the United States, it was essential for Beijing to maintain a stable and cooperative relationship with Moscow and London, which had previously proven a valuable source of political, economic, and diplomatic assistance. That Beijing should choose instead to estrange or enrage its erstwhile friends or quasi-partners, therefore, provides a potent testimony to the harmful impact of the militarized worldview on Chinese diplomacy.

Similarly, the last two cases also represent some sort of the "least likely" cases in which one expects ideational variables to have little impact on China's noted violence propensity. The issues of Taiwan and the South China Sea, after all, relate directly to China's sovereignty and territorial integrity, for which the PRC has repeatedly come into armed conflict and even wars with neighboring countries. Nevertheless, in the early phases of China's integration into international society, Beijing had already determined to resolve these two contentious issues by

peaceful and cooperative means. Exploring why China has formulated and adhered basically to this approach to date, therefore, will shed illuminating light on the inherent constraints that a demilitarized or Lockean worldview places on Chinese foreign policy and security behavior.

In accord with structured, focused historical comparison, my case studies concentrate on exploring how PRC decision-makers (1) perceive and assess a major foreign policy problem (i.e., a problem involving at least one major-state adversary), and (2) formulate what they believe to be the best policy options, *in the presence or absence of the militarized worldview*. The following standardized questions will guide my inquiry into each case:

—What goals did Beijing consider to be most worth pursuing in managing a certain foreign policy problem?

—What approach did Beijing consider to be the best or most effective for pursuing those goals?

—What constraints did Beijing consider to be most important in weighing its options?

—How did Beijing calculate the relative utilities and risks of alternative courses of action?

Drawing on many primary and secondary PRC materials hitherto unused in the English-language literature, I attempt to provide a full account of the contextual and idiosyncratic features of each case, with a view to demonstrating how various causal factors might combine in ways that foster conflictual or cooperative Chinese behavior. In addition to these four major cases, I would briefly examine a few others, including China's management of its territorial disputes with India, Burma, and Pakistan, which are intended as short examples that help to clarify or corroborate certain hypothesized causal mechanisms that find support in quantitative analyses. Overall, my cases vary in both explanatory and outcome variables, so as to avoid the common pitfall of selecting wholly on the dependent variable.

49

In the next two chapters, I begin by providing a broad overview of the evolution of China's militarized worldview and its behavioral implications. This overview would serve as the qualitative basis for the more systematic and quantitative test of the determinants of China's use of force in Chapters 4-5. It will also serve as a prelude to the more detailed studies of four major cases in Chapters 6-7.

Tables

TABLE 1.1: The Transformation of the Militarized Worldview into the Lockean Worldview

Militarized worldview	Militarized worldview in transition	Lockean worldview
1) The relationship with the international system is inimical and zero-sum.	1) The relationship with the international system allows for a certain measure of compromise and cooperation.	1) The maintenance of the international system is a desirable end in itself.
2) War is inevitable; peace is transitory.	2) War is delayable; peace is sustainable for some time.	2) War is avoidable; peace is lasting.
3) Force is a principal instrument of foreign policy.	3) Force becomes less important for conflict resolution.	3) Force is only a last resort.

Chapter 2

Mao's China and the Militarized Worldview

Contrary to the conventional wisdom that Washington had a "lost chance" in 1949-50 to reach an accommodation with Mao's China, contemporary scholarship has shown that the PRC was, so to speak, "born anti-American" (Sheng 1997: 186). Long before October 1949, the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) had come to regard the United States as unalterably hostile to the Chinese revolution and bent on its destruction through outright intervention or covert sabotage (Sheng 1997; see also Christensen 1996b, chapter 5). More significantly, proud of their triumph in China, Mao and his comrades believed that the Chinese revolution could and should be replicated worldwide, and that the CCP bore a special responsibility for promoting world revolution, at the risk of antagonizing the West and China's neighboring states if need be (Chen 2001: 122; Yang 2003: 341-344). There was, therefore, no "chance" for Washington to lose to avert a collision course with Mao's China, which had assumed the posture of a challenger to the status quo order literally from its birth date.

As a revolutionary challenger, the PRC was also born with an acute sense of insecurity. China, after all, was just liberated from foreign imperialist influences that had bedeviled the Middle Kingdom for the past hundred years; was it not natural, then, that the thwarted external enemies would seek to collude with internal enemies to restore their lost supremacy in China? In fact, from the very first days of the PRC, China's leaders had lived in constant fear of a U.S. invasion (Sheng 1997: 178-180). Eager to turn China into an impregnable fortress, the CCP

leadership not only launched wave after wave of purges against suspect elements at home,[31] but imposed strict restrictions on China's contact with the outside world.[32]

More significantly, as Chen (2001: 13) notes, because Mao and his comrades were determined to play a central role in promoting world revolution, they logically felt that the PRC thus became the primary enemy of international reactionary forces and faced an extremely threatening security situation. Thus, Maoist China was constantly "under great pressure to take extraordinary steps to defend and promote [its] security interests," especially by frequent resort to armed force (Chen 2001: 13-14). Strategically, this posture reflected the deep-seated Maoist belief that "the best deterrence is belligerence" (Whiting 1975: 202). That is, instead of clinging to a purely defensive position and reacting to challenges launched by the enemy on its own terms,

---

[31] Even before the establishment of the PRC, the CCP was already gripped by an extraordinary spy mania. In early 1949, shortly after the communist forces "liberated" Beijing (soon to be the capital of the PRC), the CCP decided to adopt a policy of "cleaning the house and evicting the guests" (*saojia zhuke*) vis-à-vis the foreign resident community in the ancient capital. By July 1950, the Beijing Public Security Bureau had identified about 25% of all foreign residents aged 12 and over as "spy suspects" or "unlawful elements," who were then forced to leave China. Of the remaining 1,262 foreign residents in Beijing, the PRC authorities arrested, detained, or evicted a total of 871 on espionage charges in 1951-52. By 1953, the housing-cleaning mission was accomplished with such thoroughness that few foreign expatriates were left in Beijing (Zhu 2006: 346-349). In 1950-1953, while engaging in the Korean War, the CCP also launched a nationwide "campaign for the suppression of counterrevolutionaries," which led to the execution of over 700, 000 alleged "counterrevolutionaries" and put another 2.5 million in jail or under probation (Yang 2006: 59).

[32] Even people-to-people exchanges with the West were then considered subversive and dangerous. In May 1950, Mao was enraged by the "grave errors" committed by a unit of the People's Liberation Army (PLA) in dealing with an American missionary school in Nanping, Fujian Province. Having requisitioned part of the school to house its political staff, the PLA unit made friendly overtures to the American missionaries by inviting them to watch a performance of its troupe. Moreover, twenty PLA cadres and soldiers were found to have committed the unforgivable sin of conversing with the Americans of their own volition. In Mao's eyes, these ostensibly innocuous exchanges were a gross violation of Party and military discipline. Thus, the Chairman personally drafted a directive to all PLA troops, warning that no such voluntary exchanges with foreigners would be tolerated in the future (Mao 1987: 336).

it makes more sense to meet the external threat with powerful and resolute counterchallenges launched at times and places that could yield a sharp initiative to Beijing.

In this chapter, I provide a historical overview of Chinese foreign policy and security posture under Mao's reign, as outlined above. My principal aim is to demonstrate the causal importance of the militarized worldview in stimulating and magnifying Maoist China's violence proneness. In so doing, I take issue with the claim that Mao created foreign crises mainly for the purpose of sustaining his permanent revolution at home.[33] I argue, instead, that China's leaders took the goal of promoting world revolution very seriously and sought to challenge the legitimacy of the existing world order, or to undermine its stability, whenever and wherever possible. Ironically, being a challenger made Beijing feel all the more insecure, fortified its conviction about the inevitability of war, and sharpened its readiness to prepare for and engage in violence (which, according to Marxist dogma, is an essential tool for overthrowing the old order and establishing the new one). Thus, for most of the Maoist period, the PRC was ideationally predisposed to act antagonistically toward the prevailing international order, instead of seeking reasonable accommodation within it.

However, investigating the ideational sources of Maoist China's violence propensity is only half of my goal. The other aim of this chapter is to demonstrate that, for a short but significant period, the PRC's incipient and positive engagement with international society did help to vitiate the militarized worldview and decrease the penchant of Mao and his comrades for bellicose postures or confrontational tactics. In 1954-1959, owing to its broadening contact and cooperation with the outside world, Beijing developed not only a less inimical view of the

---

[33] This view is most clearly expressed by Chen Jian: "Beijing's leaders use force [abroad] always for the purpose of domestic mobilization. Mao and his comrades fully understood that the tension created by an international crisis provided them with the best means to call the whole nation to act in accordance with the will and terms of the CCP" (Chen 2001: 14).

international system, but also a greater interest in maintaining peace than in preparing for war. As a result, the PRC showed a notable willingness to seek security through peaceful coexistence—by downplaying the goal of world revolution, deepening constructive exchanges with other countries, and pursuing peaceful resolution of territorial disputes.

Regrettably, this integrationist approach was interrupted in 1960, when the CCP leadership reaffirmed the promotion of world revolution as the overriding goal of Chinese foreign policy. Nevertheless, it set an important precedent for, and was in many ways a harbinger of, Deng Xiaoping's efforts to demilitarize the Chinese worldview in the late 1970s (for details, see Chapter 3). As such, it deserves a full and careful exploration, and many details of this important but often overlooked period are recounted here only for the first time.[34]

The Rise of Revolutionary China as a Challenger, 1949-1953

As a matter of fact, the CCP embarked upon strategic planning for the promotion of world revolution long before it seized power in China; and, due to geographical proximity, Southeast Asia occupied a central place in that planning. As early as July 1948, the CCP's Hong Kong-based Southern Bureau, foreseeing the strategic importance of Indochina to China and international communism, had dispatched five secret envoys to Vietnam, then a French colony, with a view to rallying the overseas Chinese under the CCP's banner (Qian 1999: 6). In December 1948, the CCP also established official contact with the Malayan Communist Party, and undertook to provide political and military training for its cadres, most of whom were ethnically Chinese (Chin 2003: 254-255). The ambitions of Mao and his associates, moreover, received a direct and substantial endorsement from the Soviet Union.

---

[34] In October 2012, three PRC historians surveyed the progress in the study of Cold War history in China over the last decade and beyond (Liang, Xia, and Chen 2012). Surprisingly, the moderation of Chinese diplomacy in 1954-1959 still has not received systematic treatment in the PRC historical scholarship.

In late June 1949, Mao dispatched a trusted lieutenant, Liao Shaoqi, to visit the Soviet Union, on a secret mission of briefing the Kremlin on the domestic and foreign policies to be adopted after the establishment of the PRC. In a report to Stalin's Politburo on July 4, Liu pledged that the cardinal principle of Beijing's diplomatic activities was to "struggle against various imperialist countries" (Liu 2005, Vol.1: 11). Impressed by the CCP's revolutionary zeal, Stalin took an unusual step to inflame it further. At a state banquet, Stalin opined that the gravity of world revolution had shifted from Europe to China and East Asia. Therefore, he suggested a "division of labor" in the coming march of international communism—i.e., while Moscow would concentrate on the West, Beijing should shoulder a greater responsibility in the East by assisting the national liberation movements across the colonial, semi-colonial, and subject countries. In those countries, Stalin emphasized, the experience of the Chinese revolution would exert a considerable influence and was more readily applicable (Shi 1991: 412).

With this blessing from the supreme pontiff of international communism, the CCP leadership wasted little time sounding a high-pitched clarion call. Shortly after the founding of the PRC, on November 16, 1949, Liu Shaoqi delivered the keynote address to the pro-communist Asian and Oceanian Trade Unions' Conference that met in Beijing. The triumph of the Chinese revolution, declared Liu, indicated that the "Chinese path" was also "a path that should be taken by many colonial and semi-colonial peoples striving for national independence." Above all, it indicated that "armed struggle could and should become the main form of the struggle for liberation" (Liu 2005, Vol.1: 164-165, 167). This revolutionary message, however, greatly alarmed many of Liu's listeners, who correctly interpreted it as an exhortation for a pan-Asian armed insurgency against the West and its collaborators. When it became apparent that the

Conference was by and large against Liu's message, Moscow quickly intervened and voiced unequivocal support of the CCP's position (Yang 2003: 343-344).

Subsequent events demonstrated that Beijing meant exactly what it said—i.e., to challenge the existing world order by promoting "armed struggles" wherever possible. In late December 1949, the CCP invited Ho Chi Minh's Viet Minh to dispatch a high-level delegation to China, for the double purpose of establishing regular contact and coordinating the two parties' "mutual struggles against imperialism" (Liu 2005, Vol.1: 229). Starting in 1950, the CCP's Central Party School began to provide special training for the leading cadres of other Asian communist parties, and the first trainees included twenty-one Vietnamese communists sent by Ho Chi Minh (Ibid., Vol.1: 295). In January 1950, the PRC signed a friendship and mutual assistance treaty with the Soviet Union, thereby cementing the Sino-Soviet alliance. Confident of this added support for his newborn regime, Mao went a step further to signal Beijing's defiance against the "imperialistic" West.

On January 6, 1950, the Beijing Military Control Committee announced its decision to confiscate the military barracks that belonged to the consulates of the United States, France, and the Netherlands. Under the Peking Treaty of 1901, those military compounds were considered the lawful property of the three states, and the previous ROC government had reaffirmed the legality of the arrangement in the 1940s (Pei et al. 1994: 261). By taking an action that clearly violated preexisting treaty obligations, the CCP aimed, figuratively, to kill two birds with one stone. First, as Mao told Liao Shaoqi in mid-January, the confiscation would teach the foreign powers a lesson so that they could no longer regard China with contempt (Liu 2005, Vol.1: 323). Second, the act was part of Mao's plan of snubbing Washington deliberately and *postponing* the establishment of diplomatic relations with the United States (Zhou 2008, Vol.2: 40). In so doing,

the CCP also publicized the image of an ascendant New China that was determined to reshape the existing international order, forcefully and unilaterally if necessary, instead of being constrained by the status quo.

By early March 1950, Beijing had built closer collaboration not only with the North Vietnamese, but with the communist parties of Burma and Thailand as well (Liu 2005, Vol.1: 572-573). In anticipation of a pan-Asian revolution, the CCP Central Committee issued an intra-party directive (drafted by Liao Shaoqi) on March 14. After the victory on the home front, the directive stressed, the CCP and the Chinese people now had an "unflinching international responsibility" to help, by all available means, the oppressed nations of Asia in their struggles for liberation. To do so was also necessary for "consolidating the triumph of the Chinese revolution on a worldwide scale." Toward that end, the CCP must be ready to provide "warm and fraternal" support for the communist parties and revolutionary groups in various countries, in order to encourage their struggles (Liu et al. 1998, Vol.2: 245). In late April, Beijing began to assemble a select group of combat-hardened PLA cadres, who were later dispatched to serve at various commanding positions in the North Vietnamese army (Chen 2001: 123-124). In the following month, the PLA started providing comprehensive military training for Ho Chi Minh's troops, with an eye to assisting them in wiping out the French presence on the entire Sino-Vietnamese border (Liu 2005, Vol.2: 186-187).

Even the outbreak of the Korean War in June 1950 did not divert the PRC from its attempts to promote revolution abroad. If anything, the U.S intervention in Korea and the Taiwan Strait reinforced Beijing's fear of encirclement and stiffened its determination to meet fire with fire. On June 27 (the day when Washington sent the Seventh Fleet to patrol the Taiwan Strait, to prevent any PRC invasion of Taiwan), the CCP leadership approved the dispatch of a Chinese

military advisory group, headed by General Wei Guoqing, to Vietnam. Receiving General Wei and his associates, Liu Shaoqi extolled the "global significance" of their mission to both world revolution and China's security. It was a "necessity" to help Vietnam, he stressed, because "if we let the enemy stay there, we will encounter increasing difficulties and troubles" (Liu et al. 1998, Vol.2: 256). What, however, were exactly these "difficulties and troubles" from Beijing's point of view?

To this question, Premier Zhou Enlai provided an important clue in an internal speech on August 26, 1950. The American imperialists, he said, were trying to make a breakthrough in Korea and turn it into an Eastern base with which Washington could wage a future world war. Therefore, the Korean question had vital implications not only for China's security, but also for the international struggle between the East and the West. Under the circumstances, the PRC's strategic planning must be based on the anticipation of a prolonged war of attrition—i.e., to weaken the United States through a series of smaller wars along China's periphery, so that Washington would feel too exhausted to launch a great war in the end (Li et al. 1997, Vol.1: 69-70). Literally, China's road to the Korean War was paved with convictions about the extreme aggressiveness of the Enemy, chiefly the United States, and about the necessity to wage unrelenting struggles—including the use of force—against it (for more details, see Chen 1994 and Zhang Shuguang 1995).

On September 16, 1950 (one day after General McArthur's landing in Inchon), the PRC's military advisory group not only commanded the Viet Minh's offensive, but directly engaged in combat against the French troops along the Sino-Vietnamese border (Zhang 2000: 392). Strategically, it made no sense for Beijing to intervene in Vietnam but not in Korea, which bordered on China's largest and most advanced industrial base. Before intervening in the Korean

War, Beijing was fully prepared for an Armageddon with the United States. On October 24, speaking to the Standing Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference (then provisional Parliament of the PRC), Zhou Enlai warned grimly that Washington would likely expand the war to include the Chinese mainland; thus, "if our generation has to face World War III, let us brave it out for the sake of our children" (Zhou 1990: 32-33). Preparing for the worst, the PLA devised contingency plans for an invasion of Southeast Asia, with a view to expanding the war to envelop the Asian continent in what would have amounted to World War III. Toward that end, the CCP extended the training programs for the cadres of the Malayan Communist Party (Chin 2003: 255).

To be sure, preparing for and even engaging in war does not mean that the CCP welcomed war under any circumstances. Due to massive war expenditures, the PRC's state budget increased by 60% in 1951—an unbearable drain on China's meager resources (Li et al. 1997, Vol.1: 195). To make ends meet, Mao had to plead with Stalin for more aid in November 1951 (Ibid., Vol.1: 179). In January 1952, despite the continuance of war in Korea, Mao also had to approve a retrenchment plan (drafted by Zhou Enlai) of reducing the size of the PLA by nearly 50%—i.e., from 6.27 million to 3.41 million—by the end of 1952 (Ibid., Vol.1: 206). In an internal speech on April 30, 1952, Zhou Enlai went a step further to suggest that "it is entirely possible to prevail over the imperialists by means of peaceful competition [i.e., not by war]" (Zhou 1990: 48).

Nonetheless, as long as Beijing remained committed to world revolution, it was bound to make continuous efforts to undermine the stability of the existing international system, by subversion and sometimes outright aggression. In March 1951, the CCP set up an International Department and appointed Wang Jiaxiang, a veteran Politburo member, as its director, for the

main purpose of "contacting" and "assisting" foreign communist parties as well as the CCP's secret branches in East and Southeast Asia (Xu 2001: 400-401). On April 9, Zhou Enlai affirmed unambiguously to a conference of PRC diplomats that "national liberation movements have become a main force for world revolution," and that "our task is to support and promote" its development (Zhou 1990: 36-37).

To revolutionary China, this sense of mission clearly took precedence over international boundaries or diplomatic niceties. In early March 1951, the CCP began to organize and train the communist guerillas of Laos, which was then a self-governing kingdom under French suzerainty. In an internal directive, Liu Shaoqi expressed support for the "Laotian people's struggles for liberation," without mentioning the classical Marxian concept that revolution cannot be exported at the point of bayonets (Liu 2005, Vol.4: 31-32). In fact, Beijing also encouraged the Viet Minh to expand the war to Laos, with an eye to putting greater pressure on the French and "liberating" the whole Indochina eventually (Chen 2001: 129). In January 1953, the PLA's General Staff finalized the said war plans. Two months later, under the direction of Chinese advisors, the North Vietnamese army marched into northern Laos. When the battle ended in early May, the Viet Minh occupied about 20% of Laotian territory (Qian 1999: 329-331, 334, 338-340). Again, there was no evidence of Chinese compunction at this gross violation of a neighboring state's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Similarly, on the Korean front, Beijing adhered to the goal of exhausting the enemy through protracted warfare, instead of seeking an early end to the war. Both Mao and Zhou, for example, were in favor of complementing diplomatic maneuvers with the unrelenting use of military force (Mao 1988: 381, 389, 426; Mao 1989: 596; Li et al. 1997, Vol.1: 158, 181-182, 213, 272-273). Indeed, to the PLA, even the signing of the Korean Armistice in July 1953 was a

little premature, for its original plan was to prolong the war for another three to six months and to mount at least three to five large-scale offensives, till it could recapture the vicinity of Seoul and leave it as a buffer zone to be administered by neutral states (Wang Yan et al. 1998: 552-553, 555). Correspondingly, in 1953, the PRC's military budget actually reached the highest level since 1949 (Ibid., 671).

On the other hand, however, the CCP leadership was not oblivious of the fact that the Korean Armistice had, at the very least, marked a step toward the relaxation of international tensions, which was welcomed heartily by many countries. In June 1953, Zhou Enlai told China's diplomats that a worldwide peace movement had emerged including the peoples of capitalist countries. Because of this movement, he said, new wars may be delayed and even become preventable. Under these new circumstances, China was to advocate the resolution of all international disputes through peaceful consultations, because "we do have the courage to allow for peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition between countries of different social systems" (Zhou 1990: 58-62). Similarly, in a telegram to the Soviet leadership in September 1953, Mao hailed the Korean Armistice as a "major achievement of the [socialist and neutral states] in their efforts to strive for peace and prevent new wars, which help to move the world toward an emerging détente" (Mao 1990: 320).

As said earlier, before the challenger adopts an integrationist course, it must realize first that the international society helps to promote peace and discourage war, and that its security was thus best ensured through constructive engagement with the rest of the world. Obviously, in the latter half of 1953, the Chinese leadership had come to this (tentative) realization.[35] This was to

---

[35] I call this realization a tentative one because its significance was not fully appreciated by the ruling elites of the CCP at that time. In December 1953, for example, Zhou Enlai proposed the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence when China was engaged in negotiations with India on

introduce a major change in Chinese foreign policy in 1954, when Zhou Enlai made his first major diplomatic achievement through engagement with the international society.

The Challenger Softens: Beijing's Integrationist Policy, 1954-1959

Embracing Peaceful Coexistence, Not World Revolution

After the end of the Korean War, the PRC embarked on its first Five-Year Plan. In order to concentrate on domestic reconstruction, Beijing adjusted its foreign policy with remarkable swiftness. In early 1954, the Soviet Union, Britain, France, and the United States decided to convene an international conference in Geneva, with a view to ending the French war in Indochina. After receiving the invitation to attend the Geneva conference, Mao and his associates were immediately intrigued. On March 2, the CCP leadership decided to seize this opportunity and adopt a new, integrationist approach to international affairs: that is, China should strengthen its diplomatic and international exchange, break the impasse in its relations with the United States and the West, and strive for the relaxation of international tensions. To signal Beijing's keen interest in rejoining the international society, Mao appointed Zhou Enlai as head of the PRC delegation (Jin et al. 2003: 554-555).

Before Zhou left for Geneva, the battle at Dien Bien Phu had assumed a white-hot intensity. Stunned by the tenacity of French resistance, the North Vietnamese high command pleaded to Beijing for a direct military intervention by the PLA. Had it been 1950, one would expect Mao and his comrades to grant this request with alacrity, as they had thrown in their lot earlier with Kim Il Sung. Nonetheless, as China was now tantalized by the prospect of reducing international tensions through the forthcoming Geneva Conference, the last thing it wanted to do

---

trade and transportation in the Tibet region. The deputy foreign minister of the PRC, however, objected strenuously to the Indian suggestion of writing these five principles into the preamble of the final agreement; and the Indian negotiators had to plead to Zhou himself to achive this objective (Kaul 1982: 168-169).

was to upset the applecart at this critical moment. For this reason, Marshal Peng Dehuai, defense

minister of the PRC, insisted that China must under no circumstances send troops to Vietnam

and that the Vietnamese must fight on their own. This position, as Peng's secretary recalled, met

with Mao's full approval (Qian 2005: 67-69). In fact, immediately before the Geneva Conference,

Mao himself ordered the PLA to halt its training programs for Vietnamese artillery divisions;

later, he also advised Ho Chi Minh to restrict the scope and intensity of the Viet Minh's

offensives during the Conference (Mao 1990: 480, 509).

More revealingly, on April 21, 1954 (one day after Zhou's departure for Geneva), the

People's Daily, always a barometer of the PRC leadership's latest moods, hailed the "immense

significance" of the Geneva Conference as follows:

"[The Conference] indicates that all participant states, especially the great powers

which bear a special responsibility for maintaining world peace, are likely to

reach an agreement that serves the Asian and worldwide interest in peace, on the

basis of equality and mutual respect. Thus, the Geneva Conference marks the

beginning of the joint efforts of all great powers to resolve international disputes

through consultation and to preserve world peace and security collectively" (Qian

2005: 84).

Thus, for the first time since 1949, Beijing began to view the United States and its Western allies

with a certain equability, and signaled its intention of working with those erstwhile "enemies of

the Chinese people," on a mutual and reciprocal basis, to maintain world—and systemic—peace.

Clearly, the militarized worldview had receded in Beijing.

As a result, China's bottom-line at Geneva differed markedly from that of its North

Vietnamese ally. Boosted by the victory at Dien Bien Phu, Ho Chi Minh's representative at

Geneva, Pham Van Dong, was initially adamant that no ceasefire be contemplated until the French agreed to meet two preconditions, namely: (1) partitioning Vietnam in such a way as to ensure the Viet Minh's control of up to two thirds of the country's territory; and (2) recognizing the legal status of the "liberation forces" (mostly North Vietnamese forces in disguise) in Cambodia and Laos. Zhou Enlai disagreed, arguing that negotiations should focus on the minimum and the possible: that is, striving to reach an agreement on the end of war and the relaxation of international tensions, in order to secure a long period of peace during which *all* socialist states could just concentrate on domestic economic development (Qian 2005: 232-234). In other words, the spread of the "socialist camp" and world revolution was no longer a top priority on Beijing's agenda. Ultimately, Zhou's powerful persuasive effort, combined with direct pressure from the Chinese leadership, moved Ho Chi Minh and his comrades toward a compromise settlement (Shi 1991: 557; Zhai 2000: 58-60; Qian 2005, chapters 27-29; Jin et al. 2008, Vol.3: 1494-1496, 1499-1505).

Meanwhile, Zhou Enlai's widely acclaimed diplomacy at Geneva further bridged the gap between the PRC and some states which Beijing had previously regarded with suspicion. The Chinese premier's friendly interactions with Anthony Eden, then British foreign secretary, led to a major diplomatic breakthrough: after four years of quibbles and procrastinations, the PRC finally agreed to station a charge d'affaires in London, despite the fact that Britain had opened its Office of the Charge d'affaires in Beijing as early as 1950 (Qian 2005: 271-272). Nor did Beijing persist in looking down upon some newly independent states as mere "puppets" or "tools" of Western imperialism. Initially, the PRC supported Hanoi's demand that its "liberation forces" remain in Cambodia and Laos—a demand that, if met, would grant North Vietnam a direct say in the internal affairs of its smaller neighbors. After active engagement with the representatives of

Cambodia and Laos, however, Zhou was impressed by their aspirations for peace and independence. Thereafter, Zhou did his best to persuade Pham Van Dong to abandon the plan of "revolutionizing Indochina" or incorporating Cambodia and Laos into a "Federation of Indochina" under Hanoi's domination (Qu 1989: 263-265; Zhai 2000: 56-57, 61-62; Qian 2005: 383-392, 469-470).

Above all, the Geneva experience helped greatly to ease Beijing's fear and animosity toward the "imperialistic" West and its alleged lackeys. Zhang Wentian, a veteran member of the CCP Politburo and Zhou Enlai's deputy on foreign affairs, was one of the first who observed after Geneva that the West might just wish to stabilize the status quo in the Far East, *not* to wage a full-scale war against the revolutionary forces in the region (Zhang et al. 2000: 953). On July 7, 1954, Mao convened a Politburo meeting to evaluate the Geneva experience. Emphatically, the Chairman noted that "now it is no longer possible to keep our door shut, and the situation is very advantageous for us to go out [i.e., integrating into international society]." In particular, Mao concurred with Zhou's observation that a large group of Western countries desired peace, and that even the United States was not single-mindedly bent on war. Therefore, he concluded, it was possible to reach accommodation with the West and to adopt a peace-oriented foreign policy: that is, as long as other states displayed an interest in maintaining peace, China should take the initiative to approach them and seek to establish official relations with them (Mao 1999: 332-334).

Evidently, Mao's decision to "go out" and end Beijing's self-imposed isolation was based on the judgment that the alleged "enemies" (the United States and its allies) were not unalterably hostile toward the PRC. In other words, integration into international society, even at this incipient stage, played a vital role in ameliorating the revolutionary challenger's siege mentality.

66

As Zhang Wentian later put it, it was after Geneva that China's leaders began to feel a "significant change" in the international atmosphere: "The sense of estrangement and misgivings haunting many states has decreased, while the sense of understanding and trust has increased" (Zhang Wentian 1995: 218).

More significantly, as the challenger starts reconsidering the character of the international system, it also comes to realize that its interests are better served by peaceful and constructive engagement with the outside world, rather than by flaunting its readiness to engage in confrontation and war. As a result, Beijing began to evince a greater interest in promoting peaceful coexistence thereafter. As early as June 1954, the CCP leadership had authorized Zhou Enlai to explore opportunities of signing a nonaggression pact or a collective security treaty with India, Indonesia, and Burma, for the sake of maintaining peace in Asia (Liu 2008, Vol.6: 268-269). During Zhou's subsequent visit to India and Burma, the Chinese premier propounded the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence for the first time, which received the enthusiastic endorsement of his Indian and Burmese counterparts (Jin et al. 2008, Vol.3: 1524-1532).[36]

On October 17, 1954, on the eve of the Indian leader Jawaharlal Nehru's first visit to China, the CCP Central Committee issued a directive to all party cadres, making clear for the first time that China would seek to promote "peaceful coexistence between states of different [social] systems" (Li et al. 1997, Vol.1: 419).[37] The next day, Zhou Enlai told a special meeting of leading cadres that the PRC shared a common interest with many states, especially Asian

---

[36] These five principles included: (1) mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty; (2) mutual non-aggression; (3) non-interference in each other's internal affairs; (4) equality and mutual benefit; (5) peaceful coexistence.

[37] Based on extant Chinese evidence, it is unclear whether and to what extent the shift toward peaceful coexistence in post-Stalin Soviet foreign policy had influenced Chinese diplomacy at this stage. Later on, however, the CCP leadership, especially Zhou Enlai, seemed to believe that Beijing was actually one step ahead of Moscow in promoting this new thinking at the just-ended Geneva Conference (see below).

countries, in maintaining peace and preventing war. Accordingly, the premier said, Beijing would expend a greater effort thereafter in seeking common ground with those states, in order to postpone the next great war (Ibid., Vol.1: 420).

In many respects, Mao himself was the foremost exponent of this decisive policy change in Chinese diplomacy. From August 1954 to May 1955, the Chairman repeatedly confided to foreign visitors that China needed at least several decades of peace for its economic development, and that Beijing was willing to sign a peace treaty with any states, for any length of time (Mao 1998a: 124, 129-130, 164). In October 1954, when meeting the Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev, Mao averred that, since the international situation had become more beneficial to the socialist camp, both China and the Soviet Union should value the present era of peace and concentrate on their own economic development (Shi 1991: 571-572).

Meanwhile, the Great Helmsman was the first to initiate a resolute break with China's prior revolutionary diplomacy. Conceptually, the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence had already made such a break inevitable: i.e., as Beijing pledged to respect other states' sovereignty and avoid interfering with their internal affairs, it also had to undertake the obligation of forsaking active support for the communist insurgency or national liberation movements in those states (Yang 2003: 364-365). In this regard, Mao displayed a remarkable readiness to adjust to new realities, in order to secure the goodwill of other countries and achieve a peaceful environment conductive to China's domestic reconstruction. In December 1954, the Chairman pledged to the Burmese prime minister explicitly that China would not abet or instigate the anti-government forces in Burma, and that the CCP had disbanded its overseas branches in Burma, Indonesia, and Singapore (Mao 1998a: 145).

In March 1955, the CCP leadership formally notified the party rank and file of this momentous policy change. Speaking to a national party conference, Liu Shaoqi expounded: "Striving for and consolidating peace …is a necessary condition for building socialism in our country." Presently, he said, the United States and its allies were too divided to wage a new great war, whereas China's Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence had gained worldwide support. In order to promote the common interests of nations, Beijing, while remaining on guard against the imperialists' adventures, should also "actively participate in and support the movement for world peace." Thus, Liu warned against the tendency to "export the experience of the Chinese revolution mindlessly," not only because "all fraternal [communist] parties must resolve problems of their own revolution independently," but because Beijing needed to engage more neutralist states in the striving for peace. In sum, he concluded, despite the lurking danger of war, "it is possible to postpone war and …obtain a peaceful international environment for a long period of time (Liu 2008, Vol.7: 108, 114-116, 122, 127-128, 138).

The following month, on April 4, the CCP convened a national conference on the Party's international work. In his keynote address to the conference, Wang Jiaxiang (director of the CCP International Department) announced: "The overall aim of our international activities is to make more friends abroad, …and obtain a long-term peaceful international environment for the sake of our development" (Wang 1989: 418). Similarly, on July 28, Zhang Wentian convened a meeting to reconsider the guidelines for the CCP's international propaganda. Given the growing East-West détente, Zhang declared, the CCP should fine-tune its international propaganda to conform to this global atmosphere of reconciliation. While the socialist and capitalist camps would continue to disagree on major international issues, China should adopt a reasonable and conciliatory attitude in addressing those disagreements (Zhang et al. 2000: 992).

Thereafter, Beijing not only sought actively to strengthen political and diplomatic relations with the countries that had already recognized the PRC, but displayed much enthusiasm in promoting economic, trade, and cultural exchanges with many states that had not established official relations with Beijing yet (for details, see Pei et al. 1994, chapters 4-5, 10-11, and 13). In accord with this integrationist approach, Chinese foreign policy showed more signs of self-restraint.

During the Bandung Conference in 1955, the PRC indicated for the first time its willingness to pursue a peaceful settlement of the Taiwan issue, partly for the sake of allaying many neighboring states' concerns about Beijing's hitherto uncompromising posture (Dai 2003a: 227-229, 236-240). At this international conference, Zhou Enlai formally extended a seven-point assurance. Apart from reaffirming the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence, the assurance explicitly committed the PRC to seek the resolution of territorial disputes only by peaceful means, and to support all measures aimed at easing international tensions and promoting world peace. Conspicuously, Zhou also called upon other states to help prod both China and the United States to resolve their disagreements peacefully (Zhou 1990: 130-133).

In mid-1955, when holding security dialogues with the Soviet Union, Marshal Peng Dehuai voiced concerns with Moscow's strategy of launching a nuclear first strike in future wars. China, insisted Peng (and echoing Mao), would adhere to "active defense" and would in no circumstances resort to a preemptive first strike (Wang Yan et al. 1998: 595-596; Liu 1998: 13; Wu Lengxi 1999: 101-102). In late 1955, the CCP even collaborated with the Soviets in persuading the Malayan Communist Party to stop its armed insurgency against the British authorities (Chin 2003: 351).

Striving for Peace—and Peaceful Resolution of Disputes

With the advent of 1956, the Chinese leadership's interest in promoting international peace and amity scaled new heights. In February 1956, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) convened its historic Twentieth Congress, which not only negated Stalin's cult of personality, but laid great stresses on the notion of peaceful coexistence in Soviet foreign policy. Upon hearing of Khrushchev's report to the Twentieth Congress, Zhang Wentian was immediately intrigued and convened a meeting of leading cadres in the PRC Foreign Ministry to discuss the implications of Khrushchev's report for Chinese foreign policy. The monumental change of Soviet policy, in Zhang's opinion, cleared the way for China to adopt a more flexible attitude toward the capitalist camp, as well as to revise the Leninist dogma about the inevitability of war (Zhang et al. 2000: 1013). Later on, when chairing a conference of the PRC's ambassadors abroad, Zhang went a step further to propose that the PRC adhere to a "peaceful foreign policy" as the "only correct foreign policy," while striving to build and promote a friendly and cooperative relationship with any states regardless of their social systems, ideology, or alliance affiliations (Zhang Wentian 1995: 191, 194).

Like his deputy, Zhou Enlai responded to the wind of change from Moscow with swiftness. On March 4, the premier received a group of delegates to a national industrial development conference, and briefed them on the current international situation. With the gradual reduction in international tensions, Zhou affirmed, war was not necessarily inevitable. This significant shift in the international situation had made it easier for the peoples of the world to maintain peace and prevent war. Under these propitious circumstances, he said, China should "open the door wider" establish greater contact with the outside world. It should, for example,

welcome not only the foreign visitors sympathetic to the PRC, but also those whose views were conservative or outright reactionary (Li et al. 1997, Vol.1: 554).

In fact, even the war-hardened commanders of the PLA agreed at this time that China's security situation had improved so appreciably as to warrant a reformulation of its defense posture. On March 6, 1956, the CCP's Central Military Commission (CMC) convened a conference to reconsider China's defense strategy. Conspicuously, Marshal Peng Dehuai described the international situation as "basically moving in a direction conducive to lasting peace in the world." Thus, he stressed, China must abjure aggressive wars; even if the enemy was found on the verge of a full-scale attack, China must still not strike the first blow. Approving Peng's keynote address, the conference decided to reduce the personnel of the PLA by one third in the next three years (Deng 1989: 434-435, 458; Wang Yan et al. 1998: 617).

On March 19, 1956, Mao chaired a Politburo meeting to contemplate the CPSU's 20th Congress. Zhou Enlai recounted how the PRC had surpassed the Soviet Union in its effort to engage the West and strive for a peaceful resolution of the Indochina crisis at Geneva two years ago. In view of the current shift in Soviet foreign policy, Zhou was obviously gratified that Beijing had taken a step in the right direction even earlier than Moscow. No one present disputed the concept of peaceful coexistence, and even Mao criticized sharply Stalin's domestic and foreign policies (Wu Lengxi 1999: 10-14).[38]

---

[38] The records of the CCP's Politburo meetings belong to the Party's archives that still remain off-limits to the public and are *not* part of the diplomatic archives opened by the Chinese Foreign Ministry in recent years. For details about many Politburo discussions in 1956-1966, I rely mainly on the memoirs of Wu Lengxi, who was then editor-in-chief of the *People's Daily*. In those ten years, Wu served continually in a special writing group assigned by the Politburo to draft all important foreign policy statements of the CCP and the Chinese government. In this capacity, Wu attended the Politburo's meetings regularly and often received face-to-face instructions from Mao and other Chinese leaders.

A month later, on April 25, Mao delivered an important policy address, entitled "On the Ten Major Relationships," to an expanded meeting of the Politburo. Regarding the international situation, the chairman opined confidently that a new anti-China war or world war was now unlikely to occur in the short term, and that the PRC might count upon a ten-year or even longer period of peace. Accordingly, he said, although China should continue to remain on guard against its enemies and maintain a strong defense capability, Beijing's present priority was to reduce its military and administrative expenditures, so that it could devote more resources to national economic development (Mao 1999, Vol.7: 26-28).

With enhanced confidence in the viability of peaceful coexistence, the CCP leadership decided to convene its own Eighth National Congress in mid-September 1956. As Mao jokingly put it, the CCP felt obliged to convene this congress partly for the sake of foreign communist parties, which were doubtless eager to sound out the Chinese opinion after the CPSU's historic Twentieth Congress (Xu 1996: 306). For its part, the CCP leadership regarded the forthcoming exchanges of opinion with foreign comrades—a total of sixty-four fraternal communist delegations would come to Beijing—with utmost caution. On July 1, overseeing the assignment of Chinese liaison officers to those foreign delegations, Wang Jiaxiang admonished his associates pointedly that "silence is golden"—i.e., it was "better to say less than say more" to the foreign comrades (Xu 2001: 434).

The meaning of Wang Jiaxiang's cryptic remarks was made clear on August 10, when the CCP Politburo held a special meeting to discuss its political report to the forthcoming party congress. At Zhang Wentian's insistence, the Politburo decided to downplay the "experience of the Chinese revolution" in the political report, lest foreign comrades misinterpret it as an indication that the CCP was still intent on "educating" them on its revolutionary tactics (Zhang et

al. 2000: 1037). According to He Fang, then Zhang's chief of staff in the Foreign Ministry, certain sections in the political report, concerning the CCP's approach to international affairs, were thus rewritten completely (He Fang 2007: 277-278).

On August 29, 1956, when editing the final report to the party congress, Mao added emphatically: "Our foreign policy is based on the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence. …We should do more in the future …in the interest of a lasting world peace. …[W]e are ready to establish friendly relations with all other countries in the world, including the United States" (Mao 1998a: 189-190). Encouraged, Zhang Wentian drafted his own address to the congress, which propounded that "in our era, peaceful coexistence is not only necessary but also inevitable," and that a new world war might be avoidable (Zhang Wentian 1995: 225). Apparently for fear that his deputy had gone too far, Zhou Enlai dissuaded Zhang from delivering the address (Zhang et al. 2000: 1039).

On September 15, the CCP's Eighth National Congress opened amid much fanfare, with Liu Shaoqi delivering the keynote political report. Instead of sounding another trumpet call for world revolution (recall Liu's address to the Asian and Oceanian Trade Unions' Conference in December 1949), the CCP adopted a much more equable and conciliatory tone this time. The international situation, Liu averred, was moving increasingly toward détente, while the prospect of lasting peace began to look hopeful. Under these circumstances, the PRC would carry out a "firm and consistent policy of peace" and advocate "peaceful coexistence and friendly cooperation among all states." Lest his audience miss this crucial point (i.e., Beijing did not seek the violent overthrow of the international system any more), Liu added furthermore that "we are not afraid of having a peaceful competition with capitalist states."

In particular, Liu emphasized that the PRC would seek good-neighborly relations with all neighboring countries. Between China and those countries, he said, there were no "insoluble disputes." As for some problems "left over by history" (i.e., territorial disputes), they could be resolved "through peaceful consultations and on the basis of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence." Similarly, he confirmed that the PRC was willing to seek peaceful coexistence with the United States and to resolve their disputes through peaceful consultations, and called upon Washington to adopt a "realistic and reasonable attitude" toward Beijing. Finally, Liu avowed that "our door is open to all people," and reaffirmed the PRC's interest in participating in the international peace movement and upgrading its economic, cultural, and people-to-people exchanges with other countries.[39]

Subsequent events showed that Liu's pledge to resolve "problems left over by history" peacefully was not just a rhetorical gesture. On the contrary, the Chinese leadership was seriously contemplating a new approach to the settlement of territorial disputes, which are the most contentious of all interstate disputes. Initially, shortly after the establishment of the PRC, the CCP had decided to adopt an agnostic attitude on the issue of border disputes—i.e., China would neither recognize nor deny its existing border, but would maintain the status quo temporarily (Jin et al. 2008, Vol.3: 1719; see also Yao, Shen, and Zou 1989: 102). As time went by, China's leaders realized that such an attitude would aggravate, rather than allay, the concerns of China's neighbors about Beijing's long-term intentions. Indeed, as Burma's prime minister U Nu put it: "It is of the utmost importance that even the best of neighbors …should know where

---

[39] Quotations from the foreign policy section of Liu's political report, available at: http://cpc.people.com.cn/GB/64162/64168/64560/65452/4526566.html (Accessed August 9, 2012). The full text of Liu's report can be found at the CCP's official database (http://cpc.people.com.cn/GB/64162/64168/index.html), which includes all important documents related to the CCP's national congresses held between 1921 and 2007.

the territory of one ends and the other begins, so as to apply faithfully the principle of respect for each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity" (quoted in Maxwell 1970: 84-85). Inevitably, as Zhou Enlai foresaw in June 1954, China's neighbors would seize upon the boundary issue as a test of Beijing's avowed commitment to the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence (Jin et al. 2008, Vol.3: 1721-1722).

In November 1955, the PLA's border guards clashed accidentally with Burmese troops in a disputed border sector. The incident immediately revived fears of Chinese aggressiveness abroad, prompting Zhou Enlai to consider ways of speeding up the settlement of China's territorial disputes (Jin et al. 2008, Vol.3: 1723-1724). Consequently, Zhou had personally studied all relevant historical materials since the Chinese Han Dynasty (206 B.C.-220 A.D.) and ascertained how successive dynasties of China administered the Sino-Burmese border regions. In this process,

> "[Zhou] carefully examined all historical maps and ascertained how and why the maps were drawn differently in various time periods. He researched the records of all diplomatic exchanges related to Sino-Burmese border disputes since the 19th century, and understood why the boundary problem was left unresolved to this day. He also studied the ethnic composition, inhabitation, and agriculture of border residents, as well as the international legal principles and customs regarding the settlement of boundary problems. …In addition, he held several roundtable discussions with some informed sources and experts, and solicited opinions from all quarters" (Zheng and Liu 1989: 297).

After intensive research, the premier was the first to propound three principles for reconsidering China's historical territorial claims, namely:

76

—Historical facts should be evaluated and ascertained objectively;

—History is continually evolving, so that issues and problems should be viewed from an evolutionary perspective;

—Most importantly, historical materials should be assessed in the light of the present situation and state policies (Zheng and Liu 1989: 297).

In August 1956, Zhou formulated a tentative compromise solution to the Sino-Burmese boundary problem. In the following three months, the PRC and Burmese governments held several rounds of top-level consultations. Prime Minister U Nu, moved by Zhou's sincerity, expressed his heartfelt thanks: "Nowadays, China is a large and powerful country, and Burma small and weak; I am very satisfied that China could propose such a reasonable solution" (Jin et al. 2008, Vol.3: 1725-1732; U Nu's remarks cited on p.1731).

At the same time, Beijing's diplomatic pragmatism was fully matched by the moderation of its security posture. On October 25, 1956, the CMC formulated three guidelines for China's border defense, namely: (1) addressing the concerns of the local population; (2) maintaining peaceful and friendly relations with neighboring countries; and (3) avoiding creating tensions on the border (Wang Yan et al. 1998: 631). A week later, on October 31, the CCP Central Committee formally notified the party rank and file of the central leadership's decision to resolve territorial disputes peacefully and amicably. According to this directive, China would strive for an early settlement of its border dispute with Burma, in order to set a good example for the resolution of other territorial disputes and thereby consolidate the PRC's peaceful coexistence with other countries (Yao, Shen, and Zou 1989: 102; the date is specified in Jin et al. 2008, Vol.3: 1719, footnote 1).

Guided by the Central Committee's directive, the PRC Foreign Ministry drew up a comprehensive report, proposing to settle all territorial disputes on the following principles:

—China should implement in earnest the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence, and forswear great-power chauvinism in handling border disputes. Since many of China's neighbors were friendly states, tensions on the border must be eliminated and all measures adopted in border areas must serve the purpose of promoting friendship.

—China should carry out more persuasive work toward the ethnic minorities residing in the border regions. While appreciating their patriotism, Beijing should persuade them to live in peace and friendship with neighboring states.[40]

—China should tighten the control over its border defense forces, so that they would obey the CCP Central Committee's October 1956 directive more strictly.

In addition, the Foreign Ministry's report emphasized the following considerations, which met with Zhou's full approval: (1) adopting a realistic attitude on the border issue; (2) accepting the legality of border treaties and agreements signed by prior governments of China; (3) abandoning certain historical claims that had propaganda value but lacked a legal basis; (4) respecting the status quo and seeking a settlement through diplomatic consultations (Zheng et al. 2003: 213-214).

Unexpectedly, the CCP leadership's decision to seek an equable and equitable resolution of territorial disputes encountered strong and widespread opposition from below. Opponents of the proposed Sino-Burmese settlement, including provincial leaders, ethnic minorities, and noncommunist elites, were particularly galled that Burma, once a vassal of the Chinese empire,

---

[40] This is because many ethnic minorities residing in Yunnan Province used to have turbulent and conflictual relations with Burma long before the establishment of the PRC. As will be shown below, opposition from those ethnic minorities was part of the reasons for the postponement of a Sino-Burmese boundary settlement in 1956-1958.

had the temerity to press territorial claims—some of which were inherited from the British

colonial administration in Burma—against the PRC. In their view, Burma had no right to ask

anything of China, but should return to the PRC all the territories that were once part of the

Chinese empire, but had been stolen by the British (Jin et al. 2008, Vol.3: 1719-1721, 1734-1735,

1742).

In January 1957, Zhou paid an official visit to Nepal, and planned to fly to Burma

immediately afterward to sign the boundary agreement in Rangoon. On January 27, while still in

Nepal, Zhou received an emergency telegram from the Politburo, which informed him that the

proposed agreement had caused such deep concerns at home that more consultations were

needed before signing the agreement. Thus, no solution could be worked out in the short term (Li

et al. 1997, Vol.2: 15-16).

Fervent nationalists as they were, China's leaders stood firmly against irredentism at this

point. Zhou, for example, opposed the idea of annexing territories simply because they had

historically belonged to, or had a tributary relationship with, the Chinese empire. He also urged

caution against assuming too much about the truthfulness of China's historical maps, which

might have exaggerated China's territorial boundaries for political reasons (Yao, Shen, and Zou

1989: 103; Jin et al. 2008, Vol.3: 1737-1739). From November 1956 to July 1957, the premier

spent much time remonstrating with opponents of the proposed Sino-Burmese boundary

agreement. According to Zhou, since China sought peaceful coexistence and good neighborly

relations, it had to eliminate tensions instead of aggravating them. Thus, the only acceptable way

of settling territorial disputes was through negotiations, and no other ways should be

contemplated. Moreover, in order to allay the concerns of neighboring states, China should

content itself with only minor adjustments of the status quo, rather than seeking to redraw the

entire borderline in its favor. Thanks to Zhou's strenuous efforts, the National People's Congress finally approved the premier's proposal on July 15, 1957 (Jin et al. 2008, Vol.3: 1735-1747).

In January 1958, Zhang Wentian briefed a joint session of high-level civilian and military cadres on Chinese foreign policy. In a lengthy address, he confirmed that "peaceful coexistence fully serves the interests of the Chinese people and all socialist states, as well as the interests of all peoples of the world" (Zhang Wentian 1995: 273). Within this context, Zhang stressed the importance of striving for a "fair and reasonable" settlement of China's territorial disputes:

> When addressing the border issue, we should take account of history, but not
>
> completely depend on history as the basis for our claims. This is because history
>
> is full of drastic changes, and if all states request a redrawing of their borders
>
> according to a certain historical period, the world will be in great turmoil. As a
>
> rule, we should settle the boundary issue according to existing treaties and
>
> conventions, and, in view of our country's foreign policy, through peaceful
>
> consultations. Our neighboring countries are mostly peaceful and neutral states,
>
> and it is vitally important for us to maintain good-neighborly and thriving
>
> relations with them. We must not allow the border issue to aggravate our
>
> neighbors' misgivings about us (Ibid., 278).

Indeed, guided by hopes of building a peaceful and friendly neighborhood, China resolved many of its territorial disputes subsequently, often with substantial concessions to its neighboring countries (for details, see Fravel 2008: 46-47).[41] Regarding the territorial disputes

---

[41] Fravel (2008) contends that domestic instability might have led Beijing to make these concessions in the latter stages of boundary negotiations. My analysis above, however, shows that the Chinese willingness to resolve territorial disputes through compromise derived foremost from the softening of the militarized worldview as early as 1954. Moreover, when Beijing first exhibited this willingness in 1956-1957, it was not beset by any signs of domestic unrest.

between its neighbors, Beijing took a similar approach. In 1956-1957, Zhou Enlai expended

considerable effort in persuading India and Pakistan to end their hostilities over the disputed

Kashmir region and to move toward reconciliation, in the hope that all China's neighbors could

live in peace and friendship and concentrate on their own development (Pei 1989: 115-117; see

also Li et al. 1997, Vol.1: 535, 629; Vol.2: 21, 24, 70).

"It is Possible to Win a Fairly Long Period of Peace"

In November 1957, Mao paid a state visit to the Soviet Union and attended the Moscow

Meeting of fraternal communist parties around the world. In retrospect, the meeting marked the

beginning of the ideological disagreement between the CCP and most of its foreign comrades

(see Luthi 2008: 75-77).[42] Mao's famous claim, "the east wind is prevailing over the west wind,"

coupled with his unnecessarily frivolous remarks about the consequences of nuclear war, was

particularly galling to the audience.[43] Privately, after the Moscow meeting, the Chairman also

expressed reservations about whether a communist party should regard peaceful coexistence as

the topmost priority of its foreign and general policy, because, ideologically, a communist party

had an obligation to support world revolution (Wu Lengxi 1999: 152).

---

[42] There is one factual error in Luthi's analysis of Chinese positions at the Moscow Meeting. He
argues that the CCP refused to accept Khrushchev's pursuit of peaceful coexistence and
delivered a secret memorandum to the Soviets expressing disagreement with the concept (Luthi
2008: 76-77). In fact, the CCP did *not* dispute the Soviet position on peaceful coexistence at the
Meeting. It only disagreed with Khrushchev's views on the so-called "peaceful transition" issue:
i.e., while the CPSU stressed that the proletariat in non-socialist countries could seize power by
peaceful and parliamentary means, the CCP contended that a proletariat triumph must ultimately
be achieved through armed struggle and violent revolution. The CCP's secret memorandum to
the Soviets was entirely about this issue and had nothing to do with peaceful coexistence (see
Wu Lengxi 1999: 135-138). In 1965, the CCP published this memorandum for the first time (see
CCP Central Committee 1965: 96-99).

[43] In 1992, the CCP published the verbatim record of Mao's highly controversial speech at the
Moscow Meeting for the first time (see Mao 1992, Vol.6: 630-644).

Nonetheless, at this time, Mao still upheld peaceful coexistence as a state policy (as versus the policy of a communist party), and his exchange of views with foreign comrades was often surprisingly moderate concerning how the socialist states should cope with the international situation. His controversial speech at the Moscow Meeting, for instance, contained two important messages often overlooked by historians:

First, despite his belief that the socialist East was prevailing over the capitalist West, Mao nevertheless stressed: "In the final analysis, we should strive for 15 years of peace. By the end of that period we shall be invincible in the world, …and the world will be able to enjoy lasting peace" (Mao 1992, Vol. 6: 635). In other words, in Mao's mind, striving for peace, rather than preparing for war, still remained the socialist camp's first order of business;

Second, Mao did *not* call for an all-out offensive against imperialism, even under present and allegedly propitious circumstances. Strategically, he averred, socialism was bound to replace capitalism and imperialism in the end; tactically, however, it was permissible to reach an accommodation with imperialist powers, just as China had done with the United States in Korea and with France in Vietnam. In sum, when dealing with the capitalist camp, socialist states must "be good not only at waging struggles, but also at reaching compromises" (Mao 1992, Vol.6: 641).

In his talks with Khrushchev during the Moscow Meeting, Mao struck an even more cautious note. The United States, he said, would not dare to launch World War III; accordingly, China and the Soviet Union should, while remaining on guard, strive to maintain the current era of peace for as long as possible. Strategically, Beijing and Moscow should thus adhere to a defensive, not offensive, posture, and shrink from any "preemptive first strike" (which was then advocated by Soviet military strategists). Khrushchev expressed full agreement with Mao on this

point. Later, Mao told his colleagues that he expounded this view to Khrushchev on purpose, for fear that the Soviet leader might feel tempted to take some rash actions in international relations (Wu Lengxi 1999: 101-102). Similarly, regarding the question of war and peace, the final declaration of the Moscow Meeting was based on a consensus between the CCP and the CPSU— i.e., although the danger of war loomed large as long as imperialism existed, the forces for peace had gained the upper hand under current circumstances, and there was a fair opportunity of preventing war (Ibid., 129-131).

Indeed, some developments in Chinese foreign and defense policy suggested that Mao's emphasis on striving for peace was not a rhetorical gesture, but a serious state policy. For one thing, the CCP's interest in fomenting world revolution had been *decreasing* over this period. As early as August 1956, Zhou Enlai had sent an oral message to the Burmese prime minister, pledging that the CCP had decided to stop establishing branch organizations among overseas Chinese. The Chinese residents abroad, stressed Zhou, would only engage in trading or other entrepreneurial activities, not in political activities (Li et al. 1997, Vol.1: 608).

In May and June 1957, Zhang Wentian made an inspection tour among the PRC's embassies in South and Southeast Asia, to make sure that Chinese diplomacy was back to a normal track and not engaged in exporting revolution any more (He Fang 2007: 280-281). In Pakistan, Zhang told China's diplomats bluntly: "Whether other states want revolutions or not is their business, not ours. Some countries that have diplomatic relations with us do pursue reactionary domestic policies, but that is still an internal affair of theirs and we have no right to intervene" (Zhang et al. 2000: 1060). Similarly, in Indonesia, Zhang exhorted PRC diplomats to realize the importance of establishing "long-term peaceful coexistence" with their host country. In particular, he warned, "the issue of the Indonesian Communist Party" was an internal affair of

the Indonesians themselves. Zhang emphasized that the time was far from ripe for a socialist revolution in Indonesia; thus, the Indonesian Communist Party should remain content with being a loyal opposition to President Sukarno's government for a long period of time, instead of trying to replicate the experience of the Chinese revolution (Ibid., 1061).

In essence, as Zhang's chief of staff He Fang points out, Zhang was "against upholding the Chinese revolution as a model for the colonies and semi-colonies, or promoting armed struggles and people's revolutions in the countries that had already obtained national independence" (He 2010: 90). Later on, Hu Qiaomu, Mao's long-time secretary, confirmed that the CCP Politburo regarded Zhang's handling of Chinese foreign policy in 1956-1957 with approval (Zhang et al. 2000: 1064, footnote 1).

At times, Mao himself signaled unambiguous support for this de-radicalization of Chinese diplomacy. In mid-July 1958, the PRC established formal diplomatic relations with Cambodia, and Wang Youping, a former PLA commander, was appointed China's first ambassador to Phnom Pehn. Before Wang's departure, Mao instructed him specially that he must not expound socialism or communism in Cambodia. Faithfully following the Chairman's instructions, Ambassador Wang soon made a name for himself by a most un-communist act. In December 1958, when hosting an exposition on the accomplishments of the Chinese economy, Wang forbade any mention of the CCP or socialism in the posters. Stunned, the staff of the Chinese embassy questioned Wang's ideological fealty indignantly; their objections were silenced only after the ambassador made clear that he was merely acting upon Mao's will (Yun 1996: 50). In the summer of 1958, the CCP also dissuaded Ho Chi Minh from reviving armed insurgency in South Vietnam, on the ground that the top priority of North Vietnam was its own reconstruction at the time (Zhai 2000: 80-81).

In the meantime, the CCP leadership placed less and less emphasis on China's military buildup. As early as November 1956, Zhou Enlai had told the CCP Central Committee that, following Mao's instructions, China's economic development plan would be based henceforth on the assumption that there would be a fairly long period of peace, which reduced the need for investment in defense industries (Zhou 1984: 236-237). Afterward, the PLA basically shelved its plan of armament development, and embarked on further retrenchment instead (Zheng 1998: 138; Wang Yan et al. 1998: 637-639). Indeed, during the PRC's first Five-Year Plan (1953-1957), the average percentage of military-administrative expenditures in the national budget was 32%; in 1956, the percentage already shrank to 20%. During the second Five-Year Plan (1958-1962), the percentage decreased further to 13%, with a record low of 12.2% in 1958 (Yang et al. 2011: 115, 121).

In mid-January 1958, Vice Premier Li Xiannian, speaking on Mao's behalf, requested Marshal Peng Dehuai to reduce the PLA's budget for 1958-59 from 5.4 billion to 5 billion renminbi (RMB). Initially shocked, Peng nevertheless submitted to Mao's will and ordered the military to grit its teeth and tighten its belts (Wang Yan et al. 1998: 671). On February 25, Mao further instructed the PLA to reduce its budget to 3.5 billion RMB, and to cut its personnel to 2 million. With a tremendous effort, the PLA's high command managed to reduce the size of the military to 2.38 million—the record low since 1949—by the end of 1958 (Ibid., 674).

In January 1958, reviewing the accomplishments of Chinese diplomacy in recent years, Zhang Wentian declared to a session of CCP's ruling elites: "International cooperation is not only necessary, but also inevitable. The expansion of international cooperation provides the necessary condition for peaceful coexistence" (Zhang Wentian 1995: 280). What Zhang called "international cooperation" included the "establishment of diplomatic relations, trade and

cultural relations, and inter-governmental and people-to-people exchanges," which he said was crucial to the PRC's success in maintaining peace and opposing war (Ibid., 271, 281). Implicitly, this statement thus reaffirmed the Chinese leadership's belief since 1954 that integration and constructive engagement held the key to the PRC's peaceful and secure existence in the international system.

In July 1958, Zhang Wentian arrived in Prague, Czechoslovakia, to brief the PRC's ambassadors abroad on the current trends in Chinese foreign policy. According to Zhang, the CCP leadership believed that "the likelihood of peace has become greater" and that China's basic strategy was now two-pronged—"strive for peace and be ready for war." Zhang went on to explain that this did not mean there was a fifty-fifty chance of war versus peace; instead, this meant the chance of war versus peace was "twenty-eighty, thirty-seventy, or at most forty-sixty." At minimum, "it is very likely to obtain ten years of peace" (Zhang Wentian1995: 299). Correspondingly, in the same month, the CMC decided that "in view of the growing détente in the international situation, it is correct and necessary to keep reducing the size and budget of the military" (Deng 1989: 515-516). When meeting with Khrushchev on August 2, Mao again suggested that the socialist states should strive to delay World War III, at least for ten to twenty years (Wu Lengxi 1999: 170-171).

An anomaly, however, remains unexplained here: Why, in this peaceful context, did Mao decide to bombard the ROC-held offshore islands of Jinmen and Mazu in late August 1958, an act that precipitated a new crisis in the Taiwan Strait and brought China and the United States to the brink of war? Contemporary historians tend to interpret Mao's decision as a reflection of his wish to use external crises to whip up the revolutionary zeal at home (see, for example, Christensen 1996b; Chen 2001). This view, however, does not do full justice to the fact that

Chiang Kai-shek had long used the offshore islands as the springboard for his planned invasion

of the mainland, and that the PLA's high command had thus long planned to seize them and

eliminate this security threat once and for all.[44]

Indeed, in 1955-1956, Marshal Peng Dehuai repeatedly recommended deploying the PLA

air force to Fujian Province, for the double purposes of countering the ROC's bombing raids and

preparing for an invasion of Jinmen. Unwilling to deviate from the reigning policy of peaceful

coexistence, however, Mao repeatedly rebuffed Peng's request (Wang Yan et al. 1998: 597-598,

606-607, 619, 628-629). It was only in December 1957, when Mao heard of the ROC's

unrelenting air raids against the mainland, that he finally approved deploying the PLA air force

in Fujian to strengthen the local air defenses (Ibid., 667).

Similarly, Mao's decision to bombard the offshore islands was calculated at least in part

as a punitive response to the ROC's escalating military provocations since 1957 (Jin et al. 2003:

850). On November 20, 1957, for example, a ROC B-17G reconnaissance plane sneaked in and

flew over eight provinces of mainland China—Fujian, Jiangxi, Hunan, Hubei, Henan, Hebei,

Shan'xi, and Shanxi, not only collecting strategic information, but dropping anti-communist

leaflets all along the way. The event caused a profound shock to Mao and other PRC leaders

(Yang et al. 2011: 234). Even so, the Chairman evidently preferred to act with double caution.

Throughout the shelling operation in 1958, the CCP leadership had utilized four secret channels

---

[44] By 1957, one third of the ROC army was stationed on the offshore islands, and even the
United States regarded the deployment of so large a force on those peripheral outposts as an
unnecessary provocation (Huang and Li 2010: 35, 51). Reminiscences of former ROC generals
have supplied ample evidence that Chiang Kai-shek had drawn up several secret plans for an all-
out invasion of the mainland in 1961-1965, and that the execution of these plans was often called
off at the eleventh hour (see, for example, Wang 1999; Wang 2006). For its part, as early as
March 1955, the PLA's General Staff had formulated a plan of launching an amphibious
invasion of Jinmen, the largest of the offshore islands, within a year. The plan met with Marshal
Peng Dehuai's full approval, but was rebuffed by Mao afterward (Wang Yan et al. 1998: 592).

to inform Chiang Kai-shek that the PLA had no intention of seizing Jinmen, and that the ROC need not relinquish Jinmen (Zhou and Guo 1995: 182-183).[45]

Meanwhile, from the very beginning, Mao had placed a number of strict restrictions on the PLA's actions, to avoid providing the United States with any pretext for armed intervention (Jin et al. 2003: 859-860). As Mao later put it, the bombardment—which actually went on intermittently until 1978—thus became largely a "political battle," whose cardinal purpose was to reinforce the PRC's claim that the cross-strait strife was an internal Chinese issue (Huang and Li 2010: 63).

Still, Mao himself seemed to have learnt a lesson. On October 2, 1958, when the crisis was raging on, he met with delegations from six foreign communist parties. To those foreign comrades, the Chairman admitted that military means should only be the "last resort" of the socialist camp in fighting imperialism, and that the bombardment of the offshore islands was not in accord with this approach (Mao 1998a: 274). In fact, Mao even encountered unexpected opposition from his own military chiefs. Marshal Peng Dehuai, for example, shows signs of passive resistance by absenting conspicuously from several war planning meetings chaired by Mao before and during the crisis (Wang Yan et al. 1998: 717). In July 1959, General Huang Kecheng, an alternate Politburo member and chief of the PLA's General Staff, told the Great Helmsman to his face that the bombardment of the offshore islands was both wasteful and created unnecessary tensions at home and abroad (Zhu et al. 2000: 16-17).

Apparently, for some of the PRC's ruling elites, the militarized worldview had ebbed to such a low point that even the military, which arguably tends to promote its corporate interest by

---

[45] This is based on the reminiscences of Huang Wenfang, former director of the Taiwan Affairs Department in the Hong Kong Branch of the Xinhua News Agency. In 1954-1992, Huang remained in charge of the CCP's secret work in Hong Kong concerning Taiwan affairs.

advocating offensive doctrines (Posen 1984: 41-59; Snyder 1984: 15-34; van Evera 1999: 206-214), had little taste for ideologically driven adventures at this time. Under the circumstances, Mao beat a timely retreat. In July 1959, the CCP convened a work conference at Mt. Lushan; due to their opposition to the excesses of the Great Leap Forward (a mass movement aimed at speeding up China's development), Marshal Peng Dehuai, General Huang Kecheng, and Zhang Wentian were all criticized harshly by Mao and politically sidetracked thereafter. Nonetheless, the Chairman still agreed with Zhang's report that the possibility of a great war kept decreasing, and that the international situation was moving toward further détente (Zhang et al. 2000: 1146). After reading Zhang's report on July 5, Mao instructed that the document be circulated among all Politburo members, with the emphatic recommendation that "it is very much worth reading" (Mao 1993, Vol.8: 339-340).

On October 5, 1959, when receiving a delegation of Latin American communists, Mao reaffirmed that international issues could only be resolved by peaceful means, not by force (Mao 1998a: 296). Two weeks later, the Chairman again professed his belief that "it is possible to win a fairly long period of peace" (Ibid., 298).

This optimism, however, was soon to evaporate.

The Resurgent Challenger: The Radicalization of Maoist China, 1960-1974

From 1960 onward, the CCP leadership's interest in peaceful coexistence began to subside noticeably. Starting in April 1960, the CCP began to voice unambiguous criticism of the official Soviet line that war was avoidable and enduring peace attainable under the contemporary global order (Shen et al. 2007: 260-265; see also Wu Lengxi 1999: 259-263, 281-284, 308-313). Meanwhile, in internal speeches, both Mao and Zhou Enlai began to question the wisdom of adhering to a foreign policy of peaceful coexistence between the socialist and capitalist camps

(Yang 2003: 382-383, 385; see also Shen et al. 2007: 273). In November 1960, when attending the second Moscow Meeting of fraternal communist parties, the CCP not only refuted openly the Soviet argument that peaceful coexistence should be the guiding principle of socialist states' foreign policy, but insisted on carrying out relentless struggles against American imperialists and their lackeys (Wu Lengxi 1999: 419-421).

This shift was in large part a reflection of the widening ideological rift between Beijing and Moscow since 1958, and especially of the CCP's growing dissatisfaction with "Russia's conciliatory attitude toward China's great enemy, the United States, and Soviet willingness often to cooperate with the US in efforts to maintain the status quo against China's radical assaults on it" (Van Ness 1970: 64).[46] As Beijing wrestled with Moscow for the leadership of the international communist movement, it tended to adopt the posture of an uncompromising fighter against the U.S.-dominated international system, as in contrast to alleged Soviet pusillanimity. As Mao told foreign visitors at the time: "All true Marxists-Leninists must fight against imperialism, primarily against American imperialism." In his view, no communist party deserved to call itself "communist" if it abandoned the goal of world revolution (cited in Yang 2003: 386).

More importantly, as Beijing resumed the posture of an implacable challenger to the international system, its sense of insecurity also grew astronomically. In January 1960, after holding several meetings to discuss the PRC's national defense strategy, the Chinese leadership reached the consensus that the United States was still preparing for war, and that Beijing's strategy must be "based on the assumption that it [i.e, America] will make war [on China], not on the assumption that it will not make war" (Wu Lengxi 1999: 236-237). On May 16, for the first

---

[46] In particular, the Chinese bombardment of the ROC-held offshore islands in August 1958 was an unwelcome surprise to Moscow and marked the beginning of the end of the Sino-Soviet alliance (see Shen et al. 2007: 233-236; Luthi 2008: 95-104).

time since 1949, the CCP's Central Secretariat contemplated a plan of constructing an underground shelter for China's supreme headquarters (Yang et al. 2009: 1549). From February to September 1960, the CMC also convened two war planning conferences, and decided upon "strengthening combat readiness and preparing for war" as the guidelines for the PLA. Afterward, the PLA entered the phase of "enduring, unprecedented, and large-scale war preparedness" (Qiu 2011: 250-254, quotations on p. 254).

Furthermore, guided by the resurgent militarized worldview, Beijing regarded itself as threatened not only by outright enemies, but also by false and perfidious "friends." From the CCP's perspective, duplicitous "friends," such as the Soviet Union and India, were even more hateful and dangerous than sworn enemies, because their seeming impartiality would only harm the unity of "us" and thereby play into the hands of "them." By February 1962, Mao had formed the conviction that "the U.S.-led imperialist bloc, the reactionary elements like Nehru, and modern revisionists [i.e., the Soviet Union] are coordinating a new anti-China chorus" (Mao 1996, Vol.10: 6). In the words of Hu Qiaomu (Mao's longtime secretary), PRC leaders then felt "as if the whole world wanted to contain and strangle China as the last Holy Place of Revolution" (Hu 1993: 266).

Not surprisingly, from August 1961 onward, "protecting against a sudden attack from the enemy" became a top priority of the PLA's daily work (Yang et al. 2011: 206-207). In early 1962, the CCP leadership concluded that China would very likely be engaged in a local or even major war in three to five years hence (Ibid., 296). On February 28 and June 8, Zhou Enlai twice emphasized to the CCP's military and civilian elites the urgency to "rectify the military and prepare for war" (Zhou 1997, Vol.4: 425-427, 433-436). To heighten the national consciousness of the forthcoming war, Mao not only endorsed Zhou's proposal, but assigned higher priority to

"preparing for war," so that the entire Party and the military would do their utmost to transform

China into a total war footing (Yang et al. 2011: 297).

Gripped by this siege mentality, the Chinese leadership believed that the intensification

of "global class struggles" would lead to an ultimate showdown, and that this world-historic

struggle required the PRC to adopt a more revolutionary and confrontational approach toward all

enemies, including the imperialists, revisionists, and reactionary elements (Shen et al. 2007:

329).[47] Against this backdrop, Beijing not only inflamed its disputes with Moscow further and

further (for details, see Chapter 6), but silently built up China's border defenses against the

Soviet Union.[48] In October 1962, the PRC also resorted to war against India, whose adoption of a

---

[47] To be sure, not all CCP leaders supported this ultraradical approach to international affairs. In early 1962, Wang Jiaxiang (director of the CCP's International Department) repeatedly advised his Politburo colleagues to reconsider the international situation and China's appropriate response to it. In his view, a world war was still preventable and lasting peace probable; thus, China should continue to uphold the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence and strive for the relaxation of international tensions, instead of clinging to an uncompromising posture in interstate disputes, especially in regard to the United States, the Soviet Union, and India (see Wang's report to the Politburo, in Wang 1989: 446-460). Concerning China's support for world revolution, Wang reminded his colleagues pointedly: "We must …be realistic and act within the limit of our capabilities" (Ibid., 445). These moderate views were unwelcome to Wang's colleagues, however. In September 1962, Foreign Minister Chen Yi, who was also a Marshal of the PLA, scolded Wang for pursuing a policy of "three reconciliations and one reduction"—i.e., pursuing reconciliation with the United States, the Soviet Union, and India, while reducing China's support for world revolution (Mao 1996, Vol.6: 188). Mao sided with Chen on this matter and criticized Wang in similar terms (Xu 1996: 493). Politically sidetracked thereafter, Wang Jiaxiang escaped a worse fate only on account of his long intimacy with the Chairman (at the CCP's historic Zunyi Conference in 1935, Wang had played a key role in elevating Mao to the top leadership position in the party and the Red Army).

[48] In September-October 1963, the CMC convened a special conference with an eye to strengthening China's border defenses against the Soviet Union and Mongolia (Shen et al. 2007: 342). From early 1964 on, Mao repeatedly stressed that China must remain on guard simultaneously against a Soviet invasion from the north, and a U.S. invasion from the south (Li 2003: 197; see also Yang et al. 2011: 393). In May 1964, the Chairman emphasized for the first time at a Politburo meeting that "we must expand a maximum effort in strengthening preparations for resisting [Soviet] armed invasion" (Wu Lengxi 1999: 778). Correspondingly, the PLA began to readjust its defense posture in preparation for a two-front war with the United States and the Soviet Union (Shen et al. 2007: 343-347; Yang et al. 2011: 403-406).

Forward Policy on the contested border had led Beijing to believe that New Delhi was "serving the needs of U.S. imperialism" and "playing the vanguard of the international anti-China movement."[49]

Due to geographical proximity, Southeast Asia was regarded by Beijing as the main battlefield for the combat with U.S. imperialism. In May 1960, the CCP expressed explicit support for Hanoi's decision to wage revolutionary war in South Vietnam for the first time (Zhai 2000: 83). According to an official estimate, between 1962 and 1966, China provided the Viet Cong insurgents with over 270,000 guns, 540 pieces of artillery, 200 million bullets, 0.9 million artillery shells, as well as large quantities of other war materials (Wang Taiping et al. 1998: 35). After mid-1961, Beijing also resumed its active aid to the communist insurgency in other Southeast Asian countries, with an eye to opening a second front against Washington (Chin 2003: 428-430).

From March to September 1963, the PLA's General Staff began to work with its counterpart in North Vietnam in drawing up the contingency plans for a joint Sino-Vietnamese war effort against the United States (Wang Taiping et al. 1998: 34). In September 1963, Zhou Enlai conferred with the top leaders of communist parties in the region, including Ho Chi Minh and Le Duan from Vietnam, Kaysone Phomvihane from Laos, and D. N. Aidit from Indonesia. Now was the time, he urged, for the communists in Southeast Asia to make up their minds to fight the United States, which Zhou said was eager to wage a war in Vietnam and Laos. To facilitate this historic struggle and prepare for the forthcoming socialist revolution, the Southeast

---

[49] The quotations are from an editorial published by the *People's Daily* on October 27, 1962. The full text is available at the *People's Daily*'s official database: http://rmrbw.net/simple/index.php?t298195.html (Accessed June 15, 2012). As a rule, all important editorials were drafted by a special writing group headed by Mao's secretary Hu Qiaomu, and had to be approved in advance by the CCP Politburo (Wu Lengxi 1999: 199-200).

Asian communists must assist and coordinate with each other more closely; and China would faithfully play the role of the "great rear" for the revolutionary movements in the region, and would do its utmost to support their anti-American struggles. In conclusion, Zhou reminded his listeners that there might well be a protracted war with the United States, and that "we must all hang together in a united effort to drive the American imperialists out of Southeast Asia" (Tong 1996: 219-220).

A year later, in July 1964, Zhou conferred with the communist leaders of North Vietnam and Laos again, to whip up their anti-American zeal. Zhou warned that the United States might set to thwart the revolutionary situation in the region in two ways—by continuing to employ special task forces in limited combat actions, or by escalating the conflict into a full-scale war and intervening directly in Vietnam and Laos. Whichever the case, Zhou pledged the PRC's unstinting support for the struggles of the peoples of Southeast Asia. He also exhorted the foreign comrades to brace themselves for a "long and arduous struggle" and build up their military strength in preparation for a war of attrition against the United States (Tong 1996: 220). For the same purpose, after July 1964, China established a training base in Ghana, to educate the African national liberation movements on the strategy and tactics of guerrilla warfare (Wang Taiping 1998: 163-164).

As the Vietnam War escalated, so did the PRC's revolutionary ardor. From January to February 1965, even the usually urbane Zhou Enlai began to call publicly for the dissolution of the United Nations and the establishment of a Revolutionary United Nations, on the grounds that the existing UN served merely the evil purposes of the United States and its cohorts (Li et al. 1997, Vol.2: 704, 708-709). Anticipating an inevitable Armageddon, Beijing's war preparedness scaled new heights. After mid-1964, the PRC already readjusted its third Five-Year Plan, to

speed up the development of its remote western and southwestern interior into a strategic

hinterland in the event of a major war (Yang et al. 2011: 396-403). By early 1965, the personnel

of the PLA had grown to 4.47 million, nearly twice its size in 1958 (Ibid., 306).

On April 13, 1965, the CCP Central Committee issued a nationwide directive, warning

that the United States might make war on China anytime. Thus, it decreed, China must brace

itself for a "small-scale war, a medium-scale war, or a great war" (Mao 1996, Vol.11: 359-360).

From April 12 to May 31, the CMC convened a war planning conference, with the conclusion

that the PRC must prepare for a joint U.S.-Soviet invasion of China, and even an atomic war.

Thereafter, "preparing for an early war, a major war, and a nuclear war" became the major

themes of Beijing's strategic thought (Yang et al. 2011: 394-395).

Correspondingly, China's defense posture grew more assertive. On April 9, 1965, Mao

agreed with his military chiefs that, faced with repeated American provocations, the PLA air

force must abandon its self-restraint and adopt a proactive posture in fighting the intruders (Li et

al. 1997, Vol.2: 724; Ma 2006: 27-28).[50] Meanwhile, Beijing took more clandestine measures to

foment the revolutionary movements in the region. In mid-May 1965, Mao dispatched several

CCP provincial leaders, including Zhang Pinghua (first secretary of Hunan Province), Wang

Renzhong (first secretary of the Central-Southern Bureau), and Tao Zhu (first secretary of the

Southern Bureau), on a secret mission to Vietnam. Years later, Zhang Pinghua reminiscences

cryptically that this mission marked the beginning of China's "grand strategy of uniting with all

---

[50] To this day, official PRC military historians have habitually described China's use of force as a justifiable response to other countries' grave provocations. A rare exception is Deng Lifeng (1994: 449), which admits that the PLA sometimes attacked its adversary on "very slight provocations" (*cabian tiaoxin*), as in the clash with the U.S. air force near Hainan Island on September 20, 1965.

the world's anti-American forces against the hegemony of both the United States and the Soviet Union" (Ma 2006: 48-49).

In fact, even Mao himself was deeply affected by this pervasive war mania. In late May 1965, the Great Helmsman revisited Mt. Jinggang, where he launched guerrilla warfare against Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist regime nearly four decades ago. One day, Mao suddenly declared that he wanted to prepare the dinner himself. Amazed, his bodyguard asked why. The Chairman replied that he felt obliged to take care of all issues, large and trivial alike, in order to brace himself for the outbreak of war (Ma 2006: 203). On June 2, Mao emphasized again that "our work must be based on the assumption that war is imminent" (Mao 1996, Vol.11: 381).

Filled with revolutionary fervor and tensed for combat, the PRC thus entered its most combative phase since 1953. On April 30, 1967, the *People's Daily* editorialized for the first time on the PRC's "sacred international obligation …to support the revolutionary struggles of the peoples in Asia, Africa, Latin America, and other parts of the world." China's unalterable determination, the editorial averred, was to "unite with all Marxists-Leninists, all revolutionary peoples, and all oppressed nations across the world, to vanquish the U.S.-led imperialists, the modern revisionists headed by the Soviet revisionist leadership, and the reactionary forces of all other states" (Xu et al. 2003, Vol.18: 124). Since the founding of the PRC, never had Beijing declared its commitment to world revolution so vehemently—or in so flagrant violation of its own acclaimed Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence.[51]

As a result, Chinese foreign policy became alarmingly belligerent in some critical regards. From August 1965 to November 1973, for instance, the PRC dispatched more than 170,000 anti-

---

[51] It is only in recent years, for example, that PRC historians began to acknowledge the fact that China provided covert but active support for the communist and separatist insurgents in northeastern India during this period (Wang et al. 1999: 125; Shang 2009: 185-187).

aircraft artillery troops to Indochina, which directly fought the U.S. air force in over 2,000

operations (Deng Lifeng 1994: 331-333, 359-360). In the summer of 1967, despite Beijing long-

standing policy of using the British-ruled Hong Kong as a bridgehead for promoting economic

and trade ties with the West, the radicals in the CCP leadership attempted deliberately to provoke

an armed showdown with the British administration in Hong Kong (for details, see Chapter 6).

Furthermore, PRC historians have shown that the Sino-Soviet conflict over the Zhenbao

Island in March 1969, hitherto described by Beijing as a "self-defensive" operation, was in fact

carefully premeditated by Mao himself (Yang 2000; Shen et al. 2007: 389-390). Nonetheless,

instead of bringing about the world revolution envisioned by the CCP, the radicalization of

Chinese diplomacy during this period had only deepened China's diplomatic isolation and

squandered its meager resources.[52]

The story that followed after the advent of the 1970s was a familiar one. After Richard

Nixon's historic visit to Beijing in February 1972, Chinese foreign policy began to turn

"pragmatic in substance despite its outward toughness" (Gong 2004: 65). Meanwhile, the PRC's

admission into the UN in October 1971 created an unprecedented opening for Beijing's

integration into the international system. For some time, these momentous changes failed to alter

PRC leaders' assessment of the inevitability of war. For Mao, the PRC's admission into the UN

represented initially an opportunity to promote the revolutionary movements across the world

(Xiong 1999: 348). As late as November 1973, in a frank conversation with Henry Kissinger,

Zhou Enlai affirmed that Beijing's basic strategy was still to prepare for the worst-case scenario

---

[52] In fact, even official PRC historians find it difficult sometimes to justify the lavish foreign aid
supplied by Maoist China to a handful of its Third World clients and allies during this period. In
November 1970, for example, Beijing had initially agreed to provide Pakistan with an interest-
free loan of 200 million RMB. Nonetheless, in a meeting with the Pakistani president on
November 13, Mao overruled his own government's decision and pledged to increase the loan to
500 million RMB (see Xu et al. 2003, Vol.21: 216-217).

in which China would be attacked simultaneously by the United States and several other states (Jin et al. 2003: 1670). Indeed, throughout 1974, Mao kept warning visiting foreign dignitaries that lasting peace was impossible and war imminent (Mao 1998b, Vol.13: 379-380, 383; Xu et al. 2003, Vol.25: 391-392).

In retrospect, the rigidity of the Maoist outlook on the inevitability of war reflected Beijing's continued commitment to world revolution and, relatedly, its determination to overhaul the status quo order. Indeed, China's continued support for national liberation or revolutionary movements in Asia, Africa, and Latin America was part and parcel of the Maoist effort to challenge the existing international system dominated by the two superpowers (Li 2003: 32). In Africa alone, the PRC had supplied arms and aid in the early 1970s to the "liberation fighters" in Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Namibia, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, South Africa, and Zimbabwe, to encourage their mortal combat with Western colonialism and its collaborators (Wang et al. 1999: 177-182). For similar purposes, Beijing took it upon itself to finance and execute the construction of the Tanzania-Zambia Railway, which cost China one billion RMB (then approximately US$ 500 million) and was the single largest foreign-aid project undertaken by Beijing at the time (He 1994: 38; see also Wang et al. 1999: 192-193).

In 1971-1972, of all foreign-made weapons procured by African liberation fighters, 75% were supplied by China free of charge (Wang et al. 1999: 184). In April 1974, Beijing completed perhaps the largest transaction of this type by providing the Liberation Commission of the African Unity Organization with light weapons enough to equip 2,000 soldiers, and $500,000 in cash (Ibid., 183). In Tanzania, China not only established special training programs and facilities for various African liberation movements (especially those from Angola, Mozambique, Namibia,

and Zimbabwe), but stationed two military advisory groups headed by field-army-level commanders from the PLA (Zhou 2004: 86, 105-106; see also Kong et al. 2009: 436-438).

As long as Beijing maintained this uncompromising posture vis-à-vis the prevailing international order, it was reluctant to conform to the accepted norms of peaceful coexistence in interstate relations. This attitude was vividly reflected in the Sino-Malaysian negotiations toward normalization. Due to its longstanding support for the Malayan Communist Party, the PRC had long refused to recognize Malaysia as a state after its independence in 1957, against which the MCP had waged guerrilla warfare for years. In May 1971, Tun Abdul Razak, then prime minister of Malaysia, conveyed a secret message to Premier Zhou Enlai, expressing Kuala Lumpur's willingness to normalize relations with the PRC through three stages: (1) improving mutual understanding through people-to-people exchanges; (2) promoting bilateral trade; (3) establishing formal diplomatic relations, with Beijing extending an invitation for Razak to visit China. In reply, Beijing demanded that the Malaysian government recognize the PRC as the sole legal government of China and not adopt a "one China, one Taiwan" policy—two preconditions that Kuala Lumpur met with alacrity (Wang et al. 1999: 89-90).

Expecting a measure of reciprocity, Razak requested China to abjure its support of the MCP. In particular, he asked Beijing to close down the MCP's representative office and secret radio station in China. The issue, however, proved a nonstarter for Beijing (Wang et al. 1999: 90). As Chin Peng (then leader of the MCP) recalled, Zhou Enlai personally reassured him in late 1972 that Beijing would, in accord with Mao's instructions, adopt a policy of separating state-to-state relations from party-to-party arrangements. In other words, seeking normalization with Malaysia would not affect Beijing's continued support of the MCP (Chin 2003: 471). When Prime Minister Razak visited Beijing in May 1974 and remonstrated again with Zhou Enlai

about the MCP issue, Zhou made the concession that China would not intervene in the conflict between the MCP and the Malaysian government; nonetheless, emphasized Zhou, the CCP felt obliged to maintain relations with foreign communist parties. Due to Beijing's procrastination, there was little substantive improvement of the Sino-Malaysian relationship despite the establishment of diplomatic relations in 1974 (Wang et al. 1999: 90-91).

Despite its recalcitrance, however, the Maoist China of the 1970s was in many aspects no longer an outsider to the international system. In fact, from the mid-1950s onward, Beijing had developed, slowly but progressively, extensive trade and diplomatic linkages with the outside world, not the least with the West. In 1955, for example, the PRC's trade with the West took up only 37% of its total trade; in 1969, the percentage had skyrocketed to 75% (Zhang 1998: 29). Similarly, in 1955, only 20-odd countries established full diplomatic relations with Beijing; in 1970, more than 50 states had done so, thereby paving the way for the PRC's historic admission into the UN in October 1971. Historically, the integration of a revolutionary state into the international society, no matter how grudging and tortuous, helped to rein in its unilateralist tendencies and encourage its gradual conformity with the norms and rules universally accepted in the international society (see Armstrong 1993). Maoist China, as shown by the telling incident below, was no exception to this rule.

In April 1971, a Maoist radical organization mounted a large-scale armed rebellion against the government headed by Mme. Bandaranaike in Sri Lanka. The Chinese government, however, acted promptly to dissociate itself from the rebellion, in the light of Colombo's close trade and diplomatic relations with the PRC. To signal Beijing's serious intent, Zhou Enlai went so far as to pledge Beijing's "firm support" of Mme. Bandaranaike's efforts to quell the rebellion, on the grounds that China valued its friendship with Sri Lanka and opposed ultra-radical

adventurism. After the rebellion quickly fizzled out, Beijing provided Colombo with a substantial amount of interest-free loans as well as military equipment (Wang et al. 1999: 128-129). Likewise, Van Ness (1970: 169-172) observed that from the mid-1960s onward, the PRC tended *not* to support revolutionary movements led by pro-Beijing communists in countries which: (1) maintained diplomatic relations with China; (2) supported Beijing's admission into the UN; and (3) had considerable trade with China.

So the militarized worldview persisted, but no longer powerful enough to block a slow but healthy evolution of Chinese policy toward the international society in the last few years of Mao's reign. Times, after all, were changing fast, and much of Maoist dogma had spent its force after the dramatic rapprochement between Beijing and Washington, two erstwhile sworn enemies. Even the Great Helmsman himself could not long remain impervious to the buffeting of new realities. The change of the Chinese worldview, as will be shown in the next chapter, was only a matter of time.

Chapter 3

Deng Xiaoping and the Lockeanization of the Chinese Worldview

In 2012, on the last page of his acclaimed biography of Deng Xiaoping, Ezra Vogel poses a hypothetical question: What would Deng say to a rapidly ascending China? To Vogel, the answer seems self-evident: "He would say that China should never behave like a hegemon that interferes in the internal affairs of another nation. Rather, it should maintain harmonious relations with other countries and concentrate on peaceful development at home" (Vogel 2012: 714).

In fact, Vogel's is not an idle question, but reflects an important debate within the PRC in 2010-2011, which concerned whether a more powerful China should take a more assertive stance in international affairs, or continue to strive for harmonious and constructive relations with other countries. According to Jeffrey Bader, former national security director for Asia in the Obama administration, the debate was eventually settled in favor of maintaining the Dengist approach to the international society—an approach that, known as "*tao guang yang hui*," blends elements of caution, modesty, and prudence (Bader 2012, especially chapter 11).

Another interesting question, however, still remains unanswered: Why does the Dengist approach continue to appeal to a majority of Chinese elites, long after the demise of the patriarch in February 1997? What is the key to its extraordinary staying power?

In this chapter, I seek to resolve the mystery by examining the evolution of the Chinese worldview in the post-Maoist period. In a nutshell, I argue that China after Mao was no longer a hostile outsider to the international society, but an insider. Through this integrationist course, the PRC leadership gradually formed the conviction that the existing international system provided the best opportunities not only for China's economic development, but for its survival and

security in the long run. Correspondingly, Beijing no longer believed that its best interests lay in challenging the stability of the system, but that it shared a common stake in promoting peace, security, and prosperity with other states. This profound ideational change, which I call the Lockeanization of the Chinese worldview, was at first initiated and cemented by Deng Xiaoping, and has guided his successors to date. As a hallmark of this more pacific Chinese worldview, the post-Maoist PRC leadership has consistently held to the following beliefs:

—In the contemporary international system, peace is sustainable, and a world war or a major war involving China is postponable and ultimately avoidable. Thus, the PRC's fundamental interest consists in integrating into international society and maintaining its stability and well-being, for the sake of China's own development;

—As China rejoins international society, it also accepts "peace and development" as the main themes of international relations, instead of rejecting or obstructing them. This is the only way for the PRC to promote its national interests (e.g., security, prosperity, and status) from within the system;

—Furthermore, as China's integration into international society deepens, its stake in promoting world peace and development also increases. Thus, the pursuit of common security and common development is viewed as a desirable goal of Chinese foreign policy.

As will be detailed below, these beliefs have given rise to a less conflictual and more cooperative Chinese approach to international affairs. Moreover, the necessity to keep China integrated within the international community serves as a constant reminder to Chinese elites that, while reaping the benefits of integration, the PRC must also look to its own behavior and act in more rule-based ways, so as to ensure that its ascendancy would not result in catastrophic

confrontations that benefit no one in international society. This "live and let live" mentality, in a

sense, is Deng's greatest foreign policy legacy, which his successors have upheld to this day.

"War is Inevitable but Postponable": The Mellowing of the Chinese Worldview, 1975-1977

In 1975, Mao was no longer intent upon a revolutionary transformation of China and the

world. Domestically, the Great Helmsman supported the efforts of the newly rehabilitated Deng

Xiaoping to initiate a series of reforms in China's political and economic life (for details, see

Vogel 2012, chapters 2-4). In foreign affairs, Mao began to downplay the prospect of world

revolution and war, and to reestablish the PRC as a normal state in international society. In April,

Mao talked of the "next great war" for the first time as a remote possibility rather than an

ineluctable certainty.[53] Meanwhile, the year 1975 also marked the beginning of the end of

China's ties with communist-led insurgent movements in Southeast Asia (Heaton 1982: 779-

780).[54]

---

[53] Mao made these comments when receiving the Belgian prime minister on April 19, 1975. When customarily stressing the instability of the world situation, Mao nevertheless opined that the next great war would probably occur 30 years hence—which was, in other words, unlikely to occur in the foreseeable future (Xu et al. 2003, Vol.26: 124).

[54] Again, China's relationship with Malaysia provides interesting clues about this policy change. On April 30, 1975, the CCP sent a congratulatory telegram to the Malayan Communist Party on the latter's 45th anniversary. While reaffirming ideological solidarity with the MCP, the telegram merely expressed appreciation of the Malayan communists' armed struggles against Japanese imperialism and British colonialism in the past, but carefully refrained from committing China to support the MCP's present struggle against the Malaysian government. Thus, according to Wang Youping, then PRC ambassador in Kuala Lumpur, the telegram was just an ideological gesture devoid of any practical meaning. Moreover, Ambassador Wang recalled: "While in Malaysia, I had never communicated with the MCP, nor had any exchanges with the MCP or its apologists. I had not even made any inquiries about the MCP." When asked by an old colleague, a Malaysian Chinese, to contact his parents who still lived in Kuala Lumpur, Wang declined for fear of giving the Malaysian government any cause for suspecting Beijing of trying to use Malaysia's large ethnic Chinese population to interfere with the country's internal affairs (Yun 1996: 218-219, 222).

As Beijing no longer itched for confrontations with the rest of the world, its sense of security began to increase at this stage. In June 1975, the CMC convened a special conference under the leadership of Deng Xiaoping. After careful review of the international situation, China's top military leaders agreed that "[a great war] is unlikely to occur within three to five years and may be postponed further" (Xu et al. 2003, Vol.26: 208). Accordingly, starting in September 1975, the PLA began to reduce its personnel drastically: in the next two years, the size of the army, navy, and air force was cut by 27.3%, 17%, and 16.4%, respectively (Ibid., Vol.26: 294).

After the Great Helmsman's death in September 1976, his successors wasted little time in abandoning the legacy of China's past revolutionary diplomacy, to clear the way for the full-scale improvement of China's relations with the countries in the region. In May 1977, PRC deputy premier Li Xiannian related the following three pledges to the visiting Burmese president Ne Win: (1) China would not attempt to export revolution; (2) China would not interfere with the Burmese government's efforts to deal with the insurgent Burmese Communist Party; (3) China's support for the communist insurgents would be basically moral and spiritual in nature (Wang et al. 2009: 1289).

As Beijing grew less enamored of the prospects of revolution and war, the post-Mao Chinese leadership openly professed a more sanguine worldview, similar to the one held by Mao and his comrades from 1954 to 1959. In August 1977, when the CCP held its 11th National Congress, Chairman Hua Guofeng (Mao's chosen successor) formally unveiled the new official line that the world war was inevitable but postponable.[55] Behind the scenes, Deng might have

---

[55] See Hua's political report to the 11th Party Congress, available at: http://cpc.people.com.cn/GB/64162/64168/64563/65449/4526443.html (Accessed May 11, 2012).

played a part in this notable policy change: for, at the same time, it was Deng, not Hua, who

instructed the commanders of the PLA to research *Deng's* argument back in June 1975 that the

world war was unlikely to occur within five years and might be postponed further (Leng et al.

2004: 191).[56] In December 1977, Deng again told the CMC: "The international situation is

good …[We should] strive for the postponement of war" (Deng Xiaoping 1994: 77).[57]

In essence, the mellowing of the Chinese worldview in the late Maoist and early post-

Maoist periods reflected a basic fact—that the PRC was no longer a hostile outsider to the

international society, but an insider. As a result, Beijing was obviously no longer haunted by a

sense of isolation and insecurity, but developed a greater faith in the sustainability of peace. As

China's interest in preserving peace and stability grew, it naturally became less inclined to

challenge the prevailing international system. Instead, to maintain peace and postpone war,

Beijing found it necessary to befriend as many states as possible, as well as to act in more

responsible and rule-governed ways. This explains why, even toward an alleged "archenemy"

such as the Soviet Union, China began to exhibit a more conciliatory attitude at this time.[58]

---

[56] Deng made the argument in the aforementioned conference of the CMC in June 1975. From April to September 1976, Deng was put under house arrest due to Mao's displeasure with his opposition to the radical line embodied in the Cultural Revolution; thus, the Great Helmsman anointed Hua Guofeng as his new successor in Deng's absence. After Mao's death, Hua served as the nominal head of the CCP for a few years; however, after his triumphant return to power in July 1977, Deng quickly reasserted his authority in party, state, and military affairs (for details, see Vogel 2012, chapters 6-7). That Deng already dwarfed Hua in stature and influence at the time was clearly reflected by the previously mentioned instruction he gave to the PLA in August 1977: for, although Hua was then chairman of the CMC (and hence nominal supreme commander of the PLA), Deng apparently "forgot" to highlight Hua's role in establishing the new official line on the question of war and peace.

[57] In his speech, Deng did not explain why or in what way the international situation was "good" for China. But it is plausible, as I argue below, that the PRC's broadening engagement with the outside world had enhanced Beijing's sense of security.

[58] In August 1977, Hua Guofeng still described the Soviet Union as a great threat to world peace in his political report to the CCP's 11th party congress. Behind the scenes, however, Beijing had

Building on this auspicious beginning, Deng Xiaoping was soon to initiate a silent revolution in China's fundamental orientation to the international system, a revolution whose impact on Chinese foreign policy has endured to this day.

Seeking Constructive Engagement and Common Interests: Deng's Integrationist Strategy, 1978-1984

In December 1978, Deng was affirmed as the new supreme leader at the historic third plenum of the CCP's 11th Central Committee. From then onward, following Deng's direction, the CCP leadership has not only consistently regarded China's modernization as its top priority, but also adhered to the Dengist line of "reform and opening" as the key to achieving that goal. Intrinsically, a commitment to reform and opening implies China's willingness to recognize its own inadequacies in comparison with others, and, more significantly, to engage others in order to improve itself.[59] For this purpose, China could no longer live in constant distrust of the rest of the world, but should make an active effort to create a peaceful and friendly international environment, to ensure its own long-term development.

As a veteran communist, Deng did not come around to this point of vew immediately, given the fact that he was actually one of the main proponents of the militarized worldview during the Sino-Soviet polemical debate in the 1960s (for details, see Chapter 6). Despite his

authorized its new ambassador in Moscow, Wang Youping, to adopt a series of conciliatory initiatives toward the Soviets; accordingly, the diplomatic exchanges between the two countries became remarkably smooth and pragmatic, devoid of the acerbic recriminations that poisoned Sino-Soviet relations in the previous decade (Yun 1996: 236-238). On November 7, 1977 (the Soviet National Day), to indicate Beijing's increased interest in normalizing Sino-Soviet relations, more than a hundred Chinese dignitaries attended the reception hosted by the Soviet embassy, a spectacle unseen since the Sino-Soviet rupture in the mid-1960s (Wang et al. 1999: 216).

[59] Deng himself made this point abundantly clear during his trip to the United States in early 1979. On February 4, 1979, Deng attended a dinner hosted by the Boeing Company, and told the U.S. business magnates present: "The Chinese people, in their effort to achieve modernization, would like to learn from the American people on many things" (Leng et al. 2004: 485).

wish to strive for the postponement of war, Deng continued for some time to believe in the Leninist dogma that war was inevitable as long as imperialism existed (He 2010: 181; see also Leng et al. 2004: 205, 247, 685). Nor did he agree to adopt a conciliatory policy toward *all* states, least of all the Soviet Union and Vietnam, against which China had fought on the contested border (Vogel 2012, chapter 9). Nevertheless, as a pragmatic statesman, Deng was not averse to hearing new ideas and forming new conceptions; and the expansion of high-level political and diplomatic contact between China and other countries, as shown below, played a key role in changing the preconceptions of Deng and his comrades.

Between November 1979 and February 1981, a group of China's topmost foreign policy experts, headed by Huan Xiang (a close advisor to Deng), had a series of in-depth exchanges with their counterparts in the United States. Through these exchanges, the Chinese experts realized that the international situation had moved further toward détente, and that Beijing's fears of Soviet aggression were exaggerated. Afterward, Huan submitted two reports to the CCP leadership, arguing that the relaxation of international tensions provided China with a double opportunity, enabling Beijing to: (1) improve relations with Moscow and Washington simultaneously; and (2) expand economic and trade relations with the outside world. For these reports, Huan received a warm commendation from Hu Yaobang, Deng's chief lieutenant and then general secretary of the CCP (He Fang 2007: 591-592).

In the meantime, the CCP's International Department set up a special team in 1980, to conduct research on the international situation and Chinese foreign relations. Based on the team's research, Li Yimang (deputy director of the International Department) advised the CCP leadership to restructure Chinese strategic thinking in a more radical way, as below:

—The international situation had changed profoundly, a new world war was unlikely to occur, and peace would endure on a long-term and even permanent basis. Such an environment would provide China with a unique opportunity to concentrate on its economic development and reform its domestic institutions. Accordingly, Beijing must abandon the Leninist dogma about the inevitability of war;

—Given the sustainability of peace, the Maoist doctrine about the "three worlds" and "promoting world revolution" had become obsolescent in theory and practice. Thereafter, China should seek to improve its relations with a broad variety of states, political parties, and mass organizations abroad, including the hitherto estranged Soviet Union and East European countries (He Fang 2007: 592-594; see also He 2010: 181-183).

When Li Yimang expounded these views at a Politburo meeting, Deng and his colleagues were surprised, but intrigued as well (He Fang 2007: 592). For, just as Li observed astutely, an insistence on the inevitability of war would ultimately contravene China's (and Deng's own) avowed goal of concentrating on economic development. That is, why should Beijing expend so much effort in economic development now, if the fruits of development are destined to be destroyed in the "inevitably" forthcoming war? Logically, would China not be better-off to concentrate on preparing for war right now? Thus, Li's argument exerted a powerful influence on the CCP's leadership's strategic policymaking (He 2010: 181-182). From then on, Deng himself began to express the belief that the prospect of war, while still looming, was no longer a clear and present danger; therefore, China need not live in constant fear, but should strive for a peaceful environment for its development (Leng et al. 2004: 620-621, 685-686, 708, 841-842, 892).

On February 11, 1981, the CCP Politburo established the Central Small Leading Group on Foreign Affairs (CSLGFA). To this day, the CSLGFA has served as the CCP's top coordinating and supervisory agency in the making of Chinese foreign policy. Charged with the task of formulating the guidelines for Chinese diplomacy, the CSLGFA consists of the leading officials not only from the Foreign Ministry, but also from the CCP's International and Intelligence Departments. Discussions on specific issues are held on a collegial basis, and all policy recommendations have to go through a process of collective contemplation and revision before they are forwarded to the Politburo for final decisions (Wang et al. 2009: 1232-1233). In this way, the making of Chinese foreign policy is no longer prey to the personal whim of any individual leader, but rests upon a broad consensus among the Party and government elites.

On March 9, 1981, at a meeting of the CCP's Central Secretariat, General Secretary Hu Yaobang enunciated the following new principles for Chinese diplomacy:

—China should strive to oppose hegemonism and maintain world peace. In particular, Beijing should "hoist up the banner of maintaining world peace to unprecedented heights";

—China should seek to establish, develop, and maintain normal state-to-state relations with all countries on the basis of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence;

—China should seek to establish, develop, and maintain peaceful and friendly people-to-people exchanges with all countries;

—China should support the struggles of any countries that suffered from outside aggression and oppression (Sheng and Wang 2007: 209-210).

In essence, the above principles signaled a fundamental change in China's basic orientation toward the international society. Clearly, Beijing had realized that its vital national interest lay not so much in preparing for war as in preserving peace. To preserve peace, the PRC

needed to develop normal and friendly relations with *all* countries, regardless of ideological differences and historical animosities. The expansion of people-to-people exchanges, viewed in this light, helped the PRC not only to secure the goodwill of others, but also to create more and more common interests with other countries in maintaining the stability and well-being of the international system, which was essential to China's long-term development.

A skeptic, however, may question whether Hu's emphasis on opposing hegemonism and assisting any countries in their struggle against outside aggressors was a contradiction to his seeming commitment to peace. It is plausible, however, that talk of anti-hegemonism was more a rhetorical gesture than a concrete policy of Dengist China, as shown by the developments in the following years. Instead of trying to expand the socialist camp against the "hegemonic" West, for example, Deng had repeatedly warned Third World leaders *not* to adopt socialism or socialist development strategies (Deng 1993: 139-140, 260-261, 289-290). Meanwhile, Deng remained adamant in rebuffing any suggestions from foreign leaders that China assume the leadership of the Third World (Leng et al. 2004: 16, 58, 829, 841).

In October 1982, the Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi visited China, to seek Beijing's assistance in the development of Libya's nuclear program. Given his emphasis on maintaining world peace, Deng was unmoved by Gaddafi's request that the PRC play a leading role in the struggle against the hegemonism of superpowers. Nuclear cooperation between Third World countries, he emphasized, could only produce "all harm and no benefit" for the world (Leng et al. 2004: 865).

In fact, as Hu Yaobang told a West German delegation on May 29, 1984: "We oppose hegemonism, but we have no intention of creating tensions with the superpowers" (Sheng and Wang 2007: 524). As said earlier, the principal goal of Chinese foreign policy was now to

maintain world peace and develop friendly relations with all countries. To challenge a hegemon, however, was a reckless and destabilizing act that could leave China isolated and friendless. In contrast, accommodation with the hegemon(s) would better serve Beijing's political, economic, and security interests. After all, China's integration into the international system was predicated foremost on its willingness to seek rapprochement with the United States, the creator, hegemon, and maintainer of the existing system. This explains why, in the years to come, Beijing had never ventured seriously to "oppose hegemonism," even on the hypersensitive question of Chinese sovereignty over Taiwan (for details, see Chapter 7).

In sum, to Deng and his comrades, the international system was not merely a marketplace where China could benefit economically and technologically, but also a social environment where Beijing could cooperate with others in achieving lasting peace. Toward that end, China's leaders decided that Beijing should, first and foremost, expand constructive exchanges and common interests with other countries, including erstwhile adversaries. Below, I provide a brief overview of Beijing's attempts to defreeze Sino-Soviet relations and explore new approaches to territorial disputes, which offers a revealing testimony to the new direction in Chinese foreign policy in the late 1970s and early 1980s.

Defreezing Sino-Soviet Relations

In February 1979, the PRC launched a short border war against Vietnam. Despite its mutual defense treaty with Hanoi, Moscow chose not to take provocative actions on the equally contested Sino-Soviet border to divert Chinese attention. Encouraged by the Soviet gesture, China's leaders decided to expand contact and exchanges with the Soviet Union thereafter, and to achieve the normalization of Sino-Soviet relations in a gradual, step-by-step manner (Yun 1996: 247-248).

Outwardly, at this time, official Chinese propaganda continued to accuse the Soviet Union of seeking hegemony and expansion. Behind the scenes, Beijing was prepared to defreeze Sino-Soviet relations on a non-ideological, pragmatic, and reciprocal basis. On May 5, 1979, Yu Zhan, deputy foreign minister of the PRC, met with the Soviet ambassador, and proposed the following items for the forthcoming Sino-Soviet negotiations: formulating the guiding principles for the bilateral relations; eliminating the obstacles to normalization; developing trade, scientific, and cultural exchanges on the basis of equality and mutual benefit (Yun 1996: 249; see also Wang et al. 1999b: 946).

Two months later, on July 17, Hu Yaobang made clear to a conference of China's ambassadors that Beijing would adopt several conciliatory initiatives toward Moscow, including not collaborating with any country in an anti-Soviet war, not provoking any border incidents, and doing its best to expand exchanges with the Soviet people (Sheng and Wang 2007: 118-119). The approach outlined by Hu was confirmed by Deng at a Politburo meeting on August 29. In Deng's view, the ultimate goal of Sino-Soviet negotiations was to have both countries undertake the obligation *not* to station troops or establish military bases in neighboring states, or to use neighboring states to threaten each other's security. He emphasized that China should not expect the negotiation to produce quick results, but should use it to engage the Soviets for a long period of time (Yun 1996: 259).

Interestingly, Moscow shared more or less the same goal with Beijing in conducting the negotiations. On the one hand, the Soviet Union was unwilling to comply with China's request that Moscow eliminate the so-called "three great obstacles to normalization," i.e., by reducing its troops in Mongolia, terminating its support of Vietnam against China, and withdrawing from Afghanistan. Yet, on the other hand, Moscow was ready to allay Beijing's concerns in several

other ways. It pledged, for example, to adhere to the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence as well; to forsake the use or threat of force against China; to disavow any intention of seeking hegemony in Asia or the world, and to manage the problems in bilateral relations with restraint. It also proposed to resolve outstanding disputes through summit meetings with Beijing, and to increase trade, economic, scientific, and cultural exchanges between the two countries (Yun 1996: 259-260).

Thus, Beijing and Moscow found some common ground in their mutual commitment to peaceful coexistence and the expansion of trade and other exchanges. This explains why, despite the lack of notable progress, both sides were willing to continue the negotiating process and explore new ways of improving Sino-Soviet relations in the following years (Yun 1996: 267-269; Shen et al. 2007: 411-419). By mid-1983, the aforementioned CSLGFA reached the conclusion that the Soviet Union was no longer a major security threat to China. Thereafter, the CCP ceased to propagate the conception of the "Soviet threat" in its internal addresses and publications (Wang et al. 2009: 1236).

In early 1984, the CSLGFA went a step further, recommending that China stop judging other states on the basis of their relations with either Moscow or Washington. Ideological differences should not prevent Beijing from seeking to develop friendly relations with other countries. Instead, China should make clear that, for the sake of maintaining world peace, it welcomed any moves toward disarmament and détente, and was willing to improve relations with both the Soviet Union and the United States (Wang et al. 2009: 1236-1237).

In August 1984, Hu Yaobang affirmed this constructive approach during a visit to Heihe, a town on the Sino-Soviet border. Beijing's overall policy, he said, was to "restore and reinforce" Sino-Soviet friendship through the expansion of economic and trade relations (Sheng and Wang

114

2007: 533-534). Within this context, Hu urged the Chinese border residents and even border guards to promote trade and people-to-people exchanges with the Soviets, so as to spur the development of state-to-state relations (Yun 1996: 272-273). In December 1984, the PRC and the Soviet Union agreed for the first time to establish a Joint Committee for Cooperation on Commerce, Trade, Science, and Technology; thereafter, their bilateral exchanges entered a phase of positive acceleration, thereby creating an auspicious atmosphere for the ultimate normalization of Sino-Soviet relations four years later (Shen et al. 2007: 423-427)

Exploring New Approaches to Territorial Disputes

As said earlier, contested territory is the most contentious issue type of all interstate disputes, and often has an enduring, poisonous impact on interstate relations. After the border war in 1962, for example, Sino-Indian relations entered a fifteen-year phase of mutual hostility; occasional friendly gestures, even those made by top political leaders, proved unable to overcome the deep suspicions prevailing on both sides (Wang 1998: 299-300; Shang 2009: 269-271). Under the circumstances, Deng Xiaoping began to contemplate new solutions to the old disputes, with a view to engaging China's neighbors through a common commitment to preserve peace and expand common interests.

As early as September 1978, Deng had informed the Nepalese prime minister of Beijing's willingness to settle the Sino-Indian border dispute through mutual compromise (Leng et al. 2004: 391). Receiving the Indian foreign minister in February 1979, Deng proposed his famous "package deal" solution to the territorial dispute between China and India: that is, China would make territorial concessions in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border, in exchange for Indian concessions in the eastern sector of the border. Deng told the Indian dignitary that the first order of business was to maintain peace on the border; as long as both countries were committed

to this goal, the lingering problems could not affect either side's security or economic development. In addition, Deng urged both countries to "do some concrete things" to develop their relations: after all, he said, China and India were the two most populous nations in the world, and it made nonsense for them to remain unfriendly toward each other (Huang Hua 2007: 289).

Although New Delhi rejected Deng's "package deal" for lack of domestic political consensus, it nevertheless regarded the prospect of developing Sino-Indian relations with a warmth unobserved since 1962 (Huang Hua 2007: 289-293). In June 1981, when receiving PRC foreign minister Huang Hua, Indian prime minister Indira Gandhi confirmed that New Delhi would adhere to a similar approach of "promoting friendship in order to create a propitious climate for [border] negotiations, and conducting negotiations in a way conductive to the promotion of friendship" (Ibid., 295). Four months later, Deng again stressed that China and India posed no threat to each other, and that the two countries should promote friendship and cooperation through economic, trade, and cultural exchanges (Deng 1993: 19-20; Leng et al. 2004: 861-862).

Regarding China's maritime disputes with other countries, Deng adopted an open-minded attitude as well. In August 1978, he told the Japanese foreign minister that China intended to shelve the dispute with Japan over the Senkaku (Diaoyu) islands, in order that, after an appropriate cooling-off period, the next generation of political leaders on both sides could work out a mutually acceptable solution (Leng et al. 2004: 355). In December 1981, he averred again that "territorial disputes …could only be settled through goodwill and long collaborative effort, and in a friendly, peaceful, and mutually acceptable way. There are no other alternatives" (Ibid., 792). Receiving an Indian delegation in October 1981, Deng reaffirmed that the Sino-Indian

boundary problem can only be resolved through compromise, because China and India posed no threat to each other. Even if the issue could not be settled anytime soon, emphasized Deng, the two countries could still deepen mutual understanding and cooperation through economic, trade, and cultural exchanges (Deng 1993: 19-20; Leng et al. 2004: 861-862).

In theory as well as in practice, the Dengist conception of "shelving the dispute while deepening cooperation" provided a novel but significant formula for interstate conflict resolution. Conceivably, the peaceful resolution of disputes can only be achieved and sustained through goodwill and constructive engagement. And, in order to promote goodwill and consolidate engagement, the disputants must share a strong common interest in maintaining peace and developing a positive momentum in their relations. Common interests, however, do not emerge out of thin air; they have to be nurtured through exchanges and cooperation. The expansion of economic, trade, and social linkages, viewed in this light, serves several key purposes. It helps to eclipse the disputants' erstwhile zero-sum perceptions of their relations, thereby creating an improving atmosphere for reaching a final and amicable settlement. It helps to increase common interests between disputants, through the creation of mutual benefit. By moving the disputants toward a win-win and interdependent relationship, it also augments their stakes in seeking a mutually acceptable solution of disagreements, instead of acting unilaterally and to their own detriment. In essence, these principles derive logically from the Lockean worldview, as elaborated in Chapter 1.

In the same spirit, Deng proposed a formula of "shelving the dispute and seeking joint development" to resolve China's maritime disputes in the East and South China Seas. In October 1984, Deng told the CCP's Central Advisory Committee that the formula represented a new solution to old problems and might have wider implications for international disputes. Through

joint development projects and enterprises, the disputants could form a collaborative relationship

and reap mutual benefits. In this way, a thorny dispute might be resolved naturally without

recourse to war (Deng 1993: 87).

In particular, Deng and his successors placed high hopes of using this formula to settle

the dispute between China and some Southeast Asian countries over the Spratly Islands in the

South China Sea (for details, see Chapter 7). In June 1986, Deng asked the vice president of the

Philippines to consider this formula, because "we can become very good friends as we share the

goal of common development" (Leng et al. 2004: 1122). Receiving the Philippine president in

April 1988, Deng again introduced the formula: by forming joint ventures and engaging in joint

explorations, he said, the disputants could resolve the dispute without resort to force (Ibid., 1227).

In 2000, China successfully resolved the dispute with Vietnam over the demarcation of

the Gulf of Tonkin, a thorny dispute that dated back to the late 19th century. As a PRC scholar

observes, the settlement of the dispute was in large part a testimony to the applicability of the

said Dengist formula (Zhang Zhirong 2005: 32). Indeed, to this day, the Dengist formula remains

the guiding principle of China's approach toward such contentious issues as the Sino-Japanese

dispute over the Senkaku (Diaoyu) Islands, and the Sino-ASEAN dispute over the Spratly

Islands (for details, see Chapter 7).

"Peace and Development are the Main Themes of Our Time": Deng Transforms the Chinese Worldview, 1985-1989

In late 1984, Deng Xiaoping began to consider a fundamental transformation of the

Chinese worldview. On November 1, when chairing a meeting of the CMC, he mused: "Since

the era of Chairman Mao, we have been talking about the danger of war for many years. Now it

is high time that we made a new, levelheaded judgment." Without such a judgment, China would

find it difficult to concentrate on economic development, or to persist in reform and opening, or

to draw up appropriate guidelines for its military buildup (Leng et al. 2004: 1011-1012). At this meeting, however, Deng did not elaborate on this "new, levelheaded judgment" immediately; yet, he did signal its basic direction, by urging China to open up to *all* countries in the world (Deng 1993: 98-99). In March 1985, he went a step further, by observing that peace and economic development were the greatest issues of the world, and that China should strive to make a greater contribution to the cause of peace and development (Ibid, 105-106).

Three months later, in June 1985, Deng finally expounded this new judgment at an expanded conference of the CMC. China's national defense policy, he said, had long been based on the conviction that war was both inevitable and imminent. A careful examination of the international situation, however, showed that neither the United States nor the Soviet Union wanted to provoke a war, and that most peoples of the world demanded the preservation of peace and opposed war. Thus, a world war was unlikely to occur for the foreseeable future; and China no longer needed to side with one superpower against another. Instead, thereafter, "it is very important [for China] to assume the image of a peacemaker and war-preventer, and we shall in effect play this role too." Accordingly, Deng ordered the PLA to reduce its personnel by one million (Deng 1993: 126-128; quotations on p. 128).

On September 7, Deng went a step further, telling the visiting prime minister of Spain that China regarded most of the world as its allies in preserving peace and preventing war. Beijing's goal, he said, was to maintain peace throughout the rest of the 20th century and the entire 21st century (Leng et al. 2004: 1074). A week later, Deng opined to the visiting Austrian president: "We now believe that war is avoidable. …If no great war occurs before the end of this century, lasting peace is hopeful in the next century." Within this context, Beijing would formulate its foreign policy solely for the sake of maintaining world peace. His conception of

119

"one country, two systems," for example, was aimed not only at resolving China's own problems peacefully, but also at inventing a new way of settling intractable disputes for the international community (Ibid., 1076-1077). Afterward, Deng repeatedly stressed to foreign dignitaries that war was avoidable for the foreseeable future, which created an opportunity for economic development of China as well as the world (Ibid., 1108-1109, 1138, 1148, 1187-1188; see also Deng 1993: 233, 289-290).

In essence, the Dengist new thinking represented a silent and thorough break with China's revolutionary past. As early as 1986, He Fang, a veteran PRC foreign policy expert, had noted that Deng's emphasis on peace and development as the main issues of the world, or the "main themes of our time," entailed a supreme strategic judgment that questioned the wisdom of Chinese foreign policy in the entire Maoist period. It indicated, above all, that the CCP's past adherence to the Leninist doctrine about the inevitability of war and world revolution had put China on the wrong side of history and led it into a blind alley. Now that the "main themes of our time" had changed from war and revolution to peace and development, China should persist in promoting peace and developing its economy thereafter, as directed by Deng (He Fang 2007: 642-643).

More significantly, the Dengist notion marked the final, decisive step toward the Lockeanization of the Chinese worldview, thereby demolishing the ideational foundation of *any* confrontational approach China might assume toward the international system. As a rule, Marxism-Leninism interprets the international system as moving slowly but inexorably toward a climactic struggle between socialism and capitalism. Consequently, a socialist state like the PRC should always emphasize struggle and conquest as the main themes of its foreign policy, and identify friends and foes in the struggle with an eye to securing the total triumph of socialism. In

the past, Mao and his comrades had adopted precisely this approach to international affairs, which not only confirmed the PRC's identity as a revolutionary state, but also shored up the CCP's rule at home.

By emphasizing peace and development as the main themes of world politics, Deng signaled that the old interpretation of the underlying dynamics of the international system was totally irrelevant and detrimental to Chinese interests. Such an interpretation, as said earlier, encourages and rationalizes *a priori* confrontational postures and policies, thereby driving China's development in unproductive directions. In sharp contrast, Deng's new thinking, like that of Mikhail Gorbachev's, depicts the international society not as a battlefield between "good" socialism and "bad" capitalism, but as a social environment where states limit their violence against each other and pursue mutual benefit through increased trade and contact.[60] In such an environment, state still have legitimate interests that will be in conflict; but it is both possible and probable to manage the conflicts in a spirit of mutual accommodation, as long as peace and development remain the commonly held goals of the international society.

Based on this reinterpretation of the basic character of the international system, Deng also introduced a profound reconsideration of the utility of force in promoting China's national interests. In September 1988, Deng observed to Singaporean prime minister Lee Kuan Yew that the world had reached the stage at which "confrontation has given way to dialogue, and tensions to détente." This trend, in his view, would keep growing for the next three to five decades. Against this background, Deng said, all hegemonic or aggressive behaviors would be ultimately self-defeating, and that even an absolute advantage in relative capabilities could not save the

---

[60] For a detailed analysis of Gorbachev's new thinking and its impact on Soviet foreign policy, see Woodby (1989). Like Deng, Gorbachev also rejected the view that "class struggle" was the driving force in the development of world politics, and emphasized the prospect of peaceful coexistence and constructive exchanges in the international society.

aggressor from eventual decline. Thus, only the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence would

be applicable in the future world (Leng et al. 2004: 1250-1251).

In Deng's view, peaceful resolution of disputes thus became an essential characteristic of

the emerging new world order: logically, if peaceful coexistence is the normal and normative

condition of interstate relations, then, negotiated agreements are certainly better than coercive

strategies for the settlement of disputes. Using force to resolve differences, therefore, should be

avoided in principle and applied in practice only as a last resort. Instead, seeking mutually

acceptable and win-win solutions presents a more sensible and effective way of conflict

resolution. In fact, this was precisely the conclusion that Deng drew from his above observations.

Receiving the president of Iran in May 1989, Deng pointed out that China was engaged in

contentious interstate disputes as well; however, given the growing détente in world politics, the

only sensible way of resolving them was to proceed step by step and settle disputes through

patient dialogue, not by recourse to war (Leng et al. 2004: 1274).

Furthermore, as the PRC becomes "an insider seeking maximum opportunities for its

development from within the existing order" (Zhao 1996: 41), it takes a keener interest in

maintaining the stability of the international society, for any attempt to disrupt it would only

decrease the opportunities for China's development. This explains why, in the late 1980s, Beijing

expended a greater effort to promote the peaceful resolution of disputes around the world. In

particular, China played an active and constructive role in persuading Iran and Iraq to stop their

long-drawn-out war (Pang 2008: 118-119; Wang et al. 2009: 1246-1247). Receiving a Polish

communist delegation on June 6, 1986, CCP general secretary Hu Yaobang made an

unprecedented declaration: "Maintaining world peace is the undeniable responsibility of all

communists around the world" (Sheng and Wang 2007: 668). A few days later, on an official

visit to London, Hu averred again that China was determined to "work in concert with the peoples of the world to prevent war during the remainder of this century, and for the next century as well." As far as the PRC was concerned, "no war forever" was the best thing (Ibid., 671).

To sum up, Deng Xiaoping not only transformed the Chinese worldview fundamentally, but reshaped Chinese foreign policy in a peaceful, cooperative, and responsible direction. Since war is avoidable, it follows naturally that China should strive to maintain peace and to develop friendly relations with all other states, in order to create a long-term and propitious environment for its development (Gong 2004: 448). Moreover, as China desires to play the role of a peacemaker (or a "responsible stakeholder," as it is called upon today), it should refrain from using force to resolve disputes, especially territorial disputes (Ye 2001: 287). Below, I provide illustrative examples of this new direction in Chinese diplomacy, by examining two hitherto little explored cases—i.e., China's attempts to curb North Korea's adventurism and to resolve the resurgent territorial dispute with India in 1986-1987. I wind up with a brief discussion of how the Dengist new thinking was accepted by China's ruling elites, especially the People's Liberation Army.

Curbing North Korean Adventurism

In the early 1980s, the North Korean leader Kim Il Sung had proposed to reunify the Korean Peninsula through the establishment of a confederation, in which north and south would coexist peacefully while keeping their respective social and governmental systems intact. Given the similarity between Kim's proposal and the Dengist formula of "one country, two systems," Beijing had welcomed Pyongyang's initiative as conducive to regional and world peace. On April 27, 1984, when meeting with U.S. president Ronald Reagan, CCP general secretary Hu Yaobang made clear that Beijing's Korea policy was based on two "clear and firm" guidelines:

"First, we hope the situation on the Korean Peninsula would stabilize for a long period of time; second, we support the peaceful reunification of Korea in the form of federation, wherein neither side would swallow the other side" (Sheng and Wang 2007: 512). A week later, Hu paid an official visit to Pyongyang, and obtained Kim Il Sung's verbal assurance that North Korea would never take any destabilizing actions, much less launching a southward invasion (Ibid., 517).

With the passage of time, however, Pyongyang seemed to have second thoughts about the matter, which caused growing concern in Beijing. In December 1985, Deng tried to persuade Kim Il Sung in person that "all international problems should be resolved only through negotiations; whoever makes war, no matter whether it is a major state, a medium-sized state, or a minor state, is bound to end up badly" (Leng et al. 2004: 1097). As Pyongyang was apparently unmoved and harboring some predatory designs on South Korea, Deng grew noticeably tougher when meeting Kim again in May 1987. Adopting the tone of a headmaster to a sullen and incorrigible schoolboy, Deng warned: "The overall international situation demonstrates that no disputes should be settled by armed force." He urged Kim to "handle international problems in more ways than one [i.e., not just by force]" and to "adopt a broader perspective." Pointedly, he reminded the North Korean leader that all states had to manage international affairs by their own standards, and "[you] have to understand this point" (Ibid., 1190).

In case Kim should fail to understand this point, Deng went a step further a few days later, telling a Japanese delegation unambiguously that China was against either South Korea's invasion of the North, or North Korea's invasion of the South (Leng et al. 2004: 1192). Under the circumstances, Deng's statement was undoubtedly targeted at North Korea, and there was no more hint of a southward military operation from Pyongyang afterward.

Managing the Sumdorong Chu Crisis with India

From December 1981 to November 1987, China and India held eight rounds of boundary talks. Despite their deep-seated disagreement on the issue, both sides displayed a notable willingness to work out a solution with amity and calmness. More importantly, both countries sought actively to create and expand their mutual interests by strengthening economic, cultural and technological exchanges, as well as their collaboration in international affairs (Wang 1998: 307-318; see also Liu 1994: 143-144). The successful management of the Sumdorong Chu crisis in 1986-87, as related below, was a testimony to the feasibility of this peaceful and cooperative approach toward a once-intractable territorial dispute.[61]

Located in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border, Sumdorong Chu is part of the disputed territory where China had launched the war against India in 1962, but had subsequently vacated on the condition that India did not occupy the area. In 1984, however, the Intelligence Bureau of India set up a seasonal post in Sumdorong Chu. In belated response, the PLA took over the post when it was evacuated in 1986, and started patrolling the area thereafter. India lodged a formal protest and increased troop deployments along the border. The tension continued into the spring of 1987, when India announced the establishment of Arunachal Pradesh in its northeastern border region, part of which was claimed by the PRC as Chinese territory.

---

[61] In researching China's approach to the Sumdonrong Chu crisis, Fravel (2008: 199-201) attributes the peaceful settlement of the crisis to several military considerations, including the limited geographical scope of the crisis, which he believes help to alleviate Beijing's threat perceptions. My analysis below does not challenge this explanation, but emphasizes two factors that Fravel does not contemplate in his account: (1) the Lockeanization of the Chinese worldview and Chinese foreign policy had created an auspicious context for peaceful resolution of disputes; (2) through increasing exchanges and cooperation over the previous decade, China and India had already accumulated a modicum of trust and mutual interests, which dampened their propensity to seek a military confrontation.

Afterward, the Indian army conducted large-scale military exercises near the border for two months (Deepak 2005: 320-321; Shang 2009: 276-279).

Despite the outward crisis, Beijing and New Delhi demonstrated remarkable equability in behind-the-scenes consultations. In July 1986, the two sides held their seventh round of boundary talks. Receiving the Indian delegation, PRC foreign minister Wu Xueqian remonstrated mildly that the atmosphere in which previous rounds of talks were held was very good, but it was not so good this time. He attributed the difficulties to the excessive news coverage of the border incident in both countries, which Beijing found unhelpful. In response, the chief of the Indian delegation admitted that there had been some untruthful reporting in the Indian newspapers. The resolution of the boundary problem, he emphasized, was the cornerstone of the friendship that both countries desired to build; and he expressed hopes of conducting the talks in a constructive atmosphere (Wang 1998: 316-317). Although this round of talks produced no tangible results, PRC acting premier Wan Li nevertheless urged both sides to maintain a patient and conciliatory attitude, and to continue the talks while preserving peace on the border (Xie et al. 2009: 334).

At this juncture, New Delhi felt the wind of change from Moscow. On July 28, the Soviet leader Gorbachev delivered an important policy address in Vladivostok, signaling the Soviet Union's willingness to improve relations with China. As a Chinese diplomat observed, Gorbachev's address "shook India considerably." During his visit to India in November 1986, Gorbachev increased the anxiety in New Delhi, by repeatedly declining to comment if Moscow would support India in case of military conflicts on the Sino-Indian border (Tang 1996: 119). Correspondingly, the Indian government began to take some measures to cool down heated nationalist sentiments at home (Shang 2009: 277-278). Instead of pressing India's unilateral

126

demands on the border, Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi made a rare gesture of goodwill toward

China, by stating publicly that the settlement of the boundary issue must take into account the

feelings of *both* the Chinese and the Indian people, as well as *both* countries' national interests

(Tang 1996: 119; italics mine).

In April 1987, the spokesman of the PRC Foreign Ministry expressed concern over

India's military exercises near the border, but denied the rumor that China intended to "teach

India a lesson" as happened in 1962. Instead, he called upon New Delhi to "avoid creating

incidents for the sake of maintaining the overall Sino-Indian friendship" (Xu et al. 2003, Vol.38:

166-167). In the following month, Prime Minister Gandhi conveyed a secret message to Beijing,

disavowing any intention of aggravating tension on the border further (Hou 2009). On May 27,

the PRC Foreign Ministry spokesman reaffirmed China's commitment to resolve the boundary

problem through friendly consultations and mutual compromise (Xu et al. 2003, Vol.38: 207).

Two weeks later, on June 15, Liu Shuqing, a deputy foreign minister of the PRC, met with the

Indian foreign minister and discussed measures of tension reduction on the border. Through his

foreign minister, Prime Minister Gandhi conveyed an oral message to Beijing, urging both

countries to "eliminate the misunderstandings and suspicions left over by the past, and create a

new start for the bilateral relationship" (Xie et al. 2009: 334).

In July, Prime Minister Gandhi publicly counseled calm and patience regarding the

border situation, and accused the Western news media of seeking to create misunderstanding and

tension between India and China (Hou 2009). Four months later, in November 1987, the two

countries held their eighth round of boundary talks in a more conciliatory spirit, and both sides

confirmed their willingness to promote cooperation in more substantive areas, in order to create a

propitious climate necessary for the ultimate settlement of the border dispute (Wang 1998: 317-

318). At the end of the talks, Prime Minister Gandhi received the Chinese delegation in a friendly atmosphere, and expressed his wish to visit China in the next year (Tang 1996: 119-120).

The peaceful resolution of the Sumdorong Chu crisis marked the end of the first and last militarized territorial dispute between China and India since 1976. In December 1988, Prime Minister Gandhi paid a groundbreaking visit to the PRC. Meeting with Gandhi, Deng Xiaoping reiterated the same oral message that he sent to Prime Minister Indira Gandhi (Rajiv's mother) in 1978: "We should improve our relations; there is no reason why we should not seek friendship and improve our relations" (Xu et al. 2003, Vol. 39: 356). According to a veteran Chinese diplomat, Rajiv Gandhi told China's leaders that India was determined to seek a mutually acceptable and mutually beneficial solution to the boundary issue, and that India understood China's proposal of a compromise solution was a realistic one. Finally, the two sides reached a "private oral understanding"—i.e., both governments agreed to adhere to "mutual, reciprocal concessions and adjustments" (*huliang hurang, huxiang tiaozheng*) as the guiding principle for the settlement of the boundary problem (Tang 1996: 123).

How was Deng's New Thinking Accepted?

Institutionally, the People's Liberation Army suffered perhaps the most from the Dengist new thinking. In 1979, China's military expenditures took up 4.6 % of its GDP. From 1985 onward, however, the Chinese leadership had deliberately kept down the appropriations for the PLA, on the grounds that China had more urgent needs for its limited resources (see Deng 1993: 99). As a result, the defense budget declined steadily over years to 1.09% of China's GDP in 1997. Moreover, from 1979 to 1994, China's military expenditures had actually witnessed an

annual decrease of 1.08%, given the high inflation rates in those years.[62] In comparative terms, between 1979 and 1988, China's purchases of foreign weapons were but one-sixth of Vietnam's, half of the nominally pacific Japan's, slightly over one half of Australia's, or one-half of Taiwan's (Overholt 1993: 341, 344).

Interestingly, despite complaints about the lack of progress in military development,[63] the high command of the PLA was overall supportive of Deng's reinterpretation of the underlying dynamics of the international system.[64] In 1986, as mentioned earlier, He Fang was the first senior policy expert to expound the Dengist conception that peace and development had become the main themes of world politics. After reading He's article, General Zhang Zhen, then president of the PLA's National Defense University, was immediately intrigued and invited He to deliver a series of lectures at NDU. Initially, He encountered some skepticism and objections. Nonetheless, as time went on, most Chinese policy elites, civilian and military alike, came around to the Dengist view (He Fang 2007: 243-244; see also Hu and Xiao 1989: 40-48).

As part of the PLA's effort to engage the civilian branches of the government in the making of China's foreign and security policy, General Zhang Zhen, who later became vice chairman of the CMC, also undertook an unprecedented measure at this time. With the support of the CMC, the National Defense University began to admit a large number of civilian cadres

---

[62] These figures are reported in the defense white paper issued by the Information Office of the PRC State Council in July 1998, available at: http://www.china.com.cn/ch-book/guofang/guofang3.htm#3 (Accessed July 6, 2012).

[63] From the mid-1980s to the early 1990s, China's military often had to keep weapons and other wartime equipment in use long past the point of obsolescence (Kong et al. 2009: 335-337). In order to economize, the two most modernized army corps of the PLA even stopped conducting joint military training exercises for several years (Liu 2004: 667).

[64] This observation, based on my analysis of extant Chinese evidence, complements Vogel's (2012: 541) contention that Deng was "probably the only leader of his time with the authority, determination, and political skill to keep [the PLA] from launching serious protest" against the retrenchment policy in military development.

into its research programs on national security issues (Zhang 2003: 282). As the civilian cadres admitted usually held director-level jobs in central ministries and provincial governments, this measure might well have helped to improve the collaboration and coordination between China's civilian and military leaders in handling future foreign policy crises, such as the Taiwan Strait crisis in 1995-1996 (which will be explored in Chapter 7).

On December 7, 1988, He Fang was invited to attend a meeting of the CSLGFA and expound his views on the Dengist conception of peace and development as the "main themes of our time." No one present disputed He's arguments, and two leaders—General Qing Jiwei (defense minister of the PRC) and Zhu Liang (director of the CCP's International Department) —immediately voiced unequivocal support for He (He Fang 2007: 678-679). Four years later, the CCP's 14th National Congress formally approved this formulation as the Party's official line (see below).

Beijing's Deepening Commitment to "Peace and Development," 1990-present

After the crackdown on the Tiananmen democracy movement in June 1989, China's relations with the West sank to a record low. Playing on the PRC's temporary estrangement from the international society, the hardliners in the CCP not only cast aspersions on the Dengist line of reform and opening, but urged greater vigilance against what they saw as a Western (especially American) conspiracy to weaken and subvert the PRC (for details, see Yang 2004: 477-487). Following the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, China's ruling elites were further divided, in the words of a senior diplomat (Wang Yusheng 2009: 137), over a stark question, namely: "How to view the international situation? And how to cope with it?"

At this critical juncture, Deng Xiaoping again displayed his granite will to move China forward. In fact, while determined to maintain the CCP's hold on power, the 85-year-old

130

patriarch was no less determined to keep China integrated within the international system, through a continuous commitment to reform and opening. On May 31, 1989 (i.e., three days before the Tiananmen crackdown), he had an important conversation with two senior members of the Politburo. The first statement made by Deng was: "The policy of reform and opening must not change in the next several decades; we must stress this point for ever and ever." After the crackdown, said Deng, the new CCP leadership must adopt a bolder approach in reforming and opening China. A "close-door" approach, he warned, was impermissible, because "China cannot resume a posture of seclusion." All members of the future Politburo and Central Secretariat of the CCP, he stressed, must be chosen on the criterion that they were committed to the goal of furthering reform and opening (Deng 1993: 296-297, 299). In the following months, Deng repeatedly stressed to his colleagues that China's future lay in accelerating the tempo of reform and opening (Ibid., 306-307, 313, 318, 320).

In November 1989, Deng officially passed the baton of power to Jiang Zemin, who was his chosen successor and head of the so-called "third-generation leadership."[65] Despite his nominal retirement, Deng was still the acknowledged supreme leader, and he continued to back the new leadership against any attempt to divert China from an integrationist course. On December 1, 1989, he confidently told a Japanese delegation: "Not only this generation of Chinese leadership, but the next and the next after the next, would adhere to the policy [of reform and opening]." This was because, he said, China's experience in the last decade had entirely validated the correctness of this policy, and "to abandon reform and opening is tantamount to abandoning our fundamental development strategy" (Deng 1993: 247).

---

[65] In official terminology, the "first-generation leadership" refers to Mao and his comrades, and the "second-generation leadership" refers to Deng and his colleagues. Jiang Zemin was appointed general secretary of the CCP in June 1989, right after the Tiananmen tragedy. In November 1989, he succeeded the retiring Deng as chairman of the Central Military Commission.

In March 1990, Deng expressed his disagreement with the hardliners about Western intentions toward China, and cautioned the Politburo headed by Jiang against the alarmist tendency to "view the international situation darkly, or perceive the situation as worsening gravely, or regard our security position as hopelessly perilous" (Deng 1993: 354). Afterward, when General Liu Huaqing (commander of the PLA navy) urged the Politburo to increase the military budget by two or three times in the next decade, the CCP's new leadership, including General Secretary Jiang Zemin, Premier Li Peng, and Deputy Premier Yao Yilin, turned down the request unanimously (Liu 2004: 585).

In October 1992, the CCP convened its 14th national congress, at which the third-generation leadership, with Jiang Zemin as its core figure, formally took over from the revolutionary elders headed by Deng. In his political report to the congress, Jiang, on behalf of the CCP's Central Committee, reaffirmed the abiding relevance of the Dengist (and Lockean) worldview in several critical regards. He stressed that despite some turbulences in the international situation, it was possible to obtain a peaceful environment and avoid world war for a long period of time. He reiterated that peace and development were the main themes of the contemporary world, and that China needed to continue its positive integration into the international society and make a contribution to world peace and development. Finally, in spite of his oblique criticisms of "hegemonism and power politics by a few states," he pledged that China would continue to develop friendly relations with all states, regardless of their differences in political ideologies or social systems (Jiang 2006, Vol.1: 241-244).

Basically, Jiang thus declared Beijing's continuous commitment to the Dengist line, which posits that China's future consists in integrating into the universal trend toward peace and development in the international system, instead of going against the tide. Moreover, from 1992

to 2007, each and every national congress of the CCP, as shown by Table 3.1, had upheld

unambiguously this Lockeanized worldview concerning how China should regard and cope with

the changing international situation.[66]

Some "China threat" theorists present a contrary view, asserting that Beijing had since

1989 regarded the world darkly while perceiving the United States as a mortal enemy (e.g.,

Bernstein and Munro 1997; Mosher 2000). This argument, however, finds little support in the

internal speeches of top PRC leaders and military chiefs. In January 1993, Jiang expounded the

guidelines for China's military strategy for the foreseeable future at an expanded meeting of the

CMC. While customarily condemning "hegemonism and power politics" (an elliptical reference

to the United States), Jiang nevertheless cautioned against the "mistaken" tendency to "view the

international situation too gravely, or …to fall prey to a siege mentality," because the

"mainstream of the current international situation are advantageous to us" (Jiang 2006, Vol.1:

281). Against this backdrop, he said, China would adhere strictly to a defensive posture and

refrain from impinging on other states' sovereignty or provoking a conflict with others. In

particular, he affirmed that Beijing would seek to resolve territorial disputes through peaceful

consultations and with an eye to stabilizing the status quo (Ibid., 288-289).[67]

Five months later, in June 1993, the CMC convened a military planning conference.

General Liu Huaqing, then vice chairman of the CMC, voiced unequivocal support of Jiang's

---

[66] The texts of the political reports of the CCP Central Committee at various party congresses in 1992-2007 can be obtained online from the CCP's official database at: http://cpc.people.com.cn/GB/64162/64168/index.html (Accessed November 20, 2012).

[67] In terms of military strategy, it should be noted that Jiang Zemin's thoughts on China's national defense, officially referred to as the "military strategy for the new era," still play a guiding role in the CCP leadership's strategic planning as late as 2011. See, for example, the CCP's *Guidelines for National Development during the Twelfth Five-Year Plan* (adopted in March 2011), which is available at: http://www.china.com.cn/policy/txt/2011-03/16/content_22156007_16.htm (Accessed October 15, 2012).

guidelines for China's military strategy. Furthermore, he spelled out three basic principles of national defense, which spoke volumes about the transformation of the Chinese worldview and its mellowing impact on Chinese conflict propensity:

"First, deterrence. …In the event of unexpected exigencies, we need to demonstrate means of deterrence through necessary show of force. This should be combined deftly with political and diplomatic struggles so as to subjugate the enemy without conflict and prevent the outbreak of war. …

"Second, forbearance. …Unless we have absolutely no other alternatives, we must not go into a major war. *We should try our best to avoid the use of force if and when a problem can be resolved by political and diplomatic means*, so as to keep some controversies from flaring up and disrupting our concentration on economic development. Presently, we do face some problems which, if considered purely in terms of national sovereignty and territorial integrity, warrant immediate use of force. However, if we choose to fight a war over these issues, it would be strategically disadvantageous to our country's development. Thus, *we must not hastily resort to force, unless as a last resort*.

"Third, self-defense. Whatever the circumstances, we must strictly adhere to the posture of self-defense. Do not offend others unless they offend us first" (Liu 2004: 636-637; italics mine)

In July 1993, Jiang Zemin talked at length about Beijing's approach toward Washington at a meeting of China's ambassadors. Describing the United States as China's primary "adversary" (*duishou*, a Chinese term milder than "enemy" or "rival"), Jiang opined that the Sino-American relationship had a dual character: while having frictions and controversies, the

two sides also needed one another and desired cooperation in economic, trade, and security affairs. Thus, Jiang declared, China must have the courage both to brave "struggles" and to seek compromises in managing Sino-American relations. That is, while refusing to yield on matters of principle, Beijing should strive to stabilize and improve its relationship with Washington as soon as possible (Jiang 2006, Vol.1: 312-313).

In accord with Jiang's thinking, the CCP Politburo reportedly adopted four principles for managing Sino-American relations in September 1993, namely: (1) China does not intend to engage in confrontation and direct conflict with the United States, either at present or in the future; (2) China will not take the initiative to provoke a confrontation with the United States or to create tensions; (3) China will not back away from political controversies, economic disputes, or other troubles initiated by the United States; (4) China does not fear U.S. political, economic, and military pressures, or other forms of sanctions and conflicts (Ren 1998: 227-230). Afterward, with strong support from Deng Xiaoping and the PRC's diplomatic establishment, Jiang Zemin embarked on seeking rapprochement with Washington (Wang Yusheng 2009: 34-36).

In November 1993, Jiang held his first summit meeting with US president William Clinton. Jiang took the initiative to pledge to Clinton: "China will not engage in an arms race, or organize military alliances, to threaten US security." He agreed with Clinton that the two countries still shared many common interests in promoting world peace and development. Toward that end, Jiang advocated holding more leadership summits in the future, to reduce misunderstanding and resolve differences in a timely manner (Jiang 2006, Vol.1: 333-334).

To be sure, Sino-American relations were still fraught with problems and even crises thereafter. However, there is much evidence to suggest that the PRC leadership rarely deviated from its essential judgment that China could and should develop a cooperative relationship with

the United States. Prominent China scholar David Lampton (2008: 264) summarizes this judgment succinctly: "For Beijing, disagreement with America is inevitable, intense conflict is avoidable, and both nations will cooperate when it is in their mutual interest to do so. Cooperation will not be easy, but it will often be essential—this is a manageable relationship." The Lockean worldview, as argued earlier, is based precisely on the belief that the relationship between Self and Other is oppositional but not inimical, and that there is much room for promoting cooperation and restricting conflict.

For instance, despite the Taiwan Strait crisis of 1995-96, Beijing and Washington managed to carve out some mutual accommodation in managing the Taiwan problem afterward (Huang and Li 2010, chapter 5), and to develop a more wide-ranging and constructive relationship (Suetinger 2003, chapters 7-8). In the summer of 1999, after NATO's accidental bombing of the Chinese embassy in Yugoslavia, some PRC elites suspected a U.S. conspiracy, and urged the central leadership to abandon the goal of economic development and prepare for war. Nonetheless, after extensive internal debates, the CCP Central Committee maintained the consensus that the overall international situation was still characterized by "more hopes than difficulties, and more opportunities than challenges" (Wang Yusheng 2009: 141; see also Finkelstein 2000). A few months later, when ROC president Lee Teng-hui tried to make unilateral changes to the status of PRC-Taiwan relations by declaring his famous "two states theory," Beijing actively sought U.S. collaboration to cut Taipei down to size, on the grounds that China and the United States shared the same interest in maintaining peace and stability in the Taiwan Strait (Huang and Li 2010, chapter 6). Since 2003, this Sino-American de facto co-management of the Taiwan issue has played a positive role in preventing Taiwanese separatism from rocking the boat in the region (Ibid., chapters 7-8).

Likewise, in handling the lingering territorial dispute with India, Beijing continued to adopt a nonzero-sum view, and sought to improve relations with New Delhi in a conciliatory and pragmatic spirit. In September 1993, the two countries signed what a Chinese expert calls a "vitally important" agreement on the maintenance of peace and tranquility in their border areas (Wang 1998: 339). For the first time, both sides pledged to settle the boundary problem through peaceful and friendly consultations, to forsake threat or use of force against the other side, and to preserve the status quo and refrain from any unilateral actions to change it pending the final settlement.[68] Three years later, in November 1996, Beijing and New Delhi went a step further by introducing more confidence building measures in the military field along the border.[69] Interestingly, while China's approach to territorial disputes depends generally on a "combination of negotiated settlements, demilitarization, confidence-building measures, and border opening, particularly for trade," India has undertaken notably to "fence its borders with virtually all neighbors and, in several cases, has reinforced its military presence in the lead-up to negotiations or expected agreements" (Gilboy and Heginbotham 2012: 92).

In May 1998, India conducted a series of nuclear tests, which New Delhi attempted to justify by reference to a potential nuclear threat from China. Despite their annoyance, China's leaders nevertheless sought and accepted a clarification from the Indian government, which stressed that India still maintained the position that China and India did not constitute a threat to each other and were not enemies. In the words of PRC state councilor Tang Jiaxuan, this clarification helped to reaffirm the "political foundation for the overall improvement" of the Sino-Indian relationship, thereby paving the way for the normalization of relations shortly

---

[68] The text of the agreement is available at:
http://www.mfa.gov.cn/eng/wjb/zzjg/yzs/gjlb/2711/2712/t15915.htm (Accessed April 15, 2012).

[69] The text of the agreement is available at:
http://www.mfa.gov.cn/eng/wjb/zzjg/yzs/gjlb/2711/2712/t15914.htm (Accessed April 15, 2012).

afterward (Tang 2009: 470-473). In April 2005, the two countries further agreed to establish a "strategic and cooperative partnership for peace and prosperity," which has served to cement the overall positive development of Sino-Indian relations to this day (Ibid., 474).

In the final analysis, as Jiang and his colleagues pursued consistently the goal of integrating China into the international system, which culminated in the PRC's historic admission into the World Trade Organization in 2001, Beijing's economic and security interests have grown more congruent with the current global order (Ikenberry 2008). Consequently, it is not uncommon for PRC policy analysts to contend nowadays that Beijing's best interests lie in safeguarding the stability of the existing international system, and in coming to an accommodation with American unipolarity (Deng 2005: 64; Gill 2007: 9). As Kim (1999: 80) put it, China has thus evolved from a "system-transforming revolutionary" into a "satisfied system maintainer." Correspondingly, its worldview has shown tentative signs of moving toward cooperative common security and common development—which is, in constructivist terminology, the beginning of a Kantian change (Wendt 1999, chapter 7).

In September 1997, Jiang opined at the CCP's 15th national congress that all states should "transcend the differences in their social systems and ideologies, …to seek the expansion of mutual benefit and cooperation, and join hands with each other in meeting the common challenges confronting the survival and development of the human race" (Jiang 2006, Vol.2: 41). Under Mao's reign, such a statement would have been condemned as heresy, because the Maoist ideology (and its attendant militarized worldview) is predicated on the assumption that the revolutionary challenger shares no common interests with the capitalist world order, and that violent conflicts are the inevitable outcome of their essentially antagonistic relationship. After

twenty years of integrating into the international society, however, Beijing had obviously come

to view peace and cooperation as a desirable end in itself.

During his visit to Thailand in September 1999, Jiang expounded Beijing's "new security

concept," which rested upon "increasing trust through dialogue, increasing security through

cooperation, mutual respect of sovereignty, and peaceful resolution of disputes" (Jiang 2006,

Vol.2: 407). In September 2000, while attending the UN millennium summit, Jiang was deeply

impressed by what he called the "common aspirations of all peoples for promoting peace and

common development." Subsequently, he exhorted the CCP Central Committee to "go with the

tide and …establish China's international image [as a state] committed to maintaining peace and

striving for common development" (Ibid., Vol.3: 125).

In August 2001, Jiang chaired a Politburo meeting on China's security situation. Again,

he stressed that Beijing needed to "increase trust, promote cooperation, and strive for the

expansion of common interests" with regard to its neighboring states. Toward that end, he said,

China must insist on peaceful resolution of disputes through dialogues and negotiations in a spirit

of equality, goodwill, and compromise (Jiang 2006, Vol.3: 314-316).

In November 2002, when transferring the baton of power to Hu Jintao,[70] Jiang also made

the CCP's 16th national congress approve this historic change in China's approach to

international affairs. The guiding principle of Chinese foreign policy, he said, was to "maintain

world peace and promote common development." Within this context, the PRC should seek not

only to "promote economic globalization in the direction of common prosperity," but also to

engage other countries on the basis of the aforementioned "new security concept" and promote

---

[70] It is widely believed (but never officially affirmed) that Deng Xiaoping, while anointing Jiang
as his successor in 1992, had also designated Hu as Jiang's successor at the same time.
Succeeding Jiang, Hu served as general secretary of the CCP in 2002-2012 and president of the
PRC in 2003-2013.

common security through the enhancement of "mutual trust, mutual benefit, equality, and cooperation" (Jiang 2006, Vol.3: 566-568).

Despite Jiang's retirement, the new generation of China' ruling elites has continued to adhere to the integrationist strategy outlined above. By 2005, for example, the PRC has engaged all major powers as well as most of its neighboring states in a number of "strategic," "good-neighborly," or "fully cooperative" partnerships.[71] These engagements, as summarized succinctly by a U.S. scholar, are characterized invariably by a "commitment to: 1) building stable bilateral relations without targeting any third party; 2) promoting extensive economic intercourse; 3) muting disagreements about domestic politics in the interest of working together on matters of shared concern in international diplomacy; and 4) routinizing official visits, especially military-to-military exchanges and regular summit meetings between top government leaders" (Goldstein 2005: 134).[72]

Meanwhile, since the late 1990s, China's participation in international institutions has increased dramatically; on a number of international normative questions, Chinese compliance with the goals and rules of these institutions has improved as well (Johnston 2003a: 12-22). To signal its growing interest in maintaining international peace, security, and stability, Beijing also adopted a more positive attitude in collaborating with other major powers in the area of arms

---

[71] These partnerships include: Russia (April 1996); Nepal (December 1996); Pakistan (December 1996); France (May 1997); the United States (October 1997); Britain (October 1998); South Korea (November 1998); Japan (November 1998); Mongolia (June 2003); ASEAN (October 2003); India (April 2005); Indonesia (April 2005); the Philippines (April 2005); Kazakhstan (June 2005).

[72] As Goldstein (2005: 134-135) keenly observes, Beijing, when establishing these partnerships, did not "expect such partnerships to yield purely cooperative relations. On the contrary, it anticipated that differing national interests, culture, and political ideology would generate conflicts between partners. What Beijing expected instead was that partners would be committed to managing unavoidable conflicts so that they could continue to work together on vital areas of common interests."

control and disarmament (Yang 2008: 198-199; see also Johnston 2008, chapters 2-3). Between 1992 and 2006, China contributed more troops to UN peacekeeping operations than any other permanent members of the Security Council (Yang 2008: 203). From 1998 onward, with an eye to increasing transparency about with the PRC's military development, Beijing decided to publish a defense white paper every two years (Ibid., 204).

Similarly, to promote common development, Beijing strives to expand economic cooperation and trade relations with other countries, especially with China's neighboring states. During the Asian financial crisis in 1997-98, Beijing scored a notable diplomatic triumph, by deciding not to devaluate its renminbi for the sake of maintaining overall economic stability in the region. It also contributed more than 4 billion U.S. dollars in aid and credit to Thailand, Indonesia, and other Southeast Asian states that were severely affected by the crisis (Zhang and Zhou 2008: 38). This friendly gesture apparently won China many friends in the region (Lampton 2008: 187; Tang 2009: 89-95), and cleared the way for the rapid advancement of regional economic integration thereafter.

In 1991, for example, China's trade with ASEAN countries totaled merely $8.4 billion; in 2006, it had risen to $160 billion (Zhang and Zhou 2008: 37). In October 2003, PRC premier Wen Jiabo formally announced that one of the primary goals of Chinese foreign policy was to build a "harmonious, secure, and prosperous neighborhood" with China's neighboring states, with a view to promoting common economic development in the region (Wen 2003). In 2006, of Beijing's top ten trading partners, five were China's neighboring countries, including Japan, South Korea, ASEAN, Russia, and India. To deepen economic cooperation, Beijing also took the initiative to engage its regional partners in the creation of free trade zones in South and Southeast Asia (Zhang and Zhou 2008: 37-39).

Against this background, in December 2005, China declared for the first time that its long-term objective was "peaceful rise" or "peaceful development" in the international community as a responsible great power.[73] In October 2007, President Hu Jintao made an unprecedented declaration to the CCP's 17th National Congress:

> The relationship between contemporary China and the world [i.e., the international system] has undergone a historic transformation, with the future of China linked more and more closely with that of the world at large. *No matter what changes in the international situation are ahead, the Chinese government and people will …always strive for the maintenance of world peace and the promotion of common development as the guiding principle of our foreign policy*.[74]

Some "China threat" theorists regard these statements as rhetorical gestures intended as a camouflage for Beijing's more sinister designs (e.g., Gertz 2000; Mosher 2000; Menges 2005). This argument is impossible to refute because it derives from the belief that China can never do anything that is helpful and reasonable simply because it is such, but always from an ulterior motive. Suffice it to say, however, that many political leaders and policy experts abroad are not convinced that Beijing made these statements or gestures merely for duplicitous purposes. Until fairly recently, they tend to find hopeful signs that the PRC is becoming a "responsible great power" by participating in and upholding commitments to status quo international economic and

---

[73] For an official explanation of China's "peaceful development road," see the white paper issued by the Information Office of the State Council of the PRC, on December 22, 2005. The full text of the document is available at: http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/english/doc/2005-12/22/content_505678.htm (Accessed November 14, 2012).

[74] See Hu's political report to the CCP's 17th National Congress, available at: http://cpc.people.com.cn/GB/64093/67507/6429855.html (Accessed November 11, 2012). The italics are mine.

security institutions (Shambaugh 2004; Johnston 2008; Lampton 2008). Meanwhile, it is observed that China's grand strategy has experienced a "kinder, gentler turn" (IISS 2004), with a view to making Beijing "an indispensable, or at least very attractive" actor in the international system (Goldstein 2005: 29-30).

In recent years, China's alleged "new assertiveness" has raised concerns abroad; however, there is little evidence that a major and ominous shift is already under way in Beijing's grand strategy (Christensen 2011; Wang 2011; Bader 2012; Johnston 2013). At this point, there seems to exist a cautious consensus, even among skeptics of Chinese intentions, that the PRC has yet to display a salient revisionist propensity, and that its hitherto mainly cooperative approach toward the U.S.-led international order will likely endure for some time (Friedberg 2011; Nathan and Scobell 2012; Sutter 2012). Whether this trend will last a thousand years or not, it is, nevertheless, the only way that the PRC leadership knows would lead to China's avowed "peaceful rise."[75]

---

[75] In an influential article in December 2010, PRC state councilor Dai Bingguo contended emphatically: "We know that in order to achieve our own development, we must also let others develop; in order to achieve our own security, we must also let others feel secure; in order to make us live well, we must also let others live well" (Dai 2010). According to Jeffrey Bader, Dai's article "obviously was intended to be an authoritative rebuttal of the public narrative dominated by hardliners. …It amounted to a rebuke of those who had been arguing for a more assertive policy toward the United States, and it emboldened others to call for a more moderate regional diplomacy. It simultaneously provided official justification for a more accommodationist approach toward the United States" (Bader 2012: 123). Even a hard-nosed realist like Henry Kissinger finds little reason to doubt the sincerity of this Chinese position (Kissinger 2011: 508-513).

Tables

TABLE 3.1: The Consistency of Official Chinese Beliefs in "Peace and Development," 1988-2007

Dates	Occasions	Statements in the Central Committee's Political Report
October 12, 1992	The 14th National Congress	For a long period of time to come, it is possible to achieve a peaceful international environment and avoid a new world war. …Peace and development are still the two main themes of the contemporary world.
September 12, 1997	The 15th National Congress	Striving for peace, cooperation, and development is a main feature of our time. …For a long period of time to come, it is possible to achieve an auspicious and peaceful environment around the world and in our immediate neighborhood, and to avoid a new world war.
November 8, 2002	The 16th National Congress	Peace and development are still the main themes of our time. …A new world war is unlikely to occur in the foreseeable future, and it is possible to achieve an auspicious and peaceful environment around the world and in our immediate neighborhood.
October 15, 2007	The 17th National Congress	Peace and development are still the main themes of our time. Striving for peace, cooperation, and development has become an irreversible trend in our world.

Chapter 4

Patterns of China's Use of Force, 1949-2010:
A Preliminary Examination of the Data

In the previous two chapters, I present a historical overview of the evolution of Chinese foreign policy and security posture since 1949. This overview suggests a causally important linkage between the Chinese worldview and the PRC's violence propensity, a linkage that goes through the following stages:

—From 1949 to 1953, revolutionary China acted as a challenger against the international system, and, accordingly, stressed the inevitability of war and the primacy of military force in countering real or perceived security threats;

—In 1954-1959, Beijing evinced an interest in integrating into international society, which led it to seek more harmonious relations with other states as well as peaceful resolution of disputes;

—Between 1960 and 1974, Maoist China relapsed into a challenger's siege mentality, which bred animosity and belligerence even toward states with which Beijing had enjoyed good or workable relations previously;

—From 1975 to 1984, the PRC again adopted an integrationist approach and mended its rambunctious ways. This helped to increase Beijing's sense of security, as well as its willingness to resolve disputes through constructive exchanges and cooperation;

—Finally, since Deng Xiaoping's decisive move to demilitarize the Chinese worldview in 1985, the PRC has been Lockeanized to the point of embracing "peace and development" as the mainstream in international affairs. As a result, Beijing emphasizes the avoidability of war and regards military force as only a last resort for conflict resolution.

145

Now, the question is: How to test the impact of China's changing worldview on China's use of force in a systematic fashion? Before evaluating a causal hypothesis, it is important to describe the data and identify the basic patterns to be explained. After all, good explanation depends in part on good description, and it makes no sense to "seek to explain what we have not described with a reasonable degree of precision" (King, Keohane, and Verba 1994: 44). In this chapter, therefore, I use simple descriptive statistics to examine the data on Chinese conflict behavior over the past decades. My aim is to identify the broad patterns in the scope, frequency, and intensity of China's use of force, as well as to compare and contrast the conflict behavior of the PRC and other major states, across various time periods in the evolution of the Chinese worldview. Specifically, I address the following questions:

—How frequently did China use military force in each period, as compared with other major states? Did the frequency increase or decrease over time?

—For each period, how did different types of interstate disputes relate to Beijing's propensity to use force, as compared with other major states? Did the relationship, if any, vary over time?

—What specific categories of militarized action did the PRC tend to resort to when addressing different types of interstate disputes, as compared with other major states? Were there any notable changes in the conditional probability of Beijing's resort to specific militarized actions over time?

—How often did China initiate militarized disputes against other states in each period, as compared with other major states? And how frequently did Beijing use force in those disputes, given their varying types? Did the frequency increase or decrease over time?

Before embarking on this inquiry, however, we need to sort out the best available data that assist research in this regard.

A Note on the Data

Currently, despite the growing interest shared by scholars and policy practitioners in Chinese conflict behavior, there are relatively few datasets that allow for a systematic and quantitative analysis of China's use of force. The renowned Issue Correlates of War (ICOW) project, for example, has yet to include either China or the Asian region. Another widely used dataset, the UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset hosted at Uppsala University, does incorporate China, but its utility is limited by the inclusion of only those armed conflicts that result in at least 25 battle-related deaths. The latest version of this dataset (v.4-2011), for example, records merely a total of 18 interstate armed conflicts concerning China between 1949 and 2010, too few to produce reliable estimates of China's use of predominantly lower-intensity force (for more information, see my appendix).[76] Moreover, unlike the ICOW project, the UCDP/PRIO dataset does not supply any information as to the type of issues under contention in those armed conflicts.

Comparatively, the Militarized Interstate Disputes dataset produced by the Correlates of War project remains to this day the best source of data on Chinese conflict behavior. Operationally, MIDs are defined as "united historical cases in which the threat, display or use of military force short of war by one member state [of the international system] is explicitly directed towards the government, official representatives, official forces, property, or territory of another state" (Jones, Bremer, and Singer 1996: 168). In this way, the MID data are able to cover

---

[76] The UCDP/PRIO dataset and its codebook can be downloaded at: http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/ucdp/datasets/ucdp_prio_armed_conflict_dataset (Accessed November 15, 2012).

a much wider range of militarized actions taken by one state against other states. These military

actions are divided into 21 categories of action and, based on a five-point hostility level scale, are

ranked to represent the different levels of force reached by a state in a dispute.[77] For China, the

latest version of the MID (v4.01) dataset (Ghosn, Palmer, and Bremer 2004) records 170 cases of

MIDs from October 1, 1949 to December 31, 2010, the date on which the dataset ends.

Apart from presenting a much larger sample of Chinese conflict behavior, the MID

dataset classifies all interstate disputes into three basic types according to the nature of the issue

in dispute: "territorial," where a state takes militarized action primarily to change or defend

claims to a specific territory; "policy," where a state seeks primarily to change, or refuse to abide

by, another state's policy; and "regime," where a state acts in a militarized way to change the

government of another state (Jones, Bremer, and Singer 1996: 178). This categorization helps

researchers to put states' conflict behavior in context and to understand how states resort to

military force to address various types of disputes.

Furthermore, the MID dataset has the additional advantage of identifying whether or not

the states harbor any revisionist goals in a dispute, depending on whether a disputant seeks to

---

[77] The 21 categories of militarized actions include: (1) threat to use force; (2) threat to blockade; (3) threat to occupy territory; (4) threat to declare war; (5) threat to use CBR weapons; (6) threat to join war; (7) show of force; (8) alert; (9) nuclear alert; (10) mobilization; (11) fortify border; (12) border violation; (13) blockade; (14) occupation of territory; (15) seizure of material or personnel; (16) attack (previously termed "raid"); (17) clash; (18) declaration of war; (19) use of CBR weapons; (20) begin interstate war; (21) join interstate war. For initial definitions of these terms, see Jones, Bremer, and Singer (1996: 171-173); for updated definitions, see Ghosn, Palmer, and Bremer (2004: 136-137). Using a five-point hostility level scale, the MID dataset defines Level 1 as "no militarized action." It then codes the aforementioned categories of 1-7 as Level 2 or "threat to use force"; categories of 8-12, as Level 3 or "display of force"; categories of 13-19, as Level 4 or "use of force"; and categories of 20-21 as Level 5 or "interstate war." Despite their assigned numerical codes, however, the foregoing categories of militarized action that are subsumed under each hostility level are not ranked. For example, while blockade and occupation of territory both belong to Level 4 or "use of force," their numerical categories (13 and 14, respectively) do not indicate an escalating order of hostility.

challenge the pre-dispute conditions by attempting to revise the status quo in the territory, policy, or regime of another state. Operationally, there could be no revisionist states in a MID, so long as no disputant demonstrates through its behavior an appreciable desire to overturn the prevailing status quo. Or, alternatively, both sides in a dispute could be revisionist states aimed at changing the status quo in a critical aspect. Thus, the term "revisionist state" does not equal "aggressor" in the dispute, nor does it necessarily specify the state that is responsible for "starting" the conflict. Instead, if a state is found to have taken the first codable militarized action on the first day of the dispute, it is coded as being on "Side A," and the state or states on "Side A" often—but not always— turn out to be revisionist states (for illustrative examples, see Ghosn, Palmer, and Bremer 2004: 138-140). These nuanced coding rules enable scholars to explore the relationship between a state's dissatisfaction with the status quo and its propensity to change it by force.

This is not to say, of course, that the MID data are flawless. Like any other large datasets, the quality of these data depends solely on the historical knowledge, skill, and consistency of the researchers who are responsible for coding them. Given the notorious paucity of primary—or secondary but trustworthy—materials on Chinese conflict behavior, it is extremely difficult to collect and verify the data on China. Inevitably, as I will show in Chapter 5, the China-related MID data suffer at times from inadequate historical knowledge, which leads not only to the erroneous coding of some existing cases, but, more significantly, to the failure to include many new and verifiable cases. These problems, needless to say, complicate scholarly efforts to draw valid inferences from the data.

Nevertheless, given the unparalleled reputation of the MID dataset in quantitative IR research, I believe it is fair enough to maintain a healthy confidence in the rigor of its overall coding process. For China, this means we could more or less rely on the assumption, as held by

prominent China specialists as well, that "coding errors were random across all cases and thus are random for the Chinese cases as well (e.g., that they cancel each other out on balance)" (Johnston 1998: 5, footnote 9). The aforementioned problems with the MID data, therefore, require us to be tentative in using these data to unveil the "facts" about Chinese conflict behavior, but they need not deter us from taking this path of inquiry altogether. As a remedial measure, I will complement my data analysis, where necessary, with specific historical knowledge.

Descriptive Analysis of China's Use of Force

Following the coding rules of the MID dataset, I consider the use of force to include a blockade, an occupation of territory, a seizure of personnel or property, a clash, an attack or raid, and a war. My examination of China's use of force centers upon four key aspects of Chinese conflict behavior—frequency, dispute types, categories of force used, and dispute initiation. I do not address the duration or "magnitude" of the disputes because the coding rules of the MID dataset do not permit us to ascertain if the magnitude of a dispute should be solely attributed to Chinese behavior. In contrast, while China might be involved in a MID through no fault of its own (e.g., when another state takes the first action to militarize a dispute with Beijing), whether to use force or not is largely a choice of Beijing's own making.

Below, I provide a descriptive analysis of the broad patterns in Chinese conflict behavior, as gathered from the MID (v4.01) dataset, across various time periods and by comparison with other major states. For the post-World War II period, the dataset lists seven major states: Britain, China (1950-the present), France, Japan (1991-the present), Germany (1991-the present), the Soviet Union/Russia, and the United States. For reasons of data comparability, I omit Germany and Japan from this study, but focus on the comparison of China and other four permanent

members of the UN Security Council. Because India is often taken in comparison to China in their national development, I also incorporate India into the data analysis.

Frequency

Table 4.1 reports the basic variations in the frequency of China's use of force across different periods.

As expected, the PRC's predilection for violence was at a peak in its first revolutionary phase (1949-1953), when Beijing resorted to force in 79% of its MID involvements. In the subsequent integrationist period (1954-1959), the percentage decreased to 65%, even though Beijing's MID involvements had almost doubled in number. When Maoist China entered its second revolutionary phase (1960-1974), Beijing still exhibited a salient tendency to use force to settle disputes, but the percentage had shrunk further to 54%. Incidentally, this also confirms Maoz's (1989) finding that newborn revolutionary states are more conflict-prone than the ones that have settled down into consolidation.

If we contrast the PRC's two revolutionary phases with its last, Lockean phase (1985-2010), the differences become more starkly impressive. Under Deng Xiaoping and his successors, the PRC employed military force in only 26% of the MIDs against its adversaries. In other words, China after the mid-1980s was much less likely to settle disputes by force than in 1949-1953 or in 1960-1974, when Mao and his comrades were haunted by the militarized worldview. A *t*-test of proportions demonstrates that this difference is statistically significant ($p<.01$), meaning that the remarkable decrease in China's violence propensity is extremely unlikely to be random.

The aforementioned difference assumes a larger significance if we take into account the fact that some key issues in dispute have actually persisted from the 1950s to this day. Due to the high and enduring salience of the Taiwan issue, for example, the PRC used to be especially

151

prone to use force in disputes vis-à-vis Taiwan, because Beijing considered the separation of the island to be a threat to China's sovereignty and territorial integrity. Between 1949 and 1985, the PRC was engaged in 13 MIDs concerning Taiwan, and resorted to force in ten of them. From 1986 to 2010, Beijing and Taipei remained adversaries in a total of 13 MIDs; however, only in one of those disputes did the PRC use military force. Similarly, China's bellicosity toward India has mellowed indisputably over time, despite the protracted border dispute between the two nations since the 1950s. From 1949 to 1985, Beijing had 21 MIDs with New Delhi, and used force in eight of them (including the famous border war in 1962). In 1985-2010, there were only four MIDs between the two countries, with no record of China's resort to violence in any of them. Moreover, the contrast in Chinese behavior between the Lockean phase and the two transitional phases—i.e., the two earlier periods in which the militarized worldview began to soften and give way to an integrationist approach—is also consistent with my theoretical expectations. In comparison with the 1954-1959 period, China was 60% less likely to resort to force in MIDs in 1985-2010. Contrasted with the 1975-1984 period, the post-1985 PRC's violence propensity has diminished by 56%. Again, a *t*-test of proportions confirms the statistical robustness of these behavioral differences, even though Beijing often remains entangled in the same types of contentious issues, especially territorial disputes, over time.

To put these variations in Chinese behavior in context, Table 4.2 reports the comparative frequency of other major states' use of force across the same time periods.

When China played the role of revolutionary challenger in the early 1950s, it was also the most violence-prone of all major states. In 1949-1953, the PRC was nearly eight times more likely to settle disputes by force than the United States, 2.4 times more likely to do so than Britain, or 1.6 times more likely to use force than France. In fact, its violence propensity was

even greater than the Soviet Union's, even though the ageing and increasingly paranoiac Stalin was then adopting a similar confrontational posture toward the West and its allies. To be sure, during this period, the newly independent India exhibited a prominent violence proneness as well, presumably because of its protracted strife with Pakistan. Still, India seemed 20% less likely to resort to force in MIDs than revolutionary China. In the next two decades, France overtook the PRC as the foremost user of military force in its MID entanglements; nonetheless, Beijing continued to appear more violence-prone than most other major states.

In the 1975-1984 period, however, both France and India surpassed the PRC in violence propensity, the contrast between China and India was more revealing in this aspect. Compared with its revolutionary era of 1949-1953, the PRC became 25% less likely to settle MIDs by force in 1975-1984. In contrast, India's propensity to use force had actually increased by 15% over the 1949-1953 period. This finding indicates that when China under Deng Xiaoping began to adopt a more conciliatory and constructive approach toward the outside world, India remained a prisoner of contentious and sometimes stormy relations with most of its neighbors, which endured from its days of independence to the 1980s.

Moreover, after the Chinese worldview entered its Lockean phase, the PRC apparently became the least violence-prone of all major states. In 1985-2010, compared with its peers, China was involved in the third greatest number of MIDs. Nevertheless, Beijing used force in only 26% of those disputes, a record low since 1949. In contrast, the percentage was 42% for the United States, 44% for Britain, 34% for France, 29% for the Soviet Union/Russia, and, rather startlingly, 67% for India over the same period. Furthermore, while the Chinese militancy kept waning over the last quarter century, both the United States and Britain had actually demonstrated a record-high propensity to settle disputes by force since 1949.

To sum up, the findings above suggest that as the Chinese worldview grows less militarized over time, the frequency of China's use of force in its MIDs decreases as well. Could this behavioral change, however, be a mere reflection of the broader changes in the type of militarized disputes besetting the PRC since 1949? To test this alternative explanation, I will next disaggregate Chinese conflict behavior by dispute type, and see if any new patterns will emerge.

Dispute Types

Table 4.3 reports the basic variations in the dispute types related to China's use of force across different periods.

From 1949 to 2010, the PRC was engaged in 49 MIDs in which territory was the primary issue in dispute, and resorted to force in 25 or 60% of these disputes. Over the same period, Beijing was involved in 43 MIDs wherein policy was the chief point of contention between China and another state, and used military force in 60.5% of them. . In contrast, the PRC was rarely entangled in disputes over the regime of another state. Since 1975, China has had no regime MIDs at all, indicating that Beijing has stopped seeking the overthrow of the government of any foreign country. This finding is consistent with my arguments that as the PRC integrates deeper into the international system, it also accepts the Lockean norms of the system that require states to respect each other's sovereignty, instead of trying to conquer or dominate one another.

On closer inspection, Beijing's propensity to use force over contested territory reached the highest point in 1949-1953, when revolutionary China resorted to force in 75% of its territorial MIDs. This, as noted earlier, was caused mostly by the PRC's internecine struggle with the ROC government on Taiwan. In the following two decades, the PRC was engaged in more territorial disputes, but its willingness to settle them by force declined steadily. For the

1954-1959 period, the conditional probability of China's use of force in territorial MIDs decreased to 55%. Even in 1960-1974, when the PRC resumed the posture of a revolutionary challenger, Beijing resorted to force in only 57% of its territorial disputes. As explained in Chapter 2, this behavioral moderation derived foremost from the PRC leadership's decision, as early as 1956, to settle China's border disputes peacefully and amicably. From 1956 to 1963, the PRC had already made considerable progress in demarcating its long and tortuous land border with many neighboring countries (see Fravel 2008: 46-47), a development that helped to keep its territorial frictions with others at manageable levels.

The 1975-1984 period, however, saw the PRC's combativeness surge again, as Beijing used force in 63% of its territorial MIDs. Under closer scrutiny, this belligerency was mostly targeted at Vietnam and the Soviet Union, two countries with strained relations with the PRC at the time, and China played the role of the initiator in only 37.5% of these disputes. More tellingly, against its traditional archenemy, the ROC government on Taiwan, the PRC did not initiate a single territorial MID during this period.

After the decisive Lockean turn in the Chinese worldview, China's bellicosity over disputed territory diminished precipitately. From 1985 to 2010, the number of China's territorial disputes reached a record high since 1949, yet the PRC resorted to force in only 36.8% of them, which is significantly lower than the baseline conditional probability of China's use of force in its post-1949 territorial disputes. This rule applies, conspicuously, to the enduring and highly salient issues concerning Taiwan and the South China Sea as well: indeed, over this quarter century, there were only two recorded cases in which Beijing had allegedly used force—one

against Taiwan in 1987, and the other against the Philippines in 1995.[78] This implies that while territory remains a contentious factor that may inflame Beijing's violence propensity, a Lockeanized China is nevertheless much less likely to tackle the issue by violent means.

Similarly, Chinese conflict behavior in policy MIDs has also showed signs of moderation, as the militarized worldview gradually faded away in Beijing. From 1949 to 1984, the PRC's propensity to settle policy MIDs by force remained extraordinarily high, and demonstrated little variation across different periods. In those three and a half decades, whether acting as a revolutionary challenger or not, Beijing seemed almost always—i.e., 100%—prone to use force in policy disputes. After the advent of the Lockean era, however, this rather alarming behavioral constancy was no more. Between 1985 and 2010, China was involved in 16 policy MIDs, three times as many as in the 1975-1984 period. Nonetheless, Beijing resorted to force in only five or 31.2% of those disputes, indicating a nearly 70% reduction in its violence proneness in contrast to the preceding period, or, for that matter, to the 1949-1953 and 1954-1959 periods as well.

Put in a comparative context, China's declining militancy appears equally impressive. Table 4.4 reports the patterns of other major states' use of force in different types of disputes across the same time periods.

Between 1949 and 2010, the United States was rarely, and Britain and France never, involved in territorial MIDs. Thus, it remains a matter of conjecture as to how these three countries would have acted had they engaged in more territorial disputes. Still, until the mid-1970s, China was clearly more pugnacious than the Soviet Union or India in handling territorial disputes. Even when the PRC adopted an integrationist approach in 1954-1959, it was not only

---

[78] The MID dataset (v4.01) records a case wherein China is coded as "attacking" Taiwan between June 8 and September 30, 1987 [case no.2782]. However, I find no record of this alleged "attack" in official or unofficial PRC source materials; so this is very likely a miscoded case.

engaged in more territorial MIDs, but showed a much higher likelihood of using force in them, than the Soviet Union and India, the only two other major powers haunted by territorial disputes after the mid-1950s. In the 1960-1974 period, New Delhi surpassed Beijing as the principal user of force in territorial MIDs; still, during this period, China was nearly two times more likely to use force than the Soviet Union in territorial disputes, even though the two countries faced a similar number of those disputes.

A conspicuous change, however, occurred in Chinese conflict behavior after 1974. Indeed, from 1975 to 1984, the Soviet Union assumed the distinction of being the most violence-prone major state in territorial disputes: Confronted by five territorial MIDs in this period, Moscow employed military force in all of them. In contrast, India had three territorial MIDs and used force in two of them; for the PRC, the percentage was five out of eight. After 1985, the relative moderation of Chinese behavior became more appreciable. Between 1985 and 2010, Beijing encountered 19 territorial MIDs, but resorted to force in only seven of them. Over the same period, both the Soviet Union/Russia and India seemed more inclined than China to fight over contested territory, even though their territorial MIDs were relatively small in number.

Similarly, there appeared a slow but inexorable decrease in the PRC's propensity to use force in policy MIDs. Until the mid-1980s, China still remained one of the most combative major states in handling policy disputes with other countries. From 1985 to 2010, however, the PRC had become the least violence-prone among its peers: while having 16 policy MIDs in this period, Beijing resorted to force in only five of them; for the United States, the percentage was 24 out of 33. Meanwhile, despite their preoccupation with much fewer policy disputes than the PRC, Britain, France, and India all displayed a much higher inclination to resolve those disputes by force. Only Russia demonstrated a declining violence propensity in this respect, but the

157

conditional probability of Moscow's resort to force was still higher than that of Beijing's in policy MIDs over this period.

Furthermore, while the post-1975 PRC ceased completely to seek the overthrow of the government of another state, the three preeminent Western powers all demonstrated an extraordinary proclivity to engage in regime MIDs in 1985-2010. In fairness, this does not necessarily suggest a violation of Lockean norms by Washington, London, or Paris. A closer look at those regime MIDs, for example, reveals that they were often aimed at removing tyrannical or unconstitutional rulers in certain countries, not at conquering these countries per se.[79] Still, that contemporary China does not seek to take advantage of its permanent status at the UN Security Council to effect regime changes concerning its adversaries may be considered a sign of the Lockeanization of the Chinese worldview, as I observed earlier.

In sum, the preceding evidence suggests that the changes in the PRC's violence propensity is not just a function of the contentious issues confronting Beijing in different time periods, but derive in large measure from the evolution of China's militarized worldview too. At this point, another pivotal question remains unanswered yet. By definition, the term "use of force" covers a broad range of possible militarized actions, some of which are of a manifestly graver nature than others (e.g., firing upon the territory of another state is a far more serious provocation than chasing a foreign fishing boat). So far, we have only examined whether there were any general patterns of China's use of force over time. We do not contemplate yet the specific categories of militarized action that characterize Chinese behavior in handling MIDs.

---

[79] These MIDs include, for example, France's intervention in Comoros in 1989 to restore the elected government overthrown by a military coup; the U.S. invasion of Panama in 1989 to topple the notorious regime of General Noriega; the U.S.-led international intervention in 1993-1994 to force the military rulers of Haiti to relinquish power; and the U.S.-led international campaign against the Taliban regime of Afghanistan in 2001 and the Saddam Hussein regime of Iraq in 2003.

As the next step, therefore, I will explore the following questions: (1) what were the PRC's most preferred military options; (2) how Beijing employed different categories of force to address different types of disputes; and (3) whether, in this critical aspect as well, China has exhibited any signs of behavioral change with the passage of time.

Categories of Force Used

Table 4.5 reports the basic variations in the categories of China's use of force across different periods.

Between 1949 and 2010, China's top three choices of action, when resorting to force in MIDs, were "clash" (44.4%), "attack" (24.7%), and "seizure" (19.8%). To begin with, it is worthwhile to consider how the MID dataset defines these three terms:

—Seizure: capture of material or personnel of official forces from another state, or the detention of private citizens operating within contested territory;

—Attack (previously termed "raid"): use of regular armed forces of a state to fire upon the armed forces, population, or territory of another state. Within this incident type, the initiator can be clearly identified and its action is not sanctioned by the target;

—Clash: outbreak of military hostilities between regular armed forces of two or more states, in which the initiator may or may not be clearly identified (Jones, Bremer, and Singer 1996: 173).

Clearly, while all the above three actions indicate the use of fatal and violent force, they do not reflect on the disputants' intentions in the same way. Engagement in clashes, for example, does not in itself constitute irrefutable evidence of Chinese assertiveness, because such military hostilities may or may not have been initiated by the Chinese side (the data provide no definitive information concerning this point). By contrast, acts of "attack" and "seizure" are more proactive

159

in intent and execution, thereby reflecting the disputants' predilection for violence more accurately. Intriguingly, it is precisely in the latter two categories of militarized action that Chinese behavior shows trends of moderation over time.

In 1949-1953, revolutionary China was involved in 14 MIDs, but initiated attacks in four or 28.6% of them. During the integrationist phase that ensued (1954-1959), the percentage shrank to 18.6%. In the late Maoist and early Dengist era (1975-1984), the percentage decreased further to 11.8%. From 1985 to 2010, the PRC had a total of 65 MIDs, but the conditional probability of China's resort to attacks tapered off to a record low of 6.2%. Meanwhile, after 1975, the conditional probability of China's resort to seizure reduced approximately by half. In addition, with the passage of time, Beijing also became much less likely to engage in military clashes. In 1949-1953, for example, Chinese forces clashed with their adversaries in five or 35.7% of the 14 MIDs involving the PRC. In 1985-2010, the conditional probability of China's engagement in military clashes was merely 7.7%, although China was then confronted by a far greater number of MIDs than in all preceding periods.

Disaggregating the categories of militarized action by dispute types, we can discover similar evidence of Beijing's decreasing violence propensity. Table 4.6 and Table 4.7 describe the categories of China's use of force in territorial and policy MIDs, respectively.

Between 1949 and 2010, attacks and clashes represented the two commonest forms of the PRC's resort to force in territorial disputes. Over time, however, Beijing became less and less dependent upon these two options for conflict resolution. In 1949-1953, revolutionary China initiated attacks in 25% of its territorial MIDs, and engaged in clashes in another 50% of these disputes. In the subsequent integrationist period (1954-1959), the two percentages decreased to 9%

160

and 36%, respectively, even though the number of China's territorial disputes had almost tripled during that period.

In 1960-1974, the PRC showed signs of resurgent bellicosity in territorial MIDs, resorting to attacks in 14% of them. Afterward, while China's militarized worldview softened once more in 1975-1984, Beijing literally gave up waging attacks over contested territory at that time. From 1985 to 2010, the PRC was involved in a record-high number of territorial MIDs, but Chinese militancy was obviously at its lowest ebb: in fact, attacks now constituted but a tiny fraction (5.3%) of Chinese actions, while only 10.5% of those disputes ended up in military clashes. In particular, during this Lockean phase, Beijing never resorted to attacks, or engaged in military clashes, in handling MIDs concerning the highly sensitive territorial claims over either Taiwan or the South China Sea. This finding is consistent with my earlier contention that under Deng Xiaoping and his successors, seeking peaceful resolution of territorial disputes has become a key tenet of Chinese foreign policy.

Regarding policy MIDs, China's penchant for violence shows an identical trend of amelioration. From 1949 to 2010, seizures, clashes, and attacks were the PRC's top three options when using force in policy disputes. Nonetheless, while the Chinese worldview mellowed gradually, Beijing's resort to these options became noticeably less frequent. At the height of Maoist militancy in 1960-1974, for example, the PRC resorted to seizure in 57% of its policy disputes, and engaged in military clashes in another 26.7% of them. Between 1985 and 2010, the conditional probability of China's resort to seizure and clashes dropped to 12.5% and 6.25%, respectively, in policy MID. s Likewise, before the mid-1980s, the PRC exhibited a high inclination—the conditional probability ranging from 30% to 100%—to initiate attacks in policy

disputes. In the post-1985 Lockean phase, this marked Chinese belligerence was evidently on the wane, as the conditional probability of Chinese attacks shrank to a paltry 6.25% in policy MIDs.

Even by comparison with other major states, the steady alleviation of the PRC's violence proneness looks fairly impressive. Table 4.8 describes the categories of other major states' use of force across different periods.

Obviously, for most major states, seizures, attacks, clashes, and even wars were the topmost options of their use of force from 1949 to 2010. Apart from the Soviet Union (and occasionally India), however, Beijing had, until 1974, resorted to seizures, attacks and clashes more frequently than most of its peers, which speaks volumes about Maoist China's violence propensity. In the 1975-1984 period, Chinese conflict behavior began to show signs of relative moderation. As the PRC rejoined international society at the time, it became less likely to resort to seizures and attacks than the United States and the Soviet Union. Indeed, Britain, France, and India appeared just as likely to adopt the two said options as China in settling MIDs during this period. Moreover, in terms of the conditional probability of engagement in military clashes, both France and India seemed more violence-prone than the PRC.

After China entered the Lockean phase (1985-2010), the mitigation of its violence propensity became more appreciable from a comparative perspective. In almost all aspects concerned, the United States and Britain demonstrated a greater probability than the PRC of using violent force: indeed, the two preeminent Western powers now appeared more likely to implement seizures, initiate attacks, engage in military clashes, or wage wars as a means of tackling interstate disputes. Even France, another established Western power, seemed more inclined to resort to attacks, clashes, and wars than China, despite the relatively smaller number of Paris's MID involvements. Similarly, the Soviet Union/Russia and India showed a great

penchant than the PRC for military attacks and clashes in handling disputes. During this quarter century, for example, the conditional probability for each state of initiating attacks in its total MIDs, was 6.2% for China, 22.6% for the United States, 8% for Britain, 13.8% for France, 11% for Russia, and 15.2% for India. Meanwhile, the conditional probability of each state's engagement in military clashes was 7.7% for China, 8.6% for the United States, 12% for Britain, 6.9% for France, 12.3% for Russia, and, astonishingly, 48.5% for India. Since the United States was rarely, and Britain and France never, involved in territorial MIDs between 1949 and 2010, I compare next the Soviet Union's and India's use of force with Chinese behavior in territorial disputes. The results of this comparison are presented in Table 4.9.

Clearly, from 1949 to 1959, Beijing not only had more territorial MIDs than both Moscow and New Delhi, but appeared more likely to resort to attacks or clashes in handling those disputes. In the 1960-1974 period, however, there no longer existed large differences between China, the Soviet Union, and India in their conditional probability of involvement in military clashes over contested territory. To be sure, during this period, the PRC still seemed slightly more likely to initiate attacks than the other two countries in addressing territorial MIDs. Nevertheless, Beijing did not implement a single seizure in those disputes.

Furthermore, between 1975 and 1984, China did not initiate any attacks, even though it remained beset by a greater number of territorial MIDs than the Soviet Union and India. On the contrary, Moscow and New Delhi began to demonstrate in the meantime a noticeably increasing tendency to engage in military clashes than Beijing in their respective territorial disputes. After the advent of the Lockean phase (1985-2010), this tendency was still perceptible: While the PRC continued to have far more territorial MIDs that its peers, its conditional probability of involvement in clashes over contested territory was only 10.5%, in contrast to 100% for the

163

Soviet Union/Russia and 75% for India. Meanwhile, Beijing's conditional probability of initiating attacks in territorial disputes was only 5.3%; for New Delhi, the percentage was 25% over the same period.

In policy MIDs, the comparison of China's and other major states' use of force produces similarly identifiable signs of the gradual moderation of Beijing's conflict behavior. Table 4.10 reports the results of this comparison.

In 1949-1953, revolutionary China was the only major state that ever resorted to attacks in handling policy MIDs. As the PRC sought to join the international society in 1954-1959, its violence propensity began to decline relatively: having a total of seven policy MIDs during this period, China initiated attacks in two or 28.6% of them, whereas France had three policy disputes and resorted to attacks in one or 33.3% of them. Moreover, although both Beijing and Paris had, respectively, engaged in clashes in one of their policy MIDs, it should be noted that the conditional probability of doing so was higher in France's case, due to its smaller number of MIDs. In the meantime, China implemented seizures in three or 42.9% of its policy MIDs; for the Soviet Union, the percentage was five out of eight or 62.5%.

In the following 1960-1974 period, China's proneness to resolve policy disputes by violent force continued to decrease, despite the resurgence of Maoist radicalism at the time. Conspicuously, over this period, Beijing did not initiate a single attack as a means of addressing policy MIDs. In contrast, both the United States and the Soviet Union were considerably more violence-prone in this respect. Meanwhile, Beijing appeared slightly less likely than Washington, Moscow, and London to resort to seizures in policy disputes: the conditional probability of doing so, for instance, was 26.7% for China, 28.6% for the United States, 30.8% for the Soviet Union,

and 33.3% for Britain. Similarly, both France and India seemed to have a greater propensity to engage in military clashes than the PRC.

In 1975-1984, the PRC had much fewer policy MIDs than before, but it still appeared more likely to resort to attacks or clashes than most of its peers. Under closer scrutiny, however, the conditional probability for China of initiating attacks was actually smaller (40%) than France (67%) and India (50%) in handling policy MIDs. Likewise, the conditional probability of Beijing's resort to seizure was lower (20%) than that of Washington's (21.4%) and Paris's (33.3%).

Furthermore, with the decisive Lockean turn in its worldview, the PRC became less violence-prone than most of its peers, as well as in more aspects than one, between 1985 and 2010. The conditional probability of China's resort to attacks in policy MIDs, for instance, was merely 6.25%, in stark contrast to 39.4% for the United States, 16.7% for Britain, 33.3% for France, 13% for Russia, and 22.2% for India. Meanwhile, the likelihood of Beijing's engagement in military clashes over policy disputes was 6.25% too, whereas the percentage was 15.2% for Washington, 11.1% for Paris, 13% for Moscow, and 33.3% for New Delhi. It was only on the possibility of implementing seizures that China appeared approximately as pugnacious as some of its peers: the conditional probability of doing so in policy MIDs was, respectively, 12.5% for the PRC, 12.1% for the United States, 16.7% for Britain, and 11.1% for India.

Overall, the foregoing analyses imply that while its militarized worldview softens over time, China becomes substantially less likely to employ violent force for the settlement of interstate disputes, regardless of the issues under contention. So far, however, we still have not investigated the variations in the PRC's propensity to initiate a MID *and* use force in it. In the following section, I turn to this last and equally important question.

165

Dispute Initiation

In the MID dataset, a country is considered to be on Side A—i.e., the initiating side—of a dispute, if it is found to have taken the first codable militarized action (i.e., at least a threat to use force) in the dispute. Thus, a plausible measure of a state's dispute proneness may be the frequency with which the state plays the role of Side A or initiator in MIDs.

Table 4.11 reports the patterns of all major states' MID initiation and of their use of force in these disputes across different time periods.

Obviously, from 1949 to 1959, the PRC remained the most dispute-prone of all major states. In this period, Beijing initiated, or was on the initiating side of, far more MIDs than the United States, Britain, France, and India. The Soviet Union trailed a close second, but the number of MIDs initiated by Moscow was 18% less than that initiated by Beijing during the said decade. In 1960-1974, however, the Soviet Union replaced China as the most dispute-prone major power, as Moscow's MID initiation surpassed that of Beijing's by nearly 32%. In the meantime, the United States also became only slightly less dispute-prone than the PRC. Afterward, the 1975-1984 period witnessed the sharpest decline ever in China' dispute proneness, as Beijing's total MID initiation dwindled to merely a fraction of Moscow's or Washington's. Since 1985, the PRC's dispute initiation has increased again, but it still lags considerably behind the United States' or the Soviet Union/Russia's.

Coupling China's MID initiation with its use of force, we observe more clearly Beijing's subsiding violence propensity from a comparative standpoint. In 1949-1953, revolutionary China was doubtless the most violence-prone of all major powers, as about 88% of its dispute initiation was accompanied by Beijing's resort to force. In contrast, the percentage was zero for the United States, 60% for Britain, 50% for France, 71% for the Soviet Union, and 67% for India over the

same period. In 1954-1959, however, the PRC was no longer the lonely black sheep; France, for example, showed an ever greater propensity to use force when initiating MIDs than China. From 1960 to 1974, the PRC again stood out as the principal initiator of violence, which is not surprising, given the resurgent militarized worldview in Beijing at the time.

In 1975-1984, Chinese bellicosity was less virulent than before. The PRC, as said earlier, initiated much fewer MIDs during this period; and the conditional probability of its use of force in these disputes was 25% and 15% less, respectively, than that of revolutionary China's in the 1949-1954 and 1960-1974 periods. Moreover, India began to show just as high a propensity to initiate violence as China over this period, and France trailed a close third. From 1985 to 2010, with the Lockeanization of its worldview, the PRC actually became the least violence-prone of all major powers: the conditional probability of using force in self-initiated MIDs, for example, was 31.6% for China, 64% for the United States, 67% for Britain, 47% for France, 34.6% for the Soviet Union/Russia, and 67% for India.

Disaggregating China's MID initiation *cum* its use of force by dispute types, we observe a more complex if equally interesting pattern. Unexpectedly, in both its first integrationist phase (1954-1959) and its Lockean phase (1985-2010), the PRC initiated notably more territorial MIDs than in other periods. Still, a comparison of those phases produces fresh evidence about Beijing's declining predilection for violence. In 1949-1953, China initiated only two territorial MIDs, and used force in one of them. In the following three decades, Beijing invariably resorted to force in two-thirds of its self-initiated territorial MIDs in each time period (no matter which one), even though the number of those disputes in each period was not considerably larger than in 1949-1953. In the Lockean phase (1985-2010), the PRC initiated 14 territorial MIDs, the greatest

number ever in its history; nonetheless, the conditional probability of its use of force in those disputes decreased to 42.9%.

Viewed in a comparative light, China was hardly unique in terms of its violence proneness in territorial MID initiation. Between 195 and 1959, for example, Beijing initiated more territorial disputes than other major states, but its propensity to settle them by force seemed slightly less than Moscow's. Likewise, in the 1960-1974 and 1975-1984 periods, India and the Soviet Union initiated just as many, or slightly more, territorial MIDs than China; moreover, they appeared, respectively, to have overtaken China as the foremost user of force in those disputes in the two periods. After the Lockeanization of the Chinese worldview, however, it should be noted that the PRC did not initiate a single MID, nor did it ever use force, against India, despite the obdurately protracted territorial dispute between the two countries. Indeed, between 1985 and 2010, Beijing initiated 14 territorial MIDs and used force in only six of them; in contrast, India initiated three such disputes, but resorted to force in all three of them.

In terms of policy MID initiation, the PRC initiated few policy disputes in two periods— 1949-1953 and 1975-1984. Instead, most of China's policy MID initiation occurred in the 1960-1974 and 1985-2010 periods. An examination of the conditional probability of Beijing's resort to force in those disputes, however, shows that China's violence propensity had stayed consistently at a high level until the mid-1980s. During its first integrationist phase (1954-1959), for example, the PRC initiated six policy MIDs, and used force in all of them. In the following 1960-1974 period, Beijing resorted to force in nine out of a total of ten self-initiated policy MIDs. Even in 1975-1984, when China entered its pre-Lockean phase, Beijing still used force in all two policy disputes of its own initiation. Nonetheless, after 1985, the conditional probability of China's

resort to force in self-initiated policy MIDs sank to a record low: between 1985 and 2010, Beijing initiated 14 such disputes, but use force in only four or 28.6% of them.

Comparatively, among all major states, the PRC had never been the topmost initiator of policy MIDs between 1949 and 2010. As a matter of fact, until the mid-1980s, the Soviet Union had initiated more—and sometimes significantly more—policy disputes than its peers in each period concerned. From 1949 to 1984, for instance, Moscow initiated a total of 50 policy MIDs, in contrast to 27 for the United States and 19 for China. Moreover, between 1960 and 1984, the United States also overtook the PRC considerably in the number of its self-initiated policy MIDs in different periods. After 1985, the Lockeanized China lagged even further behind in this respect. From 1985 to 2010, the United States initiated a total of 28 policy MIDs, while the Soviet Union/Russia initiated 22; for the PRC, the number was only 14.

Furthermore, when initiating policy MIDs, China's propensity to use force showed much variation in comparison to its great power peers over time. In 1954-1959, for example, the PRC used force in all its self-initiated policy disputes; but so did France and, to a slightly lesser degree, the Soviet Union. In 1960-1974, all major states demonstrated a high predilection for violence in handling policy MIDs of their own initiation: the conditional probability of doing so was 90% for China, 75% for the United States, 50% for Britain, 100% for France, 69.6% for the Soviet Union, and 50% for India.

Even during China's pre-Lockean phase (1975-1984), Beijing resorted to force in all its self-initiated policy MIDs; but once again, so did France and India, which initiated approximately the same number of policy disputes as the PRC over the same period. Interestingly, in this period, both the United States and the Soviet Union appeared less combative

169

than before: in handling policy MIDs of their own initiation, the conditional probability of using force was 38.5% for Washington and 28.6% for Moscow.

Nonetheless, with the Lockeanization of China's worldview, the PRC became the least violence-prone of all major powers between 1985 and 2010 on this count. As mentioned earlier, Beijing not only initiated much fewer policy MIDs than Washington or Moscow during this period, but seemed much less likely to resort to force in those disputes than all other major states. The conditional probability of using force in self-initiated MIDs, for instance, was 28.6% for China, 75% for the United States, 67% for both Britain and France, 36.4% for Russia, and 50% for India.

In conclusion, the moderation of China's dispute proneness is thus notable both across time and across countries. Indeed, since 1960, Beijing has invariably appeared less likely to challenge other countries' policy than Washington and Moscow. Even when initiating MIDs (regardless of the dispute types), the post-1985 and Lockeanized China appears less likely to resort to force than most of its great-power peers. Thus, it seems no longer plausible, by extant technical standards, to describe contemporary China as the most dispute-prone of all major powers.

Summary of Findings

From the foregoing analyses, we have made several interesting discoveries. Contrary to allegations about a relentlessly growing "China threat," the PRC's propensity to settle disputes by force had decreased markedly between 1949 and 2010. The moderation of China's violence proneness was especially conspicuous after 1985, the year in which the Chinese worldview took a decisive Lockean turn under Deng Xiaoping's leadership. Since then, China has become much less likely to use force, especially fatal and violent force, in handling MIDs, regardless of the

issues under contention. In particular, Beijing has completely given up seeking the overthrow of foreign governments by military means. Moreover, the evidence of China's decreasing proclivity for violence or dispute initiation remains strong and impressive in comparison with other major states' MID behavior over the same period(s). These findings contradict any claim that there has been no significant reduction in the frequency and intensity of China's use of force since the establishment of the PRC.

Of course, these findings are preliminary, in that we have so far been able to consider only two possible sources of China's changing violence propensity—the evolution of the Chinese worldview and the shifts in the types of contentious issues besetting the PRC since 1949. We have yet to incorporate more sophisticated considerations into our analysis. For example, one may ask: What are other possible explanations of China's declining propensity to use force? Does this phenomenon reflect the ups and downs in Beijing's relative capabilities? Alternatively, does it result from the PRC's thriving trade and economic relations with other countries? Or, is it a sign that Beijing's political interactions with other states, especially other major powers, have improved steadily over years? Obviously, only a more systematic and quantitative test of the data could help us determine the causal impact of the evolution of the militarized worldview vis-à-vis competing explanations of the remarkable changes in Chinese conflict behavior. The next chapter will take up this task.

Tables

TABLE 4.1: Comparative Frequency of China's Use of Force

Period	Uses of Force	MIDs Involvement	Uses of Force/Total MIDs
1949-1953	11	14	79%
1954-1959	17	26	65%
1960-1974	26	48	54%
1975-1984	10	17	59%
1985-2001	17	65	26%

TABLE 4.2: Comparative Frequency of Major States' Use of Force (Measured by the Percentage of Uses of Force in Each State's MID Involvements)

Period	China	U.S.	Britain	France	USSR/Russia	India
1949-1953	11/14 (79%)	1/10 (10%)	6/18 (33%)	2/4 (50%)	6/12 (50%)	3/5 (60%)
1954-1959	17/26 (65%)	4/28 (14%)	3/14 (21%)	4/6 (67%)	10/24 (42%)	6/17 (35%)
1960-1974	26/48 (54%)	17/62 (27%)	7/23 (30%)	4/6 (67%)	29/65 (45%)	18/34 (53%)
1975-1984	10/17 (59%)	11/38 (29%)	3/13 (23%)	7/9 (78%)	12/38 (32%)	9/13 (69%)
1985-2010	17/65 (26%)	44/104 (42%)	11/25 (44%)	10/29 (34%)	21/73 (29%)	22/33 (67%)

TABLE 4.3: Dispute Types of China's Use of Force

Period	Territorial MIDs	Territorial MIDs with Use of Force	Policy MIDs	Policy MIDs with Use of Force	Regime MIDs	Regime MIDs with Use of Force
1949-1953	4	3	1	1	0	0
1954-1959	11	6	6	6	1	0
1960-1974	7	4	15	9	4	4
1975-1984	8	5	5	5	0	0
1985-2010	19	7	16	5	0	0

TABLE 4.4: Dispute Types of Other Major States' Use of Force

Period	State	Territorial MIDs	Territorial MIDs with Use of Force	Policy MIDs	Policy MIDs with Use of Force	Regime MIDs	Regime MIDs with Use of Force
1949-1953	United States	3	0	0	0	0	0
	Britain	0	0	1	0	0	0
	France	0	0	0	0	0	0
	USSR	0	0	5	3	1	1
	India	1	0	0	0	0	0
	China	4	3	1	1	0	0
1954-1959	United States	0	0	2	0	2	0
	Britain	0	0	3	0	0	0
	France	0	0	3	3	0	0
	USSR	2	1	8	7	1	1
	India	9	1	0	0	0	0
	China	11	6	6	6	1	0
1960-1974	United States	0	0	14	9	3	1
	Britain	0	0	3	1	0	0
	France	0	0	2	2	1	1
	USSR	6	2	26	18	0	0
	India	5	3	2	1	1	1
	China	7	4	15	9	4	4
1975-1984	United States	0	0	14	5	2	1
	Britain	0	0	0	0	0	0
	France	0	0	3	3	0	0
	USSR	5	5	15	4	0	0
	India	3	2	2	2	0	0
	China	8	5	5	5	0	0
1985-2010	United States	0	0	33	24	4	3
	Britain	0	0	6	4	2	2
	France	0	0	9	5	3	3
	USSR/Russia	1	1	23	8	1	1
	India	4	4	9	6	0	0
	China	19	7	16	5	0	0

TABLE 4.5: Categories of China's Use of Force

Period	Blockade	Occupation of Territory	Seizure	Attack	Clash	War	Total MID Involvement
1949-1953	0	0	1	4	5	1	14
1954-1959	0	1	3	5	8	0	26
1960-1974	0	1	7	8	9	1	48
1975-1984	0	0	1	2	6	1	17
1985-2010	1	2	4	4	5	1	65
(subtotal)	1	4	16	23	33	4	170

TABLE 4.6: Categories of China's Use of Force in Territorial MIDs

Period	Blockade	Occupation of Territory	Seizure	Attack	Clash	War	Total Territorial MIDs
1949-1953	0	0	0	1	2	0	4
1954-1959	0	1	0	1	4	0	11
1960-1974	0	0	0	1	2	1	7
1975-1984	0	0	0	0	5	0	8
1985-2010	1	2	1	1	2	0	19

TABLE 4.7: Categories of China's Use of Force in Policy MIDs

Period	Occupation of Territory	Seizure	Attack	Clash	War	Total Policy MIDs
1949-1953	0	0	1	0	0	1
1954-1959	0	3	2	1	0	7
1960-1974	1	4	0	4	0	15
1975-1984	0	1	2	1	1	5
1985-2010	0	2	1	1	1	16

TABLE 4.8: Categories of Other Major States' Use of Force

Period	State	Blockade	Occupation of Territory	Seizure	Attack	Clash	War	Total MIDs
1949-1953	United States	0	0	0	0	0	1	10
	Britain	0	0	0	1	4	1	18
	France	0	0	0	0	1	1	4
	USSR	0	0	3	3	0	0	12
	India	0	0	0	1	2	0	5
	China	0	0	1	4	5	1	14
1954-1959	United States	0	0	0	1	3	0	28
	Britain	0	0	0	2	0	1	14
	France	1	0	0	1	1	1	6
	USSR	0	1	6	2	0	1	24
	India	0	0	0	0	6	0	17
	China	0	1	3	5	8	0	26
1960-1974	United States	1	0	4	6	5	1	62
	Britain	0	0	1	5	1	0	23
	France	0	0	0	1	3	0	6
	USSR	1	1	10	12	5	0	65
	India	0	0	2	1	12	3	34
	China	0	1	7	8	9	1	48
1975-1984	United States	0	4	5	4	4	0	49
	Britain	0	0	0	2	0	1	13
	France	0	0	1	2	4	0	9
	USSR	0	1	2	6	3	0	38
	India	0	0	1	2	6	0	13
	China	0	0	1	2	6	1	17
1985-2010	United States	2	0	8	21	8	2	93
	Britain	2	0	2	2	3	2	25
	France	2	1	0	4	2	1	29
	USSR/Russia	0	1	3	8	9	0	73
	India	0	0	1	5	16	0	33
	China	1	2	4	4	5	1	65

TABLE 4.9: Categories of Other Major States' Use of Force in Territorial MIDs

Period	State	Blockade	Occupation of Territory	Seizure	Attack	Clash	War	Total Territorial MIDs
1949-1953	China	0	0	0	1	2	0	4
	USSR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	India	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
1954-1959	China	0	1	0	1	4	0	11
	USSR	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
	India	0	0	0	0	1	0	9
1960-1974	China	0	0	0	1	2	1	7
	USSR	0	0	0	0	2	0	6
	India	0	0	1	0	1	1	5
1975-1984	China	0	0	0	0	5	0	8
	USSR	0	1	0	1	3	0	5
	India	0	0	0	0	2	0	3
1985-2010	China	1	2	1	1	2	0	19
	Russia	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	India	0	0	0	1	3	0	4

TABLE 4.10: Categories of Other Major States' Use of Force in Policy MIDs

Period	State	Blockade	Occupation of Territory	Seizure	Attack	Clash	Total Policy MIDs
1949-1953	United States	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Britain	0	0	0	0	0	1
	France	0	0	0	0	0	0
	USSR	0	0	3	0	0	5
	India	0	0	0	0	0	0
	China	0	0	0	1	0	1
1954-1959	United States	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Britain	0	0	0	0	0	3
	France	1	0	0	1	1	3
	USSR	0	1	5	1	0	8
	India	0	0	0	0	0	0
	China	0	0	3	2	1	7
1960-1974	United States	0	0	4	4	1	14
	Britain	0	0	1	0	0	3
	France	0	0	0	1	2	3
	USSR	1	1	8	8	0	26
	India	0	0	0	0	1	2
	China	0	1	4	0	4	15
1975-1984	United States	0	0	3	2	0	14
	Britain	0	0	0	0	0	0
	France	0	0	1	2	0	3
	USSR	0	0	0	4	0	15
	India	0	0	0	1	0	2
	China	0	0	1	2	1	5
1985-2010	United States	1	0	4	13	5	33
	Britain	1	0	1	1	0	6
	France	1	0	0	3	1	9
	USSR/Russia	0	1	1	3	3	23
	India	0	0	1	2	3	9
	China	0	0	2	1	1	16

TABLE 4.11: Comparing China's and Other Major States' MID Initiation and Use of Force

Period	State	Initiation	Initiation + Use of Force	Territorial MID Initiation	Territorial Initiation + Use of Force	Policy MID Initiation	Policy Initiation + Use of Force
1949-1953	China	8	7	2	1	1	1
	United States	4	0	2	0	0	0
	Britain	5	3	0	0	1	0
	France	2	1	0	0	0	0
	USSR	7	5	0	0	5	3
	India	3	2	0	0	0	0
1954-1959	China	17	14	6	4	6	67
	United States	8	1	0	0	2	0
	Britain	5	1	0	0	3	0
	France	3	3	0	0	3	3
	USSR	15	10	1	1	8	7
	India	6	1	4	1	0	0
1960-1974	China	28	22	3	2	10	9
	United States	27	13	0	0	12	9
	Britain	5	1	0	0	2	1
	France	5	3	0	0	2	2
	USSR	37	19	3	0	23	16
	India	14	7	3	3	2	1
1975-1984	China	6	4	3	2	2	2
	United States	23	9	0	0	13	5
	Britain	5	1	0	0	0	0
	France	5	3	0	0	3	3
	USSR	27	10	4	4	14	4
	India	6	4	1	0	2	2
1985-2010	China	38	12	14	6	14	4
	United States	50	32	0	0	28	21
	Britain	15	10	0	0	6	4
	France	17	8	0	0	6	4
	USSR/Russia	52	18	0	0	22	8
	India	21	14	3	3	6	3

Chapter 5

**The Militarized Worldview and China's Use of Force:
A Systematic Test of Competing Hypotheses**

In this chapter, I concentrate on testing the statistical association between one outcome phenomenon of interest (i.e., China's use of force) and several competing explanatory factors, as well as the substantive significance of those explanatory factors.[80] In earlier chapters, I have enunciated the following theoretically informed explanations of China's propensity to use force:

—The change in relative power (realism);

—The change in territorial disputes (the issue- or territorially-based explanation of interstate conflict);

—The evolution of the militarized worldview (my own constructivist explanation);[81]

—The extent of integration into international society, as manifested by trade relations, participation in international institutions, and the attainment of diplomatic recognition (liberalism, liberal institutionalism, and status inconsistency theory).

In relation to my main causal variable (i.e., the militarized worldview), the other explanatory variables stand as "competing" factors in the sense that they do not just constitute alternative causes of the outcome variable, but are antecedent to and plausibly associated with

---

[80] A widely used measure of relative impacts in quantitative IR scholarship, substantive significance refers to "the amount of change, or the extent of change in probabilities, brought about in the dependent variable apparently by a corresponding change in the independent variable" (Ray 2003: 11).

[81] Some IR scholars, including Wendt himself, do not consider constructivism to be a theory, but an "approach that can bundle a distinctive ideational ontology together with a wide range of extant 'middle-range theories' about human and group behavior" (Johnston 2008: xvi, footnote 4). Thus, I do not label my explanation "constructivism," even though it derives from various constructivist tenets and insights.

both the militarized worldview and China's use of force.[82] In statistical terminology, they stand as confounding variables, rather than intervening variables, to the militarized worldview; as such, they may be incorporated into the same multivariate model without biasing or confusing the results.[83] Furthermore, if the hypothesized relationship between the militarized worldview and China's use of force is spurious, the addition of competing explanatory factors to the multivariate models would then help to expose this, by eliminating the statistical association between the original independent and dependent variables.

Thus, I posit the following competing hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: *The more militarized China's worldview, the greater its violence proneness.*

Hypothesis 2: *The greater China's relative power, the greater its violence proneness.*

Hypothesis 3: *The more China's territory is contested, the greater its violence proneness.*

Hypothesis 4: *The greater China's dependence on trade, the smaller its violence proneness.*

Hypothesis 5: *The more China participates in international institutions, the smaller its violence proneness.*

Hypothesis 6: *The more diplomatic recognition China acquires, the smaller its violence proneness.*

Below, I first present a research design for testing the above hypotheses systematically, and then report and interpret the results of the quantitative tests. Next, I provide historical examples to illustrate the substantive impact of various explanatory factors that find support in

---

[82] Recall that in Chapter 1, I contend that trade relations, participation in international institutions, and diplomatic recognition may all help to soften the militarized worldview and therefore decrease the challenger's violence proneness. Similarly, the "China threat" theorists might argue that the expansion of relative power or the persistence of territorial disputes would augment the militarized worldview, thereby making China more prone to use force.

[83] For the pivotal distinction between confounding and intervening variables in multivariate models, see Ray (2003: 4-7).

the quantitative analyses. I wind up with a discussion of the theoretical and policy significance of the findings.

Research Design

In quantitative IR scholarship, the most important level of analysis has been the dyadic level. Empirically, it is found that "examining the relations between pairs of states—what they actually do to each other—has been much more productive in terms of producing stronger correlations in the analysis of foreign policy behavior and in retrodicting the onset of war" (Vasquez 1998: 194-195). Theoretically, even the very type of the international system is ultimately determined by the way states interact with one another (Wendt 1992). My own theory, as said earlier, predicts not only a generalized or aggregate effect of the international society on a challenger, but also attributes that effect to the interactions between the challenger and other states in specific issue areas (trade, IGO participation, and diplomatic recognition). Thus, a dyadic approach is also appropriate for a systematic test of my theory.

For reasons of policy relevance, I am interested primarily in investigating when China would use force against another state. Correspondingly, my unit of analysis is the dyadic country-year. Since the PRC is generally considered to have gained major-power status since 1950, all states in the international system are thus politically relevant to Beijing at the dyadic level.[84] Due to data availability, the temporal domain is 1949-2010. Altogether, my data contain 198 dyads and 9,080 country-year observations.

One might object that it makes little sense to pair China with every other state in exploring the patterns of its use of force, since the PRC did not have the capacity to project its

---

[84] Politically relevant dyads are usually defined as those that are either contiguous (including within 150 miles by sea) or containing one major state (Lemke and Reed 2001). Such dyads are considered to have a greater likelihood of going to war than others (Most and Starr 1989; Maoz and Russett 1993).

military power in most parts of the world until fairly recently. This objection, however, overlooks the fact that the term "use of force" in quantitative IR scholarship has much broader implications than just military attacks. According to the Militarized Interstate Disputes (v4.01) dataset, the use of force includes a blockade, an occupation of territory, a seizure, a clash, a raid, and a war (see Chapter 4 for definitions of those terms). Of these forms of use of force, the act of seizure, defined as the "capture of material or personnel of official forces from another state, or the detention of private citizens operating within contested territory" (Jones, Bremer, and Singer 1996: 173), can occur without having one state attacking another directly. In recounting Maoist China's violence propensity, for instance, I noted that the PRC deliberately seized the real estate of the U.S., French, and Dutch consulates in Beijing in January 1950, to demonstrate its contempt for the "imperialistic" West (see Chapter 2).

Another illustrative example happened in July 1966, between China and the Netherlands. When a PRC delegation was attending a conference organized by the International Institute of Welding in Amsterdam, one of its members tried to climb out of the hotel building, in an obvious attempt at defection. Accidentally, the defector fell from the windows and suffered critical injuries. Taking charge of the matter, the PRC's charge d'affaires in the Netherlands decided that it was useless to leave the severely wounded defector in the hospital, and had the defector moved into the premises of the Office of the Charge of d'affaires instead, where the defector died soon afterward. Upset by the incident, the Dutch government demanded an explanation from the PRC charge d'affaires, and forbid the said Chinese delegation to leave the Netherlands before they accepted a police investigation. When the PRC charge d'affaires refused to comply or cooperate with the Dutch authorities, the Dutch government declared him *persona non grata*, who quickly departed for China.

In retaliation, Beijing declared the Dutch charge d'affaires in the PRC *persona non grata* too, but prohibited him from leaving China unless and until the Dutch government allowed the said Chinese delegation to leave the Netherlands first. In effect, the luckless Dutch diplomat was held hostage by the Chinese government. The diplomatic stalemate lasted for several months, until Amsterdam finally gave in to Chinese intransigence in December 1966, and allowed the PRC delegation to depart without undergoing any judicial proceedings. The Dutch charge d'affaires was permitted to leave China one day after the Chinese delegation flew back to Beijing (Shen 2003; see also Wang Taiping et al. 1998: 397). Included in the MID (v4.01) dataset as Case 1713, this incident was another testimony to China's ability to use force without resorting to direct military assaults.

If a materially weaker China could initiate acts of seizure with little inhibition, then, one may expect a more powerful PRC to act more assertively toward those who cross Beijing in one way or another, regardless of whether those countries are geographically far away. To investigate systematically whether this is not the long-term trajectory of Chinese behavior, we need to gather more, rather than less, observations on China's interactions with other states. This is why I decide to adopt a "full" dyadic approach, as described above. Besides, if geographical proximity is indeed an important factor in facilitating or inhibiting China's use of force against others, this factor can be easily controlled for in a systematic and quantitative test of the substantive significance of various explanatory factors related to China's violence propensity (see below).

The Dependent Variable: China's Use of Force

Following the coding rules of the MID (v4.01) dataset, I define the use of force to include a blockade, an occupation of territory, a seizure, a clash, a raid, and a war.

Given the dyadic country-year approach of this analysis, we need to have as accurate historical knowledge as possible regarding China's use of force against another state in every given year. Regrettably, the current MID (v4.01) dataset has two problems in this regard. The first problem lies in its coding of the interstate disputes that last for multiple years. In such cases, the MID dataset records only the highest hostility level exhibited by the PRC in the whole dispute, without reporting the level of Chinese conflict behavior in each year. The second and more serious problem, however, is that the dataset neglects to include many cases of China's use of force, while probably miscoding some others, for the 1949-1992 period.[85] Based on my own historical research, some important but neglected cases include:

—China's repeated clashes with France, Thailand, and the United States in the border areas of Yunnan Province in 1950-1951;

—China's clashes with Portuguese troops at Macau in July 1952;

—China's repeated clashes with South Korean commando forces in 1956;

—China's continuous clashes with Taiwan in 1949-1978;

—China's continuous clashes with the United States in 1950-1973;

—China's continuous clashes with Vietnam in 1978-1990.[86]

In the meantime, some cases reported in the MID dataset are either unsupported or contradicted by official or unofficial PRC source materials. A few examples are as below:

—China clashed with Britain near Hong Kong in 1950, not in 1951 or 1952;

—China clashed with Burma in 1955, not in 1956 or 1959;

—China did *not* attack Nepal, South Vietnam, or the Philippines in 1956;

---

[85] I do not address the 1993-2010 period because the data for that period are well-documented in the MID (v4.01) dataset.

[86] Especially regarding China's clashes with Taiwan, the United States, and Vietnam, the MID dataset records only a fraction of them.

—China did *not* clash with the Soviet Union on the disputed border until 1967;

—China did *not* attack the United States or its allies in the Indochina crisis between May 1962 and July 1964;

—China *did* attack British troops in Hong Kong in July 1967, but not in 1964 or 1968;

—China *did* attack or clash with the U.S. air force in Indochina from 1965 to 1973;

—China did *not* clash with the Soviet Union in 1979-1980;

—China did *not* clash with India in 1986-1987.

To verify and complement the MID data on China, I conduct extensive research on and collect original data from a large amount of official and unofficial PRC publications. In a lengthy appendix (not included here for space reasons but available upon request), I provide a chronological summary of all cases of China's use of force in 1949-1992, as documented in the aforementioned Chinese sources. Moreover, I not only list the bibliographical sources for each case, but also explain in detail where and how my original data differ from the extant MID data.

Admittedly, my original data also have two limitations:

First, I am unable to specify the exact times of China's use of force against another state in a given year, because most PRC source materials do not report such information at all. For example, China had perhaps hundreds of military clashes annually with Taiwan in the 1950s, or with Vietnam in the 1980s. Nonetheless, there is simply no way of ascertaining the exact number of those clashes; therefore, I could only code them as one aggregate incident of "continuous," "frequent," or "intermittent" fighting on a yearly basis (for details, see the appendix);

Second, I am unable to ascertain whether China was the first to use force in an interstate dispute. Indeed, in most PRC source materials, it seems as if China had always been the victim of other states' provocations and had rarely initiated any violence at all—which is, needless to

say, a highly improbable proposition. The MID (v4.01) dataset, to be sure, is equally unable to specify the initiator of violence in a dispute. Thus, for this analysis, I can only adopt a summed or non-directed dyad approach (i.e., without reporting which side of the dispute initiated the violence). There is, however, a small consolation: that is, as long as the PRC chooses to settle a dispute by force, whether it does so reactively or proactively makes little difference to our theoretical contemplation of its violence proneness. Conversely, if Beijing could refrain from using force even when other states initiate the violence against it, such self-restraint would indicate its *decreasing* violence proneness.

Due to these data limitations, I have to utilize a dichotomous dependent variable—i.e., whether China uses military force against another state in a given year (0 means no use of force, 1 otherwise). Altogether, my data include 157 country-year observations wherein China resorts to force against another state.

Because my dependent variable takes binary values, I use logistic regression, which is suitable for examining whether a key causal variable has a significant impact on the probability of the outcome variable while controlling for the effects of other competing explanatory variables included in the model. Nonetheless, because China's use of force seems to be a rare event (i.e., only 157 out of 9,080 country-year observations), I also employ rare-event logistical regression recommended by Tomz, King, and Zeng (1999), for robustness checks.

Finally, because my data are binary time-series-cross-sectional in nature, it is necessary to control for time dependence in them. For this purpose, I utilize two alternative corrections: one is the widely used spline method of Beck, Katz, and Tucker (1998), and the other is the cubic polynomial method of Carter and Signorino (2010). All computations of the data are completed by using Stata version 10.

Independent Variables

The Militarized Worldview

As said earlier, a plausible measure of the militarized worldview might be how the challenger perceives the likelihood of war. From the earlier historical overview in Chapters 2-3, we already know that:

—When Beijing considered war to be inevitable (e.g., during 1949-1953 and 1960-1974), it tended to act as if war would break out anytime (i.e., with almost a 100% certainty);

—When Beijing considered war to be postponable (e.g., during 1954-1959 and 1975-1984), it regarded the likelihood of war as ranging between 20% and 40%;

—When Beijing considered war to be avoidable (e.g., from 1985 onward), it virtually regarded war as unlikely to occur for the foreseeable future.

Accordingly, I code the perceived probability of "war as inevitable" as 0.95 (for 1949-1953 and 1960-1974); of "war as postponable," as 0.4, 0.3, and 0.2, alternatively (for 1954-1959 and 1975-1984); of "war as avoidable," as 0.05 (for the post-1985 period). These perceived probabilities of war would serve as a proxy measure of the evolution of China's militarized worldview. For robustness checks, I reset the perceived probabilities of "war as inevitable" as 0.95, 0.9, 0.85, 0.8, 0.75, 0.7, 0.65, 0.6, and 0.55, alternatively; and of "war as avoidable," as 0.15, 0.1, and 0.05, alternatively.

This coding may look purely intuitive, but China's leaders have long had a peculiar way of judging a situation with intuitive probabilities (recall Mao's habit of describing a situation as "30% bad and 70% good"); and one of the enduring lessons suggested by China specialists is to "try to see China and the world the way that influential Chinese see China and the world"

(Christensen, Johnston, and Ross 2006: 380). Thus, my way of coding the militarized worldview may be worthwhile as a first cut at the data.

Relative Power

In quantitative IR scholarship, a commonly used measure of national power is the Composite Index of National Capabilities (CINC) provided by the COW National Material Capabilities (v4.0) dataset, which is an average of six indicators across three well-acknowledged dimensions of national power: military, economic, and demographic (Singer, Bremer, and Stuckey 1972). The annual CINC score stands for a state's share of world power capabilities.

However, the current CINC scores may have greatly overestimated China's relative power capabilities: indeed, according to these scores, the PRC's national material power has exceeded that of the United States since 1996, which is hardly a credible estimation. Therefore, in utilizing this dataset, I focus mainly on a subcomponent of the CINC score—i.e., China's annual military expenditures. Moreover, China specialists contend that the so-called "China threat" is "a matter not of absolute Chinese capabilities but of Chinese capabilities relative to those of others" (Nathan and Ross 1997: 236; see also Bernstein and Munro 1997: 64-65). Thus, I create a variable, *Relative Power*, by using the logged ratio of military expenditures between China and another state in a given year (the log function is necessary for reducing the high level of variance in the raw data).

For robustness checks, I use three alternative indicators of China's power expansion, including: (1) China's annual military expenditures, in absolute terms; (2) China's annual military expenditures as a percentage of its GDP; and (3) the logged annual ratio of China's CINC score to that of another state. Regrettably, due to the lack of reliable data on the pre-1960 GDPs of most states, I am unable to control for China's increasing *relative* economic power

188

(measured by the ratio of China's annual GDP to that of another state) in the models below.

Contested Territorial Claims

For this analysis, I consider only how many contested territorial claims China has had

with other states, *not* how many territorial MIDs occurred between them. This is because, by

definition, MIDs are instances wherein states threaten, display, or use force against each other.

As such, they might as well be a consequence of the militarized worldview, as far as Chinese

conflict behavior is concerned. Methodologically, as suggested by King, Keohane, and Verba

(1994: 173), we should avoid controlling for an explanatory variable that may be in part a

consequence of a key causal variable.

Presently, the most commonly used dataset on contested territorial claims, the Issue

Correlates of War project, has yet to include China. Fravel (2008), however, provides detailed

information on all contested sectors of China's territorial boundary since 1949. Utilizing Fravel's

(2008: 46-47) data, I create a dummy variable, *Contested Territory*, to indicate whether China

has any contested territorial claims against another state in a given year (0 if none, 1 otherwise).

Once China signs a boundary agreement regarding a particular territorial claim, I consider the

claim to be closed.[87]

As Fravel (2008) does not report when China's dispute with some ASEAN states over the

Spratly Islands started, I rely for this information on original data collected by myself. I also

collapse China's dispute over the sovereignty of Taiwan into two dyadic contests: (1) the PRC-

ROC contest from 1949 onward; and (2) the U.S.-China contest from June 1950—i.e., when

Washington deployed the Seventh Fleet in the Taiwan Strait to prevent a PRC takeover of

---

[87] I make one exception for the Sino-Russian dispute over the Abagaitu and Hexiazi Islands, which was settled 13 years after the two states signed a general boundary agreement concerning that sector. Due to its salience, this dispute is also treated by Fravel (2008: 47) as a separate territorial claim.

Taiwan—to the present. In fact, despite the termination of U.S.-ROC mutual defense treaty in 1979, the United States has never formally recognized the PRC's claim of sovereignty over Taiwan. Rather, as shown by the Taiwan Strait crisis of 1995-1996, Washington is clearly opposed to any unilateral efforts by Beijing to change the status quo.

Dependence on Foreign Trade

For the dyadic-level analysis, I create a variable, *Trade Dependence*, which is constructed as the ratio of China's annual trade with another state to China's GDP in the same year. For the trade information, I rely on the COW Bilateral Trade (v2.01) dataset (Barbieri, Keshk, and Pollins 2008), with only one exception: for the post-1949 trade between the PRC and Taiwan, I do not use the outdated information provided by this dataset, but draw on the more authoritative statistics released by the Taiwan Affairs Office of the PRC State Council.[88]

For China's annual GDP, I rely on three authoritative sources:

—The World Bank's World Development Indicators database, which provides China's GDP figures from 1960 onward;

—Assisted by the World Bank, a think tank affiliated with the PRC State Council produced an influential study of the Chinese economy in the 1980s, which calculated China's

---

[88] These official PRC-Taiwan trade statistics are available at: www.gwytb.gov.cn/lajmsj.htm (Accessed November 15, 2012). Compared with these official statistics, the information provided by the COW Bilateral Trade dataset has two problems. First, it codes all PRC-Taiwan trade statistics as "missing data" in 1949-1979; in reality, there was simply no trade at all between the two sides of the Taiwan Strait during those three decades, because the ROC imposed a strict trade embargo against mainland China. Second, the official PRC-Taiwan trade statistics incorporate huge volumes of indirect trade via Hong Kong after 1979; the COW Bilateral Trade dataset, however, perhaps overlooks this information, thereby underestimating the post-1979 trade volume across the Taiwan Strait considerably. This neglect of indirect trade via Hong Kong is no small matter, because, in 1979-1990, the ROC continued to forbid direct trade with mainland China, and allowed for only some indirect trade through Hong Kong (which was then under British rule and thus technically not part of mainland China). Although the Taiwan government rescinded the trade embargo against the PRC in the early 1990s, Hong Kong remains a focal point of cross-strait trade to this day.

GDP figures for the period 1952-1959 (Zhang et al. 1988: 30). To this day, this study represents the only effort of official or quasi-official PRC scholars to reconstruct China's historical GDP data in accordance with international financial reporting standards;

—The official yearbooks of the PRC, which report China's economic growth rates from 1949 to 1952 (Xu et al. 2003, Vol.1: 8; Vol.2: 6; Vol.3: 6). Drawing upon China's GDP figure in 1952 as estimated by the above Zhang et al. (1988), I then use these growth rates to calculate China's GDP for the period 1949-1951.

The first two sources share the additional advantage of calculating China's GDP in US$ terms (current price), a method that is consistent with the COW Bilateral Trade (v2.01) dataset and thus helps to maintain data comparability.

Given the high level of variance in the raw values of this variable, I take the natural log of it before running the models, in order to avoid biasing or confusing the results.

Participation in International Institutions

For the dyadic-level analysis, I follow a common rule in quantitative IR scholarship and create a variable, *Joint IGO Membership*, which refers to the shared membership of China and another state in intergovernmental organizations (IGOs). For this measure, I rely on the COW Intergovernmental Organizations (v2.3) dataset (Pevehouse, Nordstrom, and Warnke 2004).

Diplomatic Recognition

Given Maoist China's longtime exclusion from the international community, the PRC had suffered "perhaps the most severe status inconsistency of any major power in the postwar period" (Midlarsky 1975: 108-09). The primal evidence of such status inconsistency, as mentioned earlier, was the lack of diplomatic recognition for the PRC in a long period of time after 1949. Thus, I create a dummy variable, *Diplomatic Recognition*, to indicate whether Beijing

had formal—as a rule, ambassadorial—diplomatic relations with another state in a given year (0 if none, 1 otherwise). This information is drawn from the COW Diplomatic Exchanges (v2006.1) dataset (Bayer 2006). Since this dataset does not report the annual level of diplomatic representation between 1950 and 1965, I also rely on original data collected by myself.

<center>*Control Variables*</center>

Domestic Unrest

The disturbances at home, as the Chinese like to say, often lead to security threats from abroad (*nei you bi you wai huan*). Could Beijing's threat perceptions derive partially from the fear that China's internal restiveness might be exploited by its adversaries to their advantage? Prior research suggests that this might be the case. In his classical study of Chinese deterrence strategy, Whiting (1975: 28-41) observed that fears of domestic vulnerability could easily lead Beijing to view the international situation darkly, thereby setting the stage for a more forceful Chinese stance against real or perceived enemies abroad. The contemporary scholarship has further corroborated Whiting's observations (see, for example, Garver 2006).

Domestic unrest, then, might well be another confounding variable vis-à-vis the militarized worldview, and therefore should be controlled for in the multivariate model too. Moreover, if it can be established empirically that domestic unrest has an effect in inducing China's use of force, that would raise a large question about Beijing's habitual claim that, as a large country, the PRC is simply too preoccupied with its mounting internal problems to risk external military adventures.

Thus, I create a control variable, *Domestic Unrest*, to indicate the extent of the turbulence of China's domestic environment. This variable is the same as the CIVTOT variable in the Major Episodes of Political Violence (1946-2004) dataset hosted by Monty G. Marshall at the Center

for Systemic Peace. The annual CIVTOT score for China is the total summed magnitudes of all episodes of civil violence, civil warfare, ethnic violence, and ethnic warfare that involve China in a given year.

Contiguity

As mentioned earlier, China's capacity to project power overseas had long remained rather limited. To control for the possibility that China's violence proneness is more likely directed against its neighbors, I create a dummy variable, *Contiguity*, indicating whether China is geographically contiguous with another state either by land or within 150 miles by sea (0 if noncontiguous, 1 otherwise). This information is drawn from the COW Direct Contiguity (v3.1) dataset (Stinnett et al. 2002). Since France remained in control of Vietnam until 1954, and Britain of Hong Kong until 1997, and Portugal of Macao until 1999, I code these three states as contiguous with China until the said years.

<div align="center">Descriptive Statistics, Collinearity Concerns and Achen's Rule of Three</div>

Before running the models, it is worthwhile to examine my original data briefly to see if the patterns of China's use of force are consistent with the findings from the previous chapter. Table 5.1 reports the frequency of the country-year observations of the PRC's resort to force across different time periods.

As expected, in 1949-1953, China's propensity to use force was at a peak. In those four years, there were a total of 72 country-year observations of China's resort to force, or an average of 18 observations per year. In large part, this is a reflection of the PRC's involvement in the Korean War against the U.S.-led United Nations forces. Still, that the newborn and indigent PRC had the grit to enter into a protracted war with 17 states simultaneously spoke volumes about

Beijing's determination to challenge the international system and its main actors.[89] Furthermore, before and during the Korean War, China was also engaged in other militarized disputes with Burma, Britain, France, the Netherlands, Portugal, Taiwan, and Thailand, in which Chinese actions included occupation of territory, seizure, attacks, and clashes (for details, see the appendix).

In 1954-1959, the PRC's violence proneness subsided noticeably, as Beijing sought to rejoin the international society. Over those six years, there were 18 country-year observations of China's resort to force, or an average of 3 observations per year. These observations were associated predominantly with the ongoing struggle in the Taiwan Strait, between the PRC on the one side and the United States and Taiwan on the other. Occasionally, Beijing also engaged in clashes with Burma, Britain, India, Japan, and South Korea.

As the PRC resumed a challenger's posture in 1960-1974, its predilection for violence was again on the rise. During that one and a half decade, there were 36 country-year observations of China's use of force, or an average of 2.4 observations per year. During this period, the PRC not only fought a war with India, but attacked or clashed with the United States and Taiwan with a greater frequency. Moreover, it was the first time since 1949 that China was perilously closer to fighting a two-front war with both the United States and the Soviet Union.

Afterward, China's violence proneness was on the wane once more: in 1975-1984, there were 14 country-year observations of China's resort to force, or an average of 1.4 observations per year. But the sharpest decline in Beijing's propensity to use force occurred in the Lockean era

---

[89] In fact, following China's entry into the Korean War and its rejection of a negotiated settlement, the UN General Assembly had passed a resolution condemning the PRC for acts of aggression in Korea. It was the first time since the United Nations formed in 1945 that it had condemned a nation as an aggressor.

of 1985-2010. In this long period, there were 17 country-year observations of China's resort to force, or an average of 0.7 observation per year.

Overall, these findings are in accord with my central hypothesis that the evolution of the militarized worldview had an impact on China's use of force across various time periods. Nonetheless, the findings could also lend support to a rival hypothesis—i.e., both the militarized worldview and China's violence proneness may be a function of the PRC's political maturity. In other words, as time goes on, the PRC will perhaps grow politically more mature and responsible anyway, and therefore becomes less likely to act violently toward others. This rival hypothesis will be tested in the following data analysis.

Meanwhile, my data show that between 1949 and 2010, Beijing used force most frequently against the following states: Taiwan (30 or 19.1% of the 157 country-year observations), the United States (12.1%), Vietnam (9.6%), the Soviet Union/Russia (5.7%), Britain (3.8%), India (3.8%), and South Korea (3.8%). This finding suggests another rival hypothesis, namely, both the militarized worldview and China's violence propensity may be a function of the PRC's turbulent relations with certain countries that Beijing used to regard as enemies or dangerous rivals. This rival hypothesis will also be tested later.

Theoretically, when several explanatory factors may stand as confounding variables to the main causal variable, it is important to examine the extent of collinearity hidden in the multivariate model. For this purpose, I use the *collin* program developed by the UCLA Academic Technology Services to calculate the tolerance and variance inflation factor (VIF) for each explanatory variable.[90] Usually, a tolerance score of .20 or less (correspondingly, a VIF of 5 or

---

[90] The *collin* program is available online at: http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/stata/ado/default.htm (Accessed November 20, 2011).

above) indicates a collinearity problem. The results show that the tolerance scores for all explanatory and control variables fall safely below the threshold of collinearity.

Still, there remains one more methodological concern to be addressed. In an influential article, Achen (2002: 446) propounds forcefully the Rule of Three, on the grounds that "a statistical specification with more than three explanatory variables is meaningless." Similarly, Ray (2003, 2005) warns against the overuse of control variables in quantitative IR scholarship. Will my introduction of a total of eight explanatory variables violate Achen's Rule of Three, thereby producing drastically biased results? To find out if this is the case, I conduct a preliminary test: i.e., I introduce the explanatory variables into the multivariate model step by step, from adding one at a time to adding all eight at a time. Interestingly, the results of these step-by-step tests demonstrate remarkable consistency, with little or no impact on the statistical significance of each explanatory variable. Thus, in the following section of data analysis, I choose to present the full multivariate model that includes all eight explanatory variables.

Interpretation of Results

To begin with, Table 5.2 reports the results of the full models predicting when China might use force against another state between 1949 and 2010.[91] For the militarized worldview variable, I set the perceived probabilities of "war as postponable" as 0.4, 0.3, and 0.2, respectively, in Model 1, Model 2, and Model 3.

As hypothesized, the militarized worldview exhibits an aggravating and statistically significant impact on China's propensity to use force. Further, regardless of how this main causal

---

[91] The results reported here are conventional logit estimates with the use of splines recommended by Beck, Katz, and Tucker (1998). Using Carter and Signorino's (2010) cubic polynomials to control for time dependence in the data produces highly identical results. Using rare-event logistic regression decreases slightly the statistical significance of the two control variables, but does not affect the significance level of the main independent variables.

variable is coded in robustness checks, the impact proves robust and enduring.[92] Meanwhile, contested territorial claims and geographical contiguity also significantly contribute to China's proclivity for violence; and their relative impacts show little variation in many robustness checks wherein I attempt to code the militarized worldview variable in different ways.

Nonetheless, in stark contrast to the realist hypothesis, the expansion of China's military power relative to another state demonstrates an *inhibiting* and highly significant impact on Beijing's resort to force against that state. This surprising discovery, moreover, remains stable and robust regardless of whether China's military power is measured in absolute terms or as a percentage of its GDP in a given year. Using the logged annual ratio of China's CINC score to that of another state as another indicator of China's relative power produces similar results too. In other words, a militarily powerful China appears more likely to act with restraint toward states of smaller stature, instead of flexing its muscles at will.

Of the three "integration" variables, only trade dependence exhibits a strong and statistically robust effect in constraining China's propensity to use force, both in the main models and in most robustness checks in which I attempt to code the militarized worldview and/or China's relative power alternatively. In the main models, diplomatic recognition shows no statistical significance. However, it demonstrates a highly robust effect ($p<.01$) in reducing China's violence proneness when I measure China's relative power expansion differently in robustness checks, probably because those models of robustness checks possess a larger number of observations (N=7,308) than the main models presented here (N=6.637).

Joint IGO memberships, on the other hand, acquire a weak significance ($p<.1$) in one of

---

[92] I run a series of robustness checks with the alternative coding of the militarized worldview variable. In most cases, the militarized worldview continues to display a highly significant ($p<.001$) effect. This indicates that within a reasonable range of coding, the militarized worldview variable has an indisputable effect in stimulating China's use of force.

the main models, but appear insignificant in the other two models as well as most robustness checks. This variable shows a weakly significant effect ($p<.1$) in restraining China's use of force, too, when I use the logged annual ratio of China's CINC score to that of another state as a measure of the PRC's relative power.

Finally, domestic unrest is found to significantly inhibit China's use of force abroad. Again, the relative impact of this explanatory factor appears statistically robust and sustainable in most of my robustness checks. Empirically, this finding is consistent with Johnston's (1998a: 18-19) discovery that an increase in China's domestic disturbances was associated with a lower level of its externally directed violence. In other words, when Beijing faces a turbulent domestic environment, it appears too "preoccupied" to provoke crises abroad. This finding also corroborates Fravel's (2008) contention that Beijing is more likely to pursue compromises in territorial disputes when there exist internal threats to its regime security.

Conceivably, China's use of force could also be a multiplicative process wherein extensive interactions may occur among various explanatory variables, therefore making the causal effects of some variables potentially contingent on the presence (or absence) of others. To investigate whether some interaction effects exist among various explanatory variables, I create a series of interaction terms, which are generated by multiplying the values of any two independent variables. However, after adding the interaction terms, one at a time, into the models, I find that none of them are statistically significant, indicating that all independent variables have worked independently and no multiplicative process is at work.

To illustrate the substantive impact of various explanatory factors, Table 5.3 reports the effects on the probability of China's use of force of each explanatory variable that is statistically significant at the .05 level or better in the main models, when all other variables are held at their

198

mean values. This provides a more readily interpretable measure of each variable's effects than the coefficients and standard errors provided in Table 5.2.

The variable with the greatest aggravating influence on China's use of force, as measured by the change in probability while holding all other variables at their means, is the militarized worldview. In its presence, the probability of Beijing's resort to force increases by five times, from .0005 to .0026. The next strongest stimulant of China's violence propensity is geographical contiguity, which increases the probability of China's use of force by 2.75 times. The existence of contested territory between the PRC and another country also leads to an increase of 2.56 times in the probability of Beijing's resort to force.

On the other hand, the variable with the greatest dampening impact on China's violence propensity is the disparity in relative power. At the zenith of its relative capabilities vis-à-vis another state, Beijing is at least 170 times less likely to use force against that state. The second strongest inhibiting variable is trade. When China's trade dependence on another state peaks, it is 70% less likely to use force against that state. Domestic unrest also has a notable effect in reducing the PRC's violence propensity. At the height of China's internal restiveness, the probability of Beijing's resort to force decreases by two thirds.

Having tested the relative impacts of the main explanatory factors, I then consider the two aforementioned rival hypotheses, i.e., whether the mellowing Chinese worldview might be a function of the PRC's political maturity, or its improving relationship with certain "enemy states" (Taiwan, the United States, Vietnam, etc.). To test the first proposition, I create a control variable, *Regime Age*, which is a commonly used proxy of a regime's political maturity. Coding the year 1949 as 1 in the PRC's regime age, I hypothesize that as the PRC "matures" with the passage of time, it becomes less likely to be swayed by memories of historical humiliations into acting

aggressively toward others. This control variable, however, proves wholly insignificant, which is consistent with my earlier argument that Beijing either harbors such memories constantly, or is not really susceptible to them in conducting diplomacy (see Introduction).

To test the second proposition, I introduce another control variable, *Enduring Rivalry*, and find that it is significantly and positively associated with China's resort to force.[93] Nonetheless, the addition of this control does not eclipse the significance of the militarized worldview, indicating that the militarized worldview is unlikely a function of the PRC's historical animosity toward a handful of "enemy states."

Complementing Statistical Evidence with Historical Examples

In sum, of the main explanatory factors that purportedly impact China's violence propensity, most have worked in the expected direction in the data analysis. Conspicuously, the PRC's use of force is driven foremost by the evolution of its militarized worldview, and, to a lesser degree, by such contentious issues as territorial disputes. Meanwhile, the development of trade relations and the attainment or maintenance of diplomatic recognition both help to soften China's propensity to settle disputes by force. In this section, I draw on the diplomatic and military history of the PRC to provide some illustrative examples for the above statistical findings. I will contemplate the seemingly anomalous finding—that China's increasing relative power actually decreases its violence proneness—in the next section.

To begin with, that territorial disputes matter less than the militarized worldview in inducing China's resort to force is not surprising, from the standpoint of the PRC's relations with

---

[93] Based on the rivalry dataset of Klein, Goertz, and Diehl (2006), this variable is a dummy variable indicating whether China has an enduring rivalry with another state in a given year (0 if none, 1 otherwise). These enduring rivalries include: China-the United States (1949-2001); China-Russia (1862-1994); China-Taiwan (1949-2001); China-South Korea (1950-1994); China-Japan (1873-1958, 1978-1999); China-India (1950-1987); China-Vietnam (1975-1998); China-the Philippines (1950-2001). I thank Paul Diehl for sharing the data with me.

its two biggest neighbors, India and the Soviet Union. In fact, despite the enormous tracts of

territory in dispute between China and those two countries, Beijing had long stressed the primacy

of negotiation and compromise in resolving territorial disputes with them—until the resurgence

of the militarized worldview in the 1960s. Below, I provide a brief overview of the evolution of

the Chinese approach to the Sino-Indian and Sino-Soviet territorial disputes, respectively. I wind

up with a discussion of how trade relations and diplomatic recognition may help to constrain

China's violence proneness *in spite of* the dominance of the militarized worldview.

The Sino-Indian Dispute, 1954-1962

Official PRC sources suggest that China's leaders had long prepared to settle the

boundary dispute with India in an equable and equitable manner. As early as January 1954, Zhou

Enlai is said to have decided to put the dispute in abeyance, in order to promote the Sino-Indian

friendship (Yang 1999: 215-216). Ye Zhengjia, then a young PRC diplomat stationed in New

Delhi, recalls that a constant theme of Beijing's internal instructions between 1954 and 1962 was

that there was no fundamental conflict of interest between China and India, and that it was

important to place the overall development of Sino-Indian relations above the territorial dispute

(Ye 2006: 292-293).

The year 1959, however, marked a turning point in Sino-Indian relations. In March 1959,

after the PLA suppressed a popular uprising in the Tibetan capital of Lhasa, the Dalai Lama fled

to India, where there existed strong and widespread sympathy with the Tibetans. After New

Delhi decided to provide shelter for the Dalai Lama and his entourage, China's leaders accused

India for the first time of harboring predatory designs upon Tibet (Garver 2006: 93-96). To make

matters worse, from July to October 1959, a series of armed clashes occurred in various disputed

sectors of the Sino-Indian border, which led to the first incident of bloodshed since 1950. In

retrospect, these clashes seemed isolated incidents between local Chinese and Indian patrols. Wu Lengxi, then a close aide to the CCP Politburo, recalled that it took the PLA's command in Tibet a long time to investigate and report the incidents to the central leadership in Beijing (Wu Lengxi 1999: 210). When the Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev visited China in September 1959, the PRC leaders repeatedly emphasized to him that the incident occurred without the knowledge or authorization of Beijing (Jin et al. 2003: 1015-1016; see also Wu Lengxi 1999: 214).

Revealingly, despite the spiraling tension in Sino-Indian relations, Beijing's overall approach to New Delhi remained cautious and restrained, in the hope of preserving an amicable relationship with India. On April 25, 1959, Mao instructed the PRC's official media to propagate his view that "British imperialists and Indian expansionists had formed a shady collusion and openly interfered with China's internal affairs, for the despicable purpose of detaching Tibet from China." However, in his instructions, the Chairman also cautioned: "Do not vilify Nehru personally, and please do remember to leave enough room to maneuver out [of the dispute with India]" (Mao 1993, Vol.8: 221; see also Wu Lengxi 1999: 197-198). Following Mao's instructions, Wu Lengxi and his colleagues produced an editorial, entitled "The Revolution in Tibet and Nehru's Philosophy," for the *People's Daily* on May 6, 1959. While critical of Nehru's position on the Tibetan issue, the editorial nevertheless described the Indian prime minister as a "friend of China and opponent of imperialistic and aggressive policies" (Wu Lengxi 1999: 199-200).

On May 11, 1959, Mao convened a Politburo meeting and confirmed the importance of conciliating Nehru: "After criticizing him, we should still take note of Nehru's …good aspects and the good deeds he has done. Therefore, we should provide him with an opportunity of stepping back [from the conflict], and avoid leaving no room for maneuver" (Wu Lengxi 1999:

201-202). Two days later, Mao personally edited a diplomatic note to India, with the following additions: "India is a friendly country toward China and has been so for over 1,000 years. We believe it will still be like this for the next 1,000 or 10,000 years. …India is not our enemy, but our friend. China will not be so stupid as to make an enemy of the U.S. in the east and an enemy of India in the west" (Mao 1998a: 291).

In particular, the Chinese leadership continued to believe that negotiation, not force, was the principal instrument for the settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary problem. Shortly after the border clashes in September 1959, the CCP Politburo decided on a policy of resolving the border dispute through negotiations and of avoiding further conflict before negotiations started (Wu Lengxi 1999: 212). From then on, to cool down the situation, Mao instructed the official PRC media to stop reporting on the Sino-Indian border issue (Ibid., 215).

General Lei Yingfu, then working in the PLA's General Staff, testified in his memoirs to Beijing's forbearance toward India at this time. By November 1959, the PLA's frontline commanders had pleaded repeatedly with Beijing for a powerful and resolute response to India's "blatant aggression." Mao, however, stood firmly against any further militarization of the conflict. Instead, he proposed that both countries withdraw their forces 20 kilometers from their respective line of actual control. If New Delhi was unwilling to do so, then Beijing would withdraw unilaterally, to demonstrate its commitment to peace and good-neighborly relations (Lei and Chen 1997: 202-203). At a Politburo meeting on November 3, Mao made clear that China had "only one big consideration, which is the maintenance of peace." In his view, "the problems in Sino-Indian relations are very easy to resolve, because the [disputed] territory is not of life-and-death significance to us" (Jin et al. 2003: 1024).

In January 1960, the CCP Politburo further decided to strive for an early and negotiated settlement of all China's territorial disputes. In particular, it assigned top priority to peaceful resolution of the Sino-Indian boundary problem through mutual and reciprocal compromise (Wu Lengxi 1999: 248). Subsequently, Beijing ordered the PLA to observe a stricter policy of avoiding conflict: within 20 kilometers from the line of actual control, Chinese forces were forbidden to fire gunshots, conduct patrolling or military exercises, pursue Tibetan rebels, go on hunting trips, and even undertake target practices or construction projects that involved the use of explosives (Lei and Chen 1997: 203). In April 1960, Zhou Enlai visited India, seeking to reach a compromise agreement with Nehru. While failing in its immediate purpose, the visit nevertheless helped to ease the tension in Sino-Indian relations and commit both sides to pursue a settlement through further negotiations (Jin et al. 2008, Vol.3: 2013-2027).

What, then, made Beijing change its peaceful approach toward New Delhi afterward? Previously, eminent China specialists tended to stress that the PRC faced a menacing domestic and international environment in 1960-1962; as a result, Beijing considered the Indian encroachment on the border to be an inexcusable and perfidious attempt to take advantage of China's momentary vulnerability, and therefore determined to stop New Delhi's provocations by force (for this view, see Whiting 1975: 11-106; Gurtov and Hwang 1980: 99-152; Fravel 2008: 174-188).

Contemporary PRC historians, however, have begun to raise questions about the ideational source of the Chinese leadership's threat perceptions. In their view, China's overall security environment was not really so precarious in 1962 (Niu 2003: 588-589); nor did Beijing really come to regard the disputed territory as anything but tangential to China's core interests at

the time (Guo 2006: 387).[94] Against this background, the underlying factor in the PRC's change

of attitude on the border dispute seemed to be more ideational than material, stemming from

Beijing's growing convictions about the obsolescence of peaceful coexistence, about the "true

colors" of India and other non-aligned states, and about the inevitability of war (Dai 2003b: 548-

553). In other words, the resurgent militarized worldview in the early 1960s had led to

exaggerated threat perceptions and stiffened Beijing's will to force.

Indeed, available evidence suggests that Beijing exhibited a noticeable propensity toward

conflict in the last five months before the war (which broke out on October 20, 1962). On May

22, 1962, Zhou Enlai had already instructed the PLA to be combat-ready before the end of June.

Once China resorted to war, said Zhou, "we should aim for a total victory and recover all

territory previously trespassed by Indian troops" (Liu et al. 2000, Vol.2: 564). Moreover, a

hitherto little noted diplomatic episode, as recounted below, shows that Beijing actually rebuffed

New Delhi's attempt to seek a negotiated settlement at the eleventh hour.

In late July 1962, P. K. Banerjee, the Indian charge d'affaires in Beijing, conveyed a top-

secret message from the Indian government to the PRC leadership, which stated that Nehru was

prepared to send a high-level delegation to Beijing to "discuss, without preconditions, all

bilateral problems and disputes." Given Nehru's insistence up till then that no negotiation would

take place before the Chinese withdrew from the territory claimed by India, this proposal

doubtless represented a major Indian concession. Nevertheless, when meeting with Banerjee,

neither PRC foreign minister Chen Yi nor the usually courteous Zhou Enlai displayed any

---

[94] Guo Shi's (2006) influential article is the first in the PRC scholarship to raise a provocative
question—i.e., since China withdrew after the war of 1962 from *all* territories that had been
occupied by India before the war, why did Beijing not persist in seeking a negotiated settlement
in the first place, instead of launching a war that apparently served no practical purpose? As I
argue below, the hardening of the militarized worldview actually prevented Beijing from
pursuing a compromise settlement in the last few months before the outbreak of war.

interest in the proposal. Instead, both Chinese leaders accused New Delhi of harboring duplicitous and malevolent designs. On August 22, the Indian government again suggested secretly to Beijing that the two sides hold discussions in order to define the measures for defusing the increasing tension on the border—a proposal rejected once more by Beijing (Banerjee 1990: 51-55). The last chance for avoiding war, therefore, was squandered.

The Sino-Soviet Dispute, 1949-1964

In comparison with the Sino-Indian dispute, the territorial dispute between China and the Soviet Union had an even more complicated history. Contemporary PRC scholarship has confirmed that from 1949 to 1959, "the Chinese Communist Party and China's leaders had never opined that there were any territorial disputes between China and the Soviet Union, nor had they ever questioned the legality and appropriateness of the Sino-Soviet border" (Shen and Li 2006: 349). As a matter of fact, a great many border incidents that occurred during that period seemed to be caused by Chinese border residents' habitual and careless intrusions into Soviet territory—incidents that were usually resolved amicably (Ibid., 357-361). Thus, for a long time, the PRC maintained but a minimum of border security personnel and infrastructure along the Sino-Soviet border (Ibid., 354-355, 360-361).

In July 1958, the PRC State Council set up a Boundary Committee, with an eye to settling China's boundary problems in a gradual, step-by-step manner. With respect to the Sino-Soviet border, the committee decided that most of the border was already settled by the treaties between the late Imperial China and Tsarist Russia, and that there existed only some disputed sectors pending further demarcation (Shen and Li 2006: 362). This attitude did not change even after the Sino-Soviet relations began to turn sour after 1959. In August 1960, the first serious border incident occurred in the Boziaigeer Pass, Xinjiang (China), with confrontations between

Soviet border guards and Chinese herders over disputed grazing areas (Sun 2008: 12). In response, Beijing promptly suggested to Moscow that the two sides hold negotiations over the boundary problem; pending a settlement, both sides should maintain the status quo and avoid clashes on the border (Shen et al. 2007: 356).

Nonetheless, with the resurgence of the militarized worldview in the early 1960s, the Chinese leadership's attitude toward the Soviet Union began to harden noticeably (for more details, see Chapter 6). As a result, Beijing's approach toward the boundary problem grew less conciliatory and more confrontational, as manifested by the astronomical increase in the number of border incidents in 1962-1963 (Shen et al. 2007: 356). From February to August 1964, the PRC and the Soviet Union held eight rounds of boundary talks. Yet, in the meantime, Mao had already instructed the PLA to prepare for a two-front war with the United States and the Soviet Union (see Chapter 2).

To be sure, Beijing's bottom line at the boundary talks was not unreasonable, which included the following formulations:

—The PRC agreed to demarcate the border according to historical treaties, even though those treaties were signed by the late Imperial China under duress;

—The PRC would not demand the return of the territories ceded to Tsarist Russia under the aforementioned "unequal" treaties;

—In order to resolve the discrepancies created by the implementation of those treaties, Beijing also agreed to respect the status quo and make reasonable adjustments to the border (Wang Taiping et al. 1998: 254; see also Shen et al. 2007: 357).

The problem, however, was that the Chinese leadership demanded that the boundary talks must first confirm the "unequal" (and implicitly illegal) nature of the concerned historical

treaties, before any substantive issues could be discussed. Ideologically, such a position would enable Beijing to take the moral high ground against Moscow and thereby facilitate the CCP's ongoing struggles against the CPSU. Small wonder, then, that Moscow refused adamantly to accede to this Chinese demand, which, if met, could (from the Soviet perspective) provide Beijing with a convenient pretext for revising the territorial status quo at will. In April 1964, the Chinese delegation to the boundary talks temporarily withdrew the highly controversial demand, and began to discuss the substantive issues of boundary demarcation in a more pragmatic spirit. Eager to make progress, the Soviets showed similar pragmatism, and agreed to accommodate most of China's territorial claims on the eastern sector of the border. By late June 1964, the two sides had reached a draft agreement to that effect (for details of the boundary talks, see Shen et al. 2007: 358-362).

At this juncture, possibly dizzy with success, Mao went on the offensive against Moscow again. Receiving a Japanese communist delegation on July 10, 1964, the Great Helmsman made the inflammatory claim that Tsarist Russia had occupied too much of Chinese territory in the past, and that "we have yet to settle this account with them" (cited in Shen et al. 2007: 344). A few months later, Mao explained to some foreign visitors that his statement was merely intended to "unnerve Khrushchev, …for the purpose of attaining reasonable conditions for the boundary and the boundary treaty" (Ibid., 363-364).

Accordingly, in subsequent rounds of boundary talks, the Chinese delegation resumed a confrontational posture, pressing the Soviets to recognize the historical treaties as "unequal" treaties. Suspecting the PRC of harboring unlimited designs on Soviet territory, Moscow not only refused to budge an inch on the issue, but shelved the previously worked out draft agreement. In retrospect, even PRC historians cannot help but deplore Mao's uncompromising

posture, which had effectively scuttled any possibility of reaching a reasonable agreement with the Soviet Union (Shen et al. 2007: 362-364).

From then onward, official Chinese attitudes toward the Soviet Union became increasingly frigid and inimical. Instead of engaging Moscow in meaningful dialogues to find a mutually acceptable settlement of their disagreements, Beijing seemed to welcome every opportunity to increase tensions and to needle the Soviets—a confrontational posture derived from the militarized worldview against real or perceived enemies. After August 1964, China and the Soviet Union did not resume boundary talks, until the late 1970s. Moreover, in late 1964, the PLA's Xinjiang Military Region had drawn up contingency plans for a possible Sino-Soviet war (Shen et al. 2007: 346). Afterward, Sino-Soviet relations deteriorated inexorably, until the border conflicts in 1969 brought the two countries to the brink of war (for details, see Chapter 6).

The Role of Trade and Diplomatic Recognition

So far, I have explored how the militarized worldview led the PRC to adopt a confrontational strategy in coping with the Sino-Indian and Sino-Soviet territorial disputes that were otherwise soluble by negotiation and compromise. Why, then, was Beijing initially willing to put those disputes in abeyance and seek a peaceful settlement? One obvious explanation, as I have propounded in Chapter 2, is the temporary amelioration of the militarized worldview in 1954-1959 and its pacifying impact on China's violence proneness. In addition, we should take into account the simple but important fact that both the Soviet Union and India extended diplomatic recognition to the PRC in its earliest days, when Beijing's relations with the West remained cold. As a result, Beijing had long regarded both countries as old friends and placed a premium on developing constructive relations with them.

Indeed, in his entire life, Mao had set foot on the territory of only two foreign states—by visiting the Soviet Union in 1949 and 1957, and visiting the Indian Embassy in 1952. While doing its best to cement the Sino-Soviet alliance in the 1950s, the Chinese leadership also maintained a keen interest in befriending India, which was the first non-Western major state to recognize the PRC. From 1954 to 1958, for example, Beijing and New Delhi consolidated their relationship not only through frequent high-level visits and growing economic and cultural exchanges, but also through close and high-profile collaboration in international affairs, especially at the Bandung Conference in 1955 (Pei et al. 1994: 100-104; Wang 1998: 100-112).

Viewed in this light, the extent of the PRC's political and economic linkages with another state might serve as an important harbinger of official Chinese policy toward the said state. The tortuous development of Sino-Soviet trade relations from the early 1960s to the late 1970s was a case in point. Before the political rupture between Beijing and Moscow in the mid-1960s, the steep decline in the Sino-Soviet trade volume had already signaled that darker days loomed ahead for the relations between the two communist giants. In 1959, at the height of Sino-Soviet friendship, the annual trade volume between the two countries amounted to 1,800 million rubles, equivalent of 2 billion U.S. dollars (Wang et al. 1999: 211). Foreseeing the inevitability of the Sino-Soviet rupture, however, Mao ordered, on April 12, 1964, a substantial reduction of trade with the Soviet Union in the years to come (Wu Lengxi 1999: 747). Afterward, Sino-Soviet trade contracted drastically, decreasing to 390 million rubles in 1965, 290 million rubles in 1966, 100 million rubles in 1967, 88 million rubles in 1968, and the record low point of 52 million rubles in 1969 (Wang Taiping et al. 1998: 279).

Conversely, despite the persistence of the militarized worldview in the 1970s, an improving trade relationship with Moscow had indicated Beijing's willingness to preserve a

semblance of normal state-to-state relations, or at least to keep the frictions within controllable bounds. Shortly after the 1969 border conflict, Beijing endeavored to revitalize trade relations with Moscow, as a way of maintaining normal state-to-state relations. In late 1969, the PRC resumed annual trade negotiations with the Soviet Union, and the bilateral trade volume for 1970 rose to 130 million rubles. Encouraged by this development, Moscow proposed, in February 1971, to expand the trade further; Beijing responded positively, which led to a 52% increase in the trade volume for that year. In 1972, Sino-Soviet trade increased to 260 million rubles, and remained at that level for several years thereafter (Wang et al. 1999: 211-212). When meeting with a Czechoslovakian delegation in 1974, PRC deputy premier Li Xiannian summarized China's attitudinal changes: "Some quarrels are inevitable between us, but it is better to let history judge the merits of our respective opinions. Exchanges, including trade and scientific-technological cooperation, are to our mutual benefit. It is unnecessary to freeze our state-to-state relations simply because we hold different opinions" (Ibid., 225).

Correspondingly, between 1970 and 1986, incidents of bloodshed on the Sino-Soviet border became few and sparse, despite the protracted dispute between the two sides. In 1971-1978, Beijing and Moscow managed to achieve a *modus vivendi* on the border in. Both sides, for example, agreed to undertake the vital obligation of renouncing the use of force—including the use of conventional arms, missiles, or nuclear weapons—against each other, as well as refraining from intruding into one another's airspace. In certain disputed sectors, the Soviet side agreed to grant PRC border residents the right to conduct cropping and herding activities, which had been forbidden since the deterioration of Sino-Soviet relations in the mid-1960s (Wang et al. 1999: 205-206, 210). In addition, the Chinese and Soviet border guards maintained a tacit understanding throughout the 1970s: i.e., neither side would go on hunting near the border,

because the use of firearms for hunting might be misconstrued by the other side as signs of aggressiveness (Sun 2008: 165).

Likewise, before the realization of Sino-Indian rapprochement in the 1980s, promoting bilateral economic exchanges had become a top priority of Chinese policy toward India (see Chapter 3). In the contemporary context, it is also observed that China tends to act more peacefully and cooperatively toward its regional partners, as more trade flows between them (Chambers 2006).

Furthermore, in managing territorial disputes, Beijing seemed to take its "traditional friendship" with another country very seriously, if and when the said state was one of the earliest to establish diplomatic relations with the PRC. The Sino-Pakistani territorial dispute, for instance, was resolved peacefully in 1963, despite China's misgivings about Pakistan's participation in U.S.-led military alliances, *and* despite the then reigning militarized worldview in Beijing. Available evidence suggests two considerations that restrained Beijing's confrontational proclivities on this issue: (1) Pakistan recognized the PRC as early as May 1951; (2) Islamabad had repeatedly assured Beijing that Pakistan harbored no ill-feeling toward China.

In December 1953, the PRC had sent a memorandum to the Pakistani government, expressing grave concern with the ongoing military alliance negotiations between Pakistan and the United States. This issue, the memorandum warned, might affect stability in Asia as well as China's security. On February 13, 1954, Pakistan replied to Beijing that it needed assistance from all countries, including the United States, to preserve its independence and sovereignty; but Pakistan had absolutely no hostile intent toward China (Pei 1989: 112). Initially, the PRC leadership was not quite satisfied with Pakistan's assurance. During the Bandung Conference in 1955, Zhou Enlai raised the issue again with Muhammad Ali, the prime minister of Pakistan. In

response, Ali reaffirmed that Pakistan wanted in earnest to develop friendly relations with China and would never participate in any aggressive wars waged by the United States. Through this frank and constructive exchange, Beijing was finally convinced of the possibility of friendship and peaceful coexistence with Pakistan (Ibid, 112-113; see also Zhou 1990: 127-128; Li et al. 1997, Vol.1: 481-482).

In October 1956, Pakistani premier H. S. Suhrawardi paid a visit to the PRC and held four long meetings with Zhou Enlai. Suhrawardi reiterated that Pakistan did not fear China, had no aggressive ambitions of its own, and was willing to establish more interactions with China. Zhou replied that the PRC did not fear Pakistan either; despite Islamabad's participation in U.S.-led military blocs, Beijing would maintain a friendly approach toward Pakistan, because "we trust your goodwill." The Chinese premier also encouraged Pakistan to befriend the socialist and capitalist camps simultaneously, so that Islamabad might help to persuade both sides to ease the tension and coexist peacefully. Moved by Zhou's sincerity, Suhrawardi pledged that Pakistan would do its best to persuade the United States to engage the PRC for the relaxation of international tensions (Pei 1989: 113-114).

Thereafter, as a gesture of goodwill, the PRC voluntarily relinquished part of its claim to the disputed territory on the Sino-Pakistani border (Geng 1991: 61). Meanwhile, despite the pro-Western orientation of Pakistani foreign policy, Islamabad began to consider enlisting China's support for its struggle against India (Cai 2003: 468-470). In March 1961, the Pakistani government formally proposed holding boundary talks with the PRC. Seizing the opportunity, Beijing requested Islamabad to clarify its position on a number of sensitive issues, including Taiwan, Tibet, the possibility of an Indian-Pakistani mutual defense program, and the admission of the PRC to the UN. It also asked for the formalization of Pakistan's prior assurances about

non-participation in any aggressive wars against China. From December 1961 to March 1962, the Pakistani government complied with the Chinese request on all counts (Wang Taiping 1998: 85-86). Reciprocally, in February 1962, the PRC government agreed to hold boundary talks with Pakistan; and it took Beijing and Islamabad barely five months to conclude the negotiations and settle the entire border, to their mutual satisfaction (Pei 1989: 118; see also Cai 2003: 476).

Similarly, Beijing had long adopted a patient and friendly attitude in managing certain deep-seated frictions with Burma, which extended diplomatic recognition to the PRC as early as June 1950 and thereby qualified as another "old friend." As mentioned earlier, the Sino-Burmese boundary problem was even more complicated than the Sino-Indian dispute in some aspects (see Chapter 2). Moreover, since the defeat of Chiang Kai-shek's army on the Chinese mainland, a band of ROC irregulars (totaling about 5,000-10,000 men) had taken refuge in the border areas of Burma, from which they launched ceaseless harassment operations against the PRC for more than a decade, with the covert support of Taiwan and the United States (Pei et al. 1994: 126-127). Too weak to expel those unwelcome tenants, the newly independent Burma naturally feared that the PRC would seize upon the issue as a pretext for violating Burma's sovereignty and territorial integrity.[95]

For its part, Beijing was fully aware of Rangoon's fears, and did its best to allay them. In August 1950, when receiving the Burmese ambassador, Mao went to great lengths to expound that the two countries shared "deep feelings of sympathy and understanding toward each other," because both had fallen prey to foreign aggression and oppression for a long time (Mao 1987:

---

[95] In December 1949, for example, Zhou Enlai had declared that no matter where the remnants of Chiang's forces fled, Beijing would reserve the right to pursue and destroy them (ZRGDGW, Vol.1: 87). In 1952, when pursuing the ROC irregulars, the PLA crossed the disputed Sino-Burmese border for the first time, and occupied some territory claimed by Burma. In November 1955, the PLA clashed with the Burmese forces on the border, largely because the Chinese patrol mistook the Burmese as a band of ROC irregular raiders (Jin et al. 2008, Vol.3: 1722-1723).

462). Regarding the entrenchment of ROC irregulars in the border region, the PRC government repeatedly expressed its "understanding" with Burma's temporary inability to pacify the region (Pei et al. 1994: 127). Visiting China in December 1954, Burmese prime minister U Nu was moved to thank Mao for Beijing's "attitude of sympathy toward us," which prevented the situation from escalating into a fiery international conflict like a "second Korea or a second Indochina" (Mao 1998a: 137-138).

In 1960, the two sides eventually resolved their boundary problem, with the PRC relinquishing most of the contested territory to Burma (see Chapter 2). From November 1960 to February 1961, in close collaboration with the Burmese military, the PLA launched a full-scale offensive against the ROC irregulars on the Sino-Burmese border. The campaign successfully wiped out Chiang Kai-shek's last stronghold in the region, and restored more than 30,000 square kilometers of territory to Burma's sovereign control (Deng Lifeng 1994: 245-249).

Due to this history of mutual understanding and cooperation, maintaining Sino-Burmese friendship remained a top priority of Chinese foreign policy in the early 1960s, despite the resurgent militarized worldview in Beijing. In March 1963, General Ne Win seized power in Burma and declared his commitment to a "Burmese road to socialism." In marked contrast to its hostility toward Soviet "revisionism" at the time, the CCP regarded Ne Win's exotic "socialism" with surprising tolerance. During a state visit to Burma in April 1963, Liu Shaoqi, then president of the PRC, told Ne Win that there was no definitive or conclusive road to socialism for the present. Both China and the Soviet Union, he said, were still experimenting with their ways of building socialism; therefore Burma was entitled to conduct its own experimentation too. Liu emphasized that China and Burma should avoid criticizing each other, but adopt an open mind with respect to each other's positive experiences (Wang Taiping et al. 1998: 54-55).

Three months later, in June 1963, the CCP even helped to arrange the peace talks between Ne Win and the Burmese Communist Party. When the talks eventually broke down, Beijing made clear that this was an internal Burmese affair, and that China would continue to maintain a friendly relationship with Burma (Wang Taiping et al. 1998: 55). When the Burmese government nationalized all foreign—including Chinese—banks in 1964, Beijing did not demand compensation, but transferred its bank property to Rangoon as a "gift" (Ibid., 55-56; see also Fan 2008: 37).

Theoretical and Policy Implications: A Summary

In conclusion, the quantitative evidence of this study suggests that realist theory does not monopolize the truth on China, and that several competing theoretical perspectives could better predict Chinese conflict behavior. These findings have important policy implications for the aforementioned debate on "whither China." Below, I summarize these theoretical and policy implications, in three steps.

The Realist Hypothesis in Dispute

To begin with, it is clear that there is no definite association between China's increasing power and its violence proneness, as the realist conventional wisdom would have us believe. Instead, China's burgeoning relative power might as well prompt Beijing to act with greater restraint and become more reluctant to settle disputes by force.[96] This finding, to be sure, does not appear surprising from the standpoint of some prominent China specialists. Whiting (1975: 245), for example, had long observed that "China's past border settlements indicate a willingness

---

[96] Empirically, as said earlier, I found no statistical evidence of interaction effects between relative power and other explanatory variables. This indicates that the evolution of the militarized worldview, or the extent of China's integration into the international society, or geographical contiguity, has no confounding effects on the performance of the relative power variable, which can be assumed to have an independent impact on China's violence proneness.

to compromise rather than exert the full strength of its powerful bargaining position." Similarly, Fravel (2008: 68) notes that Beijing often sought a negotiated and mutually acceptable settlement of boundary problems, in spite of the PRC's clearest military advantages against its smaller neighbors.

Theoretically, this would suggest that the expansion of power—i.e., the capabilities and resources of states—could play a dual role, one positive and one negative, depending on the conditioning influence of the international system on the ideas that states hold about how power should be used.[97] True, power often corrupts its possessor and produces arrogant and coercive behavior. Yet, as shown by history, it could also inspire a sense of responsibility, and an overriding principle of responsibility is to learn to use power with caution and restraint, instead of succumbing to the temptation to throw one's weight around. In Shakespearean language, "it is excellent to have a giant's strength, but it is tyrannous to use it like a giant" (*Measure for Measure*, Act 2, Scene 2). In the modern international system (or international society), I contend that major powers may face stronger incentives to exercise this self-restraint, than to exploit their massive advantage in relative capabilities mercilessly, for the following reasons:

First, the modern international system, be it called "Lockean" or "Grotian," places an unprecedented valuation on maintaining peace and restricting violence (see Chapter 1). As guardians of the system and its accepted norms, great powers are universally expected to accept a special responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, and, correspondingly, to modify their behavior in the light of this managerial responsibility (Bull 1977[1995]: 196). If a

---

[97] Here I draw inspiration from Legro (2005: 3), who contends that "power, of course, is a tool, and ideas about the uses of tools vary considerably." In his view, how China would use its growing power thus depends on what attitudes Beijing would take toward the international system. Implicitly, this argument strikes a chord with my theory about the role of the changing Chinese worldview in determining the PRC's violence propensity.

major state flouts those expectations and relies on brute force alone as bargaining levers in interstate disputes and especially vis-à-vis the smaller states, it runs the grave risk of provoking universal resentment and opposition, and thereby hastens its own decline and fall, like Napoleonic France or Nazi Germany. Thus, while seeking primacy in world politics, great powers are perhaps under greater pressure to avoid using their power in a tyrannical and uninhibited way, for to do so would inevitably delegitimize their primacy on the international stage in the first place.

Second, from the perspective of classical realism, it is also advisable for a major power to avoid being seen as a super-bully in interstate relations. This is because "[w]hen violence becomes an actuality, it signifies the abdication of political power in favor of military or pseudo-military power" (Morgenthau 1948[1978]: 31). In other words, the use of violence is *not* conducive to the maintenance of the political power, much less the moral authority, of a major state. Rather, a great power might find it more befitting to act with restraint and responsibility, in order to maintain its political sway over states of lesser stature. In the contemporary international system, some empirical evidence suggests that, compared with minor states, major states are indeed less likely to use violent force first (Caprioli and Trumbore 2006).

In China's case, therefore, there are no *a priori* reasons, theoretical and empirical alike, for asserting that the arrogance of power will of necessity prevail over the responsibility of power during the PRC's ascendancy to great-power status. Instead, as China keeps integrating into international society, it may be increasingly subject to the same moral and political constraints that the international system imposes on great powers' resort to violence. Whether Beijing accepts these constraints willingly or unwillingly, of course, is difficult to judge at this point. Still, we may draw some cautious optimism from the fact that Chinese diplomacy has

often shown deference to a tradition of "imperial humility" (see Introduction), and that this

tradition may also have exerted a mellowing impact on China's propensity to use force.[98]

<p align="center">*The Importance of Constructive Engagement*</p>

Integration, of course, does not mean that the erstwhile challenger would be content with

each and every aspect of the prevailing order, or that it would no longer settle contentious

interstate issues by force. Apparently, as shown by the foregoing analysis, territorial disputes

used to play a key role in inflaming China's violence propensity, and may continue to do so for

the foreseeable future.[99] Nonetheless, as I argued in Chapter 1, integration not only creates

common interests, but grants the once challenger a higher status through its acceptance as one of

the family. In this process, the challenger may acquire a plausible interest in the peaceful

resolution of disputes, instead of behaving recklessly and forfeiting the accumulated benefits of

constructive engagement with the international society.

The quantitative evidence above lends support to this contention. To begin with, the

PRC's expanding trade relations with the outside world seem most likely to give Beijing pause

for thought, before acting violently in a foreign policy crisis or interstate dispute. At a minimum,

such linkages of common interest would help to remind China's leaders that it is more

advantageous to settle disputes through the development of an amicable and mutually beneficial

relationship, than by aggravating the tension and destroying the goodwill through the use of

force. Theoretically, this finding corroborates the trade-promotes-peace thesis, a key tenet of

---

[98] To test the strength of this tradition, I run a new model by restricting the data sample to the 1960-1974 period, when the PRC remained a revolutionary challenger against the international system. The results show that even during that period, China's expanding relative capabilities still had a highly significant and constraining impact on Beijing's use of force.

[99] Recall that the PRC remains engaged in several highly salient territorial disputes to this day. These disputes include the Sino-Indian border; the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands (with Japan); the Paracel Islands (with Vietnam); the Spratly Islands (with several members of ASEAN); and of course, Taiwan.

classical liberal thought.

In the meantime, it is plausible that diplomatic recognition—a basic sign of acceptance by the international society—provides China with an additional incentive to act less violently. Theoretically, this discovery substantiates the claim that, for a rising state, a sense of respect from others, or satisfaction with its status, may be vitally important in alleviating its proclivity for conflict (Organski and Kugler 1980; Tammen et al. 2000; Deng 2008). This explains why, in handling territorial disputes, Beijing was quite willing to renounce force against those "friendly" states which had established diplomatic relations with the PRC at an earlier stage.

Furthermore, after acquiring diplomatic recognition from most other states (a long and arduous process in itself), the erstwhile challenger may develop a deeper interest in establishing a longer-term relationship of friendly and cooperative interactions. At the very least, it understands that it cannot afford to take its status for granted or to behave with little inhibition any more, to risk condemning itself to international isolation once again. Instead, it has to engage its diplomatic partners with greater initiative, to consolidate its image as a (relatively) new and responsible member of the international society. Since the 1990s, for example, Beijing has expended an increasing effort in building "strategic" or "comprehensive" partnerships with other major powers or important regional actors, as a way of reassuring others that China's ascendancy is peaceful and constructive (see Chapter 3). In the long run, these partnerships will likely exert more constraints upon Chinese behavior.

One pivotal question, however, still remains unanswered here: Why does the shared IGO membership fail to have any appreciable impact on China's propensity to use force against other countries? Theoretically, this suggests that IGOs vary markedly in their institutional structure, mandate, and membership cohesion, and thereby do not exert a uniform impact on states'

conflict behavior or their compliance with international norms (for a summary of this very large

literature, see Rapkin and Thompson 2009). Indeed, in quantitative IR scholarship, the results

often appear mixed and sometimes even contradictory concerning the hypothesized benign

effects of international institutions (see, for example, Bennett and Stam 2000; Russett and Oneal

2001; Oneal et al. 2003; Boehmer, Gartzke, and Nordstrom 2004; Chan 2005; Pevehouse and

Russett 2006; Ward et al. 2007).

In China's case, it is observed that the PRC's conformity with international regimes and

conventions has improved on an uneven and selective basis, and that the ambiguities in certain

international institutions leave China with considerable room for evasions and maneuvers

(Johnston and Ross 1999; Economy and Oksenberg 1999; Johnston 2003a; Kent 2007). To make

further progress, it is important to take this theoretical and empirical complexity into

consideration in future research on China's participation in international institutions.

The Promise of a Constructivist Approach

Overall, the most interesting finding of my quantitative analysis is that the evolution of

China's militarized worldview, rather than the expansion of its relative power, played the

foremost role in driving Beijing's resort to force between 1949 and 2010. Theoretically, this

finding has a dual significance:

First, it demonstrates the limitations of realism in understanding the complexities of

states' security behavior. To date, it has been a standard realist assumption that ideational

variables could only explain deviant, non-realpolitik cases, but they cannot explain non-deviant,

realpolitik phenomena which are presumably more amenable to realist interpretations (Johnston

2008: xix). Now, China is an allegedly archetypal realist actor, and using force to settle disputes

constitutes a typical realpolitik practice; why, then, do the power-based predictions of realist

221

theory go astray in this critical case? Why do ideational variables such as the militarized

worldview provide a better explanation of China's resort to force? One reason, as just shown

above, is that "power," despite its material appearance, is hardly an idea-free entity, and that its

exercise is often ideationally bound. Indeed, even Morgenthau (1948[1978]: 39-41) observed

that the anti-imperialist tradition in American political ideology had exerted a potent restraining

impact on U.S. involvement in power politics until the end of the nineteenth century.

Second, it corroborates the constructivist claim that the identity or basic character of a

state is determined not only by internal forces, but also by the process of social interaction. If the

identity of a state is not immutable or impervious to the external environment, neither should be

its conception of national interests. Instead, through sustained and constructive integration into

international society, even a once challenger could revise its formerly disturbing ways and

develop a plausible interest in the maintenance of the stability and well-being of the existing

international system. Over the long term, this integrationist course induces the erstwhile

challenger to perceive its relationship to others in non-zero sum terms, to recognize the

importance of accepting the common rules of appropriate behavior, and to act less violently and

more collaboratively toward the prevailing order. The story of China, viewed in this light,

provides new facts that are crucial to a deeper understanding of the function of international

society in proscribing interstate violence, as well as in promoting peaceful resolution of disputes.

It also shows that states' images of the world play a powerful role in shaping their perceptions of

the security situation, defining their security interests, and regulating their security behaviors.

In the final analysis, that ideational forces do matter in determining the PRC's violence

propensity has profound policy implications for the debate on "whither China." In recent years,

Shirk (2007: 10) contends that the question of whether there is a "China threat" cannot be

answered just by calculating China's capabilities: "Strength is only one part of the equation. Intentions—how China chooses to use its power—make the difference between peace and war." A key difference of intentions or worldviews between the PRC and other challenger-states, as Zoellick (2005) notes, is that contemporary China no longer believes that "its future depends on overturning the fundamental order of the international system." This study shows that this ideational difference may indeed be vitally important in deciding why a more powerful China is not necessarily a violent or aggressive one. Relatedly, it also suggests that the international society has a stake in ensuring that the Chinese worldview, or Beijing's basic orientation to the international system, remains more cooperative than conflictual in nature.

Through this study, I hope to highlight the intellectual opportunities that lie in a constructivist approach to the question of China's rise and its impact on international security—a question which, due to its immense significance, should not become the preserve of realist analysis.

Tables

TABLE 5.1: Frequency of the Country-Year Observations of China's Use of Force

Periods	Observations of Use of Force	Observations/Year
1949-1953	72	18
1954-1959	18	3
1960-1974	36	2.4
1975-1984	14	1.4
1985-2010	17	0.7

TABLE 5.2: Rare-Event Logit Analysis of China's Use of Force, 1949-2010

Independent Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Militarized worldview	1.801(.508) ****	1.761 (.457) ****	1.679 (.413) ****
Relative power	-.340 (.060) ****	-.344 (.060) ****	-.347 (.061) ****
Contested territory	.979 (.374) ***	.996 (.375) ***	1.012 (.376) ***
Diplomatic recognition	-.600 (.396)	-.603 (.395)	-.613 (.394)
Joint IGO membership	-.027 (.018)	-.029 (.018)	-.032 (.018) *
Trade dependence	-.052 (.016) ****	-.053 (.016) ****	-.053 (.016) ****
Domestic unrest	-.096 (.046) **	-.103 (.046) **	-.108 (.046) **
Contiguity	.973 (.353) ***	.988 (.355) ***	.999 (.356) ***
Pseudo R^2	.605	.607	.609
N	6637	6637	6637

Entries are logit coefficients. Standard errors in parentheses.
****$p<.001$, ***$p<.01$, **$p<.05$, *$p<.1$, two-tailed tests.
Splines dropped for space limitations.

TABLE 5.3: Effects of Each Variable on Probability of China's Use of Force, 1949-2010 (based on Model 2)

Variables	Value	Probability of China's Use of Force (95% confidence intervals)	Change in Probability
Militarized worldview	Min	.0005 (.0001, .0010)	+.0021
	Max	.0026 (.0003, .0050)	
Contested territory	No	.0009 (.0002, .0015)	
	Yes	.0023 (-.0001, .0047)	+.0014
Contiguity	No	.0008 (.0002, .0015)	
	Yes	.0022 (.0002, .0043)	+.0014
Relative power	Min	.0170 (-.0014, 0.0354)	-.0170
	Max	.0000 (-.0000, .0001)	
Domestic unrest	Min	.0012 (.0003, .0021)	-.0008
	Max	.0004(-.0000, .0009)	
Trade dependence	Min	.0020 (.0003, .0036)	-.0014
	Max	.0006 (.0001, .0011)	

Chapter 6

The Militarized Worldview and Chinese Intransigence:
The Sino-Soviet Rupture, and the 1967 Hong Kong Crisis

In the previous two chapters, I have ascertained, in a systematic and quantitative way, the relative importance of the militarized worldview in inflaming China's violence proneness. How does the militarized worldview demonstrate this causal effect in specific cases? In this chapter, I address the question by exploring two hitherto less examined cases that used to have a significant impact on Chinese foreign relations and international security, namely: (1) the Sino-Soviet split in the 1960s, which brought the two communist giants to the verge of war in 1969; and (2) China's mishandling of the 1967 Hong Kong crisis, which proved detrimental to its own interests in the end.[100]

As noted in Chapter 1, both cases are chosen in that they constitute some sort of "least likely" cases. As will be shown below, before the said crises, the Soviet Union had long been a fellow socialist state and an ally of the PRC, Britain remained a useful middleman between Beijing and the US-led international order. If the militarized worldview can be shown to play a major part in causing Chinese belligerence toward those erstwhile friends or partners, then what it could do to Beijing's perceived enemies might well be imagined.

Furthermore, Chinese behavior in these two cases has long baffled even veteran China watchers.[101] Whiting (1975: 239-240), for example, found it incomprehensible that China in

---

[100] Luthi's (2008) impressive study of the Sino-Soviet split uses some primary Chinese sources, but leaves out certain important clues about the Chinese leadership's decision-making process, which I detail in this chapter. Moreover, Luthi (2008) covers only the 1956-1966 period, thereby providing no explanation of the dynamics of the rapid deterioration of Sino-Soviet relations in 1967-1969 (an issue I will address as well). As for the Hong Kong crisis, there has been no comprehensive scholarly study of Chinese decisionmaking in this case to this day.

[101] In contrast, other renowned cases of China's use of force, such as the PRC's entry into the Korean War and the Sino-Indian war of 1962, can be easily interpreted as a rationally calculated

1969 seemed willing to seek confrontation with superior Soviet power, where "prudence should have dictated the utmost caution." Johnston (1998b: 55) and Chen (2001: 8-9) take a step further and question why the PRC chose to split with the Soviet Union in the face of the continued American threat in the first place, an act that apparently contradicts the predictions of traditional balance-of-power theory. Similarly, given Hong Kong's vital economic importance to the beleaguered and impoverished PRC, Whiting (1975: 229) registered the enormous surprise of the British in 1967, "who previously relied on Chinese rationality to guarantee the colony against radical disturbances."

Of course, it is easy to attribute China's seeming irrationality to ideological radicalism; but what is the source of its ideological radicalism? Why, of the world's main socialist states during the period, did the PRC alone demonstrate an alarming bellicosity in addressing problems that were otherwise amenable to negotiation and compromise under normal circumstances?

In a recent, comprehensive study of the Sino-Soviet split, Luthi (2008: 5) suggests that the erratic Chinese behavior reflected Mao's ideologically informed goals, especially the Chairman's "extreme conviction that China's national interest was its duty to spread world revolution aggressively or to follow his brilliant policy of withdrawing the PRC from a putrid world into the splendid isolation of a solitary model society." But, as we have seen, Mao and his comrades were capable of abandoning such extremist goals and revising their convictions, at least in 1954-1959. In that integrationist period, the Chinese leadership's essential faith in

---

response to perceived security threats from abroad (see, for example, Whiting 1968, 1975; Gurtov and Hwang 1980; Chen 1994). This interpretation, however, is logically compatible with my theory about the causal effects of the militarized worldview, in that the militarized worldview had intensified Beijing's threat perceptions and sharpened its propensity to settle disputes by force in the first place (see my earlier discussion of Chinese motives in the Korean and Indian cases in Chapters 2 and 5, respectively). I do not address such cases because they are already well-documented elsewhere.

Marxist ideology clearly did not prevent Beijing from acting less antagonistically and more cooperatively toward the outside world, thanks to the mellowing of the militarized worldview. Intuitively, this indicates that it was the resurgent militarized worldview, instead of ideology per se, that played a key role in redirecting China toward a confrontational course.

Why, however, did the PRC turn upon the Soviet Union and Britain in particular, with which Beijing had previously maintained cordial working relationships? Before delving into details, it is worthwhile to look deeper into the militarized worldview and its behavioral implications. As said earlier, a hallmark of the militarized worldview is to see the world as split decisively and irrevocably between "us" and "them." If the PRC was the vanguard or head of the international movement of national liberation, then it must engage inevitably in a life-and-death struggle against a broad variety of vicious and devious enemies whose ultimate aim was the destruction of revolutionary China. From the challenger's perspective, therefore, the hero-image of itself is associated inseparably with the devil-image of the adversary, and the central question in the struggle between "us" and "them" could only be who would beat whom. A confrontational and uncompromising posture, viewed in this light, has an intrinsic and enormous appeal to the challenger, because this posture corresponds not only to its heroic self-image, but also to its indomitable will to fight and win a world-historic struggle.

Moreover, once the challenger assumes the posture of the most unbending and implacable fighter against the existing order, it is bound to regard others as either "with us" or "against us," and woe betide those who refuse to assist in its quixotic struggle.[102] If the PRC

---

[102] John Everard, former British ambassador to North Korea, recounts that Pyongyang had adopted a similar attitude even toward its allies in the socialist camp, including China and the Soviet Union, from the late 1950s to the 1980s. As the self-styled vanguard of the world revolution , North Korea simply demanded economic aid from its allies as if it had a right to generous assistance from others (Everard 2012: 186).

represented the only hope for the revolutionary transformation of the international system, then, any dissent with Beijing must be telltale signs of pusillanimity, deviation, or outright reaction; and the dissenters, if and when they wore the masks of friends or fellow-travelers, were especially repellent to the revolutionary challenger, for their relatively moderate posture threatened to sow discord among "us" and thereby yield a sharp advantage to "them." To acknowledge the validity of such dissent, by implication, was tantamount to forcing the challenger to reconsider the advisability of its own confrontational posture, or to revise its heroic self-image to accommodate the status quo order—something that the challenger, by definition, was reluctant to do. Instead, it was far more befitting, from the challenger's standpoint, to expose and best those phony "friends" as mercilessly as if they were covert enemies, on the vast arena of international communism and world revolution.

Against this backdrop, it becomes easily understandable why the militarized worldview led Maoist China to regard the Soviet Union with increasingly frigid distaste in the 1960s, or to seek a reckless showdown with the British in Hong Kong in 1967. Using the method of structured, focused historical comparison (as introduced in Chapter 1), I demonstrate below several revealing similarities in the Chinese approach to the disputes with Moscow and London, an approach derived logically and profoundly from the militarized worldview. These similarities include:

—Nothing short of the total submission of the adversary would satisfy Beijing, regardless of the type of issues under contention;

—A proactive and confrontational strategy was thereby considered to be the most effective way to bring the adversary to heel;

—Before seeking confrontation with the adversary, Beijing did not necessarily underestimate the latter's resolve, or ignore the attendant adverse consequences. But its strategic inflexibility invariably trumped tactical flexibility, leading to the continuance of a policy that left practically no room for compromise;

—Likewise, Beijing often understood that the risks associated with confrontation would be high, but compromise was in principle so unpalatable to Beijing that it was unwilling to face up to the necessity of modifying its confrontational posture until it was too late.

Through this comparison, I hope to uncover certain pivotal dynamics inhering in the militarized worldview that conditioned China's seeming irrationality, as well as to provide a template for analyzing and predicting Chinese behavior under similar political and historical conditions.

Case One: The Sino-Soviet Rupture

Background: The Origins of the Sino-Soviet Dispute

Prior to 1958, as Khrushchev once reminisced to PRC ambassador Liu Xiao, Sino-Soviet relations had been "warm beyond description" (Liu 1998: 147). Indeed, contemporary Chinese historians have unearthed ample evidence in support of this claim. From 1954 onward, the Soviet Union under Khrushchev had proven far more generous in aiding the PRC's economic and military development than in the Stalin period, and the two countries maintained close collaboration in political and diplomatic affairs (Shen et al. 2007, chapters 5-6). More significantly, despite its serious reservations about Khrushchev's efforts to de-Stalinize the Soviet political system, the CCP kept insisting, in 1956-57, that the Soviet Union remain the "center" or "head" of the socialist camp (Luthi 2008, chapter 2).

Nonetheless, in 1958-59, a noticeable chill began to set in around Sino-Soviet relations, due to a multitude of disagreements between Beijing and Moscow. In 1958, Mao decided not only to launch the Great Leap Forward (a quixotic mass movement aimed at speeding up China's development), but to bombard the ROC-held offshore islands. From the Soviet perspective, neither of the two events was welcome: while the first signaled a Chinese challenge to the Soviet leadership in the socialist camp, the second appeared a willful Chinese provocation against the international order, and one that threatened to drag the Soviet Union into a great war without prior consultation. To the PRC leadership, however, Moscow's lukewarm and conditional support of Chinese initiative in both instances was a great affront, indicating the lack of Soviet zeal for building a better socialist society and for confronting American imperialism.[103] These disagreements, as will be seen below, related directly to the heroic self-image of the revolutionary challenger, thereby increasing Beijing's distrust of Soviet motives over time.

In 1959, the divergence between Beijing and Moscow became more visible. On June 20, the CPSU notified the CCP that it would not honor a previous agreement—which was signed on October 15, 1957—to provide China with a model atomic bomb and the related technology. The Soviet explanation was that Moscow was then negotiating with the West on a nuclear test ban; under the circumstances, it was inappropriate to transfer nuclear technology to Beijing. To the CCP leadership, the explanation was hollow and outrageous, indicating the Soviet intent to seek rapprochement with the West at the expense of China and the socialist camp (Wu Lengxi 1999: 205-207).

---

[103] Both Shen et al. (2007, chapters 8-9) and Luthi (2008, chapter 3) provide excellent studies of the Sino-Soviet disputes during this period, by using newly emerging primary Chinese and Russian sources. To a large extent, the findings of these two studies complement each other in detail and analysis.

A month later, the CCP convened a work conference at Lushan to contemplate remedies for the excesses of the Great Leap Forward. Several leaders, including Marshal Peng Dehuai and Zhang Wentian, voiced criticisms of Mao's quixotic policies. To Mao, these opponents echoed suspiciously Moscow's thinly veiled criticisms of his pet mass movement (Shen et al. 2007: 244-246). Consequently, when waging a ruthless struggle to crush Peng, Zhang, and their adherents politically, the Chairman also vented his fury on what he called "many oppositionists and skeptics among the Soviet comrades," including Khrushchev himself (Mao 1993, Vol.8: 391, 462-463, 504).

In August 1959, an armed conflict occurred on the contested Sino-Indian border, under unclear circumstances.[104] Ignoring Chinese pleas for understanding and support, Moscow decided to take a neutral position. It did so not only because the Soviets suspected the Chinese of initiating the conflict, but also because Foreign Minister Gromyko hoped to have a "good tone" for Khrushchev's forthcoming visit to the United States (Wu Lengxi 1999: 210, 213-214; Luthi 2008: 145). To the annoyed CCP leadership, this was yet another sign of Khrushchev's sellout to the United States (Wu Lengxi 1999: 217).

Still, Beijing did not regard Khrushchev's U.S. tour, from September 15 to September 28, 1960, with complete hostility. Initially, China's leaders decided that the Soviet leader's visit was conducive to the relaxation of international tensions, a trend consistent with the general goals of Chinese foreign policy in 1954-1959 (Wu Lengxi 1999: 219). However, on September 30, when Khrushchev arrived in Beijing to attend the tenth anniversary of the PRC, his reception address raised the hackles of the Chinese. With an obvious intent to teach the CCP a lesson on peaceful

---

[104] In retrospect, the conflict was perhaps an accidental clash without the prior approval or knowledge of the Chinese leadership. Wu Lengxi recalled that it took even the PLA's local Tibetan command a long time to investigate the incident (Wu Lengxi 1999: 210).

coexistence, he warned against the "mistaken notion" that "since we [i.e., the socialist camp] are strong and powerful, we should try to test the stability of the capitalist system by military force" (Ibid., 220; see also Luthi 2008: 148). On October 2, when meeting the CCP's top leaders, Khrushchev repeated the foregoing thesis, and entered subsequently into a bitter quarrel with his hosts, as the two sides disagreed almost on every topic under discussion, including Beijing's U.S. and Taiwan policy, the American prisoners in China, and the Sino-Indian border conflict. Finally, Khrushchev complained: "Eisenhower told me that my visit to China would be futile. It is futile indeed!" (Wu Lengxi 1999: 221-227).

After Khrushchev's departure, the CCP Politburo immediately held a meeting to discuss the Soviet leader's seeming flirtation with the U.S.-led imperialist camp. The consensus of the meeting was that Khrushchev overlooked the predatory nature of American imperialism and hence evinced signs of "revisionism," a mortal sin that was the equivalent of sacrilege in communist ideology. Nonetheless, the CCP's leaders decided not to inflame the disagreements with Moscow for the present, but to wait patiently until future international developments compelled Khrushchev to change his mind (Wu Lengxi 1999: 227-228).

On October 14, 1959, Mao received the Soviet ambassador in a conciliatory spirit. The Chairman stated that the points of agreement between Beijing and Moscow were far greater than the points of their disagreement; therefore, neither side should allow their disagreement to affect their cherished solidarity. To allay Soviet concerns about China's assertiveness on the Taiwan issue, Mao pledged that the PRC would not wage a war against the United States or Taiwan, nor would it even try to seize the ROC-held offshore islands. A few days later, Zhou Enlai confirmed the importance of maintaining the Sino-Soviet unity in addressing the high officials of the PRC State Council. According to Zhou, while objecting to the erroneous views and policies of fellow

233

socialist countries, the CCP should always keep in mind the "big picture" (*da ju*) and strive for

solidarity (Wu Lengxi 1999: 229-230).

This patient and restrained approach to the Sino-Soviet dispute, however, did not last

long, precisely because Beijing's assessment of the "big picture," or China's fundamental

orientation to the international system, would soon undergo drastic changes. Mao's own writings

suggest that, in December 1959, the Chairman had decided to have the PRC resume the role of a

revolutionary challenger; moreover, in making the decision, Mao not only poured scorn upon

Soviet attempts to sustain the status quo order, but feared deeply that Moscow was already

engaged in a worldwide conspiracy to subvert revolutionary China.[105] As will be seen, Mao's

ambitions and fears were shared by the CCP leadership at large. Due to this militarized

worldview, Beijing was bound to look increasingly askance at the Soviet "friends," and to read

the worst into the latter's unwillingness to support the PRC in its self-righteous struggles.

Against this background, the Sino-Soviet rupture was only a matter of time.

---

[105] In December 1959, when preparing an address to an expanded meeting of the Politburo, Mao
mused that the imperialist camp was still intent on annihilating the socialist camp, not only by
war, but by peaceful subversion as well. The Soviet "friends" (as Mao sarcastically put it),
however, might assist imperialism in undermining the socialist camp from within, as evidenced
by Khrushchev's revisionist ideology and the Sino-Soviet disagreement on a number of domestic
and international issues. Internationally, the Soviet "friends" were not only "frightened by
[China's] bombardment of Jinmen [in 1958]," but "organized a great anti-China chorus in
concert with imperialists, reactionary nationalists [i.e., India], and Tito's revisionists" since
March 1959. Domestically, in Mao's view, the Soviets had supported the opposition to his
policies at the CCP's just-ended work conference in Lushan as well. In consequence, Mao
believed that China should engage in "continuous revolution" and hurl its "red banner" (i.e.,
demonstrate its revolutionary spirit) at the whole world. In so acting, predicted Mao, "China
would be isolated for a long period of time, but in the meantime win the support of many
communist parties, many states, and many peoples." As for Khrushchev, Mao depicted him
contemptuously as a bumptious but wavering element; if the Soviet leader did not mend his ways,
"he will completely fall apart" in a couple of years (Mao 1993, Vol.8: 599-602).

1960: The Beginning of China's Polemical Offensive

In January 1960, the CCP Politburo convened a conference of all provincial party secretaries and central government ministers to contemplate the international situation and China's defense strategy. As said earlier, the meeting reaffirmed the assessment that the United States was implacably hostile toward China and war was thus inevitable, thereby marking the resurgence of the militarized worldview (see Chapter 2). Given this grim estimate of China's security environment, the CCP's ruling elites expressed unanimous indignation at Khrushchev's alleged flirtation with the United States (Wu Lengxi 1999: 238). During this meeting, at Mao's instruction, all high-level cadres had the opportunity for the first time to "read and research" a confidential report on the pivotal differences between Chinese and Soviet foreign policy, as follows:

—The Soviet Union feared war and emphasized détente, reconciliation, and peaceful coexistence. China did not fear tensions, but opposed pacifism and refused to forswear "armed resistance" against imperialism;

—The Soviet Union believed that the U.S. government as well as the American people desired peace, and chose to adopt a friendly approach toward the United States accordingly. China did not trust the United States, and therefore persisted in a policy of anti-Americanism;

—The Soviet Union encouraged, through inducements, the voluntary acceptance of socialism by newly independent states, and declined to fan the flames of anti-imperialism among those countries. China sought the establishment of a union of all anti-imperialist forces against

the United States, by supporting national liberation movements and advocating revolutionary struggles.[106]

Obviously, between the PRC as the revolutionary challenger and the Soviet Union as a status quo power, there was no meeting ground, nor was there likely to be one. Thus, despite their agreement that Beijing should continue to strive for Sino-Soviet unity, China's leaders decided to "state our opinions publicly on certain important international issues," and to change Khrushchev's mind through "struggles and criticisms" (Wu Lengxi 1999: 241). Strangely, it did not occur to anyone that public criticisms of the CPSU and its leader could only lead to the disunity of the socialist camp and thus defeat the CCP's stated purpose of striving for unity. A plausible explanation, of course, was that the revolutionary challenger, being overly confidant of its own rectitude, simply could not imagine any socialist brethren should fail to see the light and come to acknowledge Beijing's superior wisdom.[107]

On January 19, 1960, the CCP Central Committee formally decided to use the occasion of the 90th anniversary of Lenin's birthday (on April 22) to publicize Beijing's position on a series of international issues, including anti-imperialism, revolution, and national liberation movements (Shen et al. 2007: 260). Coincidentally, a diplomatic incident further reinforced Beijing's perception of Moscow as an unreliable ally. On January 22, the Soviet ambassador informed the CCP that the CPSU would adhere to a "strictly neutral" position on the Sino-Indian border dispute. In reply, on January 26, Zhou Enlai asked the Soviet ambassador sarcastically:

---

[106] This report was compiled by an unspecified CCP agency and submitted to Mao on January 8, 1960. Four days later, Mao recommended it to all participants in the aforementioned conference for "reading and research" (Mao 1996, Vol.9: 7).

[107] It is interesting to note, for example, that when launching the polemical debate with the Soviet Union, Mao expressed his conviction persistently that China would ultimately win the sympathy and support of most peoples of the world (Mao 1996, Vol.9: 249, 256, 262, 264)

"Is it not a spectacle in international communist relations that, when one fraternal state is being bullied by a bourgeoisie-led country, another fraternal state should nevertheless plead neutrality?" Given Moscow's obvious partiality toward India, Zhou declared, the CCP would have to reevaluate the CPSU's motives entirely. Although the Soviet ambassador later explained that it was a matter of miscommunication for him to use the word "neutrality," Zhou insisted that the crux of the matter remained unchanged—i.e., the Sino-Soviet disagreement was real (Li et al. 1997, Vol.2: 281, 283-284).

Moreover, given the remilitarization of China in early 1960 (see Chapter 2), Beijing was annoyed by Moscow's growing interest in pushing forward universal disarmament. In early January, Khrushchev had written to the leaders of all communist states, declaring a massive and unilateral reduction in Soviet armed forces, and urging the socialist camp to strive for peaceful coexistence and worldwide disarmament (Luthi 2008: 161). Ostensibly, Mao expressed support for the Soviet initiative, which he described as a step conductive to the struggle for world peace and against the imperialist warmongers (Mao 1996, Vol.9: 8). Yet, on January 10, Zhou Enlai had proposed to torpedo the Soviet initiative, which he suspected of concealing a Soviet scheme to tie China's hands (Li et al. 1997, Vol.2: 278).

Thus, in early February 1960, Mao dispatched Kang Sheng, a notorious ultra-leftist in the CCP leadership, to make clear the Chinese position at a conference of the Warsaw Pact states. Stunning his audience, Kang warned that the imperialist and warmongering nature of the United States had not changed; thus, China would not undertake any obligations under any disarmament agreements or any international conventions to which it was not a party. Kang ended his address with a call for resolute struggles against revisionism, which he said constituted the major threat

to international communism.[108] Stung (and stimulated by the bottle), Khrushchev vented his fury

at a post-conference reception by accusing "some people" (i.e., the Chinese) of double-dealing:

th0se people praised the Soviet Union as the head of the socialist camp, but refused to provide

Moscow with any moral or political support.[109] In an obvious jab at Mao, Khrushchev also

compared "an old but unwise man" to a pair of worn-out snow boots no longer fit for use (Wu

Lengxi 1999: 251-252).

To the CCP leadership, Khrushchev's drunken outburst was a sign of his deepening

tendency to "oppose China to please the West," and therefore warranted a Chinese counter-

offensive. Thus, in early March, the Politburo decided to speed up the drafting of three polemical

articles, all scheduled to come out on Lenin's anniversary (Wu Lengxi 1999: 253). Mao's own

writings indicate that at this time, the Chairman already envisioned a protracted and long-term

struggle with the Soviet Union. Nonetheless, he predicted confidently that the anti-China

elements constituted at best one tenth of the world population, and that their opposition to China

was proof that "we are true Marxists-Leninists, and we are doing well in our work" (Mao 1996,

Vol.9: 93-94). Indeed, to the revolutionary challenger, struggle and fighting represented the best

means of vindicating its heroic self-image against real or imagined enemies.

Between April 16 and April 22, 1960, the CCP's mouthpieces, the *People's Daily* and the

Red Banner (a monthly journal), formally released the three polemical articles. According to Wu

---

[108] The full text of Kang's address was reprinted in Shijie Zhishi (1962: 28-34). Luthi (2008: 161-162) observes correctly that Kang's address signaled the deepening Sino-Soviet dispute over Khrushchev's foreign policy; but he fails to grasp Kang's crucial contention about why China refused to undertake disarmament obligations, or to explore the broader background of Chinese remilitarization as the PRC resumed the posture of a revolutionary challenger in early 1960.

[109] Khrushchev's anger had a deeper cause: In January 1959, the CPSU had notified the CCP of its intention to abandon the traditional claim that the Soviet Union was "the leader of the socialist camp, the center of international communism." The CCP Politburo, however, insisted adamantly that the terminology should remain unchanged (Yang 2001: 340).

Lengxi (a drafter of these polemics), the themes of those articles illustrated the CCP's position in direct contradiction to Soviet revisionism, as follows:

—The United States was an aggressive and warmongering power, and the maintenance of world peace depended upon fighting against American imperialism, instead of appeasing it;

—The essence of Leninism was its revolutionary spirit. Fears of war led naturally to fears of revolution. This explained why modern revisionists, frightened by the imperialists' threat of nuclear war, had come to oppose and obstruct the prospects for world revolution;

—The world was on the eve of the collapse of imperialism and the triumph of proletariat revolution. Thus, Lenin's doctrine of world revolution was still applicable under contemporary conditions (Wu Lengxi 1999: 262-263).

Stunned by the CCP's polemical offensive, the CPSU nevertheless decided to adopt a low-key position, so as not to give undue publicity to Chinese views, which the Soviets regarded as doctrinaire and out of touch with current realities. Beijing, in contrast, did its best to disseminate the three articles among foreign communist parties in no time, to the chagrin of Moscow (Shen et al. 2007: 263-265). At this juncture, an unexpected incident seemed to lend considerable support to the CCP's position: on May 1, 1960, a U.S. U-2 spy plane was shot down over the airspace of the Soviet Union, which prompted a marked deterioration of U.S.-Soviet relations. To Mao and his comrades, the incident was not only a propaganda boon for Chinese assertions about American aggressiveness, but provided an opportunity to scuttle the post-1954 policy of peaceful coexistence and shift the anti-American struggle into high gear (Shen et al. 2007: 268-273).[110]

---

[110] In May 1960 alone, Mao had received more than forty delegations of leftist organizations from Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and a recurring theme of the Chairman's address was that China and those countries needed to assist each other and wage a concerted struggle against their

Anticipating more serious struggles ahead, China's leaders decided that they could not trust the Soviet comrades completely. In fact, shortly after the U-2 incident, the CCP Politburo was of the opinion that it was impossible for Khrushchev to change his views on major international issues, while Mao branded the Soviet leader as a "quasi-revisionist" for the first time (Wu Lengxi 1999: 272; Jin et al. 2003: 1076-1077). Afterward, Beijing redoubled its efforts to expose Soviet "errors" and seek new partners in the international communist movement, and the CCP's unbending attitude inevitably provoked Soviet reprisals, leading ultimately to the sudden and unilateral withdrawal of all Soviet experts from China in July 1960 (for details, see Shen et al. 2007: 273-283; Luthi 2008: 167-174).

Did the Chinese leadership ever recognize that its approach to Moscow was unhelpful and counterproductive during this period? The available evidence suggests that the answer is no. On June 23, 1960, Mao stated his belief to the Politburo that a rupture with Moscow was unlikely under current circumstances; however, he stressed: "We need not fear a rupture, but should prepare for that possibility; only when we show that we are fearless, could we perhaps avoid a rupture" (Wu Lengxi 1999: 284). Apparently, as dictated by the militarized worldview, the Chairman assumed that a confrontational strategy was the best way of bringing the adversary to its senses and making it mend its ways; and the consequences of confrontation, no matter how grave, were but secondary to his considerations.[111] It did not occur to Mao that, by clinging to a

common enemy, i.e., American imperialism (Mao 1996, Vol.9: 171, 173, 178, 183-184, 187-189). In internal discussions with foreign comrades, Mao averred for the first time: "Peaceful coexistence does not exist at all. …Between us and imperialism, there is only a coexistence in Cold War" (cited in Shen et al. 2007: 273).

[111] Even Zhou Enlai, the superb diplomat, showed a greater interest in preparing for the rupture than in avoiding the confrontation at this time. On July 11 (i.e., a week before Moscow suddenly announced its decision to withdraw all Soviet experts from China), the premier already warned his colleagues that China must rely on self-help in its economic development and scale down its need for Soviet experts and technology thereafter (Li et al. 1997, Vol.2: 330-331).

predetermined confrontational posture, Beijing might well have lost opportunities of seeking an amicable settlement of disputes, and created enemies where there had been none. This damn-the-consequences mentality, as shown below, held a powerful sway over many ruling elites of the CCP as well.

In the summer of 1960, China's leaders realized that the Great Leap Forward had gone amiss, and that a terrible famine was setting in (Jin et al. 2008: 2045-2048, 2067-2071). Thus, outwardly, Beijing's anti-revisionist fervor began to cool off (Shen et al. 2007: 286-287; Luthi 2008: 183). Behind the scenes, the CCP remained as enamored of struggle and fighting as ever. From July 5 to August 10, the Politburo convened several work conferences. On July 18, Mao set the tone by declaring that "dark clouds have been gathering for some time, with the whole world pitted against China." Nonetheless, he asserted, Beijing need not panic and buckle, because nine-tenths of the world population supported the PRC and desired revolution. Following suit, the conferences concluded that China must stand firm against Soviet revisionism, especially by insisting on the goal of world revolution and opposing "giving up revolution for the sake of maintaining peace." For the present, it was agreed that Beijing should strive for unity and endeavor to postpone a rupture with Moscow; yet meanwhile, it should also prepare for every eventuality (Wu Lengxi 1999: 308-313, 334).

Shortly afterward, many of the CCP's provincial leaders not only voiced unequivocal support for a "long-term, resolute, and thorough struggle" against Soviet revisionism, but also called on Beijing to assume a leadership role in directing international communism and world revolution (Mao 1996, Vol.9: 276-278, 281-282, 292). In August 1960, deeply perturbed by the CCP's uncompromising attitude toward the CPSU, Ho Chi Minh visited China in an attempt to mediate between Beijing and Moscow, but to no avail: Mao retorted angrily that Khrushchev

already became an exponent of revisionism and even stooped so low as to seek peace with

imperialists and reactionary elements (Wu Lengxi 1999: 345-346; see also Luthi 2008: 183-184).

In this truculent spirit, from September to October 1960, the CCP held a series of

consultations with the CPSU, in preparation for a forthcoming meeting of 81 communist parties

in Moscow. Through these consultations, Beijing averred that its fundamental disagreement with

Moscow lay in the question of how to "interpret our time"—i.e., whether the existing

international system made lasting peace possible, or made war inevitable (Yang et al. 2009:

1574-1575, 1580, 1586).[112] As said earlier, it is extremely difficult for the revolutionary

challenger to concede on this issue. Small wonder, then, that the CCP Politburo instructed its

delegation to the Moscow Meeting to adhere to the following guidelines: "Stand firm on

principles, insist on unity, conduct struggles without trepidation or fear of a rupture, seek unity

through struggles, and strive to reach a minimum agreement" (Wu Lengxi 1999: 369). Again, it

did not occur to Mao and his comrades that querulous arguments or fearless struggles were

hardly conducive to the achievement of unity or agreement.

In Moscow, from mid- to late November 1960, the CCP delegation (headed by Liu

Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping) assumed a fierily polemical attitude and engaged their Soviet hosts

in a series of bitter arguments (Wu Lengxi 1999: 377, 381-387, 395-399). Many fraternal parties

were upset by the Chinese attitude, and the CCP's views on the prospect of war and revolution

---

[112] Deng Xiaoping, then general secretary of the CCP, headed the Chinese delegation in these
consultations. At the time, he repeatedly emphasized that the divergent interpretations of "our
time" was the root cause of the Sino-Soviet dispute, and that "our time" was still best explained
by Lenin's doctrine (i.e., the decay of imperialism and the triumph of socialist revolution
worldwide). Proceeding from the Leninist thesis, Deng concluded that a violent revolution,
rather than a peaceful transition, was the destination of world politics (Yang et al. 2009: 1552,
1556-1557, 1562-1563). Given Deng's efforts to demilitarize the Chinese worldview in the
1980s, it is striking how the same leader could experience such a fundamental change of
perceptions—which was, plausibly, a result of Deng's growing contact with the West after the
1970s (see Chapter 3).

received the endorsement of only a few communist parties from Southeast Asia (Yang 2001: 589-616).[113] Undaunted, the CCP delegation was fully prepared for a rupture then and there (Yang et al. 2009: 1597-1601). When Ho Chi Minh, alarmed by the glaring Sino-Soviet strife, attempted to arrange a private meeting between Liu Shaoqi and Khrushchev, Liu declined on the grounds that the CCP had little room for any compromises (Wu Lengxi 1999: 402-406; Yang 2001: 623-624).

After carefully weighing the situation, however, Mao decided that the time was not ripe for a rupture with Moscow. Thus, on November 28, 1960, he finally instructed the Chinese delegation to make a minimal concession, which cleared the way for the achievement of a "minimum agreement" as envisioned beforehand by Beijing (Wu Lengxi 1999: 407-409). After intense negotiations, the CCP agreed to have the final statement of the Moscow Meeting include a laudatory mention of the CPSU's 20th Congress, while the CPSU agreed to drop any implicit censure of (Chinese) factionalism and nationalism (Ibid., 409-413; Yang 2001: 626; Yang et al. 2009: 1601).[114]

Despite this minimal concession, on several other major issues, the CCP successfully forced the CPSU's hand in drafting the final statement of the meeting. Moscow had to concede, for example, that peaceful coexistence should not serve as the basic principle of the socialist

---

[113] This is based on the diary of Yang Shangkun (then director of the CCP's General Office), who was a member of the Chinese delegation and provided a detailed, day-by-day account of the Moscow Meeting.

[114] Luthi's (2008: 190-191) analysis of this episode makes two factual errors. First, he interprets the CCP's concession as an endorsement of Khrushchev's Secret Speech in 1956, which is not the case according to Chinese evidence. Second, he mistakenly interprets the concession as an act taken by the CCP delegation against Mao's will. In fact, it was precisely Mao who instructed the CCP delegation to make the concession, and the laudatory mention of the CPSU's 20th Congress was reduced to a minimum at Chinese insistence (Wu Lengxi 1999: 408-409, 412-413, 415, 418). Moreover, as I show below, the CCP actually scored a victory in having the final statement of the Moscow Meeting endorse some of its radical ideas about world politics.

camp's foreign policy, that U.S. imperialism was still the Great Enemy and a threat to peace, and that communist states had an obligation to support national liberation movements and form an anti-U.S. coalition (Wu Lengxi 1999: 419-421). By conceding to the Chinese position on these issues, Moscow virtually acknowledged, no matter how reluctantly, that Beijing's challenges to the existing international system were legitimate in principle as well as in practice. This would enable the CCP to seize the moral high ground against Soviet revisionism in the years to come.

After scoring this triumph, Liu Shaoqi proclaimed at a public gathering in Moscow: "The imperialists will never be able to see a Sino-Soviet split, just as it is impossible to see the sun rise on the west." Yet, before his departure, Liu did not forget to remind the Soviet hosts that the foundation of the Sino-Soviet unity was Marxism-Leninism, and that "any attempt to undermine this foundation will be opposed by the peoples of China, the Soviet Union, and the socialist camp." To the Chinese delegation, this was a crystal-clear sign that the CCP would continue to stand firm and fight against revisionism (Wu Lengxi 1999: 435-437). More tellingly, on November 28, 1960, China's leaders sent a telegram to the Albanian Communist Party (which had supported the Chinese position during the Moscow Meeting), pledging mutual support in the struggle against revisionism (Mao 1996, Vol.9: 371-373). The spectacle of "the sun rising on the west" (as Liu put it), therefore, was not only possible, but certain, within this context.

A Temporary Truce with Hidden Intransigence, 1961-1962

In 1961-1962, given the worsening famine at home, the Chinese leadership had little choice but to concentrate on domestic reconstruction, a task that necessitated a relaxation of tensions with other countries, including the Soviet Union. Still, in the eyes of the CCP, Moscow represented an increasingly harmful and subversive influence over international communism as

well as domestic Chinese politics. Thus, during this period, Sino-Soviet relations were characterized by outward calm and inward tensions.

In January 1961, the CCP Central Committee convened a plenary session, with the decision to make the recovery of the national economy the Party's top priority (the famine was to last until late 1962). Despite their anxiety about the economy, however, China's leaders did not forget to remind each other that the Sino-Soviet rupture was perhaps inevitable. Liu Shaoqi, for instance, estimated that the temporary improvement of Sino-Soviet relations would enable the CCP to concentrate on its domestic difficulties for the present; meanwhile, he stressed that the struggle with revisionism was unfinished and would continue for at least another ten years. Mao concurred and went even a step further. In the event of a Sino-Soviet rupture, opined the Chairman, China must stand ready to sever all economic, trade, and cultural relations with the Soviet Union, with only the vestige of a formal diplomatic relationship. As long as the CCP was psychologically prepared for the worst, declared Mao, there was nothing to be afraid of (Wu Lengxi 1999: 442-448).

As a result, Sino-Soviet relations became a "mix of positive and negative developments" (Luthi 2008: 198). Showing a degree of magnanimity, Moscow extended a helping hand to Beijing in 1961, by providing the urgently needed food assistance, waiving accrued interest on China's outstanding debts, and even supplying all technical documents related to the production of MiG-21 jet fighter aircraft free of charge (Liu 1998: 127-130). Reciprocally, Beijing strengthened its coordination and cooperation with Moscow on some international issues, which

led some Soviet leaders to conclude optimistically that the two countries had restored "friendship, trust, and fraternity" to their relationship (Shen et al. 2007: 293-294).[115]

Behind the scenes, China's leaders never ceased to regard Moscow with suspicion and disapproval. From January to August 1961, Soviet-Albanian relations deteriorated sharply; given the CCP's solidarity with the Albanian comrades in the mutual struggle against revisionism, the incident immediately raised hackles in Beijing (Wu Lengxi 1999: 457). The last straw, however, was the CPSU's 22nd Congress held in October 1961. Before the congress, when reviewing the CPSU's new political program, Mao and his comrades already concluded that Khrushchev had betrayed Marxism-Leninism completely and formed his own revisionist school of thought (Ibid., 460-467). Heading a Chinese delegation to the CPSU Congress, Zhou Enlai not only rebuked his Soviet hosts for Khrushchev's criticism of Albania at the congress, but defiantly paid homage to Stalin's embalmed body on the eve of its removal from the Lenin mausoleum (Luthi 2008: 207). After his return to Beijing, Zhou reported to the Politburo that the CCP's position had gained more support from fraternal parties at the congress, an assessment that no doubt stiffened Beijing's resolve to confront Moscow in the future (Wu Lengxi 1999: 478-479).

From December 1961 to February 1962, the CCP Central Committee convened a meeting of 7,000 cadres to discuss China's domestic and international situation. In economic matters, the meeting marked a political setback for Mao: while reluctantly acknowledging his responsibility for the disasters caused by the Great Leap Forward, the Chairman also had to sanction the economic liberalization policies promoted by other top leaders, policies that he considered

---

[115] Wu Lengxi, however, recalled that "Sino-Soviet relations had neither worsened nor improved notably in 1961; the situation was moving toward relaxation, and that was all." In fact, despite some signs of diplomatic coordination with the Soviet Union, the PRC continued to take a hard line on such international issues as anti-colonialism, anti-imperialism, and disarmament (Wu Lengxi 1999: 453-456). Given Wu's close association with the CCP Politburo, his observations perhaps reflected the Chinese leadership's perceptions of Sino-Soviet relations more accurately.

equivalent to the restoration of capitalism in China (Luthi 2008: 210-211). Nonetheless, in the realm of foreign policy, Mao was clearly supported by his colleagues, as usual. Deng Xiaoping, for example, averred that Khrushchev had displayed his revisionism thoroughly, and that a split in international communism was necessary and inevitable; thus, the CCP must carry out the struggle against revisionism to the end (Wu Lengxi 1999: 480-482). Likewise, Liu Shaoqi stressed that the CCP had a fundamental disagreement with Soviet revisionism on the question of world revolution, that Beijing had no choice but to fight against Khrushchev's "poisonous" influence, and that all leading cadres of the CCP must prepare for the worst (Ibid., 482-487).[116]

By February 1962, Mao had formed the conviction that "the U.S.-led imperialist bloc, the reactionary elements like Nehru, and modern revisionists are coordinating a new anti-China chorus" (Mao 1996, Vol.10: 6). Even among the Chinese masses, a notable Russophobia had begun to rear its head, leading to some diplomatic incidents that required Zhou Enlai's direct intervention (Li et al. 1997, Vol.2: 458-459). In the spring of 1962, over 60, 000 Russo- and

---

[116] Luthi (2008: 210) suggests that "Deng and Liu both engaged in rhetorical posturing for tactical reasons," but fails to specify these "tactical reasons" clearly. My research, however, shows that Deng and Liu had consistently taken a hard line against Soviet revisionism at least since mid-1960. Moreover, before the CPSU's 22nd Congress, it was Liu, not Mao, who stressed at a Politburo meeting (held on September 15, 1961) that "Khrushchev had formed his revisionist theory completely." As Liu saw it, the central themes of Soviet foreign policy since 1956, including peaceful coexistence, peaceful competition, and peaceful transition, were all in contradiction to Marxism-Leninism (Wu Lengxi 1999: 467). Thus, there is little evidence to question the sincerity of Deng's or Liu's ideological convictions at the time. However, Liu Shaoqi did sometimes advocate a more flexible approach toward Moscow during the famine period. At the 7,000-cadre meeting, for example, Liu ended his diatribe against Soviet revisionism with the suggestion that China still needed to maintain its friendship with the Soviet people (Wu Lengxi 1999: 487). On June 27, 1962, Liu told an Albanian delegation that it was inadvisable to exclude the Soviet revisionists from the common struggle against U.S. imperialism. The international communist movement, Liu opined, could not be based on Marxism-Leninism in its purest form, for to do so was tantamount to restricting the ranks of communists to a tiny minority. Thus, the communists could only seek unity of purpose on some vital issues, but not on any and all issues (Liu et al. 1998: 557-558). Nonetheless, for most of the time, Liu's stance appeared just as antagonistic as Mao's toward revisionism.

Turkic-Chinese refugees fled from the northwestern region of Xinjiang to Soviet Kazakhstan, under complicated circumstances (Shen et al. 2007: 307-312; Luthi 2008: 214-216). Afterward, Beijing not only gradually closed all Soviet consulates, trade offices, and other official institutions in China (Moscow was left only with an embassy by December 1962), but forced most Soviet expatriates to leave China as well (Shen et al. 2007: 313-314; Luthi 2008: 217).

To many CCP leaders, the Xinjiang incident rekindled their fear that there were hidden enemies at home in collaboration with Soviet revisionism.[117] In September 1962, the CCP Central Committee convened a plenary meeting. Warning of an association between domestic and international revisionism, Mao quashed any suggestion of improving China's relations with the West or the Soviet Union (Shen et al. 2007: 318-319; Luthi 2008: 221-222).[118] In mid-October, when Khrushchev made a friendly overture to Beijing to improve bilateral relations, the

---

[117] As early as July 1960, Wang Renzhong (First Party Secretary of Hubei Province) had reported to Mao on a debate among the prestigious Faculty of Philosophy in Wuhan University. Of the 37 CCP-affiliated members of the Faculty, only 21 expressed support for the Party's radical line, whereas the remaining 16 held either ambivalent or pro-Khrushchev positions. Thus, Wang concluded, "modern revisionism has made inroads into our own Party" (Mao 1996, Vol.9: 244-245). In that same month, Mao received a similar report from the PLA's General Political Department, concerning a class discussion among cadets of the First Tank School. Although half of the class insisted that "imperialism means war" and that world peace could only be maintained through resolute struggles against imperialism, nearly 32% of the cadets nevertheless voiced support for Khrushchev's view that war was avoidable and peaceful coexistence should be the objective of the socialist camp (Ibid., Vol.9: 258-260).

[118] Note that Mao was not the only top leader who opposed such suggestions; Foreign Minister Chen Yi opposed them as well (see Chapter 2). Zhou Enlai was said to proclaim at this Central Committee meeting: "The center of world revolution has shifted from Moscow to Beijing; we should recognize the righteousness of our mission and carry it out with bravery" (cited in Yang 2003: 386). The premier certainly did no evince much interest in improving Sino-Soviet relations at this time. In May 1962, the Soviet Union and its East European allies planned to hold a summit meeting to discuss their economic cooperation. As usual, Moscow invited the CCP to attend the summit as an observer. Zhou, however, considered the invitation a "premeditated trap," noting that Albania was excluded from the summit. Agreeing with Zhou, Mao decided to decline the Soviet invitation (Mao 1996, Vol.10: 92-93).

CCP Politburo refused to give it a chance.[119] Shortly afterward, during the Sino-Indian war and the Cuban Missile Crisis, Beijing again castigated Moscow for selling out to the American imperialists and Indian reactionaries (Shen et al. 2007: 323-324, 327-328; Luthi 2008: 224-227).

By late 1962, therefore, it was already an open secret among the CCP's ruling elites that the relationship between the CCP and the CPSU, as well as between China and Soviet Union, had become decidedly inimical in nature (Shen et al. 2007: 328). Meanwhile, the CCP began to make a systematic effort to expand China's influence in international communism and national liberation movements (Ibid., 331-333). A renewed confrontation with Moscow was inevitable.

Bracing for the Rupture, 1963-1965

In November 1962, the Chinese leadership formally decided to intensify the anti-American struggle and support national liberation movements more actively, for the purpose of "seizing the leadership role from the revisionists" in international communism (Shen et al. 2007: 331). In effect, this meant the Chinese challenge to the international system was not only targeted at the imperialists and their lackeys, but also at all revisionists that preferred and sought to maintain the status quo order. Mao's famous poem, written in January 1963, was a perfect reflection of the revolutionary challenger's exalted sense of mission:

> The Four Seas are rising, clouds and waters raging;
>
> The Five Continents are rocking, wind and thunder roaring;

---

[119] On October 14, 1962, Khrushchev and the entire CPSU Politburo hosted a farewell dinner for PRC ambassador Liu Xiao. In a lengthy address, Khrushchev noted that the Sino-Soviet rift had only benefited the imperialist camp and confused many fraternal parties. Although the CCP and the CPSU could exist independently of each other, he said, their friendship and unity would nevertheless bring enormous benefit to the entire socialist camp and the cause of world revolution. Thus, he urged Beijing and Moscow to let bygones be bygones and do their utmost to improve and strengthen their relations, with patience, tolerance, and trust. Khrushchev also expressed support for China's position on the Sino-Indian border conflict, which was soon to erupt into a full-scale war. When Ambassador Liu reported Khrushchev's message to Beijing, the central leadership decided not to respond to it at all (Liu 1998: 146-148, 150).

Our force is irresistible,

Away with all pests!

Clearly, these words reveal a surging tide of ambition, self-confidence, and arrogance that boded no good for any "pests" that dared to stand in the way of revolutionary China.

From November 1962 to January 1963, the CCP sent delegations to attend the congresses of several fraternal parties in Europe, and many foreign comrades were shocked and appalled by Chinese antagonism toward those who disagreed with Beijing's views (Luthi 2008: 228-235). The Chinese leadership, however, interpreted these developments as a new tide of revisionist attacks on China, and responded by publishing seven polemical articles, which reasserted the correctness of the Chinese position and blaming others for undermining the unity of international communism. The only sign of Chinese restraint was that all polemical articles, despite their virulent attacks on revisionism, still avoided mentioning the CPSU or Khrushchev by name—a reflection of Mao's intention to leave some room for maneuver vis-à-vis Moscow (Wu Lengxi 1999: 514-531).

Underneath this paper-thin veneer of forbearance, Beijing was already psychologically barricading itself against any compromises with Moscow. In February 1963, the CCP Central Committee convened a work conference, which reached the consensus that the struggle against revisionism would affect the "destiny of the socialist camp, international communism, world revolution, and the entire human race." Thus, despite the professed aim of maintaining the unity of international communism, the ruling elites of the CCP agreed that there could be no compromises on what Beijing regarded as fundamental matters of principle, because "unity is achieved only through struggles, not through compromises." Furthermore, it was decided that

although the CCP would not initiate the rupture, it must thereafter inform all its cadres as well as fraternal parties abroad that a rupture was likely forthcoming (Wu Lengxi 1999: 534-537).[120]

At this conference, the CCP formally set up the Central Small Group for the Drafting of Anti-Revisionist Documents, which, led by Kang Sheng and Wu Lengxi, was put under the direct supervision of the Politburo. Thereafter, all Chinese polemical articles were first produced by the writing unit, revised by the CCP's Central Secretariat headed by Deng Xiaoping, and then submitted to the Standing Committee of the Politburo for approval (Wu Lengxi 1999: 540-541). In late February 1963, the CPSU suggested to the CCP that they stop the public polemics and convene an international meeting of fraternal parties to resolve their disagreements; for that purpose, the CPSU and the CCP should first hold bilateral talks. Outwardly, Beijing responded to the Soviet suggestion positively, agreed to hold bilateral talks, and stopped the polemical offensive in early March (Ibid., 542-552).[121] Yet, behind the scenes, the aforementioned writing unit began to "work day and night" to draft a comprehensive set of documents aimed at a systematic refutation of Soviet views and positions (Ibid., 556-557).

---

[120] Using Wu Lengxi's memoirs (the same source I cite above), Luthi (2008: 237) argues that the CCP's leaders decided to sever the relations with the CPSU completely only if a fascist dictatorship was established in the Soviet Union. In fact, this is misinterpretation of Wu's reminiscences. According to Wu, the CCP leadership decided that, after a complete rupture, a war with the Soviet Union was possible only if a fascist dictatorship was established in the Soviet Union (Wu Lengxi 1999: 536-537). In other words, the CCP regarded a rupture as perfectly acceptable *even before* the Soviet Union turned (hypothetically) fascist. Similarly, Luthi (2008: 237) misinterprets Deng's suggestion of stopping the polemical offensive temporarily as an act against Mao's will; in fact, Wu Lengxi (1999: 538) made clear that the suggestion came from Mao, who contended that "after high tension, some relaxation is needed" (*yi zhang yi chi*).

[121] Wu Lengxi recalled that the CCP leadership accepted the Soviet suggestion for two reasons: first, the CCP had proposed as early as April 1962 to convene an international meeting to settle Sino-Soviet disagreements and relax the tension in their relations; second, and perhaps more importantly, the CCP wanted to avoid being accused of initiating the rupture (Wu Lengxi 1999: 543).

On March 30, 1963, the CPSU addressed another letter to the CCP, in which Moscow expounded its views on a "general line" for international communism and advocated holding bilateral talks on that conceptual basis. After reading the letter, the CCP leadership found the Soviet "general line" totally unacceptable, and decided to produce a competing Chinese "general line" as a reply (Wu Lengxi 1999: 558-559). To make this reply accurately convey the opinions of China and its allies, Mao invited Kim Il Sung to dispatch a team of North Korean ideologues to help revise the draft, which also incorporated many comments and suggestions from the communist parties of Burma, Malaya, North Vietnam, New Zealand, and Thailand (Ibid., 568-574).

On June 14, 1963, the CCP publicized its lengthy reply to the CPSU, and the document, once again, revealed Beijing's fundamental position as the arch-challenger against the current international order:

—Contrary to the Soviet position that "we should use all possible means to prevent a new world war" (CCP Central Committee 1965: 468), the CCP called for the "gradual realization of the total victory of proletariat world revolution, and the establishment of a new world without imperialism, capitalism, and exploitation" (Ibid, 5);

—Contrary to the Soviet position that international communism should preferably adopt peaceful means to further its political ends and that revolution could not be exported with a bayonet (CCP Central Committee 1965: 471-473, 476), the CCP insisted on carrying out relentless revolutionary struggles, including armed struggles, against imperialism, and on providing resolute support for the liberation of peoples in Asia, Africa, and Latin America (Ibid., 12-14);

252

—Contrary to the Soviet position that peaceful coexistence was the only sensible

principle of interstate relations in the international system (CCP Central Committee 1965: 468),

the CCP espoused "peace through struggle and revolution," and rejected peaceful coexistence as

the overall foreign policy of socialist-cum-revolutionary states (Ibid, 26, 28-30).

Not surprisingly, given these unbridgeable differences between Chinese and Soviet

positions, the CCP-CPSU talks (held in Moscow in July 1963) proved a dialogue between the

deaf (Luthi 2008: 261-263). During the talks, incensed by Chinese intransigence, the CPSU

Central Committee addressed an open letter to the party's rank and file, recounting the Sino-

Soviet dispute in detail for the first time since 1957. This move effectively scuttled the CCP

leadership's mood for seeking an identical "minimal agreement" as at the Moscow Meeting in

1960 (Wu Lengxi 1999: 610-612).[122] The subsequent conclusion of the Limited Nuclear Test

Ban negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States further reinforced Beijing's

convictions that Moscow had formed a covert alliance with American imperialists against China,

which was then working on its own A-bomb project (Ibid., 628-630). Thus, Deng Xiaoping

(chief of the CCP delegation) rejected a Soviet suggestion of describing the CCP-CPSU talks as

"comradely and friendly" in a joint communique, nor did he agree to suspend the polemical

debates thereafter (Ibid., 618). When welcoming Deng back to Beijing, Mao proclaimed: "We

are close to a rupture, we are already at the verge" (Ibid., 624).

After returning to Beijing, Deng was the first CCP leader to emphasize to foreign visitors

that the Sino-Soviet disagreement was over the fundamental question of whether a socialist state

---

[122] Before the CCP-CPSU talks began, the CCP leaders already believed the talks would produce
no good results. Nonetheless, Mao suggested that the CCP should adopt a two-pronged strategy:
while not budging on matters of principle or shrinking from polemical debates, Beijing should
also strive to postpone the rupture (Wu Lengxi 1999: 595-598). As usual, the Chairman failed to
see that the continuance of polemical debates could only hasten the rupture, instead of
postponing it.

should remain committed to world revolution, fight against imperialism, and support national liberation movements (Yang et al. 2009: 1768). From the standpoint of the militarized worldview, the answer to the question was crystal clear: since accommodation with the hateful imperialists is impossible and intolerable, the only way out for the revolutionary challenger is to fight ceaselessly against the prevailing order; and anyone who counsels moderation is a hidden collaborator with imperialism, and deserves to be treated mercilessly as such.

From September 1963 onward, under Mao's personal direction, the CCP began to publish a new series of polemical articles to expound its views systematically and thoroughly. Known collectively as the Nine Commentaries, these polemics lambasted Khrushchev and the CPSU, among other things, for conniving with colonialism, groveling to imperialism, and suppressing national liberation movements (CCP Central Committee 1965: 175-282). Militarily, it was also during this period that the PRC began to strengthen its border defenses against the Soviet Union (see Chapter 2).

In the face of Chinese recalcitrance, official Soviet media exploded in a similar wave of anti-Beijing polemics (Shen et al. 2007: 337). To stem the deterioration of bilateral relations, however, the CPSU leadership made a last attempt, by addressing a friendly letter to the CCP on November 29, 1963. The letter proposed to stop public debates and convene a new international meeting to resolve Sino-Soviet disagreements. It also proposed to improve Sino-Soviet relations with four concrete measures: to strengthen economic and scientific-technological cooperation; to resume the dispatch of Soviet experts to China to assist in its economic development; to coordinate and cooperate with China more closely in the making of their respective Five-Year Plans; and to resolve the border dispute through negotiations (Wu Lengxi 1999: 655).

Mao and his comrades showed little interest in the Soviet initiative. In December 1963, the CCP Politburo decided not to reply to the CPSU immediately, but to continue the polemical debate. In Mao's gleeful estimation, Khrushchev was going downhill day by day; thus, the Chairman recommended "launching a full-scale counteroffensive"—i.e., escalating the CCP's verbal offensive further. Liu Shaoqi concurred, emphasizing that the overall situation was very advantageous to the CCP because many vocally pro-Beijing organizations had sprung up in the international communist movement. Now was the time, Liu opined, to wage a comprehensive campaign against Soviet revisionism (Wu Lengxi 1999: 655-662).

 On February 4, 1964, the CCP embarked upon the "comprehensive campaign" by publishing the Seventh Commentary, which upbraided the "leader of the CPSU" (i.e., Khrushchev) for the first time as the "greatest revisionist, as well as the greatest sectarianist and splittist ever" in the history of international communism (Wu Lengxi 1999: 662-665). By implication, reconciliation thus became impossible between the CCP as the defender of the (communist) Faith and the CPSU the Arch-Renegade. Three weeks later, on February 29, the CCP replied to the CPSU's letter of November 1963, rejecting most Soviet suggestions of improving Sino-Soviet relations in substantive fields (Ibid., 681-684).

Alarmed by Chinese intransigence, the communist leaders of Poland and Romania endeavored to mediate between Beijing and Moscow from February to March 1964. Their pleas for unity and tolerance, however, fell on deaf ears in Beijing (Wang Taiping et al. 1998: 313; Wu Lengxi 1999: 688-723). On March 7, 1964, Deng Xiaoping, together with Liu Shaoqi and other senior leaders, told the Romanian emissaries explicitly that the CCP would only terminate the polemical debate if and when Khrushchev openly admitted his errors (Yang et al. 2009: 1802). In effect, as befitting a prisoner of the militarized worldview, Mao "had decided that he wanted

255

either a complete break with the CPSU or a complete Soviet surrender. Compromise was simply not an option" (Luthi 2008: 285). At any rate, from May 1964 onward, Mao had instructed the PLA to prepare for a two-front war against both Washington and Moscow, and the Chairman's aggressive statements were largely responsible for the breakdown of Sino-Soviet border negotiations in July 1964 (see Chapters 2 and 5, respectively).

Under the circumstances, Khrushchev insisted on convening an international meeting of fraternal parties to contemplate the Sino-Soviet dispute; as a preparatory step, he advocated holding a meeting of 26 communist parties that had comprised the Editorial Committee for the Moscow Meeting in 1960. The CCP objected strenuously to the Soviet suggestion, for fear that Moscow might use the meeting to excommunicate the CCP in the same way that Stalin did to Yugoslavia in 1948 (Wu Lengxi 1999: 808-809). Apparently, even the revolutionary challenger was sometimes afraid of its acute isolation; as dictated by the militarized worldview, however, such fears often led it to adopt an even more uncompromising posture. On August 30, 1964, the CCP notified the CPSU of its determination to boycott any international meeting convened by the CPSU, and, rather illogically, accused Moscow of attempting to split the international communist movement (Ibid., 814).

Khrushchev's fall from power in October 1964, however, revived hopes in Beijing of seeking a rapprochement with Moscow. To feel out the Soviet position, Mao dispatched Zhou Enlai and Marshal He Long to Moscow in early November 1964. After hearing a report from Marshal He of the Soviet defense minister's drunken outburst against Mao, the CCP Politburo decided to launch a new polemical offensive against Moscow (Wu Lengxi 1999: 860-864; see also Luthi 2008: 289-290). In Mao's judgment, Chinese polemics had contributed to Khrushchev's fall, and Beijing must therefore continue to use it to buffet the Soviet revisionists,

who were now following a "Khrushchev-ism without Khrushchev" (Wu Lengxi 1999: 864, 871-872). Following Mao's instructions, Premier Zhou turned a deaf ear to the repeatedly professed wish of his Soviet hosts to rebuild Sino-Soviet unity, friendship, and cooperation. Instead, the premier insisted that Beijing would terminate its polemics only if Moscow declared that its past position on the Sino-Soviet dispute had been completely wrong (Ibid., 875-877). Clearly, this was an ultimatum that no Soviet leader would find acceptable.

Despite Chinese rebuttals, the new Soviet leadership did not abandon the hope of conciliating Beijing through an international meeting. On November 26, 1964, the CPSU proposed to all fraternal parties to convene the aforementioned 26-party meeting on March 1, 1965, for the purpose of uniting the international communist movement in a concerted effort to fight against imperialism. An implicit concession to Chinese demands for anti-imperialism, the Soviet suggestion also specified the nature of the meeting as a "get-together for consultations," possibly to allay Chinese fears of any formal excommunication. Of the 26 fraternal parties, eighteen accepted the Soviet invitation (Wang Taipei et al. 1998: 261; Shen et al. 2007: 370). Mao and his comrades, however, continued to oppose the Soviet initiative obdurately, on the pretext that Moscow had not consulted Beijing on the timing or agenda of the meeting beforehand (Wu Lengxi 1999: 910). In all likelihood, Beijing was perhaps infuriated by the fact that, for once, the CPSU had seized the banner of anti-imperialism one step ahead of the CCP.

In February 1965, Soviet Premier Aleksey Kosygin paid a visit to North Vietnam. Choosing Beijing as a stopover, Kosygin arranged meetings with China's leaders, to persuade the CCP to attend the forthcoming international meeting. Talking with Zhou Enlai, Kosygin explained that the meeting was just for consultative purposes and would produce no documents with binding force. He also pledged that the post-Khrushchev Soviet leadership would do its

utmost to consolidate the relationship with China. Zhou, however, replied flatly that Beijing had

no interest in attending the meeting, regardless of its name and agenda. If Moscow was

determined to convene the meeting, he warned, a "situation of rupture" would inevitably

follow.[123] Taken aback by Chinese intransigence, Yuri Andropov (director of the CPSU's

International Department) told PRC Foreign Minister Chen Yi privately that Moscow had

already conceded to Chinese demands on the name, agenda, and date of the meeting, and that the

cancelation of the meeting would be tantamount to a total Soviet capitulation and not a

reasonable compromise. Unperturbed, Chen replied that the CCP considered attending the

meeting to be an equally unacceptable act of surrender (Wang Taipei et al. 1998: 261-262).

Before returning to Moscow, the Soviet delegation made one last attempt to conciliate the

Chinese leadership. Meeting with Chen Yi again, Andropov pleaded that not only the CPSU, but

many fraternal parties as well, wanted to hold a meeting; would the CCP please allow them to do

so and not open fire upon them? As long as the CCP were willing to make this concession, he

said, the CPSU and the CCP could rebuild their relations from anew and conduct bilateral and

multilateral consultations on any issues. Apparently moved, Chen inquired if the Soviets were

willing to postpone the meeting with the declaration that Beijing and Moscow were resuming

their consultations about the matter? To this question, Andropov gave no immediate reply (Wang

Taipei et al. 1998: 262).

At any rate, Mao was too rigid in antagonism toward the Soviet "revisionists" to ponder

any reasonable compromise at this point. On February 11, 1965, the Chairman held his last

meeting with Kosygin. Doing his best to soften Mao, Kosygin proposed to hold a Sino-Soviet

---

[123] Interestingly, during the meeting, Zhou also made a six-point suggestion of preserving normal
state-to-state relations between China and the Soviet Union (Li et al. 1997, Vol2: 706). It is
unclear, however, whether the premier or the CCP Politburo realized the contradiction between
the threat of rupture and the professed wish to maintain normal relations.

summit to address matters of mutual concern and to resolve problems through face-to-face discussions. He reiterated that the proposed 26-party meeting was purely consultative in nature and not intended to coerce any one. He called for the preservation of Sino-Soviet unity in the face of the common enemy, i.e., American imperialism. Mao would have none of it. As a precondition for rebuilding unity, he declared, the CPSU must publicly admit its mistakes of mismanaging the relationship with Albania, and of provoking the polemical debate with the CCP. Kosygin said no and rejoined if Beijing would like to make any reciprocal concessions. In that case, Mao replied that the CCP would not attend the 26-party meeting nor seek any fake unity at the moment. With a theatrical determination, he proclaimed that the Sino-Soviet debate should continue for another 10,000 years (Wu Lengxi 1999: 914-921). In effect, Mao shut the door to Sino-Soviet reconciliation once and for all.[124]

From Self-Imposed Isolation to Willful Provocation, 1966-1969

From late 1965 onward, China's relations with most fraternal socialist states went downhill all the way. In December 1965, the Polish communist leadership proposed to the CCP to hold a summit meeting of all socialist states, to explore the possibility of taking concerted action against the United States in Vietnam. In the following two months, the communist parties of Hungary, Mongolia, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and East Germany made similar pleas to Beijing. On February 9, 1966, however, the CCP rejected the Polish initiative categorically, on the grounds that Beijing would under no circumstances sit alongside the Soviet leadership in any conferences convened in the name of international communism. Moreover, Beijing accused the

---

[124] The said international meeting did take place on March 1, 1965, without the participation of the CCP and some of its allies. In reaction, the CCP issued a new polemical editorial, condemning the Soviet leadership as the inheritor of Khrushchev's revisionism as well as the collaborator of imperialism and its lackeys. It also reiterated that Beijing would reconsider joining hand with Moscow in the anti-imperialist struggle only if and when the Soviet leadership recanted completely (Wu Lengxi 1999: 927-931).

259

erstwhile Polish comrades, rather fantastically, of conniving with American imperialism, joining

an anti-China conspiracy, and sabotaging world revolution (Wang Taipei et al. 1998: 271-272,

321). Evidently, obsessed with the militarized worldview, the revolutionary challenger was now

wedded to the belief that "those who are not with me are against me."

In March 1966, to mark the final step of Sino-Soviet rupture, Mao and most members of

the CCP Politburo agreed to reject Moscow's invitation to the CCP of sending a delegation to

attend the CPSU's 23rd Congress.[125] From then onward, there was no more official contact

between the CCP and the CPSU for two decades (until 1989). On June 14, the *People's Daily*

lashed out at the new Soviet leadership for "inheriting the legacy of Khrushchev's revisionism

entirely." Two months later, the CCP Central Committee declared unequivocally that China

would henceforth combat both American imperialism and the "Soviet revisionist leadership,"

against which there could be no room for compromise (Wang Taiping et al. 1998: 263-264).

Similarly, between September 1966 and April 1967, the CCP terminated official relations with

the communist parties in Hungary, Bulgaria, and East Germany, on the grounds that these

erstwhile fraternal parties had betrayed Marxism-Leninism in favor of Soviet "revisionism"

(Wang Taiping et al. 1998: 316).

On February 7, 1967, the communist Romania, which hitherto maintained a cautious

equi-distance between Beijing and Moscow, expressed its grave concerns in a secret message to

the CCP about the rapid deterioration of Sino-Soviet relations. It urged Beijing and Moscow to

refrain from taking any actions that might further damage their relationship and cause

---

[125] Wu Lengxi's memoirs made clear that, at the Politburo's meetings (from which Mao was absent), only Peng Zhen (party secretary of Beijing) suggested attending the CPSU congress, while Liu Shaoqi, Zhou Enlai, Deng Xiaoping, and Chen Yi all voiced objections. Mao, then sojourning in southern China, sided with most of his colleagues on this matter (Wu Lengxi 1999: 935-939).

unimaginable harm to international communism and the global anti-imperialist struggle. Five months later, in July, Bucharest dispatched Premier Ion Gheorghe Maurer to Beijing for a candid exchange of views. When meeting with Zhou Enlai, Maurer tried to persuade the PRC to improve its relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist states, if only through the symbolic gesture of sending a delegation to attend the forthcoming celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution in Moscow. He also advised Beijing to improve its relationship with the United States. Zhou, however, appeared cold and unresponsive, and rejected the Romanian initiative completely (Wang Taiping et al. 1998: 329-330).

Still, Moscow and its East European allies made one last attempt to stem the downward spiral of Sino-Soviet relations. Since the escalation of the Vietnam War, the Soviet Union and other socialist states had increased their supplies of military material to Hanoi substantially, mostly by way of China. In May 1967, five East European communist parties held a summit in Czechoslovakia to coordinate their policy of assisting North Vietnam against the United States. The CCP, however, remained unmoved and scornful, denouncing the East Europeans as secretly colluding with Washington and betraying the cause of revolutionary communism (Wang Taiping et al. 1998: 316). As if turning the other cheek to the Chinese rebuff, the topmost party and government leaders of the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Hungary jointly addressed a letter to the CCP, with the suggestion of holding a summit meeting with China for the sake of taking collective action in defense of North Vietnam against U.S. aggression (Ibid., 321). If not for the militarized worldview, one may expect Beijing to seize this opportunity to band together with those countries against the common enemy of imperialism. Nonetheless, as the CCP no longer regarded those countries as potential partners, but covert enemies, no cooperation was possible.

In mid-June 1967, to signal the utmost seriousness of their intent, the aforementioned six countries entrusted a Politburo member of the Polish Communist Party with the task of conveying the letter in person to China's leaders. The CCP, however, remained impervious, designating only a secondary figure in its Central Secretariat to meet with the Polish emissary on June 16, 1967. The Polish envoy emphasized that the letter was no propaganda but reflected the six countries' genuine wish to break the impasse in their relations with China. The Chinese reply, as befitting a revolutionary challenger, was characteristically abusive and uncompromising—that the letter reflected a new conspiracy of Soviet revisionism, that the East Europeans were Moscow's tools in an anti-China movement, and that the CCP would under no circumstances coexist with the CPSU in any conferences of international communism. Understandably, the meeting ended with a Polish protest against the CCP's brutal invective (Wang Taiping 1998: 321-322).

The extant evidence suggests that there was a notable increase of Soviet troop deployments and maneuvers along the Sino-Soviet and Sino-Mongolian border in the latter half of 1967 (Gurtov and Hwang 1980: 212-213), possibly a reflection of Moscow's frustration with Beijing after the failed mission of the Polish emissary. Similarly, official PRC sources observe that clashes between Chinese and Soviet border guards became demonstrably more violent and bloody from November 1967 onward (Li and Hao 1989: 318). The Soviet military intervention in Czechoslovakia in August 1968 proved the last straw, reinforcing Beijing's conviction that Moscow represented not only a subversive influence but a clear and present security threat as well (Gurtov and Hwang1980: 218-220; Fravel 2008: 208).

For its part, since January 1968, Beijing had embarked on secret preparations for launching a forceful strike against the Soviets on the contested border (for details, see Yang

2000). Between January and February 1969, the PLA had completed the preparations for a

premeditated ambush of Soviet border guards at the disputed Zhenbao Island (located in the

Ussuri River); Zhou Enlai personally reviewed the final plan of action (Li and Hao 1989: 319-

320).[126] In retrospect, China's resort to force at the Zhenbao Island, which occurred on March 2,

1969, was aimed not only at demonstrating Chinese resolve and deterring further Soviet

provocations, but also at mobilizing the Chinese masses in support of Mao's continuous

revolution at home and challenging Soviet supremacy in international communism abroad (see

among others, Yang 2000; Goldstein 2001; Shen et al. 2007: 389; Fravel 2008: 212-213).

To provoke a foreign crisis for domestic mobilization purposes, of course, was a risky

and dangerous gamble. More dangerous still was the fact that neither China's leaders nor

ordinary Chinese seemed to realize at the time that the use of force against the Soviet revisionists,

even on a limited and manageable scale, would likely lead to an unimaginable catastrophe for the

PRC.[127] A telling episode after the Zhenbao conflict provides a vivid testimony to this peculiar

Chinese nonchalance about the possibly disastrous consequences of a rash resort to force. In the

evening of March 21, the CPSU Politburo authorized Soviet premier Kosygin to seek a hotline

conversation with China's leaders. Hence followed one of the most ludicrous exchanges in

international diplomatic history:

---

[126] Some PRC scholars (e.g., Shen et al. 2007: 389) suggest that Beijing chose the Zhenbao
Island as the battlefield for the double purposes of demonstrating Chinese resolve while
controlling the scope of conflict. That is, although the Soviet Union had controlled the island
since 1947, Moscow had agreed to cede it to China during the border talks in 1964 (the two sides
did not sign a formal agreement at the time, however). Thus, the Chinese leadership possibly
calculated that Moscow was unlikely to fight a major war over a small island that it had
previously agreed to turn over to Beijing.

[127] Instead, an essential component of Maoist strategic thought has always been that the use of
measured force would actually help to "defuse a crisis and not to win it or expand it," by
teaching the potential aggressor a lesson in the futility of trying to coerce China (Gurtov and
Hwang 1980: 250; for a similar view, see also Burles and Shulsky 2001: 17-18).

—Soviet Interpreter for Kosygin: Hello? This is Moscow; Soviet premier Kosygin asks

you to connect him to Mao Zedong.

—PRC operator: Hello? What do you want? What are you up to?

—Soviet interpreter: Premier Kosygin wants to have a conversation with Mao Zedong

about some affairs.

—PRC operator: Kosygin is a big traitor. If you have any business, talk to me now.

—Soviet interpreter: He wants to talk to Mao Zedong about some affairs.

—PRC operator: You can talk to me, or you can tell him to talk to me.

—Soviet interpreter: Hello? Premier Kosygin asks you to connect him to Mao Zedong.

—PRC operator: Hello? What are you up to? Kosygin is a big traitor, a big scoundrel,

and a disciple of Khrushchev.

—Soviet interpreter: Would you please connect us to the Foreign Minister of the People's

Republic of China?

—PRC interpreter: What else do you want?

—Soviet interpreter: We want to have a talk with him about some affairs.

—PRC operator: Impossible! Are you the Soviet intelligence service? What tricks are

you playing?

—Soviet interpreter: This is Moscow, the Soviet premier.

—PRC operator: Kosygin is a big scoundrel.[128]

Evidently, the militarized worldview had become so sanctified in Maoist China that even

a smallest cog of the Chinese state machinery was bent on acting uncompromisingly against the

---

[128] The transcript of this exchange appeared for the first time in 2006, as reproduced in Chen
Yangyong (2006: 192-193). Chen is a senior scholar at the CCP Central Committee's
Department of Research on Party Documents and thus has privileged access to still classified
diplomatic and party archives.

Soviet revisionists. With commendable forbearance, Premier Kosygin then rang the Soviet

embassy in Beijing, and asked the Soviet charge d'affaires to notify the PRC Foreign Ministry

urgently of his wish to have a hotline conversation with either Mao or Zhou Enlai. A few hours

later, shortly after midnight, the Soviet charge d'affaires met with the deputy director of the

Office of Soviet and East European Affairs in the PRC Foreign Ministry. After hearing of

Kosygin's request for a talk with Mao or Zhou, the PRC diplomat spoke as if he and the

aforementioned phone operator were identical products of the militarized worldview:

> Your party [i.e., the CPSU] has degenerated into a group of revisionist traitors.
>
> Kosygin wants to communicate with [Chairman Mao] in the name of the [CPSU]
>
> Politburo—this is an intolerable insult to our party! I resolutely reject and
>
> condemn your insolent request. As for Kosygin's wish to communicate with
>
> Premier Zhou, I would file a report of it.

After this diatribe, the Soviet charge d'affaires inquired coolly: "Is that all?" To this came the

stony response: "Yes it is" (Chen 2006: 194).

 Unlike the surly phone operator, however, the PRC diplomat did immediately report to

Zhou about Kosygin's phone-call. Shortly afterward, Zhou chaired a meeting of Foreign

Ministry officials to draft a two-sentence reply to the Soviet government, which read: "Given the

present state of Sino-Soviet relations, hotline communications are no longer appropriate. If the

Soviet government wants to send any messages, please convey them formally to the Chinese

government through diplomatic channels." On March 22, 1969, Mao approved this reply and

expressed amusement at the phone operator's verbal onslaught against the Soviet premier.

Conceding the diplomatic gaffe of declining a hotline conversation at a moment of high crisis,

the Chairman opined wistfully: "We are now isolated; nobody wants to approach us" (Chen 2006:

194-195). Yet the Great Helmsman did not ask who was to blame for antagonizing the Soviet Union since 1960 and leading the PRC step by step into this self-imposed isolation.

As Beijing willfully abandoned this opportunity of engaging Moscow in crisis management, Sino-Soviet relations continued to worsen in the next couple of months, leading to more violent confrontations on the border and Soviet threats of nuclear war against China. It was only in September 1969, when Kosygin finally had the chance to meet face to face with Zhou Enlai, that the two sides reached a tentative agreement on conflict prevention (Chen 2006: 195-199; for details of the agreement, see Zhou 1990: 462-464). The revolutionary challenger was finally shocked into a less inflated view of the utility of its confrontational strategy.

Case Two: The Hong Kong Crisis of 1967

Background: China's Pragmatic Hong Kong Policy before 1966

During the Second World War, the CCP maintained close collaboration with the Allied forces in southern China. One of its guerrilla units, the Dongjiang Column based in Guangdong Province, made an important contribution to the Allied war effort through activities of intelligence gathering and guerrilla warfare against the Japanese (Wang 2009: 250-256; Loh 2010: 60-63). In June 1947, in appreciation of the Dongjiang Column's role in the war, the British government granted a MBE to Huang Zuomei, then representative of the Column as well as the CCP in Hong Kong. The first Chinese communist recipient of an Order of the British Empire, Huang became afterward the director of the Hong Kong Branch of the Xinhua News Agency (XNA-HKB), which remained the CCP's commanding center in the British crown colony in the following years (Luo 2011: 75-78).

Given this clandestine connection to the British, the CCP's leadership recognized the complexity of the Hong Kong issue even before seizing national power in 1949. In November

1948, to allay outside concerns, Zhou Enlai authorized Qiao Guanhua, the CCP's representative in Hong Kong, to announce in a press interview that the Chinese communists had no intention of liberating the colony by force, but proposed to resolve the question by diplomatic means (Li Shi'an 1997: 12). A year later, shortly after the establishment of the PRC, Zhou wasted little time signaling Beijing's intent to leave the status quo of the colony unruffled. In a five-point directive to local communists in Hong Kong, the premier made clear that the CCP would wait patiently until the conditions were ripe for a final settlement. Therefore, the communists in the colony were expected to make friends with people of all political persuasions, including anti-communists, with an eye to building a broad united front on the basis of patriotism, not socialism. In particular, Zhou exhorted the local communists to live in peace with the British colonial government and the capitalist system, instead of seeking to overthrow the latter (Jin 1998: 3; Luo 2011: 67).

From Beijing's perspective, keeping Hong Kong under British rule served the diplomatic and economic interests of the newborn and beleaguered PRC. In the spring of 1951, when meeting with Huang Zuomei, Zhou stressed that China's Hong Kong policy could not be "understood by invoking the narrow principle of territorial sovereignty." Hong Kong, said the premier, was "our watch tower, weather station, and bridgehead," which not only provided an invaluable gateway for China's trade and other exchanges with the outside world, but also helped to drive a wedge between the United States and Britain by rendering ineffective the Western embargo against the PRC. Thus, Zhou urged the communists in Hong Kong to follow faithfully and protect this "vitally important policy," and especially to recognize Britain's special interests and status in the colony (Jin 1998: 4-5).

In the first fifteen years of the PRC, the development of Sino-British relations fully vindicated Zhou's judgment. Economically, despite the UN-imposed embargo after Beijing's entry into the Korean War, Britain refused steadfastly to terminate its trading relationship with mainland China, for which Hong Kong remained the leading supplier of advanced industrial products, machinery, foodstuffs and certain strategic raw materials (for details, see Li Shi'an 1997). Meanwhile, the colony was the main source of the indigent PRC's foreign exchange earnings (Whiting 1975: 229; Cheung 2010: 127). Diplomatically, as the first major Western power to recognize the PRC (in January 1950), Britain insisted on providing naval escorts for British merchant ships trading with mainland China in 1949-55, thereby rebuffing the efforts of Chiang Kai-shek's navy to blockade the PRC (Lin 2010: 46-48).

In August 1954, the British Labor Party dispatched a delegation to the PRC, the first semiofficial delegation from Britain since 1949. Briefing the CCP's cadres, Zhou explained that the central leadership had not yet considered the issue of whether or how China would take back Hong Kong in the future. Therefore, the premier admonished, no Chinese official should bring up the issue in discussions with the British (Zhou 1990: 83). More tellingly, when receiving the British delegation on August 24, Mao Zedong opined that Beijing and London "do not have fundamental divergences," but shared two common points of agreement: "One, both of us want peace and are not willing to fight wars. Two, each country is engaged in its own national reconstruction and so needs to do business." Peace and trade, the Chairman concluded, constituted the basis of Sino-British relations (Mao 1998: 123-124).

Indeed, between 1955 and 1958, China's imports from Western Europe increased fourfold, a large portion of which came from Britain (Lu 2003: 434-437). In May 1957, Britain relaxed unilaterally trading restrictions concerning the Chinese mainland. Encouraged by the

British example, some other Western countries sought to expand trade linkages with the PRC too, despite U.S. efforts to maintain a strict embargo against Beijing (Wang Taipei et al. 1998: 391).

In return, Beijing took much care to maintain the semblance of British dominance in Hong Kong. In June 1956, Mao instructed the CCP's Guangdong Provincial Committee: "It is better not to take back Hong Kong for some time. We are not in a hurry, because it is still useful to us at present" (archival material cited in Li Hou 1997: 40). When local communists grew too restive against the colonial government, the PRC's leading officials on Hong Kong affairs would invariably step in to pour cold water upon the hotheads. Zhou's chief deputies, especially Chen Yi (foreign minister and director of the Central Foreign Affairs Office, or CFAO) and Liao Chengzhi (deputy director of CFAO), were particularly outspoken in this respect. China's policy, as Chen and Liao repeatedly stressed, was to "conduct long-term planning and make full use" (*changqi dasuan, chongfeng liyong*) of Hong Kong, a policy that would necessitate permitting Britain to rule and reap sufficient benefits from the colony, because this was the only way to enlist British cooperation in having Hong Kong serve the interests of China as well (Loh 2010: 87-88, 92-95; Luo 2011: 112-115).

Diplomatically, Beijing also expended much effort in cultivating the British. In mid-August 1958, when planning to bombard the ROC-occupied offshore islands of Jinmen and Mazu, Mao did not forget to instruct the PLA: "Do not conduct military exercises in Guangdong and Shenzhen, and do not disturb the British" (Mao 1992: 348). In May 1960, when meeting with British field marshal Bernard Montgomery, Mao averred that China did not think Britain was a threat to its security, but wanted Britain to become stronger and "have a louder voice" in international affairs (Mao 1998: 327).

Reciprocally, Britain sometimes helped to bridge the gap between China and its then archenemy, the United States. In early 1962, Chiang Kai-shek was about to launch a full-scale invasion of the Chinese mainland. On July 11, 1962, a senior British diplomat informed the PRC charge d'affaires in London that the United States would not support any attacks of Chiang's army on the Chinese mainland; China, he said, could rest completely assured on that count. Ten days later, British foreign secretary Alexander Home notified PRC foreign minister Chen Yi that Washington not only strongly opposed, but would actively quash, Chiang's plan of invading the mainland (Wang Taiping et al. 1998: 389). On July 28, Chen Yi told the British that Beijing appreciated the U.S. assurances, with the added pledge that the PRC would not take military actions against Taiwan (Huang and Li 2010: 71).

On August 9, 1963, Mao summarized the gist of China's Hong Kong policy to the visiting prime minister of Somalia. Hong Kong, said the Chairman, was a "special case and we are not planning to touch it. You may not understand it." When asked if Beijing would refuse to assist the struggles of the people who wanted to drive the British away from Hong Kong, Mao became serious: "Hong Kong is an important path for trade. If we get control of it right now, it won't benefit world trade, nor will it benefit our trade relations with other countries." To dispel the impression that China was uninterested in carrying out anti-imperialist struggles at its doorstep, Mao quickly added: "It does not mean we shall never touch it. Britain feels at ease now, but may feel uneasy about it in the future" (Mao 1998: 383-384).

For some time, this moment of British unease seemed far off. Indeed, in a report to London in March 1964, Robert Black, then governor of Hong Kong, was all praise for Chinese forbearance: "Our present relations with China are probably as satisfactory as it is reasonable to

expect between a Colonial administration and a Communist state" (Loh 2010: 85). The storm of

the Cultural Revolution, however, would soon shatter this tranquility completely.

*The Cultural Revolution and the Radicalization of the Chinese
Foreign Policy Establishment*

Launched in mid-1966, the Cultural Revolution reflected Mao's fervent desire to turn

China into a bastion of world revolution. Toward that end, the Great Helmsman decided to

annihilate all his real or imagined opponents in the party, state, and the military, whom he

deemed unfit for and antipathetic to the forthcoming world-historic struggle. In turning upon his

erstwhile comrades, Mao's main instrument was the Central Small Leading Group on the

Cultural Revolution (CSLGCR), which was a small coterie of ultra-leftists led by the Chairman's

ambitious wife Jiang Qing. From 1966 onward, the CSLGCR quickly rose to the pinnacle of

power in Chinese communist politics, functioning virtually as the central secretariat of the

CCP.[129] In so acting, the CSLGCR drew wide support from a large section of Chinese society,

including the Red Guards (comprising mostly college students) and Revolutionary Rebels

(mainly industrial workers and lower-level cadres), who were a loose amalgam of radical

elements committed to the Maoist vision of a revolutionary transformation of China and the

world order.

In early 1967, the CSLGCR began to meddle in the making of Chinese foreign policy,

which had hitherto been the preserve of the (now defunct) Politburo, especially of Premier Zhou

---

[129] The nominal chief of the CSLGCR was Chen Boda, a longtime secretary of Mao's. As the first deputy chief of the group, however, Jiang Qing was the real mastermind behind many of its shadier activities. In 1967-69, the CSLGCR dwarfed even the Politburo in stature and influence. By 1968, of the 193 members of the CCP's eighth central committee, 89 were "beaten down" (*da dao*) by the ultra-leftists on trumped-up charges of being spies, traitors, or anti-Party elements, while another 36 were "pushed aside" (*kao bian zhan*) on the pretext that they had committed grave errors that needed to be investigated further. Only 35 members, including Mao himself, were considered politically unimpeachable (Jin et al. 2000: 914).

Enlai himself. As befitting the true believers in the militarized worldview, Mao's new protégés saw foreign enemies everywhere, and therefore favored a confrontational and uncompromising posture in handling interstate disputes. Accordingly, the CSLGCR accused the Chinese foreign policy establishment of having hitherto carried out an erroneous policy of "three surrenders and one suppression" (*san xiang yi bian*)—i.e., surrendering to Soviet revisionism, American imperialism, and reactionary forces of other countries, while suppressing national liberation movements and people's revolutions around the world.[130] Inevitably, with the incitement from the CSLGCR, Chinese diplomats, aid workers, and exchange students often provoked violent clashes with the local populace of their host countries, in the name of spreading the Maoist gospel of world revolution (Ma 2003: 135, 137-138, 147-148, 151-154; Chen 2005: 282-284).

As a result, in the first half of 1967, Beijing found itself embroiled in various disputes with nearly 30 countries, which had hitherto maintained normal and even friendly relations with the PRC (Chen 2005: 281). Ironically, these diplomatic incidents reinforced the perception in Beijing that China was besieged by vicious enemies. In reaction, a surging tide of mass xenophobia emerged in early 1967, leading to such outrages as the destruction of the British cemetery in suburb Beijing and the stoppage of a Soviet international train by zealous Red Guards (Ma 2003: 136-144).

This situation created enormous difficulties for Zhou Enlai and Foreign Minister Chen Yi, who were opposed to the excesses of this "revolutionary diplomacy" as espoused by their ultra-leftist colleagues (Ma 2003: 135-136; Chen 2005: 283-284). Yet, to avoid being accused of following the policy of "three surrenders and one suppression," they had to walk a very thin and

---

[130] In light of the evidence presented in Chapter 2 and earlier in this chapter, nothing could be further from the truth than this accusation, which was obviously concocted for purposes of domestic political struggles.

swaying political tightrope. In fact, in early 1967, Chen Yi and CFAO deputy director Liao Chengzhi were already under fire from the ultra-radicals, which further eroded the premier's authority in foreign affairs (Jin 1998: 93; Ma 2003: 44-47).

To circumscribe the CSLGCR's interference with foreign policy, Zhou took a risky step in January 1967. Counting on the fealty of the Foreign Ministry cadres, the premier deliberately encouraged them to take a leaf from the ultra-leftists' book, by assuming the posture of Revolutionary Rebels. On January 18, with Zhou's support, these cadres-turned-rebels declared the "seizure of power" (*duo quan*) at the Foreign Ministry, and secured Chen Yi's meek agreement that all important decisions would henceforth be made with their consent. Soon afterward, of about 2,200 cadres in the Foreign Ministry, 1,700 or so joined the ranks of Revolutionary Rebels (Ma 2003: 41-42, 51-42).

In so acting, Zhou had sown unwittingly the seeds of divided allegiance within the Foreign Ministry. For, despite their personal and professional attachments to the premier, these self-anointed Rebels were bound to gravitate, slowly but inexorably, toward the CSLGCR, which was the de facto command center for the radicals nationwide. Yao Dengshan, leader of these diplomat-rebels, was a case in point. Formerly China's charge d'affaires in Indonesia, Yao was declared *persona non grata* by the Indonesian government in April 1967, for his determined confrontation with anti-China Indonesian demonstrators. For this reason, Yao, who was personally close to Zhou, was favored by both the premier and the CSLGCR as exponent of revolutionary diplomacy (Jin 1998: 95-96; He 2007: 467-468). As it soon turned out, Yao and his cohort played a major part in the wholesale radicalization of the Chinese foreign policy establishment, thereby becoming part of the mounting problem besetting Chinese diplomacy.

The Hong Kong Crisis Began: Radicalism From Below, Intransigence at the Top

Initially, Zhou had tried his best to prevent the domestic disturbances from spilling over into the sphere of Hong Kong and Macau (then a colony of Portugal) affairs. In late August 1966, Liao Chengzhi conveyed an oral directive from the premier to the XNA-HKB, which stated explicitly that the Cultural Revolution was confined to the mainland and not to be exported to Hong Kong (Jin 1998: 87-88). In September 1966, Zhou again instructed the CCP's leading organ in Hong Kong, the so-called Hong Kong and Macau Work Committee (HMWC, which also directed the XNA-HKB), not to emulate the practices of the Cultural Revolution in the colony (Ran and Ma 2001: 63).[131] Ominously, at this point, the CSLGCR was said to differ from Zhou over the issue (Jin 1998: 90-92).

Soon enough, the raging storm of the Cultural Revolution proved too much for the premier to withstand. In December 1966, Macau's leftist organizations staged mass protests against the discriminatory policies of the Portuguese colonial government, which responded by using military force to suppress the protests and declaring a curfew on December 3. On December 5 and December 15, Zhou met twice with Chen Yi and Liao Chengzhi, to contemplate the situation in Macau (Li et al. 1997, Vol.3: 99). Finally, at Beijing's instructions, the provincial

---

[131] Regarding Beijing's management of the 1967 Hong Kong crisis, the PRC Foreign Ministry has yet to declassify the relevant archives. Two available primary Chinese sources, therefore, are worth particular attention. The first includes the memoirs and scholarly studies concerning this subject by Ran Longbo and Ma Jisen, who used to be mid-level PRC diplomats and participated in the management of the 1967 crisis (Ran and Ma 2001; Ma 2003). The second is the memoirs of Jin Raoru (Kam Yiu-yu in Cantonese), a veteran cadre in the XNA-HKB and then chief editor of *Wen Wei Po* (a main local communist newspaper), who was responsible for the CCP's propaganda work in the British colony (Jin 1998). Taken together, these sources provide a detailed and firsthand account of how decision-makers in Beijing interacted with local communists in Hong Kong in managing the 1967 crisis. In his otherwise comprehensive study of the 1967 riots in Hong Kong, Cheung (2010) draws much valuable information from Jin Raoru's reminiscences, but overlooks completely the works of Ran Longbo and Ma Jisen, thereby obscuring the vital role played by Beijing—and especially by Zhou Enlai—in the escalation of the crisis.

authorities of Guangdong presented an ultimatum to the Portuguese administration in Macau, demanding a formal apology and compensation for Chinese losses. Realizing the precariousness of its existence, the Portuguese government capitulated and accepted all Chinese demands on January 29, 1967 (for details, see Huang 2006, Vol.3: 1100-1122).

Inspired by the Macau disturbances, the HMWC leadership decided promptly to initiate a similar struggle in Hong Kong (Cheung 2010: 17). In principle, Zhou and Chen Yi were not opposed to the goal of "propagating the Mao Zedong Thought," as called for by the CSLGCR, in the colony (Jin 1998: 90-91). Moreover, by igniting an anti-British struggle, the HMWC leaders intended not only to protest against similar social ills and inequalities in Hong Kong, but also to prove their revolutionary mettle and save their own political skins. For, as early as September 1966, some lower- and middle-ranking XNA-HKB cadres, infected by the mood of the Cultural Revolution at home, had insinuated that the postponement of the anti-British struggle might well reflect the existence in the HWMC of the "agents of imperialists, revisionists, and reactionaries" (Jin 1998: 88-89; Cheung 2010: 127). Only the militarized worldview could breed such extremely adversarial perceptions of China's relation to the outside world, and, consequently, a fervent desire to fight against the country's (perceived) internal and external enemies.

The aforementioned "seizure of power" at the Foreign Ministry, as well as at the CFAO, added more fuel to the fire. Shortly after their ascendancy, the cadres-turned-rebels at the CFAO issued a directive to the HMWC, ordering the latter to renounce its past approach in managing Hong Kong affairs and adopt a more revolutionary posture, with an eye to "ushering in a new era" in the colony. To the HMWC, this was a clear signal that the CSLGCR had come to intervene in the field of Hong Kong affairs (Jin 1998: 92-93; Ran and Ma 2001: 66-67). Under the

circumstances, the initiation of anti-British struggles was only a matter of time, and a single spark would set off a conflagration.

In early May 1967, an opportunity finally arose for the restive leftists. On May 6, a labor dispute erupted in an artificial flower factory in Hong Kong, leading to scuffles between sacked workers and the police. Politicizing the incident, local leftist newspapers and trade unions condemned the "atrocities" of the colonial government, which they saw as colluding with U.S. imperialism in a conspiracy against China. In the following week, with the XNA-HKB's covert instigation, more clashes occurred between the leftist masses and the police (Jin 1998: 95; Cheung 2010: 23-34).

On May 12, given the mounting tension in Hong Kong, the Foreign Ministry and the CFAO convened a joint meeting to consider Beijing's response. Liao Chengzhi was present at the meeting, but remained glum and silent, when the others (mostly cadres-turned-rebels) advocated a hardline position. Echoing the prevalent militarized worldview, most cadres charged that the British had joined the imperialists, revisionists, and reactionaries in opposing China; therefore, Beijing must act firmly to crush the British conspiracy. In this pugnacious spirit, the meeting formulated the following proposal:

—China should issue a "most urgent and strongest" protest to Britain;

—The colonial government in Hong Kong must admit its errors, punish those responsible for the "bloody crackdown" on local leftists, apologize to the victims of the crackdown, and pledge not to commit any such atrocities in the future;

—To exert more pressure on the British, the Beijing Municipal Revolutionary Committee should mobilize one million people to demonstrate outside the British legation, in protest against (alleged) British atrocities;

276

—The central leadership should authorize and attend a mass rally in support of the struggle in Hong Kong (Ran and Ma 2001: 14, 22).

Clearly, like Beijing's approach to Moscow in the Sino-Soviet dispute, the above demands were aimed at forcing a total British capitulation in Hong Kong, instead of settling the crisis on reasonable terms. Zhou Enlai, however, approved the proposal without demur, and attended the suggested anti-British rally on May 18 (Ran and Ma 2001: 22-23). The only sign of Zhou's reservations was a directive from the premier to the Foreign Ministry, concerning the regulation of protests outside the British legation: the demonstrators were allowed to present petitions to the British, but forbidden to storm the legation or damage its properties, or to molest members of the British mission (Chen 2005: 291). To the HMWC leaders, Zhou's attitude seemed ambivalent, which they considered a reflection of the central leadership's divided attitude on the issue (Cheung 2010: 40).

On May 15, 1967, Vice Foreign Minister Luo Guibo presented a strongly worded note of protest, with the aforementioned Chinese demands, to the British charge d'affaires in Beijing. In the next few days, the radicals staged anti-British rallies in various major cities of China, which encouraged the Hong Kong leftists to persist in a combative posture (Cheung 2010: 37-41).

More importantly, on May 15, Yao Dengshan related to the HMWC that the recent Hong Kong struggle had piqued the CSLGCR's attention; as the next step, the HMWC should escalate the struggle and "create a brand-new situation" (*gaochu yige mingtang lai*), which, promised Yao, would obtain full support from the CSLGCR. Eager to please the new patron in Beijing, Liang Weilin and Qi Feng (director and vice-director of the XNA-HKB and the HMWC) instructed leftist unions, schools, newspapers, and mainland-funded companies to organize demonstrations outside the Government House of the British colonial government, covering its

gates with hundreds of posters that lambasted the British "atrocities" (Jin 1998: 96-97). More

provocatively, the radicals installed loudspeakers on the rooftop of the Bank of China building

(facing the colonial Government House) to broadcast anti-British propaganda, as if Hong Kong

were no longer under British rule (Ran and Ma 2001: 13-14).

After living like a prisoner in his own house for a few days, David Trench, the British

governor, ordered a curfew on May 22, 1967 (Cheung 2010: 49). Meanwhile, the governor

conveyed a secret message to the XNA-HKB, explaining that he had no intention of escalating

the fight against the leftists or imperiling Sino-British relations. He invited the XNA-HKB to

send representatives to confer with the colonial government, to achieve a peaceful settlement.

Uninterested, Liang Weilin and Qi Feng expressed their determination, in a telegram to Beijing,

to launch an "all-out offensive" against the British, including making "active preparations for

urban armed struggles," for the purpose of besting British colonialism and "creating the

conditions for the Center's [i.e., the CSLGCR's] strategy of [promoting] world revolution" (Jin

1998: 98-103).

Shortly afterward, the CSLGCR approved the HMWC's suggestion of launching a "mass

struggle against British tyranny." It also authorized setting up a "Joint Command for the Hong

Kong Compatriots' Struggle against British Tyranny" by the radicals at the CFAO and the

Foreign Ministry. Zheng Weirong, a leading radical at the CFAO, was appointed liaison officer

between the Joint Command and Hong Kong leftists. On May 23 or May 24, 1967, Liang Weilin

convened a XNA-HKB staff meeting, with the announcement that the Joint Command would

serve as agent of the CSLGCR in directing the struggle over Hong Kong (Jin 1998: 104-105).

Interestingly, responsible British officials, as well as otherwise well-informed scholars

(e.g., Cheung 2010), have to date overlooked the clandestine linkage between the CSLGCR and

Hong Kong leftists, believing instead that the crisis was a misguided initiative of local communists without deliberate direction from Beijing (Cheung 2010: 57-58, 147-148). Accordingly, on May 22, 1967, Governor Trench sought—and promptly obtained—approval from London for a series of tough measures to deal with the situation, including neutralizing several leftist-controlled buildings and arranging a visit of British warship *Bulwark* to Hong Kong (Ibid., 51-52). The arrival of *Bulwark* on May 26, however, seemed to inflame further the tempers in Beijing, making it more difficult for Zhou Enlai to manage the crisis reasonably.

The Crisis Escalated: Zhou's Fateful Ambivalence

On May 24, 1967, Zhou met with the leading officials from the Foreign Ministry, the CFAO, and the HMWC, to discuss the Hong Kong situation for the first time (Li et al. 1997, Vol.3: 155). At this meeting, the premier authorized the CFAO and the Foreign Ministry to establish a provisional interdepartmental agency, the Hong Kong and Macao Office (HMO), to coordinate the handling of the Hong Kong crisis. Luo Guibo was appointed director of the HMO, assisted by Huan Xiang, a veteran diplomat and expert on Western Europe (Ran and Ma 2001: 25-26). Thereafter, from late May to early June, the premier chaired three group meetings to contemplate the issue (Li et al. 1997, Vol.3: 155).

At the May 24 meeting, Zhou was said to issue an overarching and unequivocal command, i.e., "We must win this struggle" (Ran and Ma 2001: 25-26). Meanwhile, he voiced disagreement with the reckless behavior of Hong Kong leftists. China's policy, stressed the premier, was neither to take over Hong Kong immediately, nor to provoke a fight with the British. Therefore, Beijing should continue to pursue a "reasonable, advantageous, and restrained" (*youli, youli, youjie*) approach toward the British, instead of striking against Hong Kong proactively. For this reason, Zhou was especially upset by the XNA-HKB's wildly exaggerated

reports of British "brutality," which, he said, had served no other purpose but to inflame the popular mood at home and make China look ridiculous abroad. Zhou also rebuffed a plan of the HMWC to launch attacks on some police posts in Hong Kong and kill a few police officers, which the premier dismissed as an impermissible act of anarchism (Chen 2005: 292).

For all his reasonableness, however, the premier apparently left one key problem unresolved—i.e., given his own professed determination to "win this struggle," how could the Hong Kong leftists be persuaded to adopt a restrained approach, instead of escalating the conflict with the British? In fact, at a joint meeting on May 25, 1967, both the HMO and the HMWC realized acutely this inherently self-contradictory attitude. At the meeting, most officials agreed to adhere to the objective of forcing a British capitulation, as demanded by the Foreign Ministry on May 15. Huan Xiang, however, opined that the British were unlikely to capitulate unless Beijing was prepared to exert "full-scale and comprehensive pressure" upon Hong Kong—yet, Huan reminded his colleagues, the time was not yet ripe for doing so. Undaunted, some suggested conducting a series of military maneuvers to intimidate the British, a suggestion declined by Luo Guibo, who said it was inappropriate for the Foreign Ministry to advocate military action. Still, the meeting proposed to mobilize the masses in Hong Kong for a greater offensive against the British (Ran and Ma 2001: 26-28).

At this juncture, the said arrival of *Bulwark* in Hong Kong undoubtedly increased Chinese hostility toward Britain. On May 27, Foreign Minister Chen Yi, attending a reception at Afghanistan's embassy, assailed Britain unexpectedly for "accelerated and heinous suppression" of the Chinese in Hong Kong. Ominously, Chen warned: "The Chinese government and people cannot sit by idly and do nothing about it"—exactly the same warning issued by Beijing on the eve of its entry into the Korean War in 1950 (Xu et al. 2003, Vol.18: 144). In this overheated

atmosphere, Zhou had even smaller room for maneuvering, and was compelled to adopt a hardening posture as well.

On May 30, 1967, the premier met with HMWC and HMO cadres to contemplate their proposal. This time, Zhou said nothing against the goal of forcing a British capitulation through an escalated struggle. Instead, he questioned only the proposed means—primarily the mobilization of leftist trade unions for a general strike—of achieving the goal. Hong Kong, said Zhou, was closely integrated into the world economy, and it was not feasible to strangle it economically. Visibly disturbed, Zhou cautioned: "If the situation continues to worsen, we might be forced to take over Hong Kong earlier than scheduled." Nonetheless, when HMO officials said they would revise the proposal, the premier answered no, and ordered the HMWC cadres to return to Hong Kong and implement the proposal first (Ran and Ma 2001: 33-36).

A few days later, Zhou's ambivalence made his handling of the crisis even more convoluted. On June 3, the *People's Daily* carried an inflammatory editorial calling on the people of Hong Kong to be ready to "answer the call of the great Motherland and smash the reactionary rule of British imperialism at any time." To the Hong Kong leftists, the editorial was an inspiring signal that a Chinese invasion of the colony was possibly imminent (Jin 1998: 108). The editorial was drafted by Wang Li, a key CLSGCR member, who had presented the draft to Zhou beforehand for advice. Zhou, however, made only minor editorial revisions (Ran and Ma 2001: 40; Ma 2003: 159-160). Yet, on June 6, the premier took issue with a draft note of protest by the Foreign Ministry, which stated that the Chinese government would "take necessary measures" if the British did not stop military exercises in Hong Kong. Such wording, said Zhou, was a useless empty threat if not backed by military force. Again, Zhou cautioned against launching a general strike or provoking a conflict in Hong Kong (Chen 2005: 293).

Yet, at this moment, the crisis had developed a momentum of its own. On June 10, 1967, under the HMWC's direction, leftist trade unions launched a general strike, which was soon expanded to include the strike of wholesalers, shops and traders. While bringing huge inconvenience to ordinary life in the colony, the strike failed to unnerve the British government, which believed that a "firm but unprovocative policy" was the best approach to a China mired in political chaos and popular chauvinism, and that rational minds would eventually prevail in Beijing (Cheung 2010: 61-65, 102-106). Finally, the strike created a heavy burden on the leftists themselves, who had to ask Beijing to subsidize the living expenses of the strikers (Ran and Ma 2001: 40-41; Cheung 2010: 65-66). For this purpose, on June 13, the All-China Federation of Trade Unions remitted HK$ 10 million to Hong Kong leftists (Xu et al. 2003, Vol.18: 160).

As the crisis reached a point of ostensible impasse, Beijing faced a hard choice: Should it admit error now and reverse an unproductive course, or should it persist in a sterile enmity and court further confrontation? While the first option was perhaps unpalatable, the second one was obviously disastrous. The prevalence of the militarized worldview, however, continued to impede a rational decision. For one thing, the CLSGCR remained welded to an uncompromising approach in handling China's disputes with other countries, even regarding erstwhile friendly states like Burma and Nepal. Worse still, Mao sometimes expressed vague support for this approach (Ma 2003, 138: 149; Chen 2005: 284-285).

Accordingly, Zhou had to move with great delicacy, for he understood that accusations of "three surrenders and one suppression" still hung like a cloud over his head (Li et al. 1997, Vol.3: 167). In the Foreign Ministry, the cadres-turned-rebels provided little succor. In late June 1967, Yao Dengshan personally oversaw an attack on the Burmese embassy by radical elements; and

Zhou had to exert maximum effort to prevent the attack from escalating uncontrollably (Chen 2005: 285; Ji 2008: 235).

Moreover, regarding the Hong Kong crisis, Zhou was trapped by his own earlier command to "win this struggle." On June 30, the premier convened a meeting of the HMO. Reiterating that "we must win this struggle," Zhou inquired about how to achieve this goal. In response, the HMO recommended adopting a series of more conflict-prone measures, including inciting greater disturbances in Hong Kong, increasing troop deployments along the border, and attacking and wiping out some British check-posts on the border. The last measure was possibly intended as a prelude to a full-scale invasion of Hong Kong, a prospect for which Zhou instructed the PLA's General Staff to draw contingency plans afterward (Ran and Ma 2001: 41-42, 86).

Indeed, after June 1967, the PLA's Guangzhou Military Region had put the 7085 Garrison Regiment, which was in charge of the border area adjacent to Hong Kong, on a war footing. On June 26, Ye Tengfang, then a combat staff officer in the regiment, received a phone-call from a "leading figure" (whose name is not given by Ye) in the CCP's Central Military Commission (CMC). The CMC, Ye was told, would assume direct command of the regiment's operations thereafter. For the time being, the "leading figure" forbade the regiment to fire the first shot or cross the boundary into Hong Kong; nevertheless, he approved of distributing weapons to militias and using the latter as a frontline fighting force against the British (Ye 2003).

Inevitably, Zhou's tilting toward a hardline position led to more lethal consequences. In early July, at the border town of Sha Tau Kok, the Hong Kong police and leftist demonstrators clashed more fiercely than ever. Initially, the PLA's border guards watched passively as the Hong Kong police threw tear gas canisters at the demonstrators, even when some canisters fell

on Chinese territory accidentally. When the premier heard of these developments, he scolded the border guards for "behaving timidly" (*shi ruo*). To make amends, the PLA proposed immediately to take retaliatory action against the British, in several steps: mobilizing more demonstrators along the border; dispatching armed militias to attack British police posts across the border; deploying regular military units to provide cover for the militias' actions. Zhou not only approved the plan, but instructed the HMO to send an emissary to Sha Tau Kok to supervise its execution (Ran and Ma 2001: 44-45).

In the afternoon of July 8, 1967, a team of militias, as planned, intruded into Hong Kong in broad daylight to launch a frontal attack upon a British police post. When the Hong Kong police tried to repel the attack and capture the militias, the PLA's border garrison suddenly opened fire, killing five and wounding eleven policemen (Cheung 2010: 71-72). One Chinese was killed and eight wounded, too (Xu et al. 2003, Vol.18: 181). Reminiscing about the clash, Ye Tengfang (2003) confirms that the CMC had kept a close watch on the evolving situation at Sha Tau Kok, and that the order to open fire came directly from the aforementioned "leading figure." Indeed, it was immediately rumored among the Hong Kong leftists that Vice-Supreme Commander Lin Biao had personally directed the PLA's operation (Jin 1998: 109).

The following day, the HMO emissary returned to Beijing to report to Zhou. Expressing satisfaction with the operation, the premier nevertheless ordered the PLA not to take further actions. Zhou declared that he had communicated with Mao on what to do next with Hong Kong, and Mao's directive was to "let Hong Kong be" (*xianggang haishi nage yangzi*). Thus, the premier said, it was time to consider terminating the current struggle at an appropriate moment,

instead of escalating it further and forcing a premature takeover of Hong Kong (Ran and Ma 2001: 46).[132]

On July 10, Zhou met with General Huang Yongsheng, commander of the Guangzhou Military Region. Again, the premier related Mao's instructions about not using force against Hong Kong. Zhou stressed: "The struggle over Hong Kong is a long-term one, and we must not rush it, for over-hastiness will hurt us" (Li et al. 1997, Vol.3: 169; Chen 2005: 293). In late July 1967, the premier dispatched a vice-minister of the Foreign Ministry to Guangdong, to convey Mao's said directive and restrain the seething leftists (Chen 2005: 293).

Although available Chinese records provide no clues about why Mao decided to let Hong Kong be, the Chairman's decision clearly provided Zhou with a ladder to step down from the earlier commitment to "win this struggle," thereby creating opportunities for a peaceful solution. Nonetheless, given the still dominant influence of the militarized worldview over Chinese diplomacy, Zhou had to wait another two months to bring the crisis to a halt.

Zhou Reasserted Leadership after the Burning of the British Legation

In early July 1967, China's relations with Burma deteriorated rapidly, due in large part to the willful provocations of PRC diplomats stationed in Rangoon (Chen 2005: 284). With direct support from Mao and the CSLGCR, radical elements in Beijing staged anti-Burmese mass rallies for several days, screaming insults at the "reactionary" leadership of Burma (Ma 2003: 149). While still unwilling or unable to defy the ultra-leftists frontally, Zhou resisted steadfastly

---

[132] A Chinese historian, using the alias Li Song (1997), claims that in early July 1967, the Chinese leadership had "unanimously approved" a motion, forwarded by the CSLGCR, of taking over Hong Kong by force by October 1, 1967, and that the relevant military plan was drawn on August 20 through the joint work of the CSLGCR and the PLA. Zhou, according to this account, intervened at the last moment and persuaded Mao to abandon the plan. Nonetheless, the said historian does not provide any information about the sources for this account, which is, moreover, unsupported by any of the primary or scholarly materials that I could find on this subject.

a suggestion from the CSLGCR of "forcing Burma to sever relations with us first," and did his best to keep the mob from sacking the Burmese embassy (Chen 2005: 284-285). Regarding Hong Kong, the premier adopted a similar attitude, expressing neither support nor active objection to the continuance of the leftists' struggle, as if waiting for the radical tide to run its course (Ran and Ma 2001: 46-47).

The hotheads in Hong Kong, however, refused to let the crisis peter out. Clinging to the hope of an eventual and all-out Sino-British conflict, the HMWC leadership decided to escalate the anti-British struggle further, by resorting to terrorist tactics. From mid-July onward, local leftists began to plant bombs on the streets of Hong Kong, killing policemen and innocent civilians indiscriminately (Jin 1998: 114-115; Cheung 2010: 87-93). Meanwhile, on July 16, 1967, the CSLGCR-controlled *People's Daily* published a commentary, with the threat that the seven hundred million mainland Chinese were "determined to use all necessary measures to give complete support to their Hong Kong compatriots until final victory is achieved" (Cheung 2010: 87). Two weeks later, on July 30, the All-China Federation of Trade Unions again remitted HK$10 million to support the Hong Kong leftists (Xu et al. 2003, Vol.18: 197).

Ironically, as the British showed no signs of giving in to continued Chinese intimidation, the CSLGCR began to suspect that the cadres-turned-rebels at the Foreign Ministry were not radical enough. On August 4, 1967, when attending a mass rally in support of the leftist struggle in Hong Kong, two CSLGCR members, Guan Feng and Qi Benyu, met with Yao Dengshan and expressed dissatisfaction with the Foreign Ministry's lack of revolutionary fervor on several issues. Three days later, on August 7, Wang Li, another pivotal CSLGCR member, received Yao and his associates and delivered a more inflammatory address. Regarding foreign affairs, Wang encouraged the Foreign Ministry explicitly to "conduct a thorough revolution, implement

Chairman Mao's revolutionary line thoroughly, and eliminate the policy of 'three surrenders and one suppression' thoroughly" (Ma 2003: 167-170).

Although Wang, Guan, or Qi did not mention Hong Kong specifically, their statements clearly reinforced the radicals' sway over Chinese foreign policy behavior. In fact, after being briefed on Wang Li's address, even a veteran diplomat like Wang Youping (former ambassador to Norway and Cambodia) became convinced of the ideological correctness of the radical posture in Chinese diplomacy (Yun 1996: 99). Under the circumstances, there was no hope of softening the anti-British struggle, until it was almost too late.

On August 20, 1967, the colonial government in Hong Kong ordered the suspension of three left-wing newspapers. With the CSLGCR's admonitions still ringing in their ears, the Foreign Ministry cadres proposed delivering an ultimatum to Britain and demanding that the Hong Kong government revoke the suspension order and release all arrested leftist journalists within 48 hours, or face "grave consequences." Zhou approved the ultimatum, on the understanding that the said "grave consequences" involved only the eviction from China of a second secretary in charge of media affairs at the British legation. Later, Zhou explained to his associates that he gave the approval under conditions of extreme exhaustion (Ran and Ma 2001: 48-50). For a world-famous diplomat, such a lapse of judgment was curious and deplorable indeed.[133]

As the British government simply ignored the ultimatum, a group of Red Guards and Revolutionary Rebels from a few factories planned to storm the British legation in Beijing as soon as the 48-hour deadline lapsed. Hearing of their plan, Zhou tried to enlist the help of the

---

[133] Note that Chen Yangyong, an official CCP historian, evades completely the question of whether it was Zhou or anyone else who approved the fateful ultimatum, in his account of the incident (Chen 2005: 294).

CSLGCR in stopping the incensed radicals, but to no avail. In the evening of August 22, 1967, over one thousand radicals ransacked and burnt down the office building of the British charge d'affaires. Technically, no Foreign Ministry cadres were involved in the outrage; yet, in sending the mindless ultimatum, the diplomat-rebels had clearly thrown in their lot with the radical cause (Ran and Ma 2001: 49-50, Ma 2003: 180).

Zhou was enraged by the incident, which was a gross violation of international law and an indelible blemish on China's international image (Chen 2005: 295-297). Even Mao felt that the radicals had gone too far, commenting later that the incident was engineered by "either extremely ignorant people or criminals" (Ran and Ma 2001: 50). But the incident also provided the premier with a godsend opportunity to reassert his leadership and stave off the meddlesome CSLGCR.

On August 25, 1967, Zhou asked General Yang Chengwu, acting chief of the General Staff of the PLA, to convey a secret message to Mao (then sojourning in Shanghai). Predictably, the message included an indictment of Wang Li's August 7 address, as well as other incidents of the CSLGCR's incitement to mass disturbances. After careful contemplation, Mao voiced displeasure with Wang Li, Guan Feng, and Qi Benyu, and entrusted the premier to take Wang and Guan in charge immediately. The next day, the premier convened a meeting of all key CSLGCR members, including Chen Boda, Jiang Qing, and Kang Sheng, and announced the arrest of Wang and Guan. Qi Benyu, as Mao instructed, was ordered to recant his "grave errors" first, and finally arrested in January 1968. Given their close collaboration with Madame Mao, the downfall of Wang, Guan, and Qi dealt a severe blow to the CSLGCR, forcing it to acknowledge Zhou's authority over foreign affairs again (Li et al. 1997, Vol.3: 182-183; Chen 2005: 298-300).

Afterward, the CSLGCR quietly withdrew its support for the "Joint Command" in Hong

Kong for the anti-British struggle (Ji 1998: 147). Losing aim and direction, the local leftists

persisted, though with decreasing fervor. In late 1967, Zhou recalled the leading cadres of the

HMWC to Beijing, and ordered a complete halt of bomb attacks, demonstrations, or strikes in the

British colony (Ma 2003: 162-163). The crisis, therefore, ended with a fizzle, as soon as

Beijing's Hong Kong policymaking was no longer impacted by the militarized worldview.

In retrospect, the Hong Kong crisis availed Beijing nothing, but cost the local leftists

dearly in popular sympathy and support (Li Hou 1997: 56; Cheung 2010: 131-132). The most

candid admission of Chinese errors came afterward from Zhou. In November 1972, when

meeting with British foreign secretary Alex Douglas-Hume, the premier apologized for the

burning of the British legation in 1967: "A country cannot be always correct. It does sometimes

make mistakes, and needs to recognize them as such." Regarding Hong Kong, Zhou stated that

the Chinese government did not agree with the leftists' activities in 1967, but observed that the

British suppression of the leftists made the problem worse. Finally, Zhou made clear that Beijing

intended to preserve the status quo in the colony as long as there was no major war in Asia,

because it served the interests of both China and Britain (Chen 2005: 301).

In the final analysis, compared with the case of the Sino-Soviet rupture, Beijing's

management of the 1967 Hong Kong crisis attests no less powerfully to the harmful impact of

the militarized worldview on Chinese foreign policy behavior. Based on extremist convictions

and goals, the militarized worldview tends to regard other states as being either "with us" or

"against us," and to dictate a rancorous reaction against those perceived as being "against us," no

matter how slight the alleged provocation. Inevitably, this would create a pervasive atmosphere

of bellicosity and intransigence, leading the Chinese elites and masses to view interstate disputes as a zero-sum game that permits little room for negotiation and compromise.

Against this background, Zhou Enlai's vacillation and ambivalence during the 1967 Hong Kong crisis spoke volumes about how the militarized worldview might compel otherwise rational and moderate leaders to make irrational decisions in foreign affairs. As the architect and chief manager of China's Hong Kong policy, Zhou (with Mao's backing) had long advocated maintaining a restrained and mutually beneficial relationship with Britain over Hong Kong. Nevertheless, at the height of the Cultural Revolution, the levelheaded premier faced tremendous pressures from his radical colleagues as well as the rising tides of mass xenophobia, which forced him to adopt a confrontational approach toward the British. Had Mao not changed his mind at the eleventh hour, Zhou might have approved a full-scale invasion of Hong Kong, an act which, under the circumstances, could bring China nothing but a heavy political, economic, and military burden.

Fortunately, once Zhou (and perhaps Mao) realized that a confrontational strategy was counterproductive in handling foreign disputes, he was not afraid to admit error and abandon a posture that was harming rather than serving China's long-term interests. Similarly, after Deng Xiaoping found no use for the militarized worldview in an era of universal "peace and development," he made a determined effort to mute China's disagreements with others in favor of pursuing cooperation and mutual benefit on the two most contentious issues in Chinese diplomacy—Taiwan and the South China Sea. Why and how Deng and his successors did so will be detailed in the next chapter.

Chapter 7

The Lockean Worldview and Chinese Flexibility:
Taiwan and the South China Sea

On October 22, 1984, Deng Xiaoping delivered an important address to the CCP's

Central Advisory Committee, which was composed mostly of the revolutionary veterans who

had served under Mao Zedong. Regarding the issue of Hong Kong and Taiwan, Deng stated that

China had two ways of resolving it—through negotiation, or by force. A peaceful and negotiated

settlement must be acceptable to all parties concerned; for example, a settlement of the Hong

Kong issue must be simultaneously acceptable to China, Britain, and the people of Hong Kong.

Likewise, a settlement of the Taiwan issue must be acceptable to the United States, the Taiwan

authorities, and the people of Taiwan. By proposing to achieve reunification through the "one

country, two systems" formula, Deng said, Beijing's bottom-line was that neither side of the

Taiwan Strait should "gobble up" the other side (Deng 1993: 84-86).

At the same time, Deng cautioned that it required time and patience to resolve the Taiwan

issue. Thus, although the PRC should never rule out the possibility of a non-peaceful settlement,

Deng stressed: "We must not resort to the use of force in a hasty and offhand manner, because

we must concentrate on economic development. The postponement of reunification for some

years will not impinge upon the big picture [of China's development]." For the same reason, he

said, China should endeavor to work out new and innovative ways of settling interstate disputes.

For instance, regarding the dispute over the Spratlys in the South China Sea, Beijing could

propose to shelve the disagreements on the sovereignty issue, and to engage other disputants in

joint development projects and enterprises, so that all sides concerned could collaborate to reap

mutual benefits. In this way, thorny problems left over by history could be settled without war.

At any rate, Deng concluded, China cannot achieve long-term development by relapsing into self-imposed isolation from international society again (Deng 1993: 86-88, 90; citations on p.87).

With characteristic succinctness, Deng thus introduced several guiding principles for the PRC's approach toward contentious territorial disputes:

—China should seek to resolve the disputes through negotiation, not by force;

—China should demonstrate patience and seek mutually acceptable solutions, not itch for flexing its muscles;

—Chinese policy and behavior should help to increase goodwill and expand common interests with other countries, instead of impacting its integration into international society negatively.

In effect, these principles have guided Beijing's approach to the issues of Taiwan and the South China Sea to this day. The question is: How did Deng, once an exponent of the militarized worldview himself (see Chapter 6), come to form these beliefs that contradicted his prior convictions? More importantly, why does the PRC leadership continue to uphold the validity of the Dengist approach toward those contentious issues, long after the patriarch passed away (in February 1997)?

In this chapter, I seek to answer the question by examining the role of the Lockeanization of the Chinese worldview in moderating Beijing's conflict propensity. Theoretically, in the Lockean worldview, even relations with an adversary (or adversaries) are not hopelessly inimical and zero-sum; therefore, it is possible to create and expand common interests through engagement and cooperation, as well as to manage conflicts of interest without recourse to force. Moreover, because compromise is both possible and desirable in this context, the utility of

confrontation and violence naturally decreases as a way of settling disputes, especially as the common interests with the other side increase (see Chapter 1).

The Lockeanization of the Chinese worldview, as argued in Chapter 3, transforms Beijing's normative beliefs and behavioral preferences precisely in this direction. When Deng Xiaoping sought to integrate China into international society, he also realized that the PRC needed to improve its relations with a broad variety of states, including erstwhile adversaries and enemies. Intractable as certain old disputes were, Deng nevertheless believed that the expansion of trade and other constructive exchanges would help to create a strong common interest in deepening cooperation and avoiding conflict, thereby spurring both sides to seek an amicable settlement of their disputes. The use of force, viewed in this light, was no longer an essential instrument of Chinese foreign policy, because it would inevitably aggravate tension and diminish goodwill in China's relations with other countries.

Furthermore, as contemporary China recognizes "peace and development" as the underlying themes of international society, it also accepts the implicit obligation to preserve peace and promote common development—which is, theoretically, the only way of proving China's worth as a responsible member of international society (see Chapter 3). To demonstrate its commitment to international peace and security, the PRC should naturally exercise self-restraint in managing disputes with others; to use force wantonly would only cause universal alarm about Chinese intentions, provoke hostile reactions and encirclement, and damage the prospects for China's long-term development. Similarly, to promote common development, Beijing should endeavor to resolve disputes in a way that benefits regional stability and prosperity, thereby creating more opportunities rather than problems for the Asia-Pacific area, which is the world's most economically dynamic region.

In this chapter, I use the cases of Taiwan and the South China Sea to illustrate the effect of the Lockean worldview in increasing Beijing's flexibility and decreasing its violence propensity. In both cases, the PRC leadership has held consistently on to a similar set of perceptions and assessments, which derive logically from the Lockean worldview, as follows:

—A win-win solution, arrived at through negotiation and compromise, is the most desirable outcome for the issue in dispute;

—The expansion of constructive exchanges and mutual benefit is the best means of resolving the dispute, or at least keeping it at manageable levels;

—All options must be subordinated to China's fundamental goal of promoting economic development at home and a peaceful environment abroad;

—The use of force is only a last resort that should be avoided in principle. Even in moments of crisis, China should proceed with caution and avoid creating an unstoppable momentum toward a full-scale confrontation, and leave room for a mutually acceptable settlement in the future.

Through this comparison, I hope to uncover certain hidden patterns of consistency in the way China handles a pivotal interstate dispute or foreign policy crisis, as long as the Lockean worldview predominates in Beijing. This will also provide a template for analyzing and predicting Chinese behavior under similar political and historical conditions.

Case One: The Moderation of China's Taiwan Policy

Background: A Legacy of the Chinese Civil War

The Taiwan issue, as the Chinese like to say, is a problem left over by history. In late 1949, the Chinese Civil War (1946-1949) ended with the total collapse of Chiang Kai-shek's Republic of China government, the remnants of which then fled offshore to Taiwan, an island

province that the ROC recovered from Japan only four years ago. For some time, the existence of Chiang and his adherents seemed perilous, as Mao's victorious army stood ready to invade Taiwan, and as some U.S. officials toyed with the idea of ejecting the faltering ROC government and establishing an international or U.S. trusteeship over the island. After the outbreak of the Korean War, however, stemming communist expansion became a top priority of American foreign policy, leading the Truman administration to deploy the U.S. Seventh Fleet in the Taiwan Strait to prevent hostilities from or against Taiwan (for the evolution of U.S. policy during this period, see Finkelstein 1993 and Accinelli 1998). Thereafter, China remained—and still remains—a divided nation with two competing governments, the PRC on the Chinese mainland and the ROC on Taiwan, both of which claimed sovereignty over all of China, including Taiwan and its adjacent islands.

For Mao and his comrades, this anomalous situation presented both challenges and opportunities. On the one hand, given the U.S. presence in the Taiwan Strait, the PRC was unlikely to "liberate" Taiwan in the foreseeable future. China's sovereignty over Taiwan, therefore, became insecure, challenging Beijing to do its utmost to prevent the creation of two Chinas or an independent Taiwan. On the other hand, like the Chinese Communist Party, Chiang Kai-shek and his stalwarts in the Kuomintang (KMT, or the Chinese Nationalist Party) were fervent Chinese nationalists committed to the reunification of China. As such, they were no less determined to oppose the perpetuation of cross-strait separation, or to thwart any perceived foreign schemes to detach Taiwan from China. For this reason, the KMT shared the same interest with the CCP in maintaining that the Taiwan issue was an internal affair of China, thereby providing Beijing with an implicit opportunity to seek reconciliation with Taipei on the basis of the one-China concept.

During Mao's reign, China's Taiwan policy had basically followed the pattern outlined above (for details, see Huang and Li 2010, chapters 1-2). Between 1958 and 1978, for example, the PRC kept shelling the ROC-held offshore islands, first regularly and then intermittently, as a deliberate signal to the outside world that the civil war was unfinished and the cross-strait strife remained an internal Chinese issue. Meanwhile, Beijing insisted steadfastly that Sino-American relations could not improve unless and until the United States recognized Taiwan as a part of China and withdrew its military forces from the Taiwan Strait. Furthermore, from 1956 onward, the CCP used multiple secret channels to maintain contact with the KMT, calling for the "peaceful liberation" of Taiwan through negotiations between the two dominant parties.

In large part, Beijing's unyielding determination to preserve a de jure One China, while failing to bring Taipei to the negotiating table, did help to strike a chord with the old guard of the KMT (see Huang and Li 2010: 40-43, 64-67, 72-73). In 1972, to clear the way for rapprochement with the PRC, the Nixon administration acknowledged eventually the Chinese position that there was only one China and Taiwan was a part of China, while forswearing any U.S. support for a two-Chinas or one-China, one-Taiwan solution (Romberg 2003, chapter 2-3; see also Huang and Li 2010: 75-83). Nevertheless, in several critical aspects, Beijing's efforts to resolve the Taiwan issue on its own terms met with strenuous objections from Taipei and Washington:

First, as a precondition for peaceful resolution of the cross-strait strife, Beijing always demanded the elimination of the ROC as well as the capitalist way of life on Taiwan. To the ROC and the people of Taiwan, such a demand was plainly unacceptable (see Huang and Li 2010: 35-36, 41-43, 65-66);

Second, despite its intermittent interest in seeking a "peaceful liberation" of Taiwan,

Beijing always regarded military force as the ultimate instrument to achieve reunification. Mao,

in particular, clung to the goal of reunification by conquest to the end of his life.[134] The ROC as

well as the people of Taiwan, of course, had no wish to be "liberated" by the communists;

moreover, as Washington has insisted since the Shanghai Communique of 1972, any non-

peaceful settlement of the Taiwan issue is contrary to U.S. interests.[135]

—Third, to reserve the option of compelling reunification by force, Beijing always

insisted that the settlement of Taiwan issue was an internal affair of China and brooked no

foreign interference. Successive U.S. administrations, however, refused to accept this view, and

regarded the cross-strait strife as a threat to international security. To maintain peace and

---

[134] In mid-November 1973, Mao told Kissinger expressly that he did not believe in a "peaceful transition" in PRC-Taiwan relations, even though China could "wait a hundred years" to resolve the Taiwan issue (Kissinger 1982: 692). When meeting with Kissinger, Zhou Enlai struck a slightly different note, implying Beijing's willingness to seek to liberate Taiwan by peaceful means too. After hearing of Zhou's statement, Mao was displeased and asserted: "It is wrong to say that there might be two possible ways [peaceful and non-peaceful] to resolve the Taiwan issue, for a fight is [ultimately] necessary." Even some minor warlords in northern Shanxi, said Mao, had refused to surrender to the CCP in the 1930s unless and until the communist army attacked them frontally (Jia 1989: 310-311).

[135] In the Shanghai Communique (published after Nixon's historic visit to China in February 1972), the U.S. government made two oblique but vitally important points. First, it "reaffirms its interest in a peaceful settlement of the Taiwan question by the Chinese themselves." Second, "with this prospect in mind," it "affirms the ultimate objective of the withdrawal of all U.S. forces and military installations from Taiwan. In the meantime, it will progressively reduce its forces and military installations on Taiwan as the tension in the area diminishes." Evidently, the U.S. "interest" in a peaceful settlement means "strategic national interest, not idle curiosity" (Romberg 2003: 7). Moreover, according to John Holdridge (a drafter of the communique), the implied linkage between U.S. disengagement from Taiwan and the prospect of a peaceful settlement conveyed a significant message: "This formula made everything the United States was doing or would do militarily about Taiwan contingent on China's maintenance of a peaceful environment in the Taiwan Strait. If China were to insist on its right to use force against Taiwan and back up its words with military concentrations and/or operations, all bets would be off" (Holdridge 1997: 89).

stability in the area, Washington was opposed to any Chinese attempt to determine Taiwan's future unilaterally.

In retrospect, the foregoing (Maoist) Chinese position was hardly surprising. According to the militarized worldview, fighting and conquest were an integral part of the political universe. To a revolutionary challenger long inured to this worldview, the notion of resolving an "internal affair" in the interest of international peace and security was alien and incomprehensible. The Lockean worldview, on the other hand, values "peace and development" as an end in itself and advocates constructive engagement with the international society. Over time, therefore, it leads Beijing to pursue more peaceful, gradualist, and multilateral solutions to interstate disputes. Reflecting these perceptual changes, Deng Xiaoping introduced major innovations into China's Taiwan policy in the late 1970s, and his successors have both upheld and upgraded the Dengist approach to this day.

Striving for Peaceful Reunification: Deng's Initiatives

In 1978, when Deng decided to reform and open up China, he also placed a premium on preserving peace and developing constructive relations with the outside world (see Chapter 3). Toward that end, Deng pushed vigorously for the normalization of Sino-American relations. In his view, the establishment of an enduring, collaborative relationship with the United States had a double significance. First, he believed that normalization would "create more favorable conditions for the United States to help us realize modernization" (Leng et al. 2004: 474). During his historic visit to America in February 1979, Deng made it clearer to his hosts: "The Chinese people, in their effort to achieve modernization, would like to learn from the American people on many things" (Ibid., 485). Second, he regarded a stable Sino-American relationship as the key to global peace and security over the long run (Ibid., 437-438, 897-898, 1241).

Against this backdrop, a peaceful and accommodative approach toward Taiwan became a strategic necessity to China on several counts. To begin with, given the long-standing American involvement in the Taiwan issue, Washington was bound to oppose any PRC attempts to "liberate" Taiwan by force. To allay U.S. concerns, Beijing thus needed to readjust its policy to indicate its acceptance of the status quo, at least for the foreseeable future. This explains why, in pursuing normalization of Sino-American relations, Deng had repeatedly stated that Beijing would reconsider its Taiwan policy according to the realities on the island. A principal factor, observed Deng, was the existence of huge U.S. and international investments in Taiwan, and China would accept the reality and undertake to protect the economic interests of the United States and other countries there (Leng et al. 2004: 396, 430, 442).

Implicitly, this also means China would have to leave Taiwan's capitalist way of life alone, for it was precisely under capitalism that the island had prospered and become an integral part of the world economy. Furthermore, keeping Taiwan alive and well serves the interest of China's modernization. At a minimum, the newly affluent Chinese compatriots on Taiwan were a valuable source of capital, technology, and know-how for the long-isolated and indigent PRC. In fact, in 1978, Deng had already determined to adopt an export-oriented strategy for China's development; thus, he took a keen interest in learning from the experience of the four Asian "tigers"—i.e., Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore, and South Korea, which had achieved modernization in one generation through similar strategies (Leng et al. 2004: 318, 320).

Finally, a peaceful approach toward Taiwan would vindicate China's avowed intention of promoting a peaceful international environment. Using force against the island would not only damage the PRC's relations with the United States and many other countries that shared a stake in Taiwan's well-being, but also defeat Beijing's efforts to seek acceptance as a respectable and

responsible member of the international society. At any rate, a war in the Taiwan Strait would diminish China's prospects for achieving stable and sustained development, which Beijing now regarded as its overriding priority and achievable only within a peaceful environment abroad.

The Lockeanization of the Chinese worldview, as initiated by Deng Xiaoping, provides an auspicious context for the transformation of China's Taiwan policy in the said direction. Because the Lockean worldview perceives interstate disputes as amenable to negotiation and compromise, it encourages Beijing to adopt a "live and let live" attitude, instead of imposing its will unilaterally. As this worldview recognizes the sustainability of peace and the avoidability of war, it prompts Beijing to seek to maintain regional peace and stability, instead of disrupting it. Because the Lockean worldview places cooperation above conflict, it also induces Beijing to expand constructive exchanges with other parties in a dispute, in the hope of maximizing opportunities for reaching a mutually beneficial settlement. Against this theoretical background, it is easily understandable why Deng and his successors have sought persistently to achieve reunification with Taiwan in a gradual, step-by-step way, preferably through economic integration and not by force, and with a minimum understanding with the United States in managing the Taiwan issue. Below, I provide an overview of the major Dengist initiatives that have guided China's Taiwan policy to date.

Achieving Reunification through Integration, Not by Force

In December 1978, when Deng assumed the supreme leadership of the CCP, he approved two conciliatory measures that broke new ground in PRC-Taiwan relations. First, starting on January 1, 1979, the PLA terminated its periodic bombardment of Jinmen and Mazu, two ROC-held offshore islands that had stood as the symbol of the unfinished Chinese civil war since the Taiwan Strait Crisis of 1958. Second, on that same day, the Standing Committee of the PRC's

National People's Congress (NPC) issued a statement entitled "Message to the Taiwan Compatriots." The statement was not only the first major policy document on the Taiwan issue in the Dengist era, but also set the tone for China's approach toward Taiwan in the next three decades. As such, the document is worth a close scrutiny below.[136]

To begin with, the NPC statement struck a peaceful and pragmatic note. Throughout the lengthy text, the word "liberation" was nowhere mentioned, and the goal of reunification was implicitly associated with the maintenance of Taiwan's autonomy and prosperity. The Chinese people, it declared, were working wholeheartedly for China's modernization, and Taiwan was expected to join hands with the mainland in contributing to this grand enterprise. Toward that end, the PRC leadership was said to have "made up its mind to respect the status quo on Taiwan and the opinions of people in all walks of life there, and to adopt reasonable policies and measures . . . so as not to cause the people of Taiwan any losses," in the process of pursuing reunification.

How was reunification to be achieved? The NPC statement laid out the following roadmap. Politically, it expressed appreciation of the KMT authorities' long-standing adherence to the one-China principle and opposition to Taiwan's independence. This, the statement emphasized, "constitutes the mutual stand as well as the basis of cooperation between us," regardless of other disagreements between the two sides. Militarily, it proposed to end the state of confrontation in the Taiwan Strait, "so as to create the necessary prerequisites and a secure environment" for cross-strait contact. Socially and economically, it advocated the expansion of trade, cultural, and people-to-people exchanges across the strait, to promote mutual understanding and mutual benefit.

---

[136] The full text of the NPC statement is available at: http://news3.xinhuanet.com/ziliao/2003-01/23/content_704733.htm (Accessed November 18, 2012).

In essence, the NPC statement envisioned reunification with Taiwan as an evolutionary process, to be realized through constructive engagement and gradual integration. This explains why, despite its pleading for an early reunification, the statement did *not* call on Taiwan to enter into immediate talks over reunification. Instead, in Deng's opinion, reunification was best achieved in a "natural," step-by-step manner, and Taiwan's status as part of China would be secured after the two sides of the strait became increasingly connected and interdependent (cited in Li Li 2005: 409). Indeed, during this period, a consensus began to emerge among China's leaders that managing the Taiwan issue required patience and gradualism (Huang and Li 2010: 107-108).

To signal Beijing's sincerity in respecting the status quo in Taiwan, Deng Xiaoping formulated the famous "one country, two systems" policy. Under this policy, China will be reunified under the PRC, which will serve as the central government of all China. However, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Macau will continue to maintain their capitalist system and way of life, as well as a high degree of autonomy (Deng 1993: 30-31, 58-61; see also Leng et al. 2004: 468, 470, 474, 582-583). To the ROC government in Taiwan, this policy was still unacceptable, because it implied the political elimination of the ROC. In October 1984, after Chiang Ching-kuo, then president of the ROC, openly rejected the one-country, two-systems proposal, Deng remarked to a Japanese delegation that the PRC was fully capable of blockading the Taiwan Strait—an implied threat that caused grave concern in Taipei (Hao 2000: 621-624)

Nevertheless, as noted earlier, Deng did not attach much importance to the option of using force to reunify Taiwan, because this option contradicted his paramount goal of achieving reunification through gradual and mutually beneficial integration. Rather, in his view, the threat to use force was basically a deterrent against Taiwan's independence or a foreign invasion of the

island.[137] Indeed, in mid-1986, through private communications, Beijing reassured Taipei that the use of force was only a last resort directed against Taiwanese separatism or foreign invasion, and that the PRC would not sacrifice its pursuit of peace and development for the sake of reunification by force.[138]

Acknowledging Taiwan's Separate International Existence

If reunification is a long and evolutionary process, then the PRC obviously would have to allow for Taiwan's existence as a separate political entity in the international arena for the foreseeable future. Traditionally, the idea of international coexistence was total anathema to both Beijing and Taipei. To emphasize that both sides of the Taiwan Strait belonged to one and the same China, of which there could only be one legitimate government, the PRC and the ROC had long adhered to a foreign policy known as "*han zei bu liang li*" ("The legitimate government and the bandits cannot coexist"), which meant, in effect, that each side would sever relations automatically with any state or interstate organization that officially recognized the other side. Similarly, while formulating the one-country, two-systems policy, Deng Xiaoping was adamant that Taiwan could only exist as a local government of China, of which the PRC would be the sole representative internationally (Deng 1993: 30).

As a supreme pragmatist, however, Deng soon realized that it was impractical to deny Taiwan a separate international existence *before* reunification. In February 1983, the PRC

---

[137] On May 7, 1985, Deng told the Burmese president Ne Win that China would resort to force against Taiwan only under three sets of circumstances: (1) Taiwan's pursuit of independence; (2) Taiwan's indefinite refusal to hold peace talks with the PRC; and (3) Taiwan's occupation by foreign military forces (Leng et al. 2004: 1044). Interestingly, as will be shown later, only the first hypothetical circumstance was listed in China's Anti-Secession Law (adopted in March 2005) as a precondition for using force against Taiwan.

[138] This is based on the reminiscences of Jia Yibin, vice-chairman of the KMT Revolutionary Committee (one of the eight "democratic parties" in the PRC), who had met with a secret emissary from Taiwan in mid-1986 (Zhou and Guo 1995: 175-177; see also Li Li 2005: 68-69).

applied for admission to the Asia Development Bank (ADB), of which the ROC had been a member since 1966. Customarily, Beijing demanded the expulsion of the ROC from the bank, on the grounds that Taipei had no right to represent China. The demand met with stiff resistance from the United States, which stood firmly for Taiwan's continued membership in the ADB. Behind the scenes, Washington proposed a compromise solution: i.e., Taiwan would remain in the ADB, but only in a nongovernmental capacity, because the United States had recognized the PRC as the sole legal government of China and did not support a two-Chinas or one-China, one-Taiwan resolution of the issue (Qian 2005, Vol.2: 538-548).

In late June 1983, to feel out Beijing's position on the proposed compromise, Winston Yang, a Chinese scholar at Seton Hall University, had a meeting with Deng. Insisting on one China but showing some flexibility, Deng made clear that Beijing would allow Taipei to retain its seat in the ADB under the designation "Taiwan, China" or "Taipei, China." As Yang reminisced later, Deng's initiative was opposed at first by some conservatives in the CCP and the Foreign Ministry, who wanted to evict the ROC from the ADB and deprive Taipei of its last official representation in an intergovernmental organization. With characteristic resolution, Deng overruled the conservatives and supported Taiwan's continued membership in the ADB, to create an opportunity for engaging Taiwan and improving cross-strait relations (Zhou and Guo 1995: 230-233).[139]

In 1984, Deng displayed similar flexibility, in handling another crucial case. Earlier that year, the Chinese Physics Association (CPA) of the PRC sought admission to the International Physics Association (IPA), of which the counterpart organization of the ROC was already a

---

[139] Conspicuously, in recounting Deng's meeting with Yang in June 1983, the official PRC documentary record omits all Deng's statements on the ADB issue—possibly an indication that there still exist differences of opinion over Deng's bold initiative (e.g., see Deng 1993: 30-31; Leng et al. 2004: 917-918).

member. As usual, the PRC Foreign Ministry requested an explanatory note from the IPA, to acknowledge Beijing's position that "there is only one China, Taiwan is a part of China, and the Chinese Physics Association of the PRC is the sole representative of China in the IPA." After some consultations, however, Zhou Guangzhao, chairman of the CPA in Beijing, reached a tentative agreement with Shen Jun-shan, chairman of the counterpart organization in Taipei. Instead of saying "Taiwan is a part of China," the proposal drafted by Shen declared that "both Taiwan and the mainland are parts of China," to indicate Taiwan's (and the ROC's) political equality with mainland China. For the same reason, the proposal did not refer to the CPA in Beijing as the "sole representative of China" in the IPA.

Again, the conservatives in Beijing clamored for rejection of Shen's proposal, which constituted an unprecedented confirmation of Taiwan's separate but equal existence alongside the PRC. A shrewd negotiator, Shen Jun-shan then asked Tsung-Dao Lee, a renowned Chinese-American scientist who won the Nobel Prize for Physics in 1957, to convey the proposal directly to Deng Xiaoping and probe Deng's attitude. In October 1984, Lee visited China and met with Deng, who expressed unqualified support of Shen's proposal, thereby clearing the way for an agreement on the issue.[140] In retrospect, Shen observed gladly that, of all international agreements signed between the two sides of the Taiwan Strait, this document granted Taiwan an equal status most explicitly (Shen 2004: 155-162, 164). In fact, as will be detailed below, Deng's endorsement of the innovative formula that "both Taiwan and the mainland are parts of China" created a vitally important precedent in upgrading Taiwan's political parity with the PRC

---

[140] Note that the CCP's official historians have formally acknowledged Tsung-Dao Lee's role in helping to resolve the issue, in an official chronology of Deng Xiaoping (see Leng et al. 2004: 999).

intranationally, enabling future leaders of China to seek cross-strait rapprochement on a brand-new conceptual basis.

Seeking Accommodation with the United States

In December 1978, in a joint communique announcing the normalization of Sino-American relations, the U.S. government formally recognized the PRC as the sole legal government of China, and agreed to maintain only unofficial relations with the people of Taiwan. In so acting, Washington also "acknowledges the Chinese position that there is but one China and Taiwan is a part of China."[141] Meanwhile, the Carter administration made clear to Beijing that the United States continued to have an interest in the peaceful resolution of the Taiwan issue; for that reason, it would continue to provide arms to Taiwan for defensive purposes (Romberg 2003, chapter 4; see also Huang and Li 2010: 90-101).

On March 29, 1979, the U.S. Congress passed the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA), to formalize the U.S. commitment to maintaining peace and stability in the Taiwan Strait area. The act, however, did not specify the exact extent of U.S. defense commitment to Taiwan (for an informed analysis of the TRA, see Bush 2004: 152-160). Furthermore, on August 17, 1982, the Reagan administration signed another joint communique with the PRC on the question of U.S. arms sales to Taiwan. Echoing the 1972 and 1979 communiques between the two governments, this third communique reaffirmed that the United States had no intention of pursuing a two-Chinas or one-China, one-Taiwan policy. Meanwhile, it insisted that reductions in U.S. arms sales to Taiwan were conditioned implicitly upon continued Chinese commitment to a peaceful resolution of the Taiwan issue (For detailed analyses of this communique, see Romberg 2003,

---

[141] See the joint communiqué on the establishment of formal diplomatic relations between China and the United States, as reprinted in *American Foreign Policy Basic Documents:* 1977-1980 (Government Printing Office, 1983), pp. 967-968.

chapter 6; see also Bush 2004: 163-171). Since then, the three joint communiques, together with the TRA, have remained the guiding framework of American policy toward Taiwan.

Under the circumstances, Beijing faced an acute dilemma. In principle, it maintained that the Taiwan issue was an internal Chinese affair and brooked no foreign interference. Yet, given the U.S. "abiding interest" (a term coined by President Reagan) in the peaceful settlement of the Taiwan issue, Beijing had no choice but to seek a minimum understanding with Washington in managing Taiwan-related affairs. Deng's approach toward the United States was a case in point. On the one hand, he was deeply suspicious of American designs on Taiwan (e.g., see Leng et al. 2004: 507-506, 1050). Yet, on the other hand, he was often realistic enough to seek accommodation with Washington in the making of China's Taiwan policy. On December 19, 1984, he asked British prime minister Margaret Thatcher to inform U.S. president Reagan of "how China and Great Britain worked together to resolve the Hong Kong issue." Deng hoped that if Reagan found the one-country, two-systems formula acceptable, then "the United States, and especially President Reagan himself, can do many things on the Taiwan issue" (Ibid., 1020).

The Reagan administration, however, declined Deng's initiative, on the grounds that the Taiwan issue was a matter to be settled by the Chinese themselves (Leng et al. 2004: 1040). Nevertheless, in March 1987, U.S. secretary of state George Shultz made an important policy statement during his visit to China, expressing Washington's encouragement of cross-strait contact and exchange. In effect, Shultz's statement may well have helped to prompt ROC president Chiang Ching-kuo to reconsider Taipei's traditional "three no's" (no contact, no negotiation, no compromise) policy toward the PRC (Romberg 2003: 148-149). In November 1987, Chiang lifted the ban on family visits from Taiwan to the mainland, thereby opening the gate to future rapprochement with the PRC.

Chiang Ching-kuo, however, died soon afterward, on January 13, 1988. Uncertain of

Taiwan's future direction, Deng again sought to engage Washington in managing the Taiwan

issue. On September 7, 1988, he had a revealing conversation with U.S. secretary of defense

Frank Carlucci. Noting that Taiwan could move toward reunification just as well as

independence, Deng urged: "We hope the United States will always adhere to the principles set

forth in the three joint communiqués and *we shall jointly conform to these principles*" (Leng et al.

2004: 1246-1247; italics mine). For its part, despite its support for Taiwan's peaceful existence,

the U.S. government did take its commitment to a one-China policy seriously.[142] This minimum

understanding, as will be seen, was crucial to China's cooperation or at least coordination with

the United States regarding the Taiwan issue, in the years to come.

Upgrading Equality, Downplaying Force:
Jiang Zemin's New Thinking

When Jiang Zemin came to power in 1989, he already faced a new Taiwan as well as a

new generation of Taiwanese leadership. After forty years of separation, Taiwan had become

politically, economically, and socially distinct from mainland China. Mistrusting the

authoritarian and underdeveloped PRC, many Taiwanese were profoundly resistant to the idea of

---

[142] For instance, in February 1989, after President George H. W. Bush's visit to China, U.S. assistant secretary of state Stapleton Roy briefed General Guo Yun, the ROC's military representative in Washington, on U.S. positions and concerns. Roy warned that Taiwan's "pragmatic diplomacy," aimed at expanding the ROC's diplomatic representation abroad, might lead it into a direct confrontation with the PRC, to the detriment of Taiwan's own interests. Roy also said that some pro-independence elements in Taiwan had sought contact with Washington, and but they had been told officially that the United States did not support Taiwan's independence. According to Roy, the U.S. government suspected that some current leaders of the KMT also held pro-independence opinions, and that the pragmatic diplomacy was more or less a reflection of these opinions. From the U.S. perspective, stressed Roy, the highest political ideal of the ROC should be to inspire and prompt the entire Chinese nation to embrace democracy, liberty, and openness. After receiving a report of these briefings, ROC president Lee Teng-hui, an avid supporter of pragmatic diplomacy himself, was much distressed by Roy's statement that Washington suspected some KMT leaders of harboring pro-independence designs (Hao 2000: 1443-1444).

reunification, and supported their leaders' efforts to raise the international profile of the ROC, which had achieved economic prosperity *and* political democratization in the early 1990s. From 1989 to 1994, surveys in Taiwan indicated that "despite progress made in cross-strait economic integration, support for independence, opposition to Beijing's one-country, two-systems policy, and resistance to reunification rhetoric were all increasing" (Zhao 1999: 34).

Initially, the top leadership on both sides of the Taiwan Strait sought to increase mutual understanding through secret or unofficial channels. From 1991 to 1999, apart from the so-called "secret emissaries' meetings," some policy experts from either side were authorized to hold regular, closed-door communications and dialogues with the other side, on a wide range of issues concerning cross-strait relations (Zou 2001: 192-204; Wang 2005: 62-71).[143] Of these meetings, the only verbatim records emerging years later were three lengthy conversations between Jiang Zemin and Shen Jun-shan, a close advisor to the ROC government, between December 1990 and January 1992. In substance, they provided valuable clues as to the post-Deng Chinese leadership's new thinking concerning Taiwan.[144]

Not surprisingly, Jiang averred that Beijing would never accept an independent Taiwan or the perpetuation of cross-strait separation, or recognize the ROC as an equal Chinese government. Meanwhile, Jiang reaffirmed that the PRC was not in a hurry to reunify Taiwan. Reunification, said Jiang, was a gradual, step-by-step process, and Beijing intended to achieve reunification by peaceful means, not by coercion. While insisting on the one-China principle,

---

[143] From December 1990 to March 1995, ROC president Lee Teng-hui dispatched his confidential secretary, Su Zhi-cheng, to attend at least twenty-seven clandestine meetings with responsible PRC officials on the mainland. This channel of secret communication was terminated after June 1995, when Lee's unofficial visit to his alma mater, Cornell University, persuaded Beijing of Lee's tendency to pursue Taiwan's independence and touched off a storm in Sino-American relations (for details, see Zou 2001: 192-204).

[144] The following account is based on the verbatim records reproduced in Shen Jun-shan's memoirs (see Shen 2004: 290-364).

Jiang also put forth the novel suggestion that the two sides of the strait hold preparatory talks to discuss certain sensitive issues, such as Taipei's demand for "equality" with Beijing.

In response, Shen emphasized that the majority of the Taiwanese people did not support independence, but neither did they welcome reunification anytime soon. In the long run, he believed, the shared cultural heritage, growing economic interdependence, and regularized exchanges would bring about a voluntary reunion of the two sides of the strait. However, in the present, interim period, Shen advised Beijing to do more things to increase Taiwan's sense of security and equality vis-à-vis the PRC. For example, Beijing should contemplate recognizing the equal status of the ROC (an option that Jiang said was unacceptable), or allowing Taiwan to have a separate space for international activities (an option that Jiang agreed to consider, on condition that such a "space" did not contravene the one-China principle). At a minimum, suggested Shen, the PRC could signal its goodwill and flexibility in several ways, as follows:

—Beijing should made clear that it would not contemplate using force against Taiwan, unless and until Taiwan sought independence or fell under foreign occupation;

—Instead of envisioning "what would happen *after* reunification," Beijing should devote more attention to the question of how to move step by step *toward* reunification (e.g., by promoting economic, trade, and cultural exchanges with Taiwan, and by formalizing a one-China framework that permitted Taiwan to retain its political autonomy);

—Because peaceful reunification was at any rate a remote prospect, Beijing should concentrate on the more pragmatic goal of ending the state of hostility and establishing a *modus vivendi* between the two sides of the strait (Shen 2004: 290-364).

Admittedly, most of Shen's suggestions were in line with the Dengist approach toward Taiwan since 1979: after all, Deng had aimed precisely to promote reunification through

exchange and integration, to leave Taiwan with some international space of its own, and to depreciate the utility of force except as a deterrent option. As will be seen, Jiang Zemin not only inherited this Dengist approach, but also upgraded it accommodate to some extent Taipei's demand for political equality. Below, I provide a summary of Jiang's major initiatives in this direction, and recount how Beijing continued to seek accommodation with Washington in managing the increasingly volatile Taiwan issue, through and after the Taiwan Strait Crisis of 1995-1996.

The Jiangist Peace Initiatives, 1992-1995

In October 1992, when Jiang was elected as general secretary of the CCP at the 14th party congress, he introduced a new flexibility into China's Taiwan policy. In the Dengist era, official PRC policy always advocated a "party-to-party" (i.e., the CCP vs. the KMT) format for cross-strait negotiations, to avoid conferring any legitimacy on the ROC government in Taiwan. In contrast, Jiang stated for the first time that cross-strait political consultations should include representatives from all relevant political parties and social groups in Taiwan; moreover, under the premise of one China, "everything can be discussed," including the modalities of formal cross-strait negotiations, until a *mutually acceptable* arrangement was worked out (Jiang 2006, Vol.1: 252; italics mine). By emphasizing that a cross-strait settlement should be mutually acceptable, Jiang went a large step toward acknowledging the intra-China equality of the two sides of the Taiwan Strait.

Two months later (in late December 1992), to facilitate cross-strait exchanges, two nominally unofficial organizations, the Association for Relations across the Taiwan Strait (ARATS) in Beijing, and the Straits Exchange Foundation (SEF) in Taipei, reached an important understanding on the question of how to apply the one-China principle in cross-strait

consultations.[145] Known as the "1992 Consensus," this understanding confirmed that both sides

of the Taiwan Strait were committed to the one-China principle as well as the goal of national

reunification, but acknowledged the fact that either side had its own distinctive interpretation of

the term "one China." In this way, Beijing tacitly recognized Taiwan's de facto separate and

equal existence, in exchange for Taipei's admission of a de jure One China comprising both

sides of the Taiwan Strait (for detailed analyses of this understanding, see Huang and Li 2010:

153-161).

To be sure, despite this acknowledgment of Taipei's *intranational* parity with Beijing,

neither Jiang nor his colleagues were ready to accept the ROC's *international* equality with the

PRC, for to do so was considered tantamount to the creation of two Chinas or one China, one

Taiwan (Jiang 2006, Vol.2: 130-131). This explains why, then as now, Beijing's proffered

concessions to Taipei have always been based on the premise of one China. Still, in 1993-1994,

the post-Deng Chinese leadership has apparently formed the consensus that the PRC should not

use force against Taiwan as long as the latter did not pursue independence, and that Beijing

should demonstrate patience and sincerity in pursuit of peaceful reunification for a long period of

time (Garver 1997: 54-56, 59-61). As proof of this consensus, the PRC's top experts on Taiwan

affairs were instructed to draft an important policy statement, which formed the basis of Jiang's

upcoming eight-point proposal (Li 2010: 352).

On January 30, 1995, Jiang formally unveiled his eight-point proposal toward Taiwan.

These eight points included:

---

[145] At the time, the ROC still prohibited direct and official contact with the PRC government. Therefore, both the SEF and the ARATS were inaugurated as intermediary organizations to handle cross-strait exchanges on an ostensibly unofficial basis. Both organizations, however, were staffed by experienced ex-government officials on either side, and were headed, respectively, by two prominent figures—Koo Chen-fu (friend of Lee Teng-hui) and Wang Daohan (former mentor of Jiang Zemin).

—adhering to the one-China principle and opposing any activities aimed at creating an independent Taiwan;

—approving of Taiwan's participation in some international organizations for purposes of economic cooperation, but opposing any Taiwan activities aimed at creating two Chinas or one China, one Taiwan;

—holding cross-strait political negotiations on an equal footing, and ending the state of hostility in the Taiwan Strait under the one-China principle;

—adhering to the policy of peaceful reunification, because the Chinese should not fight fellow Chinese;

—promoting cross-strait economic exchange and cooperation, despite political differences;

—promoting cross-strait cultural exchange;

—promoting cross-strait people-to-people exchange;

—encouraging political leaders on both sides to visit each other in appropriate capacities (Jiang 2006, Vol.1: 418-424).

Upon closer examination, there were two unprecedented policy initiatives in this proposal. First, Jiang made clear that consultations and negotiations between the two sides of the Taiwan Strait would be arranged in a mutually acceptable way and conducted on an equal footing. As the first step, he said, the two sides should strive to end the state of hostility in the strait; then, proceeding from that basis, the two sides should "jointly shoulder the responsibility to safeguard China's sovereignty and territorial integrity and map out plans for the future development of cross-strait relations" (Jiang 2006, Vol.1: 421-422)

Second, and more importantly, Jiang declared: "The Chinese should not fight fellow Chinese." Beijing reserved the right to use force, he explained, only as an option against the schemes of foreign forces to interfere with China's reunification and bring about Taiwan's independence. Furthermore, despite the political differences between the two sides, Beijing would expend a greater effort in promoting exchange and cooperation, including leadership visits, across the strait (Jiang 2006, Vol.1: 422-423).

In effect, Jiang's declaration that "the Chinese should not fight fellow Chinese" signaled that Beijing had no intention of altering the status quo in the Taiwan Strait, as long as Taiwan remained embedded in a de jure One China framework (see Huang and Li 2010: 185). To the PLA, this declaration meant that Beijing would henceforth strive for reunification on the basis of peaceful negotiations, and that the use of force now became just a last resort in handling the Taiwan issue (Ren 1999: 391). Even Taiwan's military chiefs had no difficulty grasping the peaceful intent of Jiang's initiative (Qi 2006: 61, 208-209). Echoing the aforementioned Jiang-Shen conversations, Jiang's proposal indicated too that Beijing began to take Taipei's repeated demand for "equality" seriously: this time, Jiang not only stressed that cross-strait negotiations would occur on an equal and mutually acceptable footing, but also described the two sides of the strait as co-guardians of China's sovereignty and territorial integrity as well as co-planners of the development of cross-strait relations.

Nonetheless, as discussed earlier, the intranational equality of the two sides of the Taiwan Strait was the maximum concession that Beijing was ready to make to Taipei, to preserve a de jure One China. From 1993 onward, Taiwanese leaders, especially President Lee Teng-hui, had shown decreasing interest in maintaining this "one China," which they considered an impediment to Taiwan's pursuit of a separate and higher international status (for details, see

314

Huang and Li 2010: 177-181, 186-188). Frustrated with Lee's separatist tendencies, Beijing resorted to an alarming show of force in the Taiwan Strait in 1995-1996, an act that disrupted regional peace and stability and brought China and the United States to the brink of war.

In the following section, I provide a brief account of the 1995-1996 Taiwan Strait Crisis, the details of which are already recorded exhaustively elsewhere. My emphasis is on examining how, through and after the crisis, China's leaders learnt certain important lessons, primarily the necessity to maintain a gradualist approach toward Taiwan and to accommodate the U.S. interest in a peaceful resolution of the cross-strait strife. These two issues, as explained later, have continued to dominate the PRC's Taiwan policy to this day.

Learning Lessons from Crises

In May 1995, under tremendous congressional pressure, the Clinton administration reluctantly agreed to issue a travel visa to ROC president Lee Teng-hui, so that he could pay a private visit to his alma mater, Cornell University. Previously, no such visits were allowed under the U.S. one-China policy; seizing the opportunity, Lee delivered a highly controversial address at Cornell, to highlight the "ROC on Taiwan" as a separate country. Incensed by Lee's blatant separatism, and suspecting American complicity, Beijing decided to make a forceful response, to both Taipei and Washington. In mid-July 1995, Jiang instructed the PLA to conduct a series of high-profile military exercises and missile firings in the vicinity of Taiwan before the island's legislative elections in December 1995 and its first direct popular presidential election in March 1996. The purpose of these maneuvers seemed threefold: to deter further Taiwanese

provocations; to remind Washington of the seriousness of the Taiwan issue; and to divert

Taiwanese popular support from separatism.[146]

Initially, the Clinton administration tried to allay Beijing's concerns by reiterating its

one-China policy and its willingness to engage the PRC in a constructive partnership, and by

publicly disavowing any U.S. intentions to contain China or create two Chinas or one China, one

Taiwan. It also agreed to impose greater restrictions on future U.S. visits by Taiwan's top leaders.

For its part, the PRC leadership was gratified by these gestures and showed an interest in

bringing the overall Sino-American relationship back to normal. Meanwhile, however, Beijing

appeared to assume that it now had a freer hand to combat Taiwanese separatism, and launched

more war games near Taiwan after November 1995. The crisis peaked in March 1996, when the

PLA conducted missile exercises off two of Taiwan's most important ports. Annoyed by China's

disregard of the U.S. "abiding interest" in a peaceful settlement of cross-strait disagreements, the

Clinton administration dispatched two aircraft carrier battle groups, the Nimitz and the

Independence, to the vicinity of the Taiwan Strait, to demonstrate the U.S. commitment to

deterring aggression and preserving peace and stability in the area.[147]

Despite much sound and fury, however, the crisis proceeded without a shot fired, thanks

to the relative restraint displayed by both sides of the Taiwan Strait (Qi 2006: 128-129, 132, 176,

---

[146] For informed analyses of Chinese decision-making processes during the 1995-1996 crisis, see, among others, various studies in Zhao 1999, especially You 1999; Swaine 2001; Niu 2006. These scholars emphasize that China's leaders, civilian and military alike, were generally in support of taking a tougher stance on the Taiwan issue, although internal debates might have existed over the timing and emphasis of the measures to be employed. Moreover, throughout the crisis, Jiang was evidently at the helm and able to keep the military hawks under control. For instance, by announcing beforehand the "purpose, scale, time, and venue" of the PLA's military exercises in the Taiwan Strait, Beijing clearly sought to exclude the possibility of a direct Sino-American confrontation (Niu 2006: 316).

[147] Several insiders' accounts (especially Zou 2001; Qian 2003; Suettinger 2003) are particularly valuable for understanding Chinese and U.S. policy positions during the crisis. For a comprehensive study of the crisis, see Huang and Li 2010: 192-202.

240). Moreover, behind the scenes, the Clinton administration made an active effort to engage

Beijing and Taipei in frank communications and dialogues. Through these exchanges,

Washington stated firmly its opposition to any PRC attempts to resolve the Taiwan issue by

force, while dissuading Taiwan from making further provocations that could escalate the tension

and upset the overall U.S.-China relationship (Zou 2001: 277-282; Suettinger 2003: 257-258).

On March 23, 1996, a large plurality (54 percent) of the Taiwan electorate cast their vote for Lee

Teng-hui in the island's first direct popular election for president. The next day, the PLA

concluded its exercises earlier than scheduled, thereby bringing the crisis to an anticlimactic end.

In more ways than one, the 1995-1996 crisis was a wake-up call to the Chinese leadership.

Economically, the PLA's assertive maneuvers scared away many Taiwanese and international

investors, whose interest in mainland China decreased precipitately (Qi 2006: 255-256).

Politically, there was not much domestic support for a war with Taiwan: in July 1995, according

to an internal opinion poll, only 35% of mainland Chinese supported a military invasion of the

island (Ibid., 131). Diplomatically, the crisis damaged the PRC's relations with many countries,

which feared that escalating tensions in the Taiwan Strait would affect adversely stability and

prosperity in the entire Asia-Pacific region (Garver 1997: 252-253).

Despite these setbacks, Beijing proved a quick and earnest learner. Shortly after the crisis,

Taiwan's military intelligence obtained an internal report of the CCP's Central Military

Commission, which indicated that even the PLA realized that coercion and intimidation were

ineffective as a means of resolving the Taiwan issue, and that Jiang Zemin's eight-point proposal

still represented a more hopeful and pragmatic approach (Qi 2006: 252-255). This explains why,

from April 1996 onward, China's leaders opined again and again that Beijing's "fundamental

policy of peaceful reunification" had not changed and would not change for a long time to come,

that reunification would be gradual and step by step, and that Beijing would not disturb the status quo in the Taiwan Strait as long as Taiwan did not pursue independence (Huang and Li 2010: 206-207, 211-213).

Meanwhile, Beijing attached renewed significance to developing coordination and cooperation with Washington on the Taiwan issue. In September 1996, Jiang Zemin reaffirmed Beijing's willingness to "work together with the American side . . . to strengthen dialogue, increase consensus, reduce trouble, and develop cooperation, for the purpose of ensuring the development of Sino-American relations on a healthy, stable track."[148] As PRC deputy premier and foreign minister Qian Qichen pointed out, a constructive U.S.-China relationship would, at a minimum, help to curtail the maneuvering room of Taiwanese separatism (Yang 1999: 231). For its part, according to a former high official of the Clinton administration, Washington too "began in early 1996 an approach that focused on managing the U.S.-China relationship in coordination with Beijing" (Suettinger 2003: 262).

Afterward, while continuing to emphasize the U.S. interest in a peaceful resolution of the Taiwan issue, Washington began to keep a close watch on Taiwan's internal political developments, discouraging any potential provocations that might damage cross-strait relations or contravene the U.S. one-China policy (for details, see Huang and Li 2010: 204-206, 209-210). Visiting China in June 1998, Clinton became the first U.S. president to publicly affirm Washington's three-no's position on the Taiwan issue—i.e., no support for Taiwan's independence, no support for the creation of two-Chinas or one China, one Taiwan, and no

---

[148] Jiang made these remarks when meeting with former U.S. president George H. W. Bush on September 6, 1996. An official text is available at the website of the Taiwan Affairs Office of the PRC State Council: http://www.gwytb.gov.cn/zlzx/jhzl/201101/t20110123_1725484.htm (Accessed January 20, 2013).

support for Taiwan's entry into the United Nations or any international organizations composed of sovereign states (Romberg 2003: 182-185).

In the summer of 1999, this emerging coordination between Beijing and Washington demonstrated its usefulness in averting another major crisis in the Taiwan Strait. On July 9, ROC president Lee Teng-hui made the provocative statement that Taipei had since 1991 regarded cross-strait relations as a relationship between two separate states, not as an internal Chinese relationship any more. A well-calculated move, Lee's statement was part of a grand design (nicknamed the "two-states theory"), known only to Lee and a few of his closest advisors, that purported to demolish the one-China framework inhering in the ROC's constitution and relevant laws since 1949, to assert Taiwan's de jure separation—and, by implication, independence— from China (for details, see Huang and Li 2010: 218-228). This move, of course, challenged not only Beijing's one-China principle, but also Washington's one-China policy. In 1995-1996, the PRC might well have interpreted this development as a *casus belli*. In 1999, however, Beijing was far less impatient for military action, and strove instead to collaborate with Washington in cutting Taipei down to size.

Four days after Lee's statement, on July 13, 1999, U.S. deputy national security adviser James Steinberg telephoned ROC national security director Ding Mou-shih, warning that Washington would not support unilateral changes in the overall status of PRC-Taiwan relations (Suettinger 2003: 382). In the meantime, the spokesman of the U.S. State Department pointedly reiterated that Washington would maintain the one-China policy and its commitment to the aforementioned three no's (Huang and Li 2010: 231). On July 18, President Clinton initiated a hotline conversation with Jiang Zemin. Reiterating "the U.S. Government's firm commitment to the one-China policy," Clinton stressed that American policy on the Taiwan issue had not

changed and the Chinese side "can fully trust my various statements on this issue." Jiang, in turn, reassured Clinton that Beijing still adhered to its fundamental policy of peaceful reunification. In particular, he expressed appreciation of the U.S. three-no's position on the Taiwan issue, which Jiang described as being "of utmost importance" to maintaining stability in the Taiwan Strait.[149]

After the Clinton-Jiang conversation, Beijing adopted a "wait and observe" attitude regarding political developments on Taiwan, while Washington continued its quiet diplomacy to persuade Taipei to return to the one-China position (Huang and Li 2010: 231-232, 235, 239-240). Despite their differences otherwise (e.g., on the question of what "one China" means, or whether the PRC owns sovereignty over Taiwan), this was the first time that Beijing and Washington made clear their *joint* opposition to Taipei's attempts to unilaterally change the status quo; this collaborative effort, as will be seen below, was to play a more crucial role in managing future crises in the Taiwan Strait.

Striving for Peaceful Development:
Beijing Stabilizes the Status Quo in the Taiwan Strait

In November 2002, the CCP convened its 16th party congress and elected Hu Jintao as its new general secretary. In March 2003, Hu succeeded Jiang Zemin as president of the PRC. Like his two predecessors (Deng and Jiang), Hu was committed to promoting a peaceful and friendly international environment in which the PRC's security and development could rest assuredly on trust, cooperation, and mutual benefit. In official CCP terminology, this meant China must

---

[149]An official text of Jiang's conversation with Clinton is available at the website of the Taiwan Affairs Office of the PRC State Council:
http://www.gwytb.gov.cn/zlzx/jhzl/201101/t20110123_1725542.htm (Accessed January 20, 2013).

persist in "peaceful development," or acting continually with responsibility and restraint in international affairs.[150] Regarding the Taiwan issue, Hu adopted the same approach.

At the time of Hu's takeover, Taiwanese politics had taken a decidedly separatist turn. In March 2000, Chen Shui-bian, candidate of the pro-independence Democratic Progressive Party (DPP), was elected president of the ROC by a narrow margin. Initially, Beijing adopted a "wait and see" attitude toward the nascent DPP government on Taiwan. To increase mutual trust, Chen, with some prodding from the United States, made the famous five-no's pledge on his inaugural day—i.e., he would not declare Taiwan's independence, or change the national title, or revise the ROC constitution according to the two-states theory, or promote a referendum on the question of reunification or independence, or abolish the National Unification Council and the National Unification Guidelines (two institutions symbolizing Taiwan's commitment to the one-China principle).[151] Nonetheless, in the following two years, deep-seated mutual distrust prevented either Beijing or Taipei from seeking substantive improvement of cross-strait relations; to make matters worse, many policies adopted by the DPP government were aimed virtually at restricting cross-strait exchanges and highlighting Taiwan as an independent entity (Huang and Li 2010: 251-263).

---

[150] See the resolution of the sixth plenum of the CCP's 16th Central Committee on October 18, 2006, available at the website of the Xinhua News Agency: http://news.xinhuanet.com/politics/2006-10/18/content_5218639.htm (Accessed January 21, 2013).

[151] Liu Shih-chung, a member of Chen's national security team, confirms that even before his election, Chen had privately pledged to Washington that he would not declare Taiwan's independence, or revise the ROC's constitution, or promote a referendum (Liu 2010: 19-20). General Tang Fei, who served as the first prime minister in Chen's administration, recalls that Chen even submitted in advance the text of his inaugural address to Washington for approval (Tang 2011: 121). At that time, however, General Tang already had strong premonitions that Chen made the five-no's pledge merely out of expediency and would not feel bound by it in the future.

Against this backdrop, in 2002-2003, a debate occurred among the PRC's policy elites on whether China should use force to settle the Taiwan issue. According to Li Jiaquan, one of China's topmost Taiwan experts, those who advocated the use of force tended to emphasize that the Taiwan problem was a thorn in the side of China; thus, Beijing should seek an early and quick resolution of the Taiwan issue, at the expense of China's short-term economic development if need be. In marked contrast, those who opposed the use of force stressed that China must value the current peaceful international environment, which provided a rare historic opportunity for the country's development. Using force against Taiwan, they contended, would not only derail China's modernization, but also alienate the Chinese compatriots on Taiwan as well as the world opinion. Moreover, it would put the PRC on a direct collision course with the United States, which was against China's strategic interests (Li 2010: 701-703).

Eventually, the moderates carried the day again, with the consensual view that China's modernization must take precedence over its reunification. In this view, as long as China's economy kept growing, the political, economic, and cultural integration across the strait would naturally deepen over time, creating the necessary conditions for a gradual settlement of the Taiwan issue. To delay or give up economic development for the sake of reunification, therefore, was unwise policy. Instead, Beijing should continue to promote exchanges and increase trust and understanding with Taiwan (Li 2010: 704). ARATS chairman Wang Daohan, a widely respected "wise man" among the Chinese leadership, was particularly adamant that reunification required the creation of mutual interest and mutual identification, which, needless to say, could only be realized through deepening exchanges and cooperation across the Taiwan Strait, not by the use of force (Huang Renwei 2007: 145).

Within this context, Hu Jintao and his colleagues introduced an unprecedented change to China's Taiwan policy. That is, instead of upholding reunification as the overriding goal, Beijing sought foremost to stabilize the status quo in the Taiwan Strait and promote the peaceful development of cross-strait relations for a long period of time. In so doing, the PRC succeeded not only in enlisting more international support in curbing Taiwanese separatism, but also in winning over a large segment of Taiwanese society. Below, I outline the main features of this most recent turn in Beijing's strategic thinking toward Taiwan.

Striking a Chord with the International Society

Between April and November 2003, Chen Shui-bian, with an eye to winning reelection in March 2004, unveiled step by step a separatist agenda, which included creating a new Taiwan constitution in 2006 and holding a referendum in March 2004, on the same day as the presidential election (Huang and Li 2010: 273). To both Beijing and Washington, Chen's agenda represented a unilateral and unacceptable attempt to assert Taiwan's legal separation from China. Therefore, both countries felt a greater urgency to coordinate with one another in managing the Taiwan issue thereafter.

Initially, in 2001-2002, the Bush administration placed a premium on supporting Taiwan's de facto independence within the framework of the TRA. Nonetheless, after 2003, the DPP government's ceaseless pro-independence maneuvers began to reinforce the view in Washington that Taiwan might indeed be a troublemaker for the U.S.-China relationship (Liu 2010: 71). In June 2003, the State Department proposed the following standard operating procedures of crisis management, regarding U.S. responses to Taipei's referendum plan:

First, if and when Chen Shui-bian made any unexpected statements, the American Institute in Taiwan (the de facto U.S. embassy in Taipei) should immediately report them to

Washington. The State Department spokesperson would then express concern and remind Chen of his past pledge;

Second, if the crisis continued to escalate, Washington would dispatch a private but high-level delegation (composed of senior directors from the State Department, the Pentagon, and the office of the vice president) to Taiwan, to convey U.S. concerns directly to Chen and his national security team;

Third, if Chen still refused to budge, higher-level U.S. officials, from deputy assistant secretaries of state to the secretary of state, would publicly voice concern with, or objections to, Taiwan's initiative;

Finally, as a last resort, the U.S. president should use the occasion of meeting with China's leaders to publicly rebuke Taiwan for its destabilizing moves.

Indeed, from 2003 to 2008, the Bush administration had consistently followed the above procedures in handling Taipei's ceaseless "surprises" or provocations, thereby helping to discourage Taiwanese separatism and maintain the status quo in the strait (Liu 2010: 42-43, 167-175).

For its part, having learnt a lesson from the 1995-1996 crisis, Beijing was keenly aware that it did not have a blank check of U.S. (and international) support in combatting Taiwanese separatism. Instead, to gain such support, China must demonstrate foremost a serious commitment to maintaining peace and stability in the Taiwan Strait. Accordingly, from December 2003 onward, the PRC's Taiwan experts began to draft a special law on the Taiwan issue, with the objective of maximizing the common interest between China and the international community (especially the United States) in opposing unilateral changes to the status quo in Taiwan. For that purpose, China's top leadership decided that the law should focus on the theme

of opposing Taiwan's independence from China, instead of achieving reunification: for, while opposing Taiwan's independence could be interpreted as an act to preserve the status quo, achieving reunification would undoubtedly change the status quo and cause concerns abroad (Huang and Li 2010: 274-275, 279-280).

In adopting this approach, contemporary PRC leaders, unlike their predecessors, recognize virtually that the Taiwan issue was not purely an internal Chinese problem, but a matter of grave international concern. As China is already deeply integrated into the international system, it cannot afford to disregard such outside concerns, for fear of jeopardizing its development within the international society. Rather, to win international sympathy and support, Beijing has to make clear that it stands for the peaceful and stable development of cross-strait relations for a long time to come, the prospect of which is being imperiled by Taiwan's rising separatism. This, in fact, was precisely the theme of China's diplomatic campaign concerning Taiwan in 2003-2004, and with remarkable success: for the first time since the 1995-1996 crisis, the United States and the international community at large expressed unequivocal disapproval of Taipei's separatist moves (Huang and Li 2010: 275-278).

Chen Shui-bian, however, proved far more resourceful in pursuing his goals than Beijing and Washington thought. Despite tremendous U.S. and international pressure, Chen refused adamantly to abandon the making of a new constitution, or to cancel the proposed referendum. His only concession was to exclude certain sensitive issues (e.g., sovereignty or national territory) from the agenda of constitutional reform or the referendum. Moreover, after winning reelection in March 2004 (again with a slim margin), Chen continued to push for the notion of Taiwanese sovereignty, which met with sustained opposition from Beijing and Washington (Huang and Li 2010: 278-291). It was under these circumstances that the PRC adopted the aforementioned

"special law on Taiwan," or the Anti-Secession Law (ASL), to formalize its commitment to the peaceful development of cross-strait relations as long as Taiwanese separatism was kept in check. The contents and implications of this law are briefly analyzed below.

Promoting the Peaceful Development of Cross-Strait Relations

On March 13, 2005, the Anti-Secession Law was passed by the PRC's National People's Congress with an overwhelming majority.[152] That the law aims foremost to prevent Taiwan's independence is made clear by its article 1, which declares that the purpose of the law is to oppose Taiwan's secession from China first, and promote reunification second. The said "China," however, is defined elastically so as to accommodate the existing constitutions of the PRC and the ROC simultaneously: "There is only one China in the world. Both the mainland and Taiwan belong to one and the same China. China's sovereignty and territorial integrity brook no division."

Thus, at least in a legal sense, the ASL is purported to prevent Taiwan's secession from the de jure One China comprising both sides of the Taiwan Strait, rather than incorporating Taiwan into the PRC anytime soon. Indeed, article 6 of the law further indicates Beijing's willingness to maintain the status quo for a long time by obligating the PRC to "maintain peace and stability in the Taiwan Straits and promote cross-strait relations," and by "encouraging and facilitating" a wide range of cross-strait exchange and cooperation. And article 7 reaffirms the intra-China equality of the two sides of the Taiwan Strait by endorsing "consultations and negotiations . . . on an equal footing [which] may be conducted in steps and phases and with flexible and varied modalities."

---

[152] An English text of the ASL is available at the website of the *People's Daily*: http://english.peopledaily.com.cn/200503/14/eng20050314_176746.html (Accessed January 22, 2013).

The most controversial part of the ASL is article 8, which declares that the PRC would "employ non-peaceful means and other necessary measures" against Taiwan, in any of the following three scenarios—i.e., "in the event that the 'Taiwan independence' secessionist forces should act under any name or by any means to cause the fact of Taiwan's secession from China, or that major incidents entailing Taiwan's secession from China should occur, or that possibilities for a peaceful reunification should be completely exhausted." In fact, as observed by Huang and Li (2010: 303), the language of this article conveys a significant, pro-status quo message: i.e., *Taiwan's secession has not yet occurred* from Beijing's perspective. In other words, the PRC does not consider Taiwan's current separation to be a "fact" of secession that requires China's use of force, because, as noted earlier, the existing ROC constitution and relevant laws still stand for a de jure One China.

A "fact" of secession, then, could only occur if and when the existing one-China framework embodied in the ROC's constitution is legally scrapped. In this connection, as Li Jiaquan notes, the question of whether China will use force against Taiwan now depends no longer on Beijing, but depends completely on whether or when Taiwan's leaders decide to establish a separate Taiwan state (Li 2010: 296-297).[153] Moreover, because the possibilities of peaceful reunification will arguably never be completely exhausted as long as the existing de jure One China remains intact, Beijing's resort to force thus becomes a remote possibility and the maintenance of the status quo in the Taiwan Strait a long-term likelihood (Huang and Li 2010: 305).

No less interestingly, Beijing's intent to maintain the status quo is reflected by what the ASL does *not* include. The law does not mention, for example, that China would set a timetable

---

[153] Targeting the Taiwanese people, Li Jiaquan made this argument in an article published on April 1, 2005, two weeks after the ASL was passed.

for the resolution of the Taiwan issue, because Beijing is now formally constrained not to use force unless and until Taiwan legally or officially demolishes the concept of a de jure One China. For the same reason, the ASL does not threaten to use force in the case of Taiwan's prolonged refusal to negotiate reunification with the mainland. Finally, to avoid confronting the United States, the law does not list "foreign invasion of Taiwan" as a precondition for using force, as Deng Xiaoping once hypothesized (Huang and Li 2010: 304-305).

In sum, as Li Jiaquan averred at an internal meeting of the PRC's policy experts in May 2005, the ASL restricts Beijing's freedom of action in a significant aspect: "As long as [Taiwan] does not tread on [the PRC's] redline, that is, as long as it does not create any major incidents aimed at establishing a Taiwan state or de jure independence, we would not touch Taiwan no matter how rambunctious it grows" (Li 2010: 302). Furthermore, during the drafting of the law, Beijing was said to maintain a "constant regular dialogue" with Washington, to clarify Chinese intentions and seek U.S. understanding (Huang and Li 2010: 306). Revealingly, despite its concerns with the ASL, the Bush administration made an effort to discourage Taipei from making any excessive responses to it (Liu 2010: 108-115).

More significantly, after the passage of the ASL, Taiwan's major opposition parties, including the KMT, the People First Party, and the New Party, embarked upon an active engagement with the CCP, due to their mutual interest in preserving the status quo in the Taiwan Strait and opposing Taiwanese separatism spearheaded by the DPP. Through high-level contacts and communications with those Taiwanese political parties, Hu Jintao, on behalf of the CCP's leadership, affirmed repeatedly Beijing's intention of promoting cross-strait exchange and cooperation within the existing one-China framework and for a long period of time, so that the political disagreements between the two sides of the strait could be settled eventually in an

amicable and win-win atmosphere. [154] After KMT candidate Ma Ying-jeou won the presidential

election in March 2008, the two sides of the Taiwan Strait quickly rebuilt political mutual trust

on this basis, and opened up a new era of constructive engagement in their relations.

In December 2008, hailing that "peaceful development has become the main theme of

cross-strait relations," Hu Jintao reaffirmed that China would seek reunification peacefully and

through exchange, cooperation, and mutual development. Such an approach, he stressed, was not

only in the fundamental interest of the entire Chinese nation, but also consistent with the "main

trends of our time, namely, aspiring for peace, seeking development, and promoting

cooperation."[155] In other words, as long as China adheres to the Lockean worldview that regards

peace and development as the normative trends of international politics, it will likely behave in

accord with those trends, instead of going against the tide, in handling the Taiwan issue.

Case Two: Chinese Forbearance in the South China Sea

Background: The Formation of an Accommodative Approach

Since the 1950s, the Spratly Islands—or the Nansha Islands, in Chinese—in the South

China Sea (SCS) have been subject to competing claims of sovereignty from several countries,

including the PRC, the ROC, Vietnam, the Philippines, and Malaysia. Comprising over two

---

[154] See, for example, Hu Jintao's welcome address to KMT chairman Lien Chan, on March 29, 2005 (www.gwytb.gov.cn/zyjh/zyjh0.asp?zyjh_m_id=1069); the joint communiqué issued after Hu's meeting with Lien, on April 29, 2005 (www.gwytb.gov.cn/zyjh/zyjh0.asp?zyjh_m_id=1070); the joint communiqué issued after Hu's meeting with PFP chairman James Soong, on May 12, 2005 (www.gwytb.gov.cn/zyjh/zyjh0.asp?zyjh_m_id=1077). All these documents are downloadable from the official website of the Taiwan Affairs Office of the PRC State Council (Accessed January 24, 2013).

[155] See Hu's address commemorating the 30th anniversary of the NPC's "Message to the Taiwan Compatriots," the first major Taiwan policy statement of the Dengist era), available at: http://www.gwytb.gov.cn/speech/speech/201101/t20110123_1723962.htm (Accessed December 31, 2012). It is widely acknowledged that the late ARATS chairman Wang Daohan (who died in December 2005) played a major role in restructuring China's Taiwan policy in the direction of "peaceful development" (see He Lidan 2007: 223, 226).

hundred and mostly uninhabited reefs, islets, and cays, the Spratlys have a huge strategic and economic importance, because they are located at the heart of the SCS, which is not only the world's second busiest sea lane, but is believed to hold significant oil and gas reserves. Between 1970 and 1987, due to geographical proximity, Vietnam, the Philippines, and Malaysia had been most active in extending their control over the Spratlys. The PRC, in contrast, did not move into the area until the late 1980s, as shown by Table 7.1.

Technically, of course, Beijing's notable inactivity in the SCS could be attributed to its limited capacity to project power overseas until the 1980s. But, despite its tremendous progress in military modernization ever since, China has continued to adopt a posture of relative self-restraint in the Spratlys dispute, reaffirming again and again its commitment to the Dengist principle of "shelving the dispute and seeking joint development." In Chapter 3, I have examined the Lockeanization of the Chinese worldview in the 1980s and its moderating impact on Beijing's approach to territorial disputes in general. Regarding the Spratlys issue, Deng Xiaoping was equally adamant that the PRC must not seek a unilateral settlement by force (see the beginning of this chapter). On June 17, 1986, Deng told the visiting vice-president of the Philippines: "The issue of the Nansha islands shall be settled in a way that is acceptable to all concerned parties; China will make concessions, and these concessions will be substantial. …We will not let this problem impede [China's] friendly relations with the Philippines or other countries."[156]

---

[156] This is based on the archival material cited by Zhang Liangfu (2006: 193), a first secretary in the Asian Department of the PRC Foreign Ministry. Conspicuously, the PRC's official, day-to-day chronology of Deng's life omits his thought-provoking statement that "China will make concessions, and these concessions will be substantial" on the Spratlys dispute (see the entry for June 17, 1986, in Leng et al. 2004: 1122).

Short of relinquishing its own sovereign claim over the Spratlys (a step that obviously no claimants would contemplate for the foreseeable future), what could the PRC do to promote friendship and avoid conflict with other claimants? Pragmatically, the only way is to create some sort of *modus vivendi* by fostering a shared commitment to maintaining peace, stability, and common development in the SCS. Such a joint commitment, moreover, is best sustained when all claimants are bound up in a growing network of cooperation and mutual benefit, so that they will, over time, develop a common stake in settling their disputes on a peaceful and collaborative basis, instead of complicating or inflaming these disputes unilaterally. As elaborated in Chapter 3, resolving disputes in this creative and constructive manner is an essential requirement of the Lockean worldview.

The promotion of joint development, viewed in this light, marks a useful, forward step toward the eventual peaceful settlement of the Spratlys dispute. In essence, it aims to induce the claimants to hang together through cooperative effort, rather than be hanged separately through detrimental unilateralism. Politically as well as economically, as a PRC diplomat observes, joint development allows the disputants to seek a win-win outcome while retaining their respective claims and positions. After reaching an agreement on joint development, the claimants will find it easier not only to alleviate tension and ensure the stable and healthy development of their relations, but also to benefit from the exploration of maritime resources hitherto inaccessible to either side. Moreover, in a legal sense, an agreement on joint development constitutes an implicit admission that no claimant should deny other claimants the right to share the resources in a disputed area. In this way, the agreement tacitly restrains the claimants from pressing their

sovereign claims unilaterally, thereby helping to promote trust and create a benign atmosphere for the eventual settlement of the dispute (Zhang Liangfu 2006: 185-187).[157]

A skeptic, however, may raise a pivotal question here: If the PRC under Deng really desired a peaceful settlement, why, then, did Beijing engage in a short but deadly clash with Vietnam in March 1988? In a pioneering analysis of the 1988 conflict, Fravel (2008: 289-290) identifies two factors that were causally related to the 1988 conflict: (1) China's growing interest in exploiting maritime resources, especially petroleum, in the SCS; (2) China's decision to establish a permanent physical presence in the Spratlys, as a response to other claimants' continuous efforts to seize disputed territory in the area. Meanwhile, Fravel (2008: 288, 296) notes that Beijing did not have a policy of using force to evict other claimants from the features already under their occupation; rather, to minimize the likelihood of conflict, Beijing was prepared to establish a presence only on hitherto vacant features.

In the following section, I present new evidence to support and supplement Fravel's contention that the Sino-Vietnamese conflict in March 1988 was likely an unintended consequence of the PRC's move into the SCS. In a nutshell, I argue that the conflict was an

---

[157] Available evidence suggests that Deng Xiaoping first decided to dissociate the sovereignty issue from the prospect of joint development when contemplating the resolution of the Sino-Japanese dispute over the Senkaku (Diaoyu) Islands. In May 1979, Deng told a Japanese legislator that China desired joint development with Japan around the Senkakus, without touching upon either side's sovereign claims to those islands. A month later, Beijing formally proposed to Tokyo that the two sides undertake joint development near the Senkakus. Initially, Japan responded positively to the Chinese proposal, and began to formulate a plan of conducting joint development in the areas beyond the 12 nautical-mile territorial waters surrounding the Senkakus (a plan in which Beijing concurred afterward). Nevertheless, for fear of vacating its claim of sovereignty to the Senkakus, Tokyo quickly changed its mind and refused to cooperate with Beijing further on the issue. Still, from 1985 to 1992, Chinese and Japanese national oil companies maintained fairly close consultations on the prospect of joint development in the disputed maritime zones, including the Senkakus (Xiao 2005: 112-115). As will be seen below, in 2004-2005, the PRC adopted a similar approach in seeking joint development with Vietnam and the Philippines in the SCS, by evading the dispute of sovereignty over the Spratlys in the first place.

exception that proved the rule: i.e., given Beijing's consistent emphasis on avoiding conflict and

exercising self-restraint, the conflict would not have occurred at all, if not for the personal

audacity and initiative of an individual Chinese frontline commander.[158]

<div align="center">

The Sino-Vietnamese Conflict in 1988:
An Exception that Proves the Rule

</div>

In February 1988, the UNESCO Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC)

adopted a global sea-level joint observation plan, which requested the PRC to establish five

marine observation stations: three would be located along the coastline of the Chinese mainland,

and two in the Paracels and Spratlys, respectively. Given China's customary claim of

sovereignty over the Spratlys, the IOC plan met with no objections from any of the national

delegations to the UNESCO; even Vietnam's representative voted in favor of the plan (Lu 2009:

109).

To implement the IOC plan, the PRC State Council and the Central Military Commission

assigned the PLA Navy (PLAN) to conduct a preliminary and on-the-spot investigation of the

Spratlys, upon which no PRC forces had set foot since 1949. In fact, from May 15 to June 6,

1987, a large Chinese naval squadron had made the first-ever expedition to the South China Sea.

Admiral Liu Huaqing, then commander of the PLAN, recalled that the journey had three

purposes: confirming China's claim of sovereignty over the Spratlys; demonstrating China's

---

[158] Due to the sensitivity of the issue, Chinese primary materials are extremely scarce about this conflict. For the following section, I rely on two primary sources that are worth special attention. The first is the memoirs of Admiral Liu Huaqing (2004), former vice-chairman of the CMC. At the time of the 1988 conflict, Admiral Liu was in charge of the overall planning for China's military actions in the SCS (see below), and his reminiscences provide valuable clues as to how the top Chinese leadership considered the Spratlys dispute from a broad strategic perspective. The second is Lu (2009), which is based on exclusive interviews with the commander of the Chinese squadron engaged in the 1988 skirmish with the Vietnamese. Concentrating on the role of the commander and his decisions before and during the battle, Lu's (2009) work is filled with vivid details about the operational directives laid down by the CMC and, more importantly, about how those directives were interpreted by the frontline commander as he saw fit.

naval strength; testing the Chinese navy's combat readiness, and reconnoitering the Spratlys area. Meanwhile, however, Admiral Liu warned the squadron not to cause any troubles. In the case of conflict, he ordered, the Chinese navy must abide by the principles laid down by the CMC: i.e., to fight in a "reasonable, advantageous, and restrained" manner, and to demonstrate resolve but avoid unnecessary losses (Liu 2004: 494-495).

In November 1987, based on the survey undertaken jointly by the PLAN and the State Oceanic Administration, Beijing decided to set up the IOC-commissioned No. 74 Ocean Observatory in the Yongshu Reef (also known as the Fiery Cross Reef) of the Spratlys.[159] To guarantee the security of the construction site, China also took control of the Huayang Reef, which is located 40 miles south of the Yongshu Reef. Geographically, these two reefs are surrounded by Vietnam-occupied islets and reefs (see Fravel 2008: 291, map 6.2); perhaps for this reason, Hanoi suddenly began to dispute China's right to establish the observatory in the Yongshu Reef, despite its vote of approval at the IOC meeting. From January 15 to February 19, 1988, to forestall the Chinese move, Vietnamese troops seized five more features in the Spratlys (Lu 2009: 109-110; see also Table 7.1 in this chapter).

Undaunted, on February 7, 1988, Chinese workers began the construction of the observatory in the Yongshu Reef, with the protection of three or four PLAN frigates patrolling the adjacent waters (Liu 2004: 540). On February 12, Admiral Liu reported the Spratlys situation to Zhao Ziyang, premier of the PRC and vice-chairman of the CMC. Zhao agreed that China needed to consolidate its military presence in the SCS, and asked Liu to conduct research on the issue (Ibid., 535).

---

[159] Fravel (2008: 293) observes that the Yongshu Reef was then "unoccupied and isolated from features held by other states, suggesting that China sought to minimize the diplomatic fallout from its occupation of contested territory." This observation is consistent with Beijing's generally cautionary approach I outlined above.

A few days later, on February 18, the Vietnamese made an attempt to retake the Chinese-occupied Huayang Reef, but the attempt was rebuffed by Chinese marines without firing a shot. Sensing that a conflict might be imminent, Admiral Liu promptly organized a research team that comprised experts from the PLAN, the General Staff of the PLA, and the General Logistics Department. Despite his insistence that China must defend its sovereign rights and interests in the SCS, the admiral nevertheless admitted that the Spratlys dispute was a complicated and long-term problem to which there was no quick solution. Thus, he requested the research team to bear in mind that the military struggle over the Spratlys must be planned with a long view and carried out step by step, especially in a strictly restrained way and in close coordination with Chinese diplomacy (Liu 2004: 536, 538-540).

After the research team produced a tentative plan of action, Admiral Liu conferred with other top chiefs of the PLA several times, to finalize the guidelines for Chinese (re)action in any possible contingencies. On February 26, 1988, Premier Zhao Ziyang gave his verbal endorsement of the plan; three days later, it was formally approved by Deng Xiaoping (chairman of the CMC), though with some revisions suggested by Premier Zhao. On March 10, General Chi Haotian, chief of the PLA's General Staff, reported to the Standing Committee of the CCP Politburo, which put the final seal of approval to the plan (Liu 2004: 539).

When China's top leaders contemplated the plan of action, the PLAN's southern frontline command—which was located in the Yulin Base of Hainan Province, an island adjacent to the South China Sea—already received an intelligence report that the Vietnamese intended to "wreck" (*po huai*) China's construction of the observatory in the Yongshu Reef. Although the report did not explain how the Vietnamese would carry out the "wrecking," the frontline command nevertheless decided to send a naval squadron to the Spratlys again, to thwart any

335

Vietnamese attempt. Chen Weiwen, chief of staff at the Yulin Base, was appointed commander of the squadron. A professional soldier, Chen had twice engaged in small-scale naval skirmishes with the Vietnamese, in 1974 and 1979. From 1980 to 1987, Chen taught advanced-level courses at the PLA's Guangzhou Naval Academy, before assuming the command post in the Yulin Base in August 1987. Owing to his battle experience and resourcefulness, the frontline command regarded Chen as the ideal choice for leading the naval expedition (Lu 2009: 108, 110-112).

In late February 1988, Vice-Admiral Liu Xizhong, a vice commander of the PLAN's South Sea Fleet, came to the Yulin Base to inspect the combat readiness of Chen's squadron, prior to its departure for the Spratlys. In a private conversation, the vice-admiral made clear that the squadron had a double task—to safeguard the security of the Yongshu and Huayang Reefs, and to occupy another four to six reefs in adjacent waters. However, when Chen inquired about how the squadron should respond to the "wrecking" by the Vietnamese, the vice-admiral fell silent and merely handed him a copy of the guidelines from the CMC, which amounted practically to "one do and five don'ts" —i.e., don't provoke troubles, don't fire the first shot, don't cave in, don't suffer unnecessary losses, don't lose face; but, if the enemy attempts to seize the PRC-occupied islets, do drive them away forcefully (Lu 2009: 115-117).

Chen was bewildered by these directives, which, from a military standpoint, were vague and contradictory. Knowing the tenaciousness of the Vietnamese, he was convinced that only a resolute act of war could curb Vietnamese provocations. As if reading Chen's mind, Vice-Admiral Liu explained that the squadron must, of course, abide by the CMC's directives; but the implementation of them was contingent on the actualities in case of a conflict. Still uncertain of the CMC's intentions, but more confident in his own experience of dealing with the Vietnamese, Chen led his small squadron (comprising only two light frigates) afterward into the South China

336

Sea, where he made rendezvous with another four frigates already patrolling the area, thereby increasing China's military presence. From late February to early March 1988, Chen's squadron occupied an additional total of nine reefs, exceeding the original goal of seizing four to six reefs. Three of these newly occupied reefs—the Chigua Reef, the Guihan Reef, and the Qiong Reef— were soon to become the theater of a short but bloody battle between China and Vietnam (Lu 2009: 117-119).

In the early morning of March 13, 1988, Chen suddenly received an order from the headquarters of the South Sea Fleet, which directed his squadron, still patrolling the Spratlys, to head toward the Chigua Reef. Arriving there in the evening, Chen found a Vietnamese squadron, consisting of the No. 604 carrier (of 822 tons) and the No. 505 tank-landing ship (of 4,080 tons), were heading toward the Chigua Reef and the Guihan Reef. A third Vietnamese vessel, the No. 605 carrier, headed toward the Qiong Reef. Loaded with soldiers and construction materials, the Vietnamese squadron obviously intended to retake the three reefs and build fortifications on them, to prevent any Chinese takeover in the future. In response, Chen redeployed his squadron in a simultaneous three-pronged defense against Vietnamese maneuvers (Lu 2009: 121-123).

In the early morning of March 14, the Vietnamese No. 604 carrier, already onsite, began to disembark some soldiers, who quickly reached the Chigua Reef and raised the Vietnamese flags. To counter the Vietnamese intrusion, Chen ordered the Chinese marines to land on the reef too and to try to drive away the Vietnamese by all possible means. Soon afterward, the opposing soldiers of both sides were engaged in pitched fistfight on the reef. To prevent the Chinese from removing their flags, the Vietnamese opened fire at 8:47 a.m., wounding a PRC marine lightly. Upon learning that the exchange of live ammunition had started on the reef, Chen immediately ordered his squadron to start bombarding the three Vietnamese vessels simultaneously. With

337

superior firepower, the Chinese quickly devastated the Vietnamese ships, one of which was sunk

in short order while the other two, though managing to escape, sank in adjacent waters afterward.

The whole battle lasted but 28 minutes, leaving the Vietnamese over 300 casualties (including

the dead and wounded) and nine prisoners in Chinese hands. Chen's squadron suffered neither

loss nor damage, with only one marine wounded (Lu 2009: 123-124).

Despite this stunning victory, Chen had, to be sure, disobeyed a number of directives

issued by his superiors shortly before and during the battle.[160] Within that fateful half-hour, the

command headquarters of the South Sea Fleet tapped out a total of 26 telegrams to Chen,

ordering him to avoid combat or, failing that, to avoid the escalation of conflict. Specifically,

these orders included the following:

—Strictly abide by the principles formulated by the CMC, and do not collide with

Vietnamese ships;

—Stop the Vietnamese from landing on the reefs, but do not fire the first shot;

—When facing artillery fire from the Vietnamese, do not respond so long as it does not

pose a direct threat to the security of the squadron;

—Do not provoke troubles, and avoid unnecessary losses;

—Do not attack the Vietnamese ships any more, especially because the ships are but

transporters;

—Do not attack the Vietnamese targets in other directions, unless they open fire first;

—Do not escalate the conflict, and avoid further contact with Vietnamese ships; the goal

is to hold on to the reefs already occupied by China;

---

[160] Citing a secondary source, Fravel (2008: 295-296) assumes that "the local Chinese commander" (i.e., Chen) ordered the attack on Vietnamese ships before receiving instructions from above. This is not true, according to Lu (2009), on which I base my following account. Otherwise, Fravel's summary of the military technicalities of the battle is accurate.

—Do not take the initiative to remove the Vietnamese flags planted in the reefs, and do not be the first to use force. The squadron is forbidden to open fire as long as the Vietnamese do not resort to artillery fire, and as long as their artillery fire does not pose a direct threat.

Militarily, when the opposing forces of two countries faced imminent and deadly combat, such orders undoubtedly bespoke an excessive caution. At any rate, made bold by the climactic moment of fire and with the lives of his crew at stake, Chen decided that this was not the moment to exercise careful judiciousness, but to overtake and annihilate the enemy. In so acting, he was keenly aware that he was taking a great risk. One member of his staff, for example, reminded him that it might be improper to attack the Vietnamese No. 605 carrier, which did not fire upon the Chinese at the time. Chen, however, brushed aside such arguments and ordered the attack resolutely, on the grounds that the carrier belonged to the same theater of war. To stiffen the resolve of his crew, Chen, while giving orders, stated unambiguously that he would bear any and all responsibility for the actions of the squadron, if and when the command headquarters found fault with the battle (Lu 2009: 123-126).

Chen's premonitions proved correct. Instead of reveling in the victory, the command headquarters of the South Sea Fleet, not to speak of the CMC in Beijing, were aghast at the fait accompli of the battle, and immediately started an investigation of why Chen had appeared to court combat instead of avoiding it. The crew under Chen's command, however, expressed wild enthusiasm for his audacity. Privately, even Vice-Admiral Liu Xizhong congratulated Chen's bold initiative: "If it were not for you, this battle would not have occurred at all!" Meanwhile, Chinese public opinion was overwhelmingly supportive of this latest flexing of China's military muscles in the Spratlys. Under the circumstances, Chen's superiors made a Solomon-like decision. On the one hand, they acknowledged Chen's commanding abilities by promoting him,

in October 1988, to the rank of rear-admiral.[161] On the other hand, Chen was never again given a command at sea, and sent back to the Guangzhou Naval Academy to resume a teaching career there, until his final retirement in July 1995 (Lu 2009: 126-137).

In retrospect, as Fravel (2008: 296) correctly observes, what is really striking about the aftermath of the 1988 conflict is that China did not seize the opportunity created by its victory to attack other important Vietnamese-occupied features, or to expand its presence in the Spratlys at all. In fact, possibly as a sop to Vietnam, the PRC abandoned a total of five reefs previously seized by Chen's squadron, three of which were subsequently occupied by Vietnam.[162] Moreover, as shown by Table 7.1, after 1988, the PRC was content merely to maintain its newfound foothold in the South China Sea; in sharp contrast, Vietnam continued to act aggressively to extend its control over the remaining uninhabited reefs, islets, atolls, and cays in the Spratlys, till the late 1990s.

To be sure, despite its relative restraint, the leadership in Beijing was determined to maintain the Chinese presence in the Spratlys. Admiral Liu Huaqing, for example, pushed actively thereafter for the development of tanker aircraft, as well as for the construction of an air force base in the Paracels, with an eye to increasing the PLA's capability to intervene effectively in any future conflict over the Spratlys. By the mid-1990s, both of these projects were completed, giving the PLA a substantial edge over other claimants (Liu 2004: 543-544). Nevertheless, at that

---

[161] Note that Mao had abolished ranks in the PLA in 1965; the Chinese military restored the rank system only in October 1988. This is why, in recounting Chen's exploits in this section, I never referred to his rank. For convenience's sake, however, I chose to address the two senior naval commanders, Liu Huaqing and Liu Xizhong, by their rank (although they, too, acquired their rank only in October 1988).

[162] These five reefs include Naluo, Qiong, Guihan, Anda, and Niu'e. The first three of those reefs were occupied by Vietnam in March and June 1988 (see Table 7.1). However, the Vietnamese stopped attempts to interfere with China's construction of the ocean observatory on the Yongshu Reef.

time, a new generation of Chinese leaders had reaffirmed their commitment to a peaceful and win-win settlement, while downplaying the utility of use of force. Why and how they did so will be elaborated in the next section.

<div align="center">

Engagement Breeds Cooperation—and Compromise:
China Edges toward the Declaration of Conduct in the SCS

</div>

After the Tiananmen crackdown in 1989, China's relations with the West suffered a steep decline. Nonetheless, spearheaded by Indonesia, ASEAN took major and active steps to normalize political and economic relations with the PRC in 1990-1991, which was no doubt deeply appreciated by Beijing at a time when it was still shunned by much of the international community (Lee 1999: 16-17; see also Shambaugh 2004: 67-68). Thereafter, seeking dialogue and cooperation with ASEAN remained a constant theme of Chinese foreign policy.

In 1990, to promote stability and avoid conflict in the SCS, Hasjim Djalal, former Indonesian ambassador to the UN, began to organize an informal workshop on "Managing Potential Conflicts in the South China Sea," which was intended mainly as a multilateral, Track II dialogue between China and ASEAN on the Spratlys dispute. The workshop was guided by the hope that "talking would develop understanding and that more linkages among the various participants would inhibit animosity and warlike policies and actions" (Djalal 2001: 98). The second workshop, held at Bandung in July 1991, was attended by PRC officials and experts for the first time. Neither China nor any other claimants, however, were prepared to compromise on their respective claims even in those closed-door dialogues. Still, from the very beginning, Beijing seemed to be more active than others in presenting specific proposals of promoting cooperation on a wide range of technical matters that were of concern to all involved parties (Lee 1999: 60-62, 65).

<div align="center">341</div>

More significantly, through the Bandung workshop in 1991, China and other claimants reached an agreement on the following principles for a code of conduct in the SCS, most of which were later incorporated into the Declaration on the Conduct of Parties in the South China Sea in 2002:

—Without prejudice to territorial and jurisdictional claims, all claimants should actively explore areas of cooperation in the SCS;

—The areas of cooperation may include promoting safety of navigation and communication, combating piracy and armed robbery, promoting the rational utilization of living resources, protecting and preserving the marine environment, conducting marine scientific research, and eliminating illicit traffic in drugs;

—In areas where conflicting territorial claims exist, the relevant states may consider the possibility of undertaking cooperation for mutual benefit, including exchange of information and joint development;

—Any territorial and jurisdictional dispute in the South China Sea should be resolved by peaceful means through dialogue and negotiation;

—Force should not be used to settle territorial and jurisdictional disputes;

—The parties involved in such disputes are urged to exercise self-restraint in order to avoid complicating the situation (Djalal 2001: 99-100).

In essence, these principles were in perfect accord with the Dengist and Lockean notion that the best solution to territorial disputes was not by force, but through patient dialogue and negotiation, as well as through the expansion of cooperation and mutual benefit. Besides, as indicated by a PRC expert (Wu 2005: 228-229), the Chinese position was implicitly based on certain provisions and requirements of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea

(UNCLOS), which not only provide the legal basis for joint development, but also obligate the signatory states to exercise self-restraint in the areas over which they have conflicting sovereign claims. [163] Furthermore, between the late 1980s and the early 1990s, the new Chinese leadership headed by Jiang Zemin had reached the conclusion that tension reduction was a "grand and irreversible trend" in world politics; consequently, they decided, China should continue to strive for a propitious international environment (Jiang 2006, Vol.2: 273). Engaging ASEAN in a peaceful and collaborative settlement of the Spratlys dispute, therefore, became an imperative necessity for Chinese diplomacy.

In July 1992, China was invited for the first time to attend the annual meeting of ASEAN foreign ministers. Seizing the opportunity, PRC deputy premier and foreign minister Qian Qichen stressed that Beijing was ready to establish relations and strengthen cooperation with ASEAN in all fields. Regarding the Spratlys dispute, Qian reiterated that China favored putting aside the sovereignty dispute and seeking joint development, with the added assurance that Beijing would not permit the dispute to affect the development of friendly state-to-state relations, or affect peace and stability in the region (Lee 1999: 24-25; see also Li Jinming 2005: 129). Indeed, at this meeting, the PRC backed up its words with some constructive deeds: apart from providing information about China's military budget in recent years, Qian and his colleagues participated actively in discussions and consultations concerning conflict resolution, and expressed support for the establishment of a regional security mechanism through bilateral and multilateral dialogues (Li Jinming 2005: 130).

---

[163] China signed the UNCLOS in 1982 and ratified it in 1996. As a PRC scholar of international law observes, Beijing made a serious effort to bring its domestic laws into conformity with the requirements of the UNCLOS. China's 1992 Law on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, for example, was highly identical to the relevant provisions of the UNCLOS. Similarly, China's 1998 Law on the Exclusive Economic Zone and the Continental Shelf reflected a conscious intent to strike a chord with the UNCLOS (Gao 2004: 6-8, 180-190).

To be sure, then as later, China continued to insist that the best way of resolving the Spratlys dispute lay in bilateral negotiations between directly involved parties, *not* in formal and multilateral mechanisms. Nonetheless, through constant engagement with and participation in regional mechanisms of dialogue and consultation, especially the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF, established in 1994), Beijing seemed to develop an increasing faith in the utility of such mechanisms, as well as a growing willingness to enhance trust and understanding with ASEAN in a multilateral context (Lee 1999, chapters 3-4; see also Johnston 2008: 183-191). At a minimum, this ongoing multilateral process obligated the PRC to remain committed to a peaceful settlement and make at least some cooperative efforts in that direction (e.g., by promoting confidence-building measures with other claimants), thereby helping to constrain unilateral Chinese behavior.

According to Chinese estimates, for example, there occurred a total of 92 incidents in the SCS from 1989 to 1998, wherein over eighty PRC fishing boats were assaulted or detained by some ASEAN states, with 31 Chinese fishermen killed or wounded (Ji 2009: 90). In managing such incidents, Beijing invariably adopted a low-key and restrained posture, and preferred quiet diplomacy to loud protests or coercive strategies (for example, see Wu Deguang 1999: 289-293). In early 1995, China's fishery administration agency took over the Meiji Reef (Mischief Reef), located in the eastern Spratlys.[164] The incident provoked a diplomat protest from the Philippines, but Beijing's swift efforts to engage Manila and ASEAN suggests that it realized the need to act in a more responsible and accommodating manner in the area (Lee 1999: 34-38; Fravel 2008: 297-298).

---

[164] Xu Yan, an official Chinese military historian, states in a recent article that China's fishery administration agency was the initiator and implementer of the occupation of the Meiji Reef in 1995, although the PLA subsequently lent its support to the plan (Xu 2012).

On July 30, 1995, during a dialogue with ASEAN foreign ministers, PRC foreign minister Qian Qichen declared for the first time that China would adhere to the basic principles of international ocean law, including the UNCLOS, and seek an equitable solution through peaceful negotiations (Li Jinming 2005: 247; see also Lee 1999: 36-37). Two weeks later, in early August, China and the Philippines held consultations on the Spratlys dispute, and agreed on the following principles of dispute resolution, including: nonuse of force; settling disputes in a peaceful and friendly manner, through consultations, and on the basis of equality and mutual respect; maintaining the normal development of bilateral relations; drawing on international law, especially the UNCLOS, for the resolution of disputes. Signaling its interest in engaging other claimants to the Spratlys, Beijing also stated its willingness to consider multilateral cooperation with other states in the region at an appropriate time (Li Jinming 2005: 57).

As a follow-up measure, from 1996 onward, China and the Philippines began to hold vice-ministerial-level talks annually, with an eye to averting maritime conflict and promoting a steady exchange of high-level political visits to both countries. The two sides also agreed to establish a bilateral consultative mechanism to explore ways of cooperation in the South China Sea (Li Jinming 2005: 57). In the meantime, as noted by Johnston (2003b: 137), China has "quietly scaled down its claims, recognizing that any diplomatic formula will probably require the sacrifice of some portion of extant claims." As a first step in this direction, Beijing dropped the claim to Indonesia's Natuna Islands. In March 1997, an official PRC vessel undertook some oil and gas exploration projects in the northern SCS; after Vietnam lodged a formal protest against the Chinese move, however, the PRC vessel quietly terminated its operations and did not return to the area (Li Jinming 2005: 249-250). After July 1997, the Asian financial crisis ravaged most ASEAN states. Instead of seizing the opportunity to press other claimants for concessions,

345

Beijing provided active aid and assistance to the region, to strengthen friendship and cooperation with ASEAN (see Chapter 3).

On August 28, 1998, Jiang Zemin chaired a meeting of China's ambassadors abroad. In contemporary international politics, averred Jiang, great powers demonstrated a salient tendency to seek coordination and cooperation, which led to decreasing tension around the world. While the PRC should resist outside attempts to subvert its socialist system or Westernize China, Chinese diplomacy should nevertheless concentrate on "seeking to expand mutual interests with all countries and strengthening political dialogues, economic cooperation, and scientific exchanges." Within this context, Jiang stressed that the PRC must continue to maintain a peaceful and friendly approach toward neighboring countries, because a good-neighborly environment was vitally important to China's development. In particular, Jiang pointed out that Beijing had striven to maintain stability in the SCS in recent years; in the future, China should persist in this approach and enhance its coordination and cooperation with ASEAN in regional affairs (Jiang 2006, Vol.2: 196-198, 204-205, quotations on p.198).

Against this background, Beijing began to contemplate for the first time the making of a regional code of conduct in the SCS, an idea that originated in the meeting of ASEAN foreign ministers in 1996. At that time, PRC foreign minister Qian Qichen was cautiously noncommittal about the idea, given that various claimants had kept consolidating their facilities in the islets or reefs under their control over the years, regardless of others' concerns and protests (Lee 1999: 45, 70). Yet, in late 1998, an unexpected incident forced Beijing to reconsider the issue. In 1995, after the Meiji Reef incident, the PRC had reached an understanding with the Philippines and ASEAN, whereby all concerned parties were obligated to notify each other in advance in the event of any new constructions in the islets or reefs under their control. Accordingly, in October

346

1998, China notified all ASEAN states that it intended to repair the facilities on the Meiji Reef; still, this seemingly innocuous move caused deep concern in the Philippines, although other claimants did not find fault with Beijing (Li 2003: 30; Li Jinming 2005: 56-57).

To avoid the repetition of such unpleasant incidents, in December 1998, the ASEAN summit meeting proposed again to establish a code of conduct in the SCS. This time, China accepted the proposal with alacrity (Li Jinming 2005: 140), no doubt because the initiative accorded with Beijing's goal of promoting cooperative common security and common development in the region (see Chapter 3). In September 1999, Jiang confirmed that China and ASEAN shared a mutual interest in promoting good-neighborly relations; no disputes, he said, were insoluble if and when both sides persisted in friendly consultations. Specifically, regarding the Spratly dispute, Jiang made clear Beijing's readiness to "hold more in-depth discussions with ASEAN countries about the principles and ways of maintaining peace and stability in the South China Sea region," as well as to resolve outstanding disagreements through continued consultation and negotiation. Meanwhile, China would seek to deepen exchanges and cooperation with ASEAN in areas of trade, science, technology and social development (Jiang 2006, Vol.2: 407).

Of other claimants, Malaysia and Brunei were notably more receptive to this Chinese approach, and were as just eager to expand political, economic, and military relations with Beijing in the hope of creating a more constructive atmosphere for the resolution of the Spratlys dispute (Lee 1999: 117-126). Even Vietnam was then moving step by step toward the resolution of its protracted dispute with China over the demarcation of the land border and the Gulf of Tonkin (see below). The Philippines, on the other hand, proved more intractable, initiating more clashes with Chinese fishing boats in the SCS through 1999-2000 (Li Jinming 2005: 60-61).

Nevertheless, during this period, the PRC leadership was determined to establish China's image as a responsible great power, and to befriend its neighbors in the interest of peace and common development (see Chapter 3).

On August 6, 2001, Jiang Zemin chaired a Politburo meeting to discuss the security situation in China's neighborhood. In the 21st century, he asserted, China should continue to develop friendly relations with neighboring countries and maintain regional stability. Despite the protracted territorial and maritime disputes, none of these neighboring states presented a threat to China's security, and "the mutual interests are greater than disagreements [between China and these states]." Therefore, in dealing with neighboring countries, Beijing should take a long view and endeavor to increase mutual trust through engagement and cooperation, with an eye to expanding the mutual interests. In particular, Jiang pointed out: "China is a great power, and it is only natural that some smaller neighboring countries may harbor misgivings about us." To dispel such misgivings, China should approach these states in a patient and well-meaning manner; even in defending its sovereign rights and interests, Beijing should act with some restraint and try not to hurt other countries' feelings (Jiang 2006, Vol.3: 313-315).

On the same occasion, regarding China's territorial disputes, Jiang stressed that Beijing should "remain committed to the principle of seeking a fair and reasonable settlement through mutual concessions and compromises, as well as through friendly consultations." As far as the SCS dispute was concerned, Jiang placed a premium on "propagating the notion of shelving disputes and seeking joint development, as well as exploring feasible and pragmatic ways of promoting joint development." To achieve these objectives, Jiang urged that China should expend a greater effort in promoting trade, economic, cultural, and people-to-people exchanges

with neighboring countries, to cement a friendly and cooperative relationship with the latter (Jiang 2006, Vol.3: 315-317).

Under these circumstances, after lengthy consultations, China and ASEAN finally signed the historic Declaration on the Conduct of Parties in the South China Sea, in November 2002. Among other things, the declaration committed all concerned parties to seek a peaceful settlement through friendly negotiations and without resort to force, to refrain from unilateral actions that may complicate or escalate disputes, and to undertake cooperative activities in many non-contentious areas.[165] In essence, these were precisely the principles that Beijing had advocated consistently regarding the Spratlys dispute since the 1980s. Moreover, as will be shown below, China has finally begun to make notable progress in engaging other claimants in joint development since the advent of the 21st century.

Seeking Joint Development: Progress and Obstacles

In December 2000, China and Vietnam resolved successfully the demarcation problem concerning the Gulf of Tonkin. According to PRC sources, the key to the settlement lay in an unconventional and creative arrangement agreed to by both sides—i.e., instead of insisting upon a rigid demarcation line, Beijing and Hanoi agreed to set aside a large disputed area, which included most of the medium- and high-production offshore fisheries in the Gulf of Tonkin, as their "mutual fishing ground" (Jia 2005: 219; Ji 2009: 89). In this way, the two sides turned a thorny dispute into a matter of how to cooperate for mutual benefit, as befitting the Dengist (and Lockean) notion of conflict resolution (Zhang Zhirong 2005: 32).

---

[165] The text of the declaration is downloadable from the ASEAN's official website at: http://www.asean.org/asean/external-relations/china/item/declaration-on-the-conduct-of-parties-in-the-south-china-sea (Accessed January 27, 2013).

The resolution of this once-intractable problem boosted confidence in Beijing and Hanoi that the Spratlys dispute, too, could be settled in a spirit of mutual accommodation and mutual benefit. In late December 2000, President Tran Duc Luong of Vietnam visited China and reached an agreement with President Jiang Zemin, on promoting "all-round cooperation" between the two countries in the 21st century. While agreeing to increase consultations and deepen cooperation in all fields of the bilateral relationship, the two sides avowed specifically to "persevere in peaceful negotiation," so as to seek a "basic, enduring, and mutually acceptable settlement" of their maritime disputes. Prior to such a settlement, both sides agreed to forswear the threat or use of force, as well as to adopt a "cool and constructive attitude" in managing disputes through timely consultations, so that their state-to-state relations would continue to develop regardless of certain disagreements.[166]

Thereafter, China strove to upgrade its cooperative partnership with ASEAN to unprecedented levels. In October 2003, the PRC formally joined the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia, which made China the first great power to undertake the obligation, as stipulated by ASEAN, to promote lasting peace, amity and cooperation in the region, and to adhere to the principle of peaceful resolution of disputes. Within this context, from 2004 onward, China began to intensify its efforts to engage other claimants in exploring the resources in the SCS in a *multilateral* manner.

On August 8, 2004, China and Vietnam reached an agreement for the first time on conducting research and exchanging views about "shelving disputes and seeking joint development" in the SCS. The next month, President Gloria Macapagal Arroyo of the Philippines paid an official visit to China. As a crowning achievement of her visit, Chinese and

---

[166] See the Sino-Vietnamese joint communique issued on December 25, 2000, available at: http://vn.chineseembassy.org/chn/zt/sbzywj/t918233.htm (Accessed August 2, 2012).

Philippine national oil companies agreed to undertake a joint exploration project that covered a maritime area of about 140,000 square kilometers in dispute between Beijing and Manila. Initially, Vietnam voiced strong objections to the Sino-Philippine agreement; after the Chinese government made "repeated persuasive efforts," however, Hanoi eventually changed its mind and decided to join the Sino-Philippine agreement as a third party (Zhang Liangfu 2006: 195-196).[167]

In December 2004, China and Vietnam held their ninth round of experts' meetings on maritime issues, with a detailed explanation from the Chinese side about the principles, cooperative methods, and actual implementation of joint development. Shortly afterward, Beijing and Hanoi reached a "consensus in principle" and agreed to go a step further by identifying appropriate modalities and blocks for joint development (Zhang Liangfu 2006: 196-197; see also Zhu and Ren 2006: 222 -223).

On March 14, 2005, the national oil companies of China, Vietnam, and the Philippines achieved the first major breakthrough in promoting joint development in the SCS, by signing a trilateral agreement on conducting joint oil and gas exploration surveys in a disputed area covering over 140, 000 square kilometers for the next three years. Receiving the representatives of these companies, the Philippine president Arroyo praised the trilateral agreement as a historic achievement in implementing the China-ASEAN declaration of conduct in 2002. It also marked, she said, a concrete step toward transforming the SCS from a sea of contention into a sea of peace, stability, and cooperation. Likewise, Wu Hongbo, PRC ambassador to the Philippines, emphasized that the agreement represented not only a cooperative effort of the three national oil

---

[167] Regrettably, Zhang Liangfu, a PRC diplomat, does not explain in detail how the Chinese government succeeded in persuading Vietnam to change its mind.

companies, but also a major breakthrough in realizing Deng Xiaoping's vision of shelving

disputes and seeking joint development in the SCS (Zhu and Ren 2006: 222).

In July 2005, to confirm Hanoi's appreciation of the trilateral agreement, the Vietnamese

president Tran Duc Luong paid an official visit to the PRC and met with President Hu Jintao.

The two leaders reached a new agreement on jointly investigating the fishery resources and

exploring the oil reserves in the Gulf of Tonkin, as well as on conducting joint naval patrols of

the area. Applying this collaborative principle to the SCS, they also agreed to implement the

trilateral agreement in earnest, so that the cooperative enterprise would soon benefit all parties

concerned.[168]

The trilateral agreement, however, expired in 2008, large due to domestic objections in

the Philippines. Since then, and especially in 2010-2012, the PRC has been engaged in renewed

disputes with Vietnam and the Philippines in the Spratlys area. Nonetheless, some China

specialists (i.e., Goldstein 2011; Swaine and Fravel 2011) have observed that Beijing was often

not the initiator of disputes, but reacted strongly to other claimants' prior assertive moves, which

typically involved arresting Chinese fishermen or exploring energy resources unilaterally in

disputed areas. Furthermore, the PRC's alleged "new assertiveness" in the South China Sea is

less militarized than is generally believed abroad. As a well-placed U.S. scholar aptly puts it, the

Chinese approach resembles an "abundance of noise and smoke, but little fire" (Goldstein

2011).[169] The Sino-Philippine skirmish between April and August 2012, for example, was caused

by an attempt of a Philippine frigate to arrest Chinese fishermen in the disputed Scarborough

---

[168] See the Sino-Vietnamese joint communique issued in July 2005, available at:
http://vn.chineseembassy.org/chn/zt/sbzywj/t918234.htm (Accessed August 2, 2012).

[169] For a more recent assessment of the Spratlys dispute, see the interview of Douglas H. Paal, an
expert at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, by RTE News on September 20, 2012,
available at: http://carnegieendowment.org/2012/09/20/doug-paal-on-south-china-sea/dvn3
(Accessed September 21, 2012).

Shaol (Huangyan Island), an attempt blocked by two PRC marine surveillance vessels, not

Chinese warships (Santos 2012). Technically, China's acts therefore do not fall into the category

of "use of force" or even "show of force," as defined by the Correlates of War project (see

Chapter 4).

For the foreseeable future, I believe there are several hopeful signs that China would

continue to seek a peaceful settlement and avoid the use of force, as follows:

First, the pursuit of peace, development, and cooperation has guided contemporary

China's orientation to the international society for over three decades. Fundamentally, this

strategic orientation has obviated the primacy of force as a means of settling disputes (see

Chapter 3). To resort to force in the SCS, as a senior Chinese diplomat put it, is tantamount to

abandoning this orientation and attempting to resolve a contemporary problem with obsolete

means (Wu 2011). Moreover, even China's military chiefs understand that armed force is not the

best option for conflict resolution in today's world. General Ma Xiaotian, deputy chief of the

PLA's General Staff, made this point abundantly clear in May 2012: "We are capable of

defending our maritime boundary, but we are not prepared to use military force to do so, for

[force] is only our last resort. Presently, we should continue the government-to-government

negotiations and resolve the disputes through diplomatic and nonmilitary means, for this is the

best approach."[170]

Second, as the PRC seeks to become a responsible great power, Beijing is well aware that

Chinese conduct cannot escape the most critical scrutiny by the rest of the world, especially by

the smaller states. For reputational purposes, as noted by a former PRC ambassador to Vietnam

---

[170] See General Ma's interview with Phoenix TV on May 28, 2012, available at:
http://news.ifeng.com/mainland/special/nanhaizhengduan/content-
3/detail_2012_05/28/14866227_0.shtml (Accessed August 2, 2012).

in October 2009, "as long as China hopes to be a great power with a good image, it is unlikely to commit an act of war willfully against its neighbors."[171] Instead, to polish its international image, the PRC has to make a continuous and positive contribution to the stability and prosperity of its neighborhood. In this connection, the expansion of political, economic, trade, and other exchanges has not only increased the mutual interests between China and ASEAN, but also given the two sides a shared stake in cementing the existing bonds of amity and cooperation. This explains why, in November 2012, General Secretary Hu Jintao stated emphatically at the CCP's 18th party congress: "We shall persist in our efforts to engage and conciliate our neighbors, to consolidate friendly relations and deepen cooperation for mutual benefit, and to make China's development better serve the interests of our neighboring countries."[172]

Third, as a practical rule, before settling a territorial dispute with a neighboring country, China strives first of all to reach an agreement with that country on the basic principles for a future settlement. As noted by a former PRC ambassador to Vietnam in July 2012, the first and foremost principle of such an agreement is the commitment to resolving disputes only through peaceful negotiation.[173] Regarding the Spratlys dispute, the PRC has already signed two such agreements of basic principles, including the 2002 declaration of conduct in the SCS, and, in October 2011, the Sino-Vietnamese Agreement on Basic Principles Guiding the Settlement of

---

[171] Comments by Ambassador Qi Jianguo in an interview with the news weekly *Nan Feng Chuang*, on October 22, 2009. Ambassador Qi served as China's ambassador to Vietnam between 2000 and 2006. The transcript of the interview is available at: http://news.qq.com/a/20091022/001552.htm (Accessed August 2, 2012).

[172] See Hu Jintao's political report to the 18th party congress, available at: http://news.xinhuanet.com/18cpcnc/2012-11/17/c_113711665_12.htm (Accessed January 2, 2013).

[173] See Ambassador Qi Jianguo's interview with the Huanqiu Net's on July 27, 2012, available at: http://opinion.huanqiu.com/1152/2012-07/2957867.html (Accessed August 2, 2012).

Maritime Issues.[174] In the past, China had kept faith with similar declaratory statements and

achieved successfully a negotiated settlement of similar thorny issues, no matter how long and

arduous the negotiating process was.[175] With time and patience, Beijing might find a way of

resolving the Spratlys dispute peacefully, with fresh and meaningful concessions as well.[176]

Last, but not the least, the Chinese government never abandons the principle of

promoting joint development as the key to increasing mutual interests and decreasing mutual

distrust with other claimants. Indeed, Beijing seems to take a keen interest in transforming every

resurgent controversy into an opportunity of jump-starting the stalled process of joint

development. In January 2013, for example, the Chinese ambassador in Manila suggested again

that China and the Philippines forge ahead with the joint exploration of oil and gas reserves in

---

[174] The agreement was signed in October 2011, when Nguyen Phu Trong, general secretary of the Vietnamese Communist Party, paid an official visit to China. The basic principles laid down in this agreement obligated both sides to resolve their disputes through "friendly negotiations and consultations," as well as to conduct "active discussion on cooperation for joint development." The full text of the agreement is available at: http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/mfa_chn/ziliao_611306/1179_611310/t866484.shtml (Accessed October 14, 2012).

[175] From 1991 to 2000, Ambassador Qi Jianguo served as a leading Chinese official in the negotiations on the demarcation of the Sino-Vietnamese border and the Gulf of Tonkin. The final demarcation agreements were signed in December 1999 (for the land border) and December 2000 (for the Gulf of Tonkin). On February 2, 2010, in an interview with the official China Net, Ambassador Qi reminisced about the negotiating process, stressing that the two agreements were products of mutual accommodation and compromise. He also observed that the two countries invariably resolved the "most vital and contentious problems" in the last round of their negotiations, thanks to the political will exhibited by the top leaders in both states. The transcript of the interview is available at: http://www.china.com.cn/international/txt/2010-02/02/content_19356018.htm (Accessed August 2, 2012).

[176] It is noted, for instance, that China signed a 25-year agreement to purchase liquefied natural gas from Malaysia in 2006, despite the fact that Malaysian gas fields cover a substantial portion of the disputed waters in the South China Sea. This was interpreted as Beijing's silent acquiescence in Kuala Lumpur's claim of sovereignty over that area (Gilboy and Heginbotham 2012: 76). In 2011-2012, some of the PRC's top foreign policy experts began to opine publicly that China should adopt a more open-minded attitude and reconsider its existing positions on the Spratlys dispute, for the sake of regional peace and its own long-term development (see, for example, Zhang 2012).

the disputed area, so as to place cooperation above their squabbles over the territorial boundaries. According to a Philippine news source, the country's leading oil companies responded positively to the Chinese ambassador's suggestion and confirmed their ongoing discussions of cooperation with the Chinese side; still, they were concerned that "political realities" may impede any progress in that direction (Cabacungan 2013).

Many unknowns, therefore, hang over the question of whether the PRC and other claimants can muster the political will to give renewed impetus to joint development. For all parties concerned, the unhappy and unwelcome alternative would be to pursue adversarial strategies designed to thwart their opponent and register temporary gains for their own side. Fortunately, with the advent of the 21st century, all claimants in the South China Sea seem to have found little use for this alternative, which is equivalent to letting the protracted Spratlys dispute fester according to its own momentum when its most likely outcome is evidently in no one's interests.

Tables

Table 7.1: The Islands (Islets, Reefs, Etc.) Occupied by Different States in Different Periods

States	1970s	1980s	1990s	Total
Vietnam	Nanzi Island (Apr. 1975); Dunqian Cay (Apr. 1975); Hongxiu Island (Apr. 1975); Jinghong Island (Apr. 1975); Nanwei Island (Apr. 1975); Anbo Cay (Apr. 1975); Zhong Reef (Apr. 1975); Ranqing Cay (March 1978).	Bo Reef (Feb. 1987); Bisheng Reef (Apr. 1987); Xi Reef (Dec. 1987); Wumie Reef (Jan. 1988); Riji Reef (Feb. 1988); Daxian Reef (Feb. 1988); Dong Reef (Feb. 1988); Liumen Reef (Feb. 1988); Nanhua Reef (March 1988); Bolan Reef (March 1988); Nailuo Reef (March 1988); Guihan Reef (June 1988); Qiong Reef (June 1988); Pengbobao Reef (June 1989); Guangya Cay (June 1989); Wan'an Cay (July 1989).	Xiwei Cay (Nov. 1990); Lizhun Cay (Nov. 1991); Renjun Cay (Nov. 1993); Jindun Reef (June 1998); Ao'nan Reef (June 1998); Xiaonanxun Reef (1999).	4 islands, 8 cays, and 18 reefs.
The Philippines	Mahuan Island (Sept. 1970); Feixin Island (Sept. 1970); Zhongye Island (May 1971); Nanyao Island (July 1971); Beizi Island (July 1971); Xiyue Island (July 1971); Shuanghuang Cay (March 1978).	Siling Reef (July 1980)	Ren'ai Reef (1999)	7 islands (including Zhongye, the second largest island in the Spratlys), and 2 reefs.
Malaysia	0	Danwan Reef (Aug. 1983); Guangxingzai Reef (Oct. 1986); Nanhai Reef (Oct. 1986).	Yuya Cay (Apr. 1999); Boji Reef (Apr. 1999).	4 reefs, and 1 cay.
China	0	Zhubi Reef (March 1988); Nanxun Reef (March 1988); Dongmen Reef (March 1988); Chigua Reef (March 1988); Yongshu Reef (March 1988); Huayang Reef (March 1988).	Meiji (Mischief) Reef (February 1995)	7 reefs

Source: Li 2003: 7-9; Li Jinming 2005: 33-34. All names based on Chinese sources.

Chapter 8

Conclusion

For a long time, the People's Republic of China was known to be prone to use military force to settle foreign policy crises or interstate disputes. So how will China's rise impact international peace and security? Disputing the conventional wisdom of realist theory, I argue that a more powerful China will not necessarily become more aggressive. Rather, as a result of its deepening integration into the international system, the PRC has experienced a profound change in its worldview, which decreases its reliance on force as an essential instrument of foreign policy. Through detailed historical research and large-N quantitative analysis, I demonstrate that China's evolving worldview, rather than its increasing relative power, played a foremost role in driving Beijing's resort to force between 1949 and 2010.

At the end of Chapter 5, I have examined tentatively the theoretical and policy implications of the main findings. In this concluding chapter, I discuss further how these findings help to advance the study of international society itself, followed by a contemplation of the constraints on the reemergence of the militarized worldview in contemporary China. I wind up with a suggestion on the possible applications of the analytical framework of this study to enrich international relations theory.

International Society as an Ideational Stimulant of Chinese Foreign Policy

According to Bull (1977[1995]: 65), the notion of international society has become the "fundamental or constitutional normative principle of world politics" since the advent of the modern era. This principle has manifested itself in a whole complex of legal, moral, customary, and operational rules, designed to further the fundamental purposes of international society—to maintain peace and restrict violence, to ensure coexistence of states, and to facilitate interstate exchanges and cooperation (Ibid., 66-67).

In theory, classical realists also seem to subscribe to the idea of international society and its capacity for regulating state behavior through societal norms (Little 2003: 445-447). Methodologically, however, contemporary realist scholars charge that the English School of International Relations, with Bull as one of its founding fathers, has not yet developed a rigorous and testable theory about how the international society exactly guides states on the proper ways of behavior. For instance, despite its acclaimed "historical" approach to international relations, the English School produces surprisingly few diplomatic-historical analyses that carefully examine whether and how the perceptions held by state elites or leaders about the international society have a causal impact on state behavior. Without such analyses, we are unable to ascertain whether state leaders are truly aware of international societal norms or to take them into account when considering foreign policy options (Copeland 2003: 431-432).

This study attempts to make up for this deficit by providing a comprehensive and in-depth account of how the changing perceptions or worldviews of China's leaders result in the profound metamorphosis of the PRC's approach to international politics. In ample historical detail, I demonstrate that Beijing's behavioral preferences are closely associated with its perceptions of the so-called "main themes" (i.e., the underlying features or normative conditions) of the international system:

—When the PRC was a challenger against the system, Beijing saw enmity, persecution, and conspiracies against the survival of revolutionary China everywhere. Perceiving conflict as inevitable and compromise undesirable in this context, Beijing thus developed a penchant for confrontational postures and tactics, including the use of force;

—Upon China's tentative integration into the international system, Beijing began to perceive a greater possibility of peaceful coexistence and cooperation in international politics.

359

This perception was reinforced by the PRC's growing trade, diplomatic, and people-to-people exchanges with other countries. Consequently, Beijing developed an increasing interest in promoting friendly and constructive relations with the rest of the world, as well as in the peaceful resolution of disputes;

—After the PRC was sufficiently integrated into the international society, Beijing not only formed, but remained committed to, the perception that "peace and development" were the main and enduring characteristics of international politics. As a result, Beijing demonstrated a growing willingness to contribute to world peace and stability, and to settle disputes through compromise and the creation of mutual benefit. Today, as the PRC seeks to become a responsible and respected actor in international society, it considers the use of force to be merely a last resort for conflict resolution.

Theoretically, then this study corroborates Buzan's (1993: 330) insightful contention that "the very act of perceiving international relations in societal terms will itself condition behavior by opening new understandings of what is possible and what is desirable." Moreover, if integration into international society could induce such profound changes in the basic character and behavior of an erstwhile challenger, it is plausible to describe international society as an ideational stimulant that impels states to act less aggressively and more cooperatively toward each other.

Of course, to say that China is integrated into the international system (or international society) does not mean that Beijing is fully content with all aspects of the system, or that it will always settle disputes peacefully. Nonetheless, available evidence suggests that China's leaders believe that the prevailing system is overall well-functioning, conducive to the PRC's long-term development, and capable of regulating the conflicts of interest among states properly. At a

minimum, Beijing recognizes that "the existing international system, though far from desirable, [is] not unacceptable" (Zhang 1998: 106). As long as the PRC leadership continues to value "peace and development" as the driving forces of international politics as well as the top priority of Chinese foreign policy, there is easier to believe that Beijing would favor incremental changes to, rather than a radical transformation of, the prevailing conditions of the international system.

At any rate, a China which is bound by normative considerations of what is good or appropriate behavior in international society presents much less of a threat than a China which is not. To paraphrase Bull (1977[1995]: 43), a norms-bound PRC will, before resorting to force against others, at least decide that it owes the international society an explanation of its conduct, in terms of commonly accepted rules; and the strength of this explanation will undoubtedly determine the extent of the violence to be employed. Conversely, a China which holds the international system in contempt would have no compunctions or inhibitions about disrupting international peace and stability. To this day, Beijing obviously prefers to adopt the first approach, and its ways of managing frictions and disputes with others reflect essentially the requirements of the Lockean worldview: that is, those frictions seem to "give China stronger interests in favor of than against regional stability, and for rather than against cooperative relations with its potential great-power rivals" (Nathan and Ross 1997: 230).

Will the PRC's avowed "peaceful development," then, continue for years to come? Admittedly, many uncertainties linger on. In particular, China specialists inform us that an insurgent and vocal group of "new nationalists" has recently gained strength in the PRC's internal debates, who believe that war is likely or inevitable as China keeps rising (Lampton 2008: 14-15). Based on this study, I suggest that the world should be wary of Beijing's long-term intentions if and when the notion of the inevitability of war again becomes the consensus among

361

PRC elites, signaling the resuscitation of the militarized worldview as well as the resumption of a challenger's posture by China. In the next section, I consider the possible circumstances under which the militarized worldview might reemerge and drive the PRC toward a renewed collision course with the international system, as well as the domestic and international constraints that may diminish the likelihood of this scenario.

Will the Militarized Worldview Reemerge?

In theory, before the PRC reverts to a confrontational posture against the international system, China's leaders and elites have to develop the following perceptions: (1) the system no longer represents a propitious social environment conducive to China's long-term stability, security, and prosperity; (2) China has diminishing common interests with the rest of the world, especially with other major powers; (3) accordingly, the settlement of China's disputes with other countries, depends not so much on cooperation and compromise, as on sheer might and military force.

These perceptions, needless to say, stand in direct antithesis to the Lockean worldview endorsed by Deng Xiaoping and his successors to this day. As elaborated earlier, the Lockeanization of the Chinese worldview is based on the perception that peaceful coexistence and cooperation are a normal and lasting condition of the international system. Therefore, it is both possible and desirable to increase goodwill and decrease tension in China's relations with other countries, as well as to create common interests and avoid conflict, through constructive engagement with the rest of the world. As long as this Dengist perception of international society predominates, Beijing displays considerable pragmatism and cool-minded in managing interstate disputes or foreign policy crises.

After the NATO's accidental bombing of the Chinese embassy in Yugoslavia in May 1999, the internal debates among the PRC's policy elites were a case in point. Despite their deep-seated distrust of U.S. strategic intentions toward China, few Chinese elites subscribed to the view that war with the United States was imminent or unavoidable. Instead, most of them continued to uphold the Dengist notion that "peace and development" were the main trends in international politics, and that China's future lay in sustained integration into the international system (Finkelstein 2000: 28-29). Despite his indignation at U.S. "hegemonism," President Jiang Zemin also confirmed at a Politburo meeting that the incident gave China a stronger incentive to remain committed to the "fundamental policy of reform and opening," so that Beijing could make more friends internationally in a united effort to oppose hegemonism and promote peace and development around the world (Jiang 2006, Vol.2: 326). In fact, shortly afterward, Chinese foreign policy began to place an unprecedented valuation upon the pursuit of cooperative common security and common development (see Chapter 3).

To make a sharp and complete reversal of the Lockean worldview, therefore, the PRC must encounter a far more shocking foreign policy crisis, which not only intensifies Chinese distrust of the United States and its allies phenomenally, but drives Beijing into a position of combative rivalry immediately. Hypothetically, one such crisis would be a public statement from the governments of the United States or other major powers that supports the independence of Taiwan, Tibet, or Xinjiang. Such a statement, impinging upon China's avowed "core interest" in territorial integrity, would deliver a crushing blow to the reigning Chinese perception of international society as a benign social environment, while fortifying the position of the ultra-conservatives or nationalists who clamor for a strong and hostile reaction against the U.S.-led international system. Likewise, given the complexity of the maritime disputes in the East and

South China Seas, a direct and public U.S. rebuttal of the PRC's sovereign claims in favor of other contestants' positions would cause deep and widespread resentment in China too, forcing Beijing into a more confrontational posture.

Short of such cataclysmic crises (which are unlikely to occur for the foreseeable future), I believe the Lockean worldview will likely prevail in Beijing for years to come, due to a combination of both domestic and international factors:

Domestically, the Lockeanization of the Chinese worldview was not accomplished in a day, but arose from a long process of consensus maintenance or accumulation among China's leaders and elites since the late 1970s. By the same token, this consensus cannot disappear overnight, and to overturn it under normal circumstances (i.e., ine the absence of violent international shocks) would require a profound restructuring of domestic Chinese politics. Even in Mao's days, such a feat required a massive purge of dissenting leaders and elites (recall that China's resumption of a challenger's posture in 1960 was preceded by Mao's purges at the Lushan Conference in 1959). In contemporary China, to carry out such purges is both unthinkable and infeasible.

Available evidence, for example, suggests that the last attempt to purge the CCP of ideologically "soft" elements was mounted by the elderly Party hardliners in the wake of the 1989 Tiananmen crisis, in concert with their (unsuccessful) efforts to push China toward a more confrontational posture against the West-dominated international order. Even at that time, however, such drastic policy reversal failed to appeal to all leading conservatives in the CCP. Chen Yun, the alleged arch-conservative and another towering patriarch in the Party, opposed the expulsion of some liberal-minded elites from the CCP, on the grounds that political disagreements within the Party should be handled with particular caution, to avoid repeating the

"fundamental historical blunders" in Mao's days (Jin et al. 2005: 1804-1805). Meanwhile, the

CCP's main ideologues were reluctant to dispute the Dengist notion that peace and development

were the main themes of international politics (He Fang 2007: 644-645). Finally, due to quiet

opposition from many quarters of the Party elites, the attempted mass purges were never carried

out. [177]

    If, at a moment of national exigency like the 1989 Tiananmen crisis, the PRC's leaders

and elites still found it inadvisable to revise the Dengist orientation toward the international

system, what chance do Chinese elites have today of accomplishing the feat under current

circumstances? The answer is well-nigh zero. To begin with, while Mao's proclivities were

"usually determinative" and Deng's "extremely important" in shaping policy, contemporary

Chinese leaders have to spend enormous energy building and maintaining coalitions and support

for their policy inclinations (Lampton 2001: 314). In today's China, both the elites and ordinary

people have come to regard a sustained commitment to reform and opening as a "vital criterion

for measuring social progress, ideological open-mindedness, and political legitimacy" (Wang

2003: 47). Correspondingly, it is much easier to maintain a coalition for rather than against the

continuance of the Lockean worldview, which, after all, is intrinsically and inseparably

associated with the Dengist grand strategy of reform and opening.

---

[177] An episode concerning the official Chinese Writers' Association—which had openly
supported the Tiananmen democracy movement before the crackdown—was highly illustrative.
Initially, according to a plan of the hardliners, 99 out of the 200-odd staff members of the
association would suffer various forms of administrative punishment. Nonetheless, Ma Feng, a
veteran communist and party secretary of the association, refused to carry out the plan, arguing
that the CCP's past experiences had long demonstrated the foolishness of conducting witch-hunts
against perceived "subversive" or "hostile" elements at home. At Ma's insistence, the Writers'
Association eventually metered out token punishment to only eight staff members. More
intriguingly, when the matter was referred to the CCP's Central Secretariat for adjudication, the
top leadership chose to back Ma's more sensible judgment (Chen 2010: 214-215).

Internationally, China's integration into international society has also created formidable obstacles to any attempt to turn back history and reinstate the militarized worldview. For one thing, the growing bonds of economic interdependence and mutual benefit will undoubtedly serve as a constant reminder to Beijing that it shares a strong common interest with the rest of the world in preserving peace and avoiding conflict. Similarly, the PRC's increasing political and diplomatic engagement with other countries will induce Beijing to continue to seek acceptance and respect through responsible and restrained behavior, instead of violence and confrontation. Furthermore, as a PRC expert points out, China's active participation in international institutions, while not always producing desirable results, has at least reinforced Beijing's implicit faith in the "legitimacy and effectiveness" of the existing international system (Wang 2003: 46).

Finally, the aforementioned domestic and international factors may join forces in bringing about more positive changes in China's approach toward the international system. It is noted, for example, that reform and opening have led to a profound transformation of China's social, economic, and political institutions (e.g., in the fields of environmental protection and human rights), in conformity with international norms, rules, and standards. As a result, even ordinary Chinese have come to develop a growing identification with the international system (Wang 2003: 47). If these trends continue, it is not unlikely that China's emerging civil society will, in times of foreign policy crises, raise voices in favor of compromise and draw attention to China's obligation to act in more rule-based ways. In this regard, that some Chinese scholars of international law have openly advocated settling the maritime disputes in the East and South China Seas through compromise and on the basis of international conventions is a hopeful sign (see, for example, Gao 2004: 101-115, 136-138; Jia 2006: 140-141).

Summarizing the Past, Looking ahead to the Future

In 1975, concluding his seminal study of the Chinese calculus of deterrence, Allen Whiting observed: "[U]nderstanding China's international behavior is both possible and essential. Understanding is not sufficient to guarantee peace, but misunderstanding increases the risk of war" (Whiting 1975: 248). To make a genuine attempt at understanding, one has to evaluate past Chinese perceptions and patterns of behavior, which provide a useful framework for interpreting the present and forecasting the future. Conversely, a typical misunderstanding lies with those who are welded to the habit of calculating worst-case contingencies on the basis of capabilities rather than intentions (Ibid., 248).

In essence, this study represents one step further down the path blazed by Whiting. Theoretically, I start with a similar rejection of the realist conventional wisdom, which sees capabilities, not intentions, as the basis of behavior. Likewise, I turn to perceptions or worldviews in analyzing the hidden dynamics driving China's behavioral change. By evaluating the PRC's past experience, my goal, too, is to provide a framework for predicting its future behavior—a difficult but not impossible task. As noted by Whiting (1975: 248), the future is never wholly discontinuous from the past. Therefore, while the past does not give precise answers, it often does supply revealing clues as to the direction of the future. Moreover, using a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods, I demonstrate that it is feasible to uncover the patterns of Chinese behavior in a way that is both systematic and conducive to the cumulation of knowledge.

In the final analysis, there are two possible ways of building on this work to produce new findings at a more generalizable level of IR theory:

First, recall that the theoretical framework of this study aims to explain the security behavior of all challenger-states, of which China is but one case. Thus, the next step in this line

of research is to examine the shifts, if any, in the violence proneness of other famed challengers from the same theoretical and empirical perspective, to see whether they exhibit identical patterns of behavioral change;

Second, as I suggested in Chapter 5, the great powers, as guardians of the modern international system, are conceivably more likely to modify their foreign policy and security behavior in the interest of international society. If the PRC, a relative latecomer, has learnt to moderate its violence propensity and seek peaceful resolution of disputes, there is every reason to believe that the more established powers, too, would have shown similar or even stronger patterns of behavioral moderation over time, especially since the end of WWII. This is a testable proposition that, if confirmed, has significant implications for the advancement of the study of international society.

To conduct research along these lines, of course, requires a mastery of specific political and historical knowledge about those states concerned, which is beyond the scope of this study; but it will be energy well spent. To this day, the China scholarship has largely gone along a separate path of inquiry within its parent discipline of international relations, as if China were some esoteric realm beyond the purview of any general theory that might be applicable to other states. By attempting to put China in a broader theoretical context, this study hopes to initiate a dialogue that may stimulate further research.

Bibliography

ACCINELLI, ROBERT. (1998) *Crisis and Commitment: United States Policy toward Taiwan, 1950-1955*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

ACHEN, CHRISTOPHER H. (2002) Toward a New Political Methodology: Microfoundations and ART. *Annual Review of Political Science* 5 (1): 423-450.

ALLEE, TODD L., AND PAUL K. HUTH. (2006a) Legitimizing Dispute Settlement: International Adjudication as Domestic Political Cover. *American Political Science Review* 100 (2): 219-234.

———. (2006b) The Pursuit of Legal Settlements to Territorial Disputes. *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 23 (4): 285-307.

ARMSTRONG, DAVID. (1993) *Revolution and World Order: The Revolutionary State in International society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

BADER, JEFFREY A. (2012) *Obama and China's Rise: An Insider's Account of America's Asia Strategy*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

BANERJEE, PURNENDU K. (1990) *My Peking Memoirs of the Chinese Invasion of India*. New Delhi: Clarion Books.

BARBIERI, KATHERINE. (2002) *The Liberal Illusion: Does Trade Promote Peace?* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

BARBIERI, KATHERINE, AND JACK S. LEVY. (1999) Sleeping with the Enemy: the Impact of War on Trade. *Journal of Peace Research* 36 (4): 463-479.

BARBIERI, KATHERINE, AND GERALD SCHNEIDER. (1999) Globalization and Peace: Assessing New Directions in the Study of Trade and Conflict. *Journal of Peace Research* 36 (4): 387-404.

BARBIERI, KATHERINE, OMAR KESHK, AND BRIAN POLLINS. (2008) Correlates of War Project Trade Data Set Codebook, Version 2.0. Available at http://correlatesofwar.org.

BAYER, REᵒAT. (2006) Diplomatic Exchange Dataset, v2006.1. Available at http://correlatesofwar.org.

BECK, NATHANIEL, KATZ, JONATHAN N., AND RICHARD TUCKER. (1998) Taking Time Seriously in Binary Time-Series-Cross-Section Analysis. *American Journal of Political Science* 42(4): 1260-1288.

BEN-YAHUDA, HEMDA. (2004) Territoriality and War in International Crises: Theory and Findings, 1918-2001. *International Studies Review* 6 (4): 85-105.

BENNETT, D. SCOTT, AND ALAN C. STAM. (2000) Research Design and Estimator Choices in the Analysis of Interstate Dyads: When Decisions Matter. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 44 (5): 653-685.

BERGER, THOMAS. (1998) *Cultures of Antimilitarism: National Security in Germany and Japan*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

BERNSTEIN, RICHARD, AND ROSS H. MUNRO. (1997) *The Coming Conflict with China*. New York: Vantage.

BICKERS, ROBERT. (2011) *The Scramble for China: Foreign Devils in the Qing Empire, 1832-1914*. London: Allen Lane.

BOEHMER, CHARLES, ERIK GARTZKE, AND TIMOTHY NORDSTROM. (2004). Do Intergovernmental Organizations Promote Peace? *World Politics* 57 (1): 1-38.

BOSCH, WILLIAM J. (1970) *Judgment on Nuremberg*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

BULL, HEDLEY. (1977[1995]) *The Anarchical Society*, 2nd edition. New York: Columbia

University Press.

BURLES, MARK, AND ABRAM N. SHULSKY. (2001) *Patterns in China's Use of Force: Evidence from History and Doctrinal Writings*. Santa Barbara, CA: Rand Corporation.

BUSH, RICHARD C. (2004) *At Cross Purposes: U.S.-Taiwan Relations since 1942*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

BUZANO, BARRY. (1993) From International System to International Society: Structural Realism and Regime Theory Meet the English School. *International Organization* 47 (3): 327-352.

BUZO, ADRIAN. (1998) *The Guerilla Dynasty: Politics and Leadership in North Korea*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

CABACUNGAN, GIL C. (2013) China Open to Joint Oil Development in Recto Bank. *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, January 7, 2013. Available at:

http://globalnation.inquirer.net/61007/china-open-to-joint-oil-devt-in-recto-bank

(Accessed January 12, 2013).

CAI JIAHE. (2003) Lenzhan yu 60 niandai qianqi nanya guoji guanxi de bianhua [The Cold War and the Changing Interstate Relations in South Asia in the Early 1960s]. In *Lenzhan yu zhongguo de zhoubian guanxi* [The Cold War and China's Relations with eighboring States], edited by Niu Dayong and Shen Zhihua. Beijing: Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe.

CAO YINGWANG. (2006) *Zhongguo waijiao diyiren Zhou Enlai* [Zhou Enlai: The Foremost Exponent of Chinese Diplomacy]. Shanghai: Shanghai Renmin Chubanshe.

CAPRIOLI, MARY, AND PETER F. TRUMBORE. (2006) First Use of Violent Force in Militarized Interstate Disputes, 1980-2001. *Journal of Peace Research* 43 (6): 741-749.

CARTER, DAVID B., AND CURTIS S. SIGNORINO. (2010) Back to the Future: Modeling Time

Dependence in Binary Data. *Political Analysis* 18 (3): 271-292.

CCP CENTRAL COMMITTEE. (1965) *Guanyu guoji gongchan zhuyi yuandong zongluxian de lunzhan* [The Great Debate on the General Guidelines for International Communism]. Beijing: Renmin Chubanshe.

CHA, VICTOR. (2012) *The Impossible State: North Korea, Past and Future*. New York: HarperCollins.

CHADWICK, PETER K. (1992) *Borderline: A Psychological Study of Paranoia and Delusional Thinking*. New York: Routledge.

CHAMBERS, MICHAEL. (2006) Rising China: The Search for Power and Plenty. In *Trade, Interdependence, and Security*, edited by Ashley J. Tellis and Michael Wills. Seattle: National Bureau of Asian Research.

CHAN, STEVE. (2005) Discerning the Causal Relationships between Great Powers' Membership in Intergovernmental Organizations and Their Initiation of Militarized Disputes. *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 22 (3): 239-256.

CHEN JIAN. (1994) *China's Road to the Korean War: The Making of the Sino-American Confrontation*. New York: Columbia University Press.

————. (2001) *Mao's China and the Cold War*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

CHEN WEIREN. (2010) *Ma Feng wuci: huimou zhongguo dangdai wentan de yige shijiao* [Ma Feng the Amiable: Reflections on the Literary Circles of Contemporary China].Taipei: Showwe Information.

CHEN YANGYONG. (2005) *Kucheng weiju: Zhou Enlai zai 1967* [The Anchor in the Storm: Zhou Enlai in 1967]. Chongqing: Chongqing Chubanshe.

———. (2006) *Zhongquan chuji: Zhou Enlai zai "jiuyisan" shijian zhihou* [Decisive Blows: Zhou Enlai's Actions after the "September 13th" Incident]. Chongqing: Chongqing Chubanshe.

CHENG HUA. (1992) *Zhou Enlai yu ta de mishu men* [Zhou Enlai and His Secretaries]. Beijing: Zhongguo Guangbo Dianshi Chubanshe.

CHENG RUISHENG. (2006) Zhongyin liangguo de bianjie tanpan jiqi qianjing [The Sino-Indian Border Negotiations: Processes and Prospects]. In *Kuayue ximalaya zhang'ai: Zhongguo xunqiu liaojie yindu* [Across the Himalayan Divide: China Seeks to Understand India], edited by Zhang Minqiu. Chongqing: Chongqing Chubanshe.

CHEUNG, GARY KA-WAI (2009) *Hong Kong's Watershed: The 1967 Riots*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Univ. Press.

CHIN, PENG. (2003) *My Side of History*. Singapore: Media Masters.

CHRISTENSEN, THOMAS J. (1996a) Chinese Realpolitik: Reading Beijing's Worldview. *Foreign Affairs* 75 (5): 37-52.

———. (1996b) *Useful Adversaries: Grand Strategy, Domestic Mobilization, and Sino-American Conflict, 1947-1958*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

(2006) Windows and War: Trend Analysis and Beijing's Use of Force. In *New Directions in the Study of China's Foreign Policy*, edited by Alastair Iain Johnston and Robert S. Ross. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

———. (2011) The Advantages of an Assertive China. *Foreign Affairs* 90 (2): 54-67.

CHRISTENSEN, THOMAS J., Alastair Iain Johnston, and Robert Ross. (2006) Conclusions and Future Directions. In *New Directions in the Study of China's Foreign Policy*, edited by Alastair Iain Johnston and Robert S. Ross. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

COPELAND, DALE, C. (2000) The Constructivist Challenge to Structural Realism. *International Security* 25 (2): 187-212.

―――. (2003) A Realist Critique of the English School. Review of *International Studies* 29 (3): 427-441.

DAI BINGGUO. (2010) Jianchi zou heping fazhan daolu [We Must Persist in Taking the Road of Peaceful Development]. Available at: http://www.gov.cn/ldhd/2010-12/06/content_1760381.htm (Accessed March 19, 2012).

DAI CHAOWU. (2003a) *Didui yu weiji de niandai: 1954-1958 nian de zhongmei guanxi* [Years of Antagonism and Crisis: Sino-American Relations, 1954-1958]. Beijing: Shehui Kexue Wenxian Chubanshe.

―――. (2003b). Yindu waijiao zhengce, daguo guanxi yu 1962 nian zhongyin bianjie chongtu [Indian Foreign Policy, Great-Power Relations, and the Sino-Indian Border Conflict in 1962]. In *Lenzhan yu zhongguo de zhoubian guanxi* [The Cold War and China's Relations with Neighboring States], edited by Niu Dayong and Shen Zhihua. Beijing: Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe.

DEEPAK, B. R. (2005) *India and China, 1904-2004: A Century of Peace and Conflict*. New Delhi: Manak.

DENG LIFENG. (1989) *Xinzhongguo junshi huodong jishi, 1949-1959* [China's Military Actions, 1949-1959]. Beijing: Zhongguo Dangshi Ziliao Chubanshe.

―――. (1994). *Jianguo hou junshi xingdong quanlu* [China's Military Actions since the Founding of the PRC]. Taiyuan: Shanxi Renmin Chubanshe.

DENG LIFENG, ET AL. (2011) *Zhongguo renmin jiefangjun junshi* [History of the Chinese People's Liberation Army], Vol.6. Beijing: Junshi Kexue Chubanshe.

DENG XIAOPING. (1993) *Deng Xiaoping wenxuan* [Selected Works of Deng Xiaoping], Vol. 3. Beijing: Renmin Chubanshe.

―――. (1994) *Deng Xiaoping wenxuan*, Vol. 2. Beijing: Renmin Chubanshe.

―――. (2004) *Deng Xiaoping junshi wenji* [Selected Works of Deng Xiaoping on Military Affairs], 3 vols. Beijing: Junshi Kexue Chubanshe and Zhongyang Wenxian Chubanshe.

DENG, YONG. (2005) Better than Power: "International Status" in Chinese Foreign Policy. In *China Rising: Power and Motivation in Chinese Foreign Policy,* edited by Yong Deng and Fei-ling Wang. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

―――. (2008) *China's Struggle for Status: The Realignment of International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DIEHL, PAUL F. (1992) What Are They Fighting for? The Importance of Issues in International Conflict Research. *Journal of Peace Research* 29 (3): 333-344.

DING YUZHOU, AND WANG SHICHUN. (2004) *Ding Yuzhou huiyilu* [Memoirs of Ding Yuzhou]. Taipei: Commonwealth Publishing.

DJALAL, HASJIM. (2001) Indonesia and the South China Sea Initiative. *Ocean Development and International Law* 32 (2): 97-103.

DONG HUI (2004). Lishi jiemi: guo gong liangdang zai bashi niandai de mimi tanpan jiyao [History Declassified: A Summary Account of the CCP-KMT Secret Talks in the 1980s]. *Wenshi Jinghua* [Gems of Culture and History], no. 5: 4-12.

DUAN JIELONG, ET AL. (2011) *Zhongguo guojifa shijian yu anli* [China and International Law: Practices and Case Studies]. Beijing: Falu Chubanshe.

ECONOMY, ELIZABETH, AND MICHEL OKSENBERG, Eds. (1999) *China Joins the World: Progress and Prospects*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations.

ERIK, CORNELL. (2002) *North Korea under Communism: Report of an Envoy to Paradise.* London: Routledge.

EVERARD, JOHN. (2012) *Only Beautiful, Please: A British Diplomat in North Korea*. Stanford: Walter H. Shorenstein Asia-Pacific Research Center, Stanford University.

FENG, HUIYUN. (2007) *Chinese Strategic Culture and Foreign Policy Decision-Making*. London: Routledge.

FINKELSTEIN, DAVID M. (1993) *Washington's Taiwan Dilemma, 1949-1950: From Abandonment to Salvation*. Fairfax: George Mason University Press.

————. (2000) *China Reconsiders Its National Security: The Great Peace and Development Debate of 1999*. Alexandria, VA: CNA Corporation.

FINNEMORE, MARTHA. (1996) *National Interests in International Society*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

FRAVEL, M. TAYLOR. (2008) *Secure Borders, Strong Nation: Cooperation and Conflict in China's Territorial Disputes*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

FRIEDBERG, AARON. (2005) The Future of U.S.-China Relations: Is Conflict Inevitable? *International Security* 30 (2): 7-45.

————.. (2011) *A Contest for Supremacy: China, the United States, and the Struggle for Mastery in Asia*. New York: W. W. Norton.

GAO JIANJUN. (2004) *Zhongguo yu guoji haiyangfa* [China and International Ocean Law]. Beijing: Haiyang Chubanshe.

GARTZKE, ERIK, AND QUAN LI. (2003) Measure for Measure: Concept Operationalization and the Trade Interdependence-Conflict Debate. *Journal of Peace Research* 40 (5): 553–571.

GARVER, JOHN W. (1997) *Face Off: China, the United States, and Taiwan's Democratization.*

Seattle: University of Washington Press.

———. (2006) CHINA'S DECISION FOR WAR WITH INDIA IN 1962. In *New Directions in the Study of China's Foreign Policy*, edited by Alastair Iain Johnston and Robert S. Ross. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

GENG BIAO. (1991) Tuidong zhongguo he Bajisitan guanxi zhuanxiang youhao fazhan de jici zhongyao waijiao xingdong [Some Important Diplomatic Initiatives that Helped to Promote the Sino-Pakistani Friendship]. In *Xin zhongguo waijiao fengyun* [Major Events in New China's Diplomacy], vol.2, edited by the Office of Diplomatic Historians, Ministry of Foreign Aaffairs. Beijing: Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe.

GEORGE, ALEXANDER L. (1979) Case Studies and Theory Development: The Method of Structured, Focused Comparison. In *Diplomacy: New Approaches in History, Theory, and Policy*, edited by Paul G. Lauren. New York: Free Press.

GEORGE, ALEXANDER L., AND RICHARD SMOKE. (1974) *Deterrence in American Foreign Policy: Theory and Practice*. New York: Columbia University Press.

GERTZ, BILL. (2000) *The China Threat*. Washington, DC: Regnery.

GHOSN, FATEN, GLENN PALMER, AND STUART BREMER. (2004) The MID3 Data Set, 1993–2001: Procedures, Coding Rules, and Description. *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 21 (2): 133-154.

GIBLER, DOUGLAS M. (1996) Alliances that Never Balance: The Territorial Settlement Treaty. *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 15 (1): 75-97.

———. (1997) Control the Issues, Control the Conflict: The Effects of Alliances that Settle Territorial Issues on Interstate Rivalry. *International Interactions* 22 (4): 341-368.

———. (2007) Bordering on Peace: Democracy, Territorial Issues, and Conflict. *International*

Studies Quarterly 51 (3): 509-532.

GILBOY, GEORGE J., AND ERIC HEGINBOTHAM. (2012) *Chinese and Indian Strategic Behavior: Growing Power and Alarm.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

GILL, BATES. (2007) *Rising Star: China's New Security Diplomacy*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

GILPIN, ROBERT. (1981) *War and Change in International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

GLASER, CHARLES. (2011) Will China's Rise Lead to War? *Foreign Affairs* 90 (2): 80-91.

GLASER, BONNIE S., AND EVAN S. MEDEIROS. (2007) The Changing Ecology of Foreign Policy-Making in China: The Ascension and Demise of the Theory of "Peaceful Rise." *The China Quarterly* 190: 291-310.

GOCHMAN, CHARLES. (1980) Status, Capabilities, and Major Power Conflict. In *The Correlates of War: Testing Some Realpolitik Models*, edited by J. David Singer. New York: Free Press.

GOCHMAN, CHARLES, AND RUSSELL J. LENG. (1983) Realpolitik and the Road to War. *International Studies Quarterly* 27 (1): 97-120.

GOERTZ, GARY, AND PAUL DIEHL. (1992) *Territorial Changes and International Conflict*. London: Routledge.

GOLDSTEIN, AVERY. (2005) *Rising to the Challenge: China's Grand Strategy and International Security*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

GOLDSTEIN, LYLE J. (2001) Return to Zhenbao Island: Who Started Shooting and Why Does it Matter. *China Quarterly*, no.168: 985-997.

———. (2011) Chinese Naval Strategy in the South China Sea: An Abundance of Noise and

Smoke, but Little Fire. *Contemporary Southeast Asia* 33 (3): 320-347.

GONG LI. (2004) *Deng Xiaoping yu meiguo* [Deng Xiaoping and the United States]. Beijing: Zhonggong Dangshi Chubanshe.

GRIES, PETER. (2005) *China's New Nationalism: Pride, Politics, and Diplomacy.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

GROTIUS, HUGO. (1625[1979]) *The Rights of War and Peace.* Westport, CT: Hyperion.

GUO SHI. (2006) Dui 1962 nian zhongyin bianjie chongtu de huigu yu fansi [Reflections on the Sino-Indian Border Conflict in 1962]. In *Kuayue ximalaya zhang'ai: Zhongguo xunqiu liaojie yindu* [Across the Himalayan Divide: China Seeks to Understand India], edited by Zhang Minqiu. Chongqing: Chongqing Chubanshe.

GURTOV, MELVIN, AND BYONG-MOO HWANG. (1980) *China under Threat: The Politics of Strategy and Diplomac*y. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University.

HAO PO-TSUN. (2000) *Ba nian canmou zongzhang riji* [Diary of My Eight Years as Chief of the General Staff]. Taipei: Commonwealth Publishing.

HASSNER, RON E. (2006/07) The Path to Intractability: Time and the Entrenchment of Territorial Disputes. *International Security* 31 (3): 107-133.

HE FANG. (2007) *Cong Yan'an yilu zoulai de fansi: He Fang zishu* [My Pathway from Yan'an: The Memoirs of He Fang]. Honh Kong: Ming Pao Press.

————. (2010) *He Fang tan shi yi ren* [He Fang Reminisces about Past Events and Colleagues]. Beijing: Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe.

HE LIDAN (2007) Wang-Gu jiahua, zhongliu yihan [The Wang-Koo Meeting—The Regrets Left behind]. In *Huainian Wang Daohan* [In Memory of Wang Daohan], edited by Shanghai Jiaotong University. Shanghai: Shanghai Jiaotong University Press.

HE YING. (1994) Dui yuanjian tanzan tielu juece de huigu [Reflections on China's Decision to Assist in the Building of the Tanzania-Zambia Railway]. In *Xin zhongguo waijiao fengyun* [Major Events in New China's Diplomacy], vol.3, edited by Office of Diplomatic Historians, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Beijing: Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe.

HEATON, WILLIAM R. (1982) China and Southeast Asian Communist Movements: The Decline of Dual Track Diplomacy. *Asian Survey* 22 (8): 779-800.

HENSEL, PAUL R. (2000) Territory: Theory and Evidence on Geography and Conflict. In *What Do We Know about War*?, edited by John A. Vasquez. Lamham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

———. (2001) Contentious Issues and World Politics: The Management of Territorial Claims in the Americas, 1816-1992. *International Studies Quarterly* 45 (1): 81-109.

———. (2006) Territorial Claims and Armed Conflict between Neighbors. Paper presented to the Lineae Terrarum International Borders Conference at the University of Texas—El Paso, New Mexico University, Colegio de la Frontera Norte, and Universidad Autonoma de Ciudad Juarez, March.

HENSEL, PAUL R., AND SARA M. MITCHELL. (2005) Issue Indivisibility and Territorial Claims. *GeoJournal* 64 (4): 275-285.

HENSEL, PAUL R., SARA M. MITCHELL, THOMAS SOWERS II, AND CLAYTON THYNE. (2008) Bones of Contention: Comparing Territorial, Maritime, and River Issues. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 52 (1): 117-143.

HOLDRIDGE, JOHN. (1997) *Crossing the Divide: An Insider's Account of Normalization of U.S.-China Relations*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

HOPF, TED. (2002) *Social Construction of International Politics: Identities & Foreign Policies, Moscow, 1955 and 1999*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

HOU TAO. (2009) Shibing mianduimian duizhi: 87 nian zhongyin bianjing chongtu shimo [Soldiers Face off against Each Other: The Sino-Indian Border Conflict in 1987). *Huanqiu Shibao* (*Global Times*), October 29. Available at: http://history.huanqiu.com/china/2009-10/616962.html (Accessed April 20, 2011).

HSU, CHING-HSIUNG. (2000) *Taiwan jianguo de lilun jichu* [The Theoretical Foundation of Taiwan's State-Building]. Taipei: Qianwei.

———. (2001) *Zhonghua minguo ruhe chengwei guojia* [How to Transform the Republic of China into a State]. Taipei: Qianwei.

HU GUANGZHENG, AND XIAO XIANSHE. (1989) *Yingxiang dao 21 shiji de zhengming* [The Debates that Impact the 21st Century]. Beijing: Jiefangjun Chubanshe.

HU JINTAO. (2005) Nuli jianshe chijiu heping gongtong fanrong de hexie shijie [Striving for a Harmonious World with Lasting Peace and common Propserity]. Available at: http://news.xinhuanet.com/world/2005-09/16/content_3496858.htm (Accessed on March 21, 2012)

HU QIAOMU. (1993) *Hu Qiaomu wenji* [Selected Works of Hu Qiaomu], Vol. 2. Beijing: Renmin Chubanshe.

HUANG HUA. (2007) *Qinli yu jianwen* [The Memoirs of Huang Hua]. Beijing: Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe.

HUANG, JING, AND XIAOTING LI. (2010) *Inseparable Separation: The Making of China's Taiwan*

Policy. Singapore: World Scientific Press.

HUANG QINGHUA. (2006) *Zhongpu guanxi shi* [History of Sino-Portuguese Relations], 3 vols. Hefei: Huangshan Shushe.

HUANG RENWEI. (2007) Qingxi liangan de chizi zhi xin, chaoyue shikong de zhanlue siwei [Empathy toward Compatriots across the Strait, and Unsurpassed Strategic Acumen—In Memory of Wang Daohan]. In *Huainian Wang Daohan* [In Memory of Wang Daohan], edited by Shanghai Jiaotong University. Shanghai: Shanghai Jiaotong University Press.

HUTH, PAUL K. (1996) *Standing Your Ground: Territorial Disputes and International Conflict*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

———. (1997) Reputation and Deterrence: A Theoretical and Empirical Assessment. *Security Studies* 7 (1): 72-99.

IKENBERRY, G. JOHN. (2008) The Rise of China and the Future of the West: Can the Liberal System Survive? *Foreign Affairs* 87 (1): 23-37.

INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL AND STRATEGIC STUDIES (IISS). (2004) *China's Grand Strategy: A Kinder, Gentler Turn*. London: IISS.

JEPPENSON, RONALD L., ALEXANDER WENDT, AND PETER J. KATZENSTEIN. (1996) Norms, Identity, and Culture in National Security. In *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics* (pp. 33-75), edited by Peter J. Katzenstein. New York: Columbia University Press.

JI CHAOZHU. (2008) *The Man on Mao's Right*. New York: Random House.

JI QUOXING. (2009) *Zhongguo de haiyang anquan he haiyu guanxia* [China's Maritime Security and Administration]. Shanghai: Shanghai Renmin Chubanshe.

JIA SHINAN. (1989) *Mao Zedong renji jiaowang shilu, 1915-1976* [The Records of Mao Zedong's

Interpersonal Relationships, 1915-1976]. Nanjing: Jiangsu Wenyi Chubanshe.

JIA YU. (2005) Zhongyue beibuwan haiyang huajie he yuye xieding shuping [On the

Demarcation of the Gulf of Tonkin and the Fishery Agreement between China and

Vietnam]. In *Xin Guoji haiyangfa de xin jinzhan* [New Developments in International

Ocean Law], edited by Gao Zhiguo, Jia Yu, and Zhang Haiwen. Beijing: Haiyang

Chubanshe.

———. (2006) Zhongri diaoyu dao zhengyi sheji de zhuyao falu wenti [The Main Legal

Questions Concerning the Sino-Japanese Dispute over the Diaoyu Islands]. In *Guoji*

haiyangfa de lilun yu shijian [The Theory and Practice of International Ocean Law],

edited by Gao Zhiguo, Jia Yu, and Zhang Haiwen. Beijing: Haiyang Chubanshe.

JIANG ZEMIN. (2006) *Jiang Zemin wenxuan* [Selected Works of Jiang Zemin], 3 vols. Beijing:

Renmin Chubanshe.

JIN CHONGJI, ET AL. (2000) *Zhu De zhuan* [A Biography of Zhu De]. Beijing: Zhongyang

Wenxian Chubanshe.

———. (2003) *Mao Zedong zhuan, 1949-1976* [A Biography of Mao Zedong, 1949-

1976]. Beijing: Zhongyang Wenxian Chubanshe.

———. (2005) *Chen yuan zhuan* [A Biography of Chen Yun]. Beijing: Zhongyang Wenxian

Chubanshe.

———. (2008) *Zhou Enlai zhuan* [A Biography of Zhou Enlai], 4 vols. Beijing: Zhongyang

Wenxian Chubanshe.

JIN RAORU. (1998) Zhonggong xianggan zhengce miwen shilu [The Inner Story of Chinese

Communist Policy toward Hong Kong]. Hong Kong: Tianyuan Shuwu.

JOHNSTON, ALASTAIR IAIN. (1996) Cultural Realism and Strategy in Maoist China. In *The*

Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics, edited by Peter J.
Katzenstein. New York: Columbia University Press.

———. (1998a) China's Militarized Interstate Dispute Behavior, 1949-1992: A First Cut at the
Data. *The China Quarterly* 153: 1-30.

———. (1998b) International Structures and Chinese Foreign Policy. In *China and the World:
Chinese Foreign Policy Faces the New Millennium*, 4th edition, edited by Samuel S. Kim.
Boulder, CO: Westview.

———. (2003a) Is China a Status Quo Power? *International Security* 27 (4): 5-56.

———. (2003b) Socialization in International Institutions. In *International Relations Theory
and the Asia-Pacific*, edited by G. John Ikenberry and Michael Mastanduno. New York:
Columbia University.

———. (2008) *Social States: China in International Institutions, 1980-2000*. Princeton:
Princeton University Press.

———. (2012) What (if anything) Does East Asia Tell us About International Relations Theory?
Annual Review of Political Science 15: 53-78.

———. (2013) How New and Assertive is China's New Assertiveness? *International Security*
37 (4): 7-48.

JOHNSTON, ALASTAIR IAIN, AND PAUL EVANS. (1999) China's Engagement with Multilateral
Security Institutions. In *Engaging China: The Management of an Emerging Power*,
edited by Alastair Iain Johnston and Robert S. Ross. New York: Routledge.

JOHNSTON, ALASTAIR IAIN, AND ROBERT ROSS, Eds. (1999) *Engaging China: the Management of
an Emerging Power*. New York: Routledge.

JONES, DANIEL M., STUART A. BREMER, AND J. DAVID SINGER. (1996) Militarized Interstate

Disputes, 1816-1992: Rationale, Coding Rules, and Empirical Patterns. *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 15 (2): 163-213.

KANG, DAVID. (2007) *China Rising: Peace, Power, and Order in East Asia*. New York: Columbia University Press.

KASTNER, SCOTT L., AND PHILLIP SAUNDERS. (2012) Is China a Status Quo or Revisionist State? Leadership Travel as an Empirical Indicator of Foreign Policy Priorities. *International Studies Quarterly* 56 (1): 163-177.

KATZENSTEIN, PETER J., ED. (1996) *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.

KAUL, T. N. (1982) *Reminiscences: Discreet and Indiscreet*. New Delhi: Lancers Publishers.

KECK, MARGARET E., AND KATHRYN SIKKINK. (1998) *Activists beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks In International Politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

KENT, ANN. (2007) *Beyond Compliance: China, International Organizations, and Global Security*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

KEOHANE, ROBERT. (1984) *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

KIER, ELIZABETH. (1997) *Imagining Wars: French and British Military Doctrine between the Wars*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

KIM, SAMUEL S. (1999) China in the United Nations. In *China Joins the World: Progress and Prospects*, edited by Elizabeth Economy and Michel Oksenberg. New York: Council on Foreign Relations.

KING, GARY, ROBERT KEOHANE, AND SIDNEY VERBA. (1994) *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

KISSINGER, HENRY. (1982) *Years of Upheaval.* Boston: Little, Brown & Company.

―――. (2011) *On China*. New York: Penguin.

KLEIN, JAMES P., GARY GOERTZ, AND PAUL DIEHL. (2006) The New Rivalry Dataset: Procedures

and Patterns. *Journal of Peace Research* 43 (3): 331-348.

KOCS, STEPHEN. (1995) Territorial Disputes and Interstate War, 1945-1987. *Journal of Politics*

57 (1): 159-175.

KONG FANJUN, et al. (2009) *Chi Haotian zhuan* [A Biography of Chi Haotian]. Beijing:

Jiefangjun Chubanshe.

KRISTOF, NICHOLAS D. (1993) The Rise of China. *Foreign Affairs* 72 (3): 59–74.

LAMPTON, DAVID M. (2001) *Same Bed, Different Dreams: Managing U.S.-China Relations,*

1989-2000. Los Angles: University of California Press.

―――. (2008) *The Three Faces of Chinese Power: Might, Money, and Minds*.

Berkeley: University of California Press.

LARSON, DEBORAH WELCH, AND ALEXEI SHEVCHENKO. (2010) Status Seekers: Chinese and

Russian Responses to U.S. Primacy. *International Security* 34 (4): 63-95.

LEE LAI TO. (1999) *China and the South China Sea Dialogues*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.

LEGRO, JEFFERY W. (1995) *Cooperation under Fire: Anglo-German Restraint during World War*

II. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

―――. (2005) *Rethinking the World: Great Power Strategies and International Order.* Ithaca:

Cornell University Press.

LEI YINGFU, AND CHEN XIANYI. (1997) *Zai zuigao tongshuaibu dang canmou: Lei Yingfu*

jiangjun huiyilu [Serving as Staff Officer at GHQ: Memories of General Lei Yingfu].

Nanchang: Baihuazhou Wenyi Chubanshe.

LEMKE, DOUGLAS, AND WILLIAM REED. (2001) The Relevance of Politically Relevant Dyads.

Journal of Conflict Resolution 45 (1): 126-144.

LENG RONG, ET AL. (2004) *Deng Xiaoping nianpu, 1975-1997* [A Chronology of Deng Xiaoping, 1975-1997]. Beijing: Zhongyang Wenxian Chubanshe.

LEVINE, STEVEN I. (1994) Perception and Ideology in Chinese Foreign Policy. In *Chinese Foreign Policy: Theory and Practice*, edited by Thomas W. Robinson and David Shambaugh. New York: Oxford University Press.

LI HUI, ET AL. (1994) *Zhongyin bianjing ziwei fanji zuozhanshi* [History of the Self-Defensive War on the Sino-Indian Border], internal circulation only. Beijing: Junshi Kexue Chubanshe.

LI HOU (1997) *Bainian quru shi di zhongjie: Xianggang wenti shimo* [End of the Century of Humiliation: The Beginning and End of the Hong Kong Issue]. Beijing: Zhongyang Wenxian Press.

LI JIAQUAN. (2010) *Taihai fengyun liushi nian, 1949-2009* [Sixty Years of Developments in Cross-Taiwan Strait Relations, 1949-2009]. Beijing: Jiuzhou Chubanshe.

LI JIE. (2003) *Mao Zedong yu xinzhongguo de neizheng waijiao* [Mao Zedong and the PRC's Domestic and Foreign Policies]. Beijing: Zhongguo Qingnian chubanshe.

LI JINMING. (2003) *Nanhai Zhengduan yu guoji haiyangfa* [The Dispute over the South China Sea and the International law of the Sea]. Beijing: Haiyang Chubanshe.

———. (2005) *Nanhai botao: dongnanya guojia yu nanhai wenti* [The Turbulent South China Sea: Southeast Asian States and the Spratlys Dispute]. Nanchang: Jiangxi Gaoxiao Chubanshe.

LI KE, AND HAO SHENGZHANG. (1989) *Wenhua dageming zhong de renmin jiefangjun* [The People's Liberation Army during the Cultural Revolution]. Beijing: Zhonggong Dangshi Ziliao Chubanshe.

LI LI. (2005) *Muji taihai fengyun* [Witnessing the Big Events across the Taiwan Strait]. Beijing: Huayi.

LI PING, et al. (1997). *Zhou Enlai nianpu, 1949-1976* [A Chronology of Zhou Enlai, 1949-1976]. Vols. 1-3, edited by the CCP's Department of Research on Party Documents. Beijing: Zhongyang Wenxian Chubanshe.

LI SHI'AN. (1997) Xianggang zai xinzhongguo chengli chuqi duiwai maoyi zhong de zuoyong [Hong Kong's Role in China's Foreign Trade in the Early Years of the PRC]. *Shijie Lishi* (a journal published by the Institute of World History under the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences), no.2: 10-17.

LI SONG (1997) Gaozhan yuanzhu, yingming guoduan: wenge zhong Zhou Enlai zuzhi jinjun Xianggang [Great Foresight, Brave Resolution: How Zhou Enlai Stopped the Invasion of Hong Kong during the Cultural Revolution]. *Dangshi Zonghen* [Review of Party History], No.8, p.42.

LI, XIAOTING. (2013) The Taming of the Red Dragon: The Militarized Worldview and China's Use of Force, 1949-2001. *Foreign Policy Analysis* 9 (4): 387-407.

LIANG ZHI, YAFENG XIA, AND MING CHEN. (2012) Recent Trends in the Study of Cold War History in China. The ECNU-WWICS Occasional Paper Series No. 1. Washington, DC: Cold War International History Project, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

LIEBERTHAL, KENNETH, AND WANG JISI. (2012) *Addressing U.S.-China Strategic Distrust*. John L. Thornton China Center Monograph Series No. 4. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

LIN HONGYI. (2010) Guanbi zhengce: guomindang dangju fengsuo dalu yanhai de xingdong, 1949-1960 [The Close Door Operation: The Kuomintang Authorities' Blockade of Coastal Mainland China in 1949-1960]. In *Jinmen: Neizhan yu Lengzhan* [Kinmen: Civil

War and the Cold War], edited by Shen Zhihua and Tang Qihua. Beijing: Jiuzhou Chubanshe.

LITTLE, RICHARD. (2003) The English School vs. American Realism: a Meeting of Minds or Divided by a Common Language? *Review of International Studies* 29 (3): 443-460.

LIU CHONGWEN, et al. (1998). *Liu Shaoqi nianpu*, *1898-1969* [A Chronology of Liu Shaoqi, 1898-1969]. Vols. 1-2, edited by the CCP's Department of Research on Party Documents. Beijing: Zhongyang Wenxian Chubanshe.

LIU HUAQING. (2004) *Liu Huaqing huiyilu* [Memoirs of Liu Huaqing]. Beijing: Jiefangjun Chubanshe.

LIU SHAOQI. (2005) *Jianguo yilai Liu Shaoqi wengao* [Manuscripts of Liu Shaoqi since the Founding of the PRC]. (2005) Vols. 1-4, edited by the CCP's Department of Research on Party Documents. Beijing: Zhongyang Wenxian Chubanshe.

———. (2008) *Jianguo yilai Liu Shaoqi wengao* [Manuscripts of Liu Shaoqi since the Founding of the PRC]. (2005) Vols. 5-7, edited by the CCP's Department of Research on Party Documents. Beijing: Zhongyang Wenxian Chubanshe.

LIU SHIH-CHUNG. (2010) *Lishi de jiujie: taimei guanxi de zhanlue hezuo yu fengqi* [The Knot of History: Strategic Cooperation and Divergence in Taiwan-U.S. Relations]. Taipei: Taiwan Brain Trust.

LIU WUSHENG, ET AL. (2000) *Zhou Enlai junshi huodong jishi* [A Chronology of Zhou Enlai's Military Activities], 2 vols. Beijing: Zhongyang Wenxian Chubanshe.

LIU XIAO. (1998) *Chushi sulian banian* [My Eight Years as Ambassador to the Soviet Union]. Beijing: Zhonggong Dangshi Chubanshe.

LIU XUECHENG. (1994) *The Sino-Indian Border Dispute and Sino-Indian Relations*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

LOCKE, JOHN. (1690[1980]) *Second Treatise of Government*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.

LOH, CHRISTINE. (2010) *Underground Front: The Chinese Communist Party in Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong Press.

LU MING. (2003) Zhongguo yu disici zhongri minjian maoyi jieding [China and the Fourth Sino-Japanese People-to-People Trade Agreement]. In *Lenzhan yu zhongguo de zhoubian guanxi* [The Cold War and China's Relations with Neighboring States], edited by Niu Dayong and Shen Zhihua. Beijing: Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe.

LU QIMING. (2009) Dahai jiangxing: nansha haizhan biandui zhihuiyuan Chen Weiwen jishi [The Star over the Sea: The Untold Story of Chen Weiwen, Commanding Officer of the Navy in the Nansha Conflict]. In Lu Qiming, *Liushi Nian Haijun Zuoping Xuan* [Collected Works about the Navy in the Past 60 Years], Vol. 5 (pp. 108-137). Beijing: Zhongguo Wenhua Chubanshe.

LUO HAILEI. (2011) *Wo de fuqin Luo Fu: yige baoren, "jiandie," he zuojia de gushi* [My Father Luo Fu: A Newsman, "Spy," and Writer]. Hong Kong: Cosmos Books.

LUTHI, LORENZ. (2008) *The Sino-Soviet Split: Cold War in the Communist World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

RAN LONGBO, AND MA JISEN. (2001) *Zhou Enlai yu xianggang 67 baodong niemu* [Zhou Enlai and the 1967 Revolt in Hong Kong]. Hong Kong: Ming Pao Press.

MA JISEN. (2003) *Waijiao bu wenge jishi* [The Cultural Revolution in the Foreign Ministry]. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press.

MA SHEXIANG. (2006) *Jianzou: Mao Zedong 1965 nian chongshang Jinggangshan* [The Prelude: Mao Zedong's Homecoming Visit to Mt. Jinggang in 1965]. Beijing: Dangdai Zhongguo Chubanshe.

MANSBACH, RICHARD, AND JOHN A. VASQUEZ. (1981) *In Search of Theory: A New Paradigm*

for Global Politics. New York: Columbia University Press.

MANSFIELD, EDWARD D, AND BRIAN M. POLLINS, Eds. (2003) *Economic Interdependence and International Conflict*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

MAO ZEDONG. (1987) *Jianguo yilai Mao Zedong wengao* [Manuscripts of Mao Zedong since the Founding of the PRC], Vol.1. Beijing: Zhongyang Wenxian Chubanshe.

———. (1988) *Jianguo yilai Mao Zedong wengao* [Manuscripts of Mao Zedong since the Founding of the PRC], Vol.2. Beijing: Zhongyang Wenxian Chubanshe.

———. (1989) *Jianguo yilai Mao Zedong wengao* [Manuscripts of Mao Zedong since the Founding of the PRC], Vol.3. Beijing: Zhongyang Wenxian Chubanshe.

———. (1990) *Jianguo yilai Mao Zedong wengao* [Manuscripts of Mao Zedong since the Founding of the PRC], Vol.4. Beijing: Zhongyang Wenxian Chubanshe.

———. (1991) *Jianguo yilai Mao Zedong wengao* [Manuscripts of Mao Zedong since the Founding of the PRC], Vol.5. Beijing: Zhongyang Wenxian Chubanshe.

———. (1992) *Jianguo yilai Mao Zedong wengao* [Manuscripts of Mao Zedong since the Founding of the PRC], vols.6-7. Beijing: Zhongyang Wenxian Chubanshe.

———. (1993) *Jianguo yilai Mao Zedong wengao* [Manuscripts of Mao Zedong since the Founding of the PRC], Vol.8. Beijing: Zhongyang Wenxian Chubanshe.

———. (1996) *Jianguo yilai Mao Zedong wengao* [Manuscripts of Mao Zedong since the Founding of the PRC], vols.9-11. Beijing: Zhongyang Wenxian Chubanshe.

———. (1998a) *Mao Zedong on Diplomacy*. Beijing: Foreign Languages Press.

———. (1998b) *Jianguo yilai Mao Zedong wengao* [Manuscripts of Mao Zedong since the Founding of the PRC], vols.12-13. Beijing: Zhongyang Wenxian Chubanshe.

———. (1999) *Mao Zedong wenji* [Collected Works of Mao Zedong], Vols. 6-8. Beijing: Renmin Chubanshe.

MAOZ, ZEEV, AND BRUCE RUSSETT. (1993) Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic

Peace, 1946-1986. *American Political Science Review* 87 (3): 624-638.

MAXWELL, NEVILLE. (1970) *India's China War*. New York: Pantheon.

MEARSHEIMER, JOHN. (2001) *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: W. W. Norton.

MENGES, CONSTANTINE C. (2005) *China: The Gathering Threat*. Nashville, TN: Nelson Current.

MIDLARSKY, MANUS. (1975) *On War: Political Violence in the International System*. New York: Free Press.

MORGENTHAU, HANS. (1948[1978]) *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, 5th edition. New York: Knopf.

MOSHER, STEVEN. (2000) *Hegemon: China's Plan to Dominate Asia and the World*. San Francisco, CA: Encounter Books.

MOST, BENJAMIN A., AND HARVEY STARR. (1989) *Inquiry, Logic, and International Politics*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

MYERS, B.R. (2010) *The Cleanest Race: How North Koreans See Themselves and Why It Matters*. New York: Melville House.

NATHAN, ANDREW, AND ROBERT ROSS. (1997) *The Great Wall and the Empty Fortress: China's Search for Security*. New York: W. W. Norton.

NATHAN, ANDREW, AND ANDREW SCOBELL. (2012) *China's Search for Security*. New York: Columbia University Press.

NIU JUN. (2003) 1962: zhongguo duiwai zhengce zuo zhuan de qianye [1962: Chinese Foreign Policy on the Eve of Radicalization]. In *Lenzhan yu zhongguo de zhoubian guanxi* [The Cold War and China's Relations with Neighboring States], edited by Niu Dayong and Shen Zhihua. Beijing: Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe.

———. (2006) Chinese Decision Making in Three Military Actions across the Taiwan Strait. In *Managing Sino-American Crises: Case Studies and Analysis*, edited by Michael

Swaine and Zhang Tuosheng. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

ONEAL, JOHN R., AND JAMES L. RAY. (1997) New Tests of the Democratic Peace: Controlling for Economic Interdependence, 1950-85. *Political Research Quarterly* 50 (4): 751-75.

ONEAL, JOHN R., AND BRUCE M. RUSSETT. (1997) The Classical Liberals Were Right: Democracy, Interdependence, and Conflict, 1950-1985. *International Studies Quarterly* 41 (2): 267-94.

———. (1999) Assessing the Liberal Peace with Alternative Specifications: Trade Still Reduces Conflict. *Journal of Peace Research* 36 (4): 423-42.

ONEAL, JOHN R., BRUCE RUSSETT, AND MICHAEL BERBAUM. (2003) Causes of Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations, 1885-1992. *International Studies Quarterly* 47 (3): 371-393.

ORGANSKI, A. F. K., AND JACEK KUGLER. (1980) *The War Ledger*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

OVERHOLT, WILLIAM. (1993) *The Rise of China: How Economic Reform is Creating a New Superpower*. New York: W. W. Norton.

OWSIAK, ANDREW P. (2012) Signing up for Peace: International Boundary Agreements, Democracy, and Militarized Interstate Conflict. *International Studies Quarterly* 56 (1): 51-66.

PANG SEN. (2008) Zhongguo yu lianheguo de guanxi [China's Relations with the United Nations]. In *Zhongguo duiwai guanxi zhuanxing sanshi nian, 1978-2008* [The Transformation of China's Foreign Policy, 1978-2008], edited by Wang Yzhou. Beijing: Shehui Kexue Wenxian Chubanshe.

PEI MONONG. (1989) Cong zhong ba guanxi kan Zhou Enlai zhengqu youhao linbang de yuanda

    moulue [Zhou Enlai's Grand Strategy of Befriending Neighboring States—From the

    Standpoint of China's Relations with Pakistan]. In *Yanjiu Zhou Enlai* [Studying Zhou

    Enlai], edited by Pei Jianzhang. Beijing: Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe.

PEI JIANZHANG, et al. (1994) *Zhonghua renmin gongheguo waijiaoshi, 1949-1956* [A Diplomatic

    History of the People's Republic of China, 1949-1956]. Beijing: Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe.

PEVEHOUSE. JON C., TIMOTHY NORDSTROM, AND KEVIN WARNKE. (2004) The COW-2

    International Organizations Dataset Version 2.0. *Conflict Management and Peace

    Science* 21 (2): 101-119.

PEVEHOUSE, JON C., AND BRUCE RUSSETT. (2006) Democratic International Governmental

    Organizations Promote Peace. *International Organization* 60 (4): 969-1000.

POSEN, BARRY R. (1984) *The Sources of Military Doctrine: France, Britain, and Germany

    between the World Wars*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

PRICE, RICHARD, AND NINA TANNENWALD. (1996) Norms and Deterrence: The Nuclear and

    Chemical Weapons Taboos. In *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in

    World Politics,* edited by Peter J. Katzenstein. New York: Columbia University Press.

QI YUEYI. (2006) *Hanwei xingdong: 1996 taihai feidan weiji fengyun lu* [Operation Safeguard:

    An Account of the 1996 Missile Crisis in the Taiwan Strait]. Taipei: Liming Wenhua.

Qian Fu. (2005) *Qian Fu huiyi lu* [Memoirs of Qian Fu], 2 volumes. Taipei: Commonwealth

    Publishing.

QIAN JIANG. (1999) *Mimi zhengzhan: zhongguo junshi guwentuan yuanyue kangfa jishi* [Secret

    Battles: How China's Military Advisory Group Assisted Vietnam's Struggles against

    France]. Chengdu: Sichuan Renmin Chubanshe.

———. (2005) *Zhou Enlai yu Geneva huiyi* [Zhou Enlai and the Geneva Conference]. Beijing:

Zhonggong Dangshi Chubanshe.

QIAN QICHEN. (2003) *Waijiao Shiji* [Ten Diplomatic Episodes]. Beijing: Shijie Zhishi chubanshe.

QIN YAQING, AND WEI LING (2008). Structures, Processes, and the Socialization of Power: East

    Asian Community-building and the Rise of China. In *China's Ascent: Power, Security,*

    and the Future of International Politics, edited by Robert S. Ross and Zhu Feng.

    Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

QIU HUIZUO. (2011) *Qiu Huizuo huiyilu* [Memoirs of Qiu Huizuo]. Hong Kong: New Century

    Press.

QU XING. (1989) Shilun 1954 nian rineiwa huiyi shang de Zhou Enlai waijiao [A Tentative

    Analysis of Zhou Enlai's Diplomacy at the 1954 Geneva Conference]. In *Yanjiu Zhou*

    Enlai [Studying Zhou Enlai], edited by Pei Jianzhang. Beijing: Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe.

RAPKIN, DAVID P., AND WILLIAM R. THOMPSON. (2009) Kantian Dynamics and Systemic

    Transitions: Can International Organizations Influence U.S.-China Conflict? In *Systemic*

    Transitions: Past, Present, and Future, edited by William R. Thompson. New York:

    Palgrave Macmillan.

RAY, JAMES LEE. (2003) Explaining Interstate Conflict and War: What Should be Controled for?

    Conflict Management and Peace Science 20 (1): 1-31.

———. (2005) Constructing Multivariate Analyses (of Dangerous Dyads). *Conflict*

    Management and Peace Science 22 (4): 277-292.

REN HUIWEN. (1998) *Zhongnanhai quanli jiaoban neimu* [The Inner Stories of China's

    Leadership Succession]. Hong Kong: Pacific Century.

———. (1999) *Zhongnanhai lingdao miwenlu* [The Inner Stories of China's Top Leadership].

    Hong Kong: Pacific Century.

RISSE, THOMAS, STEPHEN C. ROPP, AND KATHRYN SIKKINK. (1999) *The Power of Human Rights:*

International Norms and Domestic Change. New York: Cambridge University Press.

ROBINS, ROBERT S., AND JERROLD M. POST. (1997) *Political Paranoia: The Psychopolitics of Hatred*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

ROMBERG, ALAN D. (2003) *Rein at the Brink of the Precipice: American Policy toward Taiwan and U.S.-PRC Relations*. Washington, DC: Henry L. Stimson Center.

ROSEN, STEPHEN. (1996) *Societies and Military Power: India and Its Armies*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

ROSENAU, JAMES, N. (1994) China in a Bifurcated World: Competing Theoretical Perspectives. In *Chinese Foreign Policy: Theory and Practice*, edited by Thomas W. Robinson and David Shambaugh. New York: Oxford University Press.

ROSS, ROBERT S. (1988) *The Indochina Tangle: China's Vietnam Policy, 1975-1979*. New York: Columbia University Press.

———. (1997) Beijing as a Conservative Power. *Foreign Affairs* 76 (2): 33-44.

ROWE, DAVID M. (2005) The Tragedy of Liberalism – How Globalization Caused the First World War. *Security Studies* 14 (3): 407-47.

RUSSETT, BRUCE, AND JOHN ONEAL. (2001) *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations*. New York: W. W. Norton.

RYNNING, STEN, AND JENS RINGSMOSE. (2008) Why Are Revisionist States Revisionist? Reviving Classical Realism as an Approach to Understanding International Change. *International Politics* 45: 19-39.

SANTOS, TINA G. (2012) PH, Chinese Naval Vessels in Scarborough Shaol Standoff. *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, April 11. Available at: http://globalnation.inquirer.net/32341/ph-chinese-naval-vessels-in-scarborough-shoal-standoff (Accessed April 18, 2012).

SCHWELLER, RANDALL. (1994) Bandwagoning for Profit: Bringing the Revisionist State Back in. *International Security* 19 (1): 72-107.

SCHWELLER, RANDALL, AND XIAOYU PU. (2011) After Unipolarity: China's Visions of International Oder in an Era of U.S. Decline. *International Security* 36 (1): 41-72.

SCOBELL, ANDREW. (2003*) China's Use of Military Force: Beyond the Great Wall and the Long March*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

SENESE, PAUL. (1996) Geographical Proximity and Issue Salience: Their Effects on the Escalation of Militarized Interstate Conflict. *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 15 (2): 133-161.

SENESE, PAUL, AND JOHN VASQUEZ. (2008) *The Steps to War: An Empirical Study*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

SHAMBAUGH, DAVID. (2004) China Engages Asia: Reshaping the Regional Order. *International Security* 29 (3): 64-99.

SHANG QUANYU. (2009) *Nehru shidai zhongguo he yindu de guanxi, 1947-1964* [Sino-Indian Relations in the Nehru Era, 1947-1964]. Beijing: Zhongguo Shehui Kexue Chubanshe.

SHEN WEILIANG. (2003) Helan qugan wodaiban shijian zhenxiang [Truths about the Netherlands' Eviction of the Chinese Charge d'affaires]. In Li Tongcheng (ed.), *Zhongguo waijiaoguan qinli zhongda lishi shijian* [Chinese Diplomats' Firsthand Accounts of Important Historical Incidents] (pp. 123-131). Taiyuan: Shanxi Renmin Chubanshe.

SHEN JUN-SHAN. (2004) *Fusheng houji* [My Life Story, Part II]. Taipei: Commonwealth Publishing.

———. (2005) *Fusheng zaiji* [My Life Story, Part III]. Taipei: Commonwealth Publishing.

SHEN ZHIHUA, AND LI DANHUI. (2006) *Zhanhou zhongsu guanxi ruogan wenti yanjiu* [Studies of

Some Problems in Sino-Soviet Relations after 1945]. Beijing: Renmin Chubanshe.

SHEN ZHIHUA, YANG KUISONG, LI DANHUI, AND LUAN JINGHE. (2007) *Zhongsu guanxi shigang, 1917-1991* [History of Sino-Soviet Relations, 1917-1991]. Beijing: Xinhua Chubanshe.

SHENG, MICHAEL M. (1997) *Battling Western Imperialism: Stalin, Mao, and the United States*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

SHENG PING, AND WANG ZAIXING. (2007) *Hu Yaobang sixiang nianpu, 1975-1989 (zhengqiu yijian gao)* [A Chronology of Hu Yaobang's Thoughts, 1975-1989 (Draft Edition)]. Los Angeles: Chinese Publications Service Center.

SHI ZHE. (1991) *Zai lishi juren shenbian: Shi Zhe huiyilu* [With the Giants: The Memoirs of Shi Zhe]. Beijing: Zhongyang Wenxian Chubanshe.

SHIJIE ZHISHI, ED. (1962). *Zhonghua Renmin Gongheguo Duiwai Guanxi Wenjianji* [Documents on the Foreign Relations of the People's Republic of China], Vol.7. Beijing: Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe.

SHIRK, SUSAN. (2007) *China: Fragile Superpower*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

SINGER, J. DAVID, STUART BREMER, AND JOHN STUCKEY. (1972) Capability Distribution, Uncertainty, and War, 1820-1965. In *Peace, War, and Numbers*, edited by Bruce M. Russett. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

SNYDER, JACK. (1984) *The Ideology of the Offensive*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

STINNETT, DOUGLAS, M., JAROSLAV TIR, PHILIP SCHAFER, PAUL F. DIEHL, AND CHARLES GOCHMAN. (2002) The Correlates of War Project Direct Contiguity Data, Version 3. *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 19 (2): 58-66.

SUETTINGER, ROBERT. (2003) *Beyond Tiananmen: The Politics of US-China Relations, 1989-2000*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

SUN ZHENGUANG. (2008) *Wo de bianjie suiyue* [My Years on the Sino-Soviet Border]. Beijing:

Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe.

SUTTER, ROBERT G. (2012) *Chinese Foreign Relations: Power and Policy Since the Cold War*, 3rd edition. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.

SWAINE, MICHAEL D. (2001) Chinese Decisionmaking Regarding Taiwan, 1979-2000. In *The Making of Chinese Foreign and Security Policy in the Era of Reform, 1978-2000*, edited by David M. Lampton. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

SWAINE, MICHAEL D. AND M. TAYLOR FRAVEL. (2011) China's Assertive Behavior, Part II: The Maritime Strategy. China Leadership Monitor. Available at: http://opinion.huanqiu.com/roll/2011-06/1772749.html (Accessed August 2, 2012).

TAMMEN, RONALD, ET AL. (2000) *Power Transitions: Strategies for the 21st Century*. New York: Chatham House.

TANG FEI. (2011) *Taipei heping zhi chun* [The Spring of Peace in Taipei]. Taipei: Commonwealth Publishing.

TANG JIAXUAN. (2009) *Jinyu xufeng* [Memoirs of Tang Jiaxuan]. Hong Kong: Shangwu Yinshuguan.

TANG, SHIPING. (2008) From Offensive to Defensive Realism: A Social Evolutionary Interpretation of China's Security Strategy. In *China's Ascent: Power, Security, and the Future of International Politics*, edited by Robert S. Ross and Zhu Feng. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

TANG YEWEN. (1996) La gandi zongli fanghua [Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi's Visit to China]. In *Xin zhongguo waijiao fengyun* [Major Events in New China's Diplomacy], vol.4, edited by the Office of Diplomatic Historians, Ministry of Foreign Aaffairs. Beijing: Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe.

TOMZ, MICHAEL, GARY KING, AND LANGCHE ZENG. (1999) RELOGIT: Rare Events Logistic

    Regression, Version 1.1. Cambridge: Harvard University.

TONG XIAOPENG. (1996) *Fengyu sishi nian* [Forty Years of Storms], Vol.2. Beijing: Zhongyang

    Wenxian Chubanshe.

TUCKER, ROBERT, C. (1990) *Stalin in Power: The Revolution from above,1928-1941*. New York:

    W. W. Norton.

VAN EVERA, STEPHEN. (1999) *Causes of War: Power and the Roots of Conflict*. Ithaca: Cornell

    University Press.

VAN NESS, PETER. (1970) *Revolution and Chinese Foreign Policy: Peking's Support for Wars of*

    National Liberation. Berkeley: University of California Press.

VASQUEZ, JOHN A. (1993) *The War Puzzle*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

————. (1998) *The Power of Power Politics*, 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University

    Press.

————. (2009) *The War Puzzle Revisited*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

VASQUEZ, JOHN A., and Marie T. Henehan. (2001) Territorial Disputes and the Probability of

    War, 1816-1992. *Journal of Peace Research* 38 (2): 123-138.

VOGEL, EZRA. (2012) *Deng Xiaoping and the Transformation of China*. Cambridge: Harvard

    University Press.

VOLGY, THOMAS J., AND STACEY MAYHALL. (1995) Status Inconsistency and International War:

    Exploring the Effects of Systemic Change. *International Studies Quarterly* 39 (1): 67-84.

VOLGY, THOMAS J., RENATO CORBETTA, KEITH A. GRANT, AND RYAN G. BAIRD. (2011) *Major*

    Powers and the Quest for Status in International Politics: Global and Regional

    Perspectives. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

WALLACE, MICHAEL. (1971) Power, Status, and International War. *Journal of Peace Research* 8 (1): 23-35.

———. (1972) Status, Formal Organization, and Arms Levels as Factors Leading to the Onset of War, 1820-1964. In *Peace, War, and Numbers*, edited by Bruce M. Russett. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

WANG HONGWEI. (1998) *Ximalaya shan qingjie: zhongyin guanxi yanjiu* [The Himalayas Complex: A Study of Sino-Indian Relations]. Beijing: Zhongguo Zangxue Chubanshe.

WANG JIAXIANG. (1989) *Wang Jiaxiang xuanji* [Selected Works of Wang Jiaxiang]. Beijing: Renmin Chubanshe.

WANG JISI. (2005) China's Search for Stability with America. *Foreign Affairs* 84 (5): 39-48.

———. (2011) China's Search for a Grand Strategy. *Foreign Affairs* 90 (2): 68-79.

WANG LI. (2001) *Wang Li fansi lu* [The Memoirs of Wang Li]. Hong Kong: Beixing Chubanshe.

WANG MING-YI. (1997) *Liang'an hetan: Taiwan yu zhongguo de zhengzhi duihua* [Cross-Strait Peace Talks: Taiwan's Political Dialogue with China]. Taipei: Caixun.

WANG SHICHUN. (1999) *Zhong yu guo: Qingzhi shouzhang Wang Hsi-ling de qiluo* [A Matter of Honor: The Life of Admiral Wang Hsi-ling]. Taipei: Commonwealth Publishing.

———. (2006) *Piaoyi suiyue: Jiangjun dashi Hu Xin de zhanzheng jishi* [Wandering Years: The War Accounts of Ambassador-General Hu Xin]. Taipei: Lianhe Wenxue.

WANG TAIPING, et al. (1998) *Zhonghua renmin gongheguo waijiao shi, 1957-1969* [A Diplomatic History of the People's Republic of China, 1957-1969]. Beijing: Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe.

———. (1999) *Zhonghua renmin gongheguo waijiao shi, 1970-1978* [A Diplomatic History of the People's Republic of China, 1970-1978]. Beijing: Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe.

WANG WEICHENG, ET AL. (2009) *Li Xiannian zhuan, 1949-1992* [A Biography of Li Xiannian].

Beijing: Zhongyang Wenxian Chubanshe.

WANG YAN, et al. (1998) *Peng Dehuai nianpu* [A Chronology of Peng Dehuai]. Beijing: Renmin Chubanshe.

WANG YIZHOU. (2003) *Quanqiu zhengzhi he zhongguo waijiao* [Global Politics and China's foreign Policy]. Beijing: Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe.

———. (2006) Xulun [Introduction]. In *Zhongguo guoji guanxi yanjiu, 1995-2005* [China's International Relations Scholarship, 1995-2005], edited by Wang Yizhou and Yuan Zhengqing. Beijing: Peking University Press.

———. (2008) Daolun [Introduction]. In *Zhongguo duiwai guanxi zhuanxing sanshi nian, 1978-2008* [The Transformation of China's Foreign Policy, 1978-2008], edited by Wang Yzhou. Beijing: Shehui Kexue Wenxian Chubanshe.

WANG YUSHENG. (2009) *Qianwan biebei huyou le* [Don't Take China as a Fool]. Beijing: Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe.

WANG, YUAN-KANG. (2010) *Harmony and War: Confucian Culture and Chinese Power Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.

WANG ZUOYAO. (2009) *Dongzong yiye* [My Memoirs of the Dongjiang Brigand]. Guangzhou: Guangdong Renmin Chubanshe.

WARD, LEE. (2006) Locke on the Moral Basis of International Relations. *American Journal of Political Science* 50 (3): 691-705.

WEN JIAOBAO. (2003) Zhongguo de fazhan he yazhou de zhenxin [China's Development and the Rise of Asia (Speech at the ASEAN Commerce and Investment Summit)]. Available at: http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/chn/gxh/zlb/ldzyjh/t27173.htm (Accessed March 21, 2012)

WENDT, ALEXANDER. (1975) Anarchy is What States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics. *International Organization* 46 (2): 391-425.

402

———. (1999) *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

WHITING, ALLEN S. (1968) *The China Crosses the Yalu: The Decision to Enter the Korean War*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

———. (1975) *The Chinese Calculus of Deterrence: India and Indochina*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

———. (2001) China's Use of Force, 1950-96, and Taiwan. *International Security* 26 (2): 103-131.

WOODBY, SYLVIA. (1989) *Gorbachev and the Decline of Ideology in Soviet Foreign Policy*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

WU DEGUANG. (1999) ZAI GUJIN DE RIZI LI [MY DAYS IN KUCHING]. In *Xin zhongguo waijiao fengyun* [Major Events in New China's Diplomacy], vol.5, edited by the Office of Diplomatic Historians, Ministry of Foreign Aaffairs. Beijing: Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe.

WU JIANMIN. (2011) Nanhai chengduan: zhongguo kezhi shi zhong zixin [The South China Sea Dispute: China's Restraint Implies Confidence]. *Huanqiu Shibao* [*Global Times*], June 22, 2011. Available at: http://opinion.huanqiu.com/roll/2011-06/1772749.html (Accessed August 2, 2012).

WU JILU. (2005) Guanyu gongtong kaifa youguan falu wenti de sikao [Reflections on Some Legal Questions Concerning Joint Exploration]. In *Xin Guoji haiyangfa de xin jinzhan* [New Developments in International Ocean Law], edited by Gao Zhiguo, Jia Yu, and Zhang Haiwen. Beijing: Haiyang Chubanshe.

WU LENGXI. (1999) *Shinian lunzhan: 1956-1966 zhongsu guanxi huiyilu* [A Decade of Polemical Debates: My Memoirs of Sino-Soviet Relations, 1956-1966]. Beijing: Zhongyang

Wenxian Chubanshe.

XIAO JIANGUO. (2005) Donghai zhengyi haiyu gongtong kaifa licheng huigu [Reflections on the Development of Joint Exploration in the Disputed Areas of the East China Sea]. In *Xin Guoji haiyangfa de xin jinzhan* [New Developments in International Ocean Law], edited by Gao Zhiguo, Jia Yu, and Zhang Haiwen. Beijing: Haiyang Chubanshe.

XIE YIXIAN, ET AL. (2009) *Zhongguo dangdai waijiao shi, 1949-2009* [A Diplomatic History of Contemporary China, 1949-2009]. Beijing: Zhongguo Qingnian Chubanshe.

XIONG XIANGHUI. (2005) *Wo de qingbao yu waijiao shengya* [My Life in the Intelligence and Diplomatic Service]. Beijing: Zhonggong Dangshi Chubanshe.

XU JIALU, ET AL. (2003) *Zhonghua renmin gongheguo rishi* [The Day-by-Day History of the PRC], 50 vols. Chengdu: Sichuan Renmin Chubanshe.

XU YAN. (2012) Zhongfei nanhai zhengzhi jishi nian [Decades of Contention between China and the Philippines]. *Xuebi Shibao* [Study Times], May 21, p.7.

XU ZEHAO. (1996) *Wang Jiaxiang zhuan* [A Biography of Wang Jiaxiang]. Beijing: Dangdai Zhongguo Chubanshe.

———. (2001) *Wang Jiaxiang nianpu, 1906-1974* [A Chronology of Wang Jiaxiang, 1906-1974]. Beijing: Zhongyang Wenxian Chubanshe.

YANG GONGSU. (1999) Cangsang jiushi nian: yige waijiao teshi de huiyi [Ninety Years: Memoirs of a Diplomatic Emissary]. Haikou: Hainan Chubanshe.

YANG GUIHUA, GUO ZHIGANG, BAO MINGRONG, WANG YOUSHENG. (2011) *Zhongguo renmin jiefangjun junshi* [The History of the Chinese People's Liberation Army], Vol.5. Beijing: Junshi Kexue Chubanshe.

YANG JISHENG. (2004) *Zhongguo gaige niandai de zhengzhi douzheng* [The Political Struggles in

China's Era of Reform and Opening]. Hong Kong: Excellent Culture.

YANG KUISONG. (1998) *Mao Zedong yu Moscow de enen yuanyuan* [Mao Zedong's Love-Hate Relationship with Moscow], 2nd edition. Nanchang: Jiangxi Renmin Chubanshe.

———. (2000) The Sino-Soviet Border Clash of 1969: From Zhenbao Island to Sino-American Rapprochement. *Cold War History* 1 (1): 21-52.

———. (2002) *Changes in Mao Zedong's Attitude toward the Indochina War, 1949-1973*. Cold War International History Project, Working Paper #34. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

———. (2003) Mao Zedong yu liangci taihai weiji [Mao Zedong and the Two Taiwan Strait Crises]. In *Lenzhan yu zhongguo de zhoubian guanxi* [The Cold War and China's Relations with Neighboring States], edited by Niu Dayong and Shen Zhihua. Beijing: Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe.

———. (2006) Xin zhongguo "zhenya fangemin" yundong yanjiu [A Study in the Campaign for the "Suppression of Counterrevolutionaries" in the Early Periods of the PRC]. *Shixue Yuekan* [Historical Studies Monthly], no.1: 45-61.

YANG SHANGKUN. (2001) *Yang Shangkun riji* [The Diary of Yang Shangkun]. Beijing: Zhongyang Wenxian Chubanshe.

YANG SHENQUN, ET AL. (2009) *Deng Xiaoping nianpu, 1904-1974* [A Chronology of Deng Xiaoping, 1904-1974]. Beijing: Zhongyang Wenxian Chubanshe.

YANG YI. (2008) Zhongguo de guofang xiandaihua [China's Military Modernization]. In *Zhongguo duiwai guanxi zhuanxing sanshi nian, 1978-2008* [The Transformation of China's Foreign Policy, 1978-2008], edited by Wang Yizhou. Beijing: Shehui Kexue Wenxian Chubanshe.

YANG ZHONGMEI. (1999) *Zhonggong Waijiao Jiaofu Qian Qichen* [Qian Qichen: The Godfather of Chinese Communist Diplomacy]. Taipei: Shibao Wenhua.

YAO ZHONGMING, SHEN WEILIANG, AND ZUO JUNFENG. (1989) Zhou Enlai zongli jiejue zhong mian bianjie wenti de guanghui yeji [Premier Zhou Enlai's Great Achievement in the Settlement of the Sino-Burmese Boundary Issue]. In *Yanjiu Zhou Enlai* [Studying Zhou Enlai], edited by Pei Jianzhang. Beijing: Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe.

YE TENGFANG. (2003) Ershi shiji liushi niandai fasheng zai shatoujiao zhen de zhongying moca [The Sino-British Clashes in Shatoujiao in 1967]. *Shenzhen Wenshi* [History and Literature of Shenzhen], Vol. 5. Available at the official website of the Shenzhen City Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference at: http://www.szzx.gov.cn/zxxxzwhgz/zwhgzwh/ws_wjzl/wsgjszws/szws5/201004/t201004 06_1491560.htm

YE ZHENGJIA. (2006) Zhongguo he yindu de guanxi [China's Relations with India]. In *Kuayue ximalaya zhang'ai: Zhongguo xunqiu liaojie yindu* [Across the Himalayan Divide: China Seeks to Understand India], edited by Zhang Minqiu. Chongqing: Chongqing Chubanshe.

YE ZICHENG. (2001) *Xinzhongguo waijiao sixiang: cong Mao Zedong dao Deng Xiaoping* [Diplomacy of the PRC: From Mao Zedong to Deng Xiaoping]. Beijing: Peking University Press.

You Ji. (1999) Changing Leadership Consensus: The Domestic Context of War Games. In *Across the Taiwan Strait: Mainland China, Taiwan, and the 1995-1996 Crisis*, edited by Suisheng Zhao. New York: Routledge.

YUAN BINGZHONG, AND ZHAI JINGSHENG (2003) Wen Jiaobao zongli chuxi dongmeng shangye yu touzi fenghui bing fabiao yanjiang [Premier Wen Jiabao's Address to the ASEAN Business and Investment Summit], Xinhua News Agency, October 7. Available at:

http://www.people.com.cn/GB/shizheng/1024/2121579.html (Accessed March 21, 2012)

YUN SHUI. (1996) *Chushi qi guo jishi: jiangjun dashi Wang Youping* [The Ambassadorial Career of General Wang Youping]. Beijing: Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe.

ZHAI, QIANG. (2000) *China and the Vietnam Wars: 1950-1975*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

ZHANG DEQUN. (2000) Yuanyue guwentuan gongzuo suoyi [Reminiscences of My Work in China's Military Advisory Group in Vietnam]. In *Qinli zhongda lishi shijian shilu* [Reminiscences about Important Historical Events], Vol. 4, edited by the CCP's Department of Research on Party History. Beijing: Dangjian Duwu Chubanshe.

ZHANG FENGBO, ET AL. (1988) *Zhongguo Hongguan Jingji Jiegou yu Zhengce* [China's Macro-Economy: Structures and Policies]. Beijing: Zhongguo Caizheng Jingji Chubanshe.

ZHANG LIANGFU. (2005) Lianheguo haiyangfa gongyue yu nanhai wenti [The UN Convention on the Law of the Sea and the Question of the South China Sea]. In *Xin Guoji haiyangfa de xin jinzhan* [New Developments in International Ocean Law], edited by Gao Zhiguo, Jia Yu, and Zhang Haiwen. Beijing: Haiyang Chubanshe.

———. (2006) Guanyu zhengyi haiyu youqi ziyuan gongtong kaifa de wenti [The Question of Joint Exploration of Oil and Gas Resources in the Disputed Maritime Areas]. In *Guoji haiyangfa de lilun yu shijian* [The Theory and Practice of International Ocean Law], edited by Gao Zhiguo, Jia Yu, and Zhang Haiwen. Beijing: Haiyang Chubanshe.

ZHANG MINQIU, ET AL. (2004) *Zhongyin guanxi yanjiu, 1947-2003* [Studies of Sino-Indian Relations, 1947-2003]. Beijing: Peking University Press.

ZHANG PEISEN, ET AL. (2000) *Zhang Wentian nianpu, 1900-1976* [A Chronology of Zhang Wentian, 1900-1976]. Beijing: Zhonggong Dangshi Chubanshe.

ZHANG SHU GUANG. (1995) *Mao's Military Romanticism: China and the Korean War, 1950-1953*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press.

ZHANG, YONGJIN. (1998) *China in International Society since 1949.* New York: St. Martin's.

ZHANG YUNLIN, AND ZHOU FANGYIN. (2008) Zhongguo yu linguo de guanxi [China's Relations with Neighboring States]. In *Zhongguo duiwai guanxi zhuanxing sanshi nian, 1978-2008* [The Transformation of China's Foreign Policy, 1978-2008], edited by Wang Yizhou. Beijing: Shehui Kexue Wenxian Chubanshe.

ZHANG WENTIAN. (1995) *Zhang Wentian wenji* [Selected Works of Zhang Wentian], Vol. 4. Beijing: Zhonggong Dangshi Chubanshe.

ZHANG ZHEN. (2003) *Zhang Zhen huiyilu* [Memoirs of Liu Huaqing], 2 vols. Beijing: Jiefangjun Chubanshe.

ZHANG ZHIRONG. (2005) Zhongyue beibuwan huajie tanpan jiqi dui jiejue haijiang zhengduan de qishi [The Negotiations on the Demarcation of the Gulf of Tonkin and Their Implications for China's Maritime Disputes]. *International Forum* 7 (2): 29-33.

ZHAO, QUANSHENG. (1996) *Interpreting Chinese Foreign Policy: The Micro-Macro Linkage Approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

ZHAO, SUISHENG. (1999) Economic Interdependence and Political Divergence: A Background Analysis of the Taiwan Strait Crisis. In *Across the Taiwan Strait: Mainland China, Taiwan, and the 1995-1996 Crisis*, edited by Suisheng Zhao. New York: Routledge.

ZHENG BIJIAN. (2005) China's "Peaceful Rise" to Great-Power Status. *Foreign Affairs* 84 (5): 18-24.

ZHENG JINJIONG, AND LIU QIBAO. (1989) Zhou Enlai yu waishi diaoyan [Zhou Enlai and the Research Work in Diplomacy]. In *Yanjiu Zhou Enlai* [Studying Zhou Enlai], edited by

Pei Jianzhang. Beijing: Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe.

ZHENG RUIXIANG, ET AL. (2003) *Zhang Hanfu Zhuan* [A Biography of Zhang Hanfu]. Beijing: Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe.

ZHENG WENHAN. (1998) *Mishu riji li de Peng laozong* [Marshal Peng Dehuai as Pictured in His Secretary's Diary]. Beijing: Junshi Kexue Chubanshe.

ZHOU BOPING. (2004) Feichang shiqi de waijiao shengya [My Diplomatic Career in an Unusual Era]. Beijing: Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe.

ZHOU ENLAI. (1984) *Zhou Enlai xuanji* [Selected Works of Zhou Enlai], Vol. 2. Beijing: Renmin Chubanshe.

———. (1990) *Zhou Enlai waijiao wenxuan* [Zhou Enlai on Diplomacy]. Beijing: Zhongyang Wenxian Chubanshe.

———. (1999) *Zhou Enlai junshi wenxuan* [Zhou Enlai on Military Affairs], 4 vols. Beijing: Renmin Chubanshe.

———. (2008) *Jianguo yilai Zhou Enlai wengao* [Manuscripts of Zhou Enlai since the Founding of the PRC]. (2008) Vols. 1-3, edited by the CCP's Department of Research on Party Documents. Beijing: Zhongyang Wenxian Chubanshe.

ZHOU TIANRUI, AND GUO HONGZHI. (1995) *Shen Cheng: wo ti Yang Shangkun chuanxin gei Chiang Ching-kuo—haixia liang'an yiduan mimi jiaowang de zhenxiang* [Shen Cheng: "I Conveyed a Letter from Yang Shangkun to Chiang Ching-kuo"—The Truth about the Secret Interactions between the Two Sides of the Taiwan Strait]. Taipei: Xin Xin Wen.

ZHU HUAYOU, AND REN HUAIFENG. (2006) Nanhai gongtong kaifa yu quyu hezuo [Joint Development and Regional Cooperation in the South China Sea]. In *Guoji haiyangfa de lilun yu shijian* [The Theory and Practice of International Ocean Law], edited by Gao Zhiguo, Jia Yu, and Zhang Haiwen. Beijing: Haiyang Chubanshe.

ZHU ZHENCAI. (2006) *Jianguo chuqi Beijing fanjiandie da'an* [Major Cases of Anti-Espionage in Beijing in the Early Years of the PRC]. Beijing: Shehui Kexue Chubanshe.

ZHU ZHENYOU, ET AL. (2000) Zhengzhi ganyan de Huang Kecheng de mingyun [General Huang Kecheng: A Tragedy of Being Honest and Upright]. *Yanhuang Chunqiu* [China Chronicles], 2000 (1): 11-17.

ZOELLICK, ROBERT. (2005) Whither China: From Membership to Responsibility? Remarks to National Committee on U.S.-China Relations. Available at http://www.ncuscr.org/recent-remarks-and-speeches (Accessed March 19, 2010.)

ZOU JINGWEN. (2001) *Li Denghui Zhizheng Gaobai Shilu* [Records of Lee Teng-hui's Government]. Taipei: Chenyang Chubanshe.

ZRGDGW, or *Zhonghua Renmin Gongheguo Duiwai Guanxi Wenjianji* [Documents on the Foreign Relations of the People's Republic of China], 10 vols. published between 1957 and 1965 under the supervision of the PRC Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Beijing: Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe.