CHINESE PERCEPTIONS OF TRADITIONAL AND NONTRADITIONAL SECURITY THREATS

Susan L. Craig

March 2007

*****

The views expressed in this report are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, the Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government. This report is cleared for public release; distribution is unlimited.

*****

I would like to thank the Foreign Military Studies Office for providing me the opportunity and freedom to research "whatever I wanted" while I worked there. Specifically, I appreciate the encouragement and counsel of Dr. Jacob Kipp, Mr. Tim Thomas, and Mr. Scott Henderson. The Air Force's Institute for National Security Studies (INSS) provided funding for my travel to Shanghai. Dr. Brad Roberts of the Institute for Defense Analyses also provided much appreciated advice and wisdom. And a special thanks to my favorite editor, my husband, Jim, who is a constant source of encouragement and support. Of course, all mistakes are mine alone.

*****

Comments pertaining to this report are invited and should be forwarded to: Director, Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 122 Forbes Ave, Carlisle, PA 17013-5244.

*****

All Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) publications are available on the SSI homepage for electronic dissemination. Hard copies of this report also may be ordered from our homepage. SSI's homepage address is: *www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil*.

*****

The Strategic Studies Institute publishes a monthly e-mail newsletter to update the national security community on the research of our analysts, recent and forthcoming publications, and upcoming conferences sponsored by the Institute. Each newsletter also provides a strategic commentary by one of our research analysts. If you are interested in receiving this newsletter, please subscribe on our homepage at *www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil/newsletter/.*

ISBN 1-58487-287-X

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

While "knowing your enemy" has long been a Chinese stratagem, cultural intelligence only recently has gained precedence in American military strategy. Our efforts in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the war on terror remind us of how differently much of the rest of the world thinks and perceives. This monograph is an effort to better understand Chinese thinking. Ms. Susan Craig's research into Chinese threat perceptions is important for several reasons. Above all, it provides valuable insight into the comprehensiveness of the Chinese concept of national security and how China perceives itself, the world, and China's place within it. Further, the author's deliberate effort to maintain a Chinese perspective by relying solely on Chinese sources—namely, scholarly journals, the news media, official policy pronouncements, and personal interviews—demonstrates that Chinese intentions and motivations are not a secret. The author's research shows that there is a significant amount of information about Chinese concerns, perceptions, and motivations that is available openly, and that many of China's influential elite are willing and able to meet and openly exchange ideas. Also, it shows that there is an active arena for debate in China on national security issues. Likely due to the rapidly changing international environment and China's growing interest and participation in it, Chinese perceptions about its national security are more diverse, nuanced, and sophisticated today than ever before. By acknowledging that Chinese thinking is not monolithic, we can better appreciate and influence debates that are occurring.

While Ms. Craig's analysis shows that the Chinese perspective is very different from our own, it also shows that the two perspectives may share a common view of the future. Both the United States and China aspire to a

future with a free, open, and robust economic marketplace and an international order where all nations contribute to peace, development, and prosperity (in other words, where we are all "responsible stakeholders"). Despite Chinese fears, the United States does not strive to overturn the current world order; we have as much at stake in maintaining it as China does. We also confront similar nontraditional threats: terrorism, pollution, proliferation, energy insecurity, drug trafficking, and infectious disease. With cooperation in pursuing shared goals and overcoming shared threats, the threats we each perceive as posed by the other are likely to diminish.

If that is not reason enough to study China's threat perceptions, perhaps beating the Chinese at their own game is. As Ms. Craig's research demonstrates, China's influential elite spends a great deal of time studying American policy and politics and has a very good understanding of American threat perceptions. Many of China's recent policies and actions are direct responses to American criticisms and concerns. We could take additional actions to allay Chinese concerns and limit misunderstanding if only we better understood these concerns. Or we could decide not to dispel perceived U.S. threats to China. Either way, an understanding of China's perceptions of national security threats provides the United States with increased opportunities for action and cooperation and a decreased likelihood of misunderstanding and conflict. For all of these reasons, the Strategic Studies Institute is pleased to offer this monograph as a contribution to the national security discourse on China.

DOUGLAS C. LOVELACE, JR.
Director
Strategic Studies Institute

SUMMARY

In order to begin to understand the motivations and decisions of China's leadership, and in order to behave in a manner such that we can influence them, we must try to understand the world as China does. This research is an attempt to do so by examining the writings and opinions of China's scholars, journalists, and leaders—its influential elite. It will show that China has a comprehensive concept of national security that includes not only defending its sovereignty and territorial integrity, but continuing its economic and social development and maintaining its international stature.

There are two main types of threats to China's national security: traditional and nontraditional. Traditional threats can be characterized loosely as threats to a nation emanating from other nations and involving a military component. While the most talked-about threat to China's territory is a declaration of independence by Taiwan, the influential elite actually find this possibility unlikely. The focus is therefore on the few countries considered both capable of and willing to endanger all three of China's components of national security: sovereignty, economic development, and international stature. The United States, Japan, and India have significant ideological, historical, or territorial disagreements with China and possess the military, economic, and/or international diplomatic means to go to battle over such differences. While China's influential elite are concerned about a direct military confrontation with the United States, Japan, and India, they are far more concerned about the possibility of containment efforts by any—or all—of

these countries. The threat of containment, however, is less of a military threat and more of a diplomatic, political, and economic one. The influential elite also express concern over the fluctuating, unpredictable, and seemingly unstable nature of the democratic process in all of these countries.

Even more troublesome to China's security environment are nontraditional threats. While military deterrence and diplomatic skill have managed traditional threats successfully to date, they are insufficient for overcoming nontraditional threats. Such threats, while never precisely defined by the influential elite, are considered to transcend national boundaries, go beyond the military sphere, are unpredictable and/or unexpected, have both internal and external elements and ramifications, and are frequently interwoven with traditional security threats. There is an array of nontraditional threats facing China: bird flu, terrorism, proliferation, drug trafficking, AIDS, and piracy, to name a few. The focus of this monograph is on three nontraditional threats: economic and social disparities within China, environmental degradation, and energy insecurity.

At least three conclusions can be reached from an examination of these nontraditional threats. First, China's leadership is very concerned about all of them as demonstrated by the extent of public rhetoric voiced and the policies implemented. Second, while the leadership is very vocal and active in addressing these threats, scholars offer surprisingly little analysis of them, at least publicly. This absence of analysis or recommendations is striking, given scholarly consensus that nontraditional threats endanger national security more than traditional ones. This may be due to the third conclusion: China's central leadership is largely

unable to implement its policy priorities. Mitigating nontraditional threats therefore requires serious internal reforms. China will need to strengthen its social safety net, judicial system, and mechanisms for resolving public concerns. It will need to become more flexible so as to be better able to respond in times of crisis. It will need to more effectively enforce penalties for corruption and pollution. China's nontraditional threats are more menacing than traditional ones because they require China's leadership not only to look outward in efforts to foster cooperation, but also to look inward and make serious internal reforms as well.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

> The outside world has little knowledge of Chinese motivations and decisionmaking.
>
> The Pentagon's *Annual Report to Congress: The Military Power of the People's Republic of China 2005*[1]

Understanding any one person's decisionmaking is extremely difficult. It is exponentially harder when seeking to understand how and why a state makes the decisions it does. Organizations and individuals, to include their interests, biases, and perceptions, all play a significant role in the decisionmaking of a nation. How much of a role they play is hard to measure.[2] However, we do not need to know exactly how much perceptions influence behavior if we can agree on the following: In order to understand others' behavior, and in order to behave in a manner such that we can influence others, *we must try to understand the world as they do*.

Even this is difficult, given language barriers and inherent biases, but the effort to do so at least reminds us that ours is not the only perspective. This research on China's perceptions of threats to its national security is therefore an attempt to see the world as China does. As the epigraph above reminds us, much about China's government remains a mystery. We can begin to demystify it somewhat by attempting to glimpse the world through Chinese eyes.

This monograph attempts to view the world through China's eyes by examining the writings and

opinions of Chinese scholars and Chinese news media. The news media are state-controlled, so it hardly offers an unfettered perspective, but it is the primary source of information for China's public. The perceptions both projected by and formed as a result of China's mainstream news media thus provide a good starting place for getting to know the Chinese perspective.

The thoughts of Chinese scholars as presented through academic journals provide another avenue for getting to know the Chinese point of view. Research institutes where Chinese scholars work, unlike American think tanks, are subordinate to and funded by the Central government. As employees of the government, these are more than just scholars, they also are intelligence analysts and policy advisors. They provide the political leadership with classified reports and briefings through official government channels. Literally referred to as the government's "external brain," China's think tanks provide a "secret factor in the success of the decision maker."[3] They also inform the public through their unclassified publications and their scholars' appearances in the broadcast news media. Thus, at the least, scholars in China's research institutes are influential in the formulation of both public and official perceptions, and potentially they are directly and authoritatively influential in official Chinese decisionmaking. Because of the influence that China's news media and scholars have on the public's and officials' perceptions, they, along with China's decisionmakers, will be referred to collectively hereafter as China's "influential elite."[4]

The recent writings of China's influential elite, some of which were published in English but most of which needed to be translated, are the main focus of this research. Interviews conducted by the author

with a number of the influential elite further inform this work. A conscious effort was made not to read or cite American scholars in order to maintain a strictly Chinese perspective. In doing so, it became clear that despite controlled news media, there is an open and active arena for debate in China, at least on some topics. This was made especially clear in the interviews conducted, as the influential elite demonstrated surprising candor and independent thinking. Likely due to the rapidly changing international environment and China's growing interest and participation in it, Chinese opinions regarding China's national security are more diversified, nuanced, and sophisticated today than ever before. Michael Pillsbury and David Shambaugh both conducted similar research, interviewing Chinese scholars and policymakers and assessing their perspectives.[5] But these works are already outdated, likely as a result of China's greater global interactions today. As China opens to the global marketplace, so, too, does it open to the marketplace of ideas.

This does not mean that the perceptions held by China's influential elite are necessarily accurate. But their accuracy is not as important as understanding what the perceptions are and how they differ from our own. (For this reason, the accuracy of Chinese perceptions presented here will not be challenged.) For example, during a speech in Singapore in June 2005, the U.S. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld expressed the belief that China did not face any threats from other nations.[6] China's influential elite have a very different perception. Not only do China's influential elite believe China's national security is threatened "traditionally" by other nations such as the United States, Japan, and India, they also believe China faces

serious nontraditional threats from issues such as social disparities within the country, environmental degradation, and energy dependency. Each of these threats is examined in turn. While these are not the only threats China fears, they do provide insight into how China thinks about its security environment and what is—and is not—considered threatening to China's national security.

As Secretary Rumsfeld's remarks remind us, Americans do not appreciate fully China's security environment. By focusing on that nation's threat perceptions, we not only learn about how the Chinese view their security environment, we gain insight into what is perhaps the most motivating factor behind decisionmaking and action by the Chinese government. This survey does not examine the role the Communist Party plays in decisionmaking or the many other dynamics that shape Chinese decisionmaking, mostly because the nature of China's closed society makes doing so extremely difficult. Nonetheless, this examination allows us to better appreciate how and why Chinese perceptions differ from our own. And in doing so, we can begin to understand Chinese leadership motivations and decisionmaking.

While many of our perceptions as Americans differ from those of the Chinese, this assessment also will demonstrate that there are a number of perceptions, concerns, and values that we share. Understanding where our interests and concerns coincide provides a valuable opportunity for cooperation. If understanding our similarities and differences is not reason enough to study China's threat perceptions, perhaps beating them at their own game is. China's influential elite spend a great deal of time studying American policy and have a very good understanding of American

threat perceptions. Many of China's recent declared positions—for example, positions on peaceful development, arms control, and greater transparency—are direct responses to American criticisms and concerns. We could take reciprocal actions to allay Chinese concerns and limit misunderstanding if we better understood what those concerns were. Even if we decide not to dispel threats perceived by China, it is better to make such decisions deliberately and knowingly. Either way, an understanding of China's perceptions of national security threats provides the United States with increased opportunities for action and cooperation and a decreased likelihood of misunderstanding and conflict.

How China Perceives.

Before examining *what* it is that the Chinese perceive, let us consider *how* the Chinese perceive. Richard Nisbett, an American psychologist, studied the differences in Western and Asian thought processes and found rather striking differences in the way we process information and view the world. He differentiated the two thought processes in this way. Western thought, descended from the ancient Greek philosophers, is analytic and atomistic. The world can be understood by studying individual objects as discrete and separate from their environments. Rational thought, logic, and debate can lead to one right answer. The individual is paramount and is in control of events around him. Easterners, on the other hand, products of the teachings of Taoism, Confucianism, and Buddhism, see the world in a more holistic light. In order to understand events, one must look to a host of factors and understand their relation to one another. The individual is defined by relationships

and is subordinate to the community, where harmony and balance are paramount. One cannot control events so much as learn to adapt to them. This is important because the world is constantly changing. While Western strategic thought strives to determine the right answer in a logical and systematic way, Eastern strategic thought is founded on dialecticism, using contradictions to understand relations among events or objects. Dialecticism does not seek to decontextualize and find one answer, but instead to see things in their appropriate, complex context, perhaps leading to more than one answer.[7]

While Nisbett's characterization of Eastern and Western thought may be too simplifying in an increasingly globalized world, the differences he ascribes to our respective cultures are useful in attempting to comprehend an Eastern viewpoint through a Western lens. Understanding dialecticism and the holistic perspective that colors Eastern thought processes will do much to enlighten our understanding of why China perceives the threats they do and how they think about them in a comprehensive and interconnected way.

How China Perceives Itself.

It is also important to understand how China's influential elite perceive their own country before examining their assessment of others. There are several themes consistent throughout Chinese writing, all based on the premise of Chinese exceptionalism.[8] Specifically, the Chinese see their country as unlike any other, given their long history, pursuit of peace, and inherently defensive rather than offensive approach to international relations. Each of these concepts will be addressed briefly. Finally, China's influential elite

take a comparative and quantitative approach when looking at their country in relation to the rest of the world. They see a China rising in power in a world that is trending towards multipolarity. This trend favors China's approach to international relations and is bound to further increase China's role and stature on the world stage. But this time frame, in which their power is growing and the world is becoming more multipolar, is limited and fraught with danger. It is a window of strategic opportunity for China, which must make the most of it, continuing its fast-paced economic developments and social transformation while limiting any external threats to peace and stability.

The Chinese influential elite uniformly espouse the idea that China is unique and does not behave as other states do. China is very proud of its 5,000 years of history and culture. For 2 millennia, China considered itself the hub of civilization. Lieutenant General Li Jijun, in attempting to explain China to an audience at the U.S. Army War College, noted proudly that "China is the only uninterrupted civilization in world history."[9] Chinese historians often boast that China has engaged in more than 6,000 battles in 4,000 years. General Li credited the country's longevity despite these conflicts to "the soul of the Chinese nation, which makes unremitting efforts for self-improvement and stresses morality and respect for others and national unity."[10] The importance of national unity to the Chinese is a result of invasions and defeats suffered at the hands of the West in the 19th century. This "century of humiliation" had a profound effect on China's self-image, which long had been one of cultural, technological, and moral superiority. This experience likely contributed to what General Li termed a Chinese "unifying consciousness" dedicated to "maintaining the unity of the country and its territorial integrity and sovereignty."[11]

Despite frequent invasions and threats to China's territory, China maintained its pursuit of peace. The oft-told story of explorer Zheng He has come to symbolize this uniquely peaceful disposition to the Chinese. Eighty-seven years before Christopher Columbus' voyage across the Atlantic, Zheng He made seven voyages, involving 27,000 people and 200 ships, to more than 30 countries and regions. As Lieutenant General Li Jijun told the students at the U.S. Army War College, "Unlike later Western explorers who conquered the land they discovered, this fleet did not subdue the newly discovered lands by force. This was not a voyage to plunder the local populace for treasure nor was it one to establish overseas colonies." Zheng's mission was "simply to convey friendship and goodwill and to promote economic and cultural exchanges."[12] On the 600th anniversary of Zheng's first expedition, the *China Daily* featured an opinion piece on Zheng's peaceful missions, noting how they are still symbolic of China's peaceful nature: "Six hundred years after Zheng, China cherishes a similar desire to befriend the world. But regrettably its goodwill is demonized because established powers fear a resurgent China."[13]

China's influential elite also see their country as unique in its emphasis on defense rather than offense. Mo Zi, a Chinese thinker who lived 5 centuries before Jesus Christ, is credited with the concept of "nonoffense." The Chinese influential elite commonly refer to the Great Wall as a symbol of this concept. Professor Qu Xing, Vice President of the Foreign Affairs College, summarized China's nonoffensive posture in this way: "Traditional Chinese culture pays attention to 'broad love' and 'nonattacking,' advocates the 'kingly way' of convincing people by reasoning, despises the 'domineering way' of overwhelming

others by force."[14] Qu demonstrates this by referencing historic achievements, reminding the reader of China's long-standing technological eminence as well as its nonoffensive disposition: "The Chinese invented gunpowder, but they do not use it [with] guns to invade others, the Chinese invented the compass, but they do not use it to [guide] warships to prowl about the four seas."[15]

Further, there is a unique emphasis in Chinese writings, both historical and contemporary, on morality and justice in warfare. As early as the 5th century B.C., Chinese military strategists stipulated that wars must have a just cause, the enemy should be notified of pending attacks, and innocents should be protected.[16] Confucian ideals of benevolence and righteousness, which further supported the concept of nonoffense, permeated military strategy then and continue to do so today. As Zhang Xiaojun and Xu Jia described in a 2004 *China Military Science* article, military strategists influenced by Confucianism advocated cautious war and "opposed rashly beginning war." Zhang and Xu conclude that Chinese strategic culture places great emphasis on just cause to this day as a result: "When war cannot be avoided, the issues of right and wrong in the war are of primary importance."[17] *The Science of Military Strategy*, the first contemporary book translated into English that provides real insight into Chinese thinking on military strategy, asserted that the justness of a war is determined by its influence on the development of society. Just wars are considered those that "facilitate the progress of society and promote the liberation of productive forces." Examples of such war are "people's war, revolutionary war, and anti-aggressive war." Those who hinder the progress of society, such as perpetrators of "aggressive war,

expansionist war, and predatory wars," are considered unjust.[18]

These concepts of defense and justness in China's national security can be traced back to the famous writings of Sun Tzu and his fellow military theorists. Their ideas permeated the writings by Mao Zedong and Deng Xiaoping, and today they are reflected in the language the government uses to describe its new security concept. "Active defense," "peaceful development," "win-win," and "mutual security through cooperation" all reflect its long-standing culture of nonaggression, benevolence, and peace. Whether or not Chinese actions live up to these ideals can be debated. But it is important to note that even if Chinese decisionmaking is not guided by the principles of morality, peace, and defense, Chinese *perceive* that their decisions and actions are guided by them. The Chinese strategists who wrote the *Science of Military Strategy* demonstrated this perception: "If a war breaks out, may it be anti-invasion, anti-separation, anti-interference, our country will be forced into it. . . . We [will] have no choice but to take action. The war will be defensive and just because China would not use forces in an unlimited and unjust way."[19] So China's perception of itself is that it is a country unique in its peaceful and defensive nature—and all actions, whether truly defensive or just, nonetheless can be justified by Chinese perceptions of their righteousness.[20]

Because China is so exceptional, its influential elite believe its rise will be unlike that of any other country in history. China will be able to develop without resorting to violence or conflict for two reasons. First, it does not seek hegemony like other rising powers, or to challenge the current international system. Ye Zicheng, Director for Chinese Strategic Studies at Beijing University, made this distinction:

> The biggest difference between the now ascendant China on the one hand, and Germany during World War I and Japan during World War II on the other, is that China has no intent to challenge the existing international system through military expansion. Nor does it seek to create another international system outside the existing system to engage in confrontation.[21]

Second, China's rise can occur peacefully because of the globalized economy and China's importance within it. Ye continued,

> It was necessary for the powers of the past to resort to military force because they could not achieve the goal of development using peaceful means. Previously, markets and resources were divvied up. The only way to capture them was to use force. Today, even though there are conflicts between China and the powers in the allocation of markets and resources, they can be worked out peacefully.[22]

The World Trade Organization (WTO), for example, provides a forum for peaceful dispute resolution that previously was unavailable to rising nations. It is worth noting here that despite China's stated desire to maintain the current international order, its dramatic rise inevitably will impact the current international balance of power. There is little open self-reflection among China's influential elite about these likely worldwide repercussions.

Another concept important to understanding how China perceives itself, the world, and China's role within it is *shi*, which, as translated from the Chinese Dictionary, means power or influence, momentum, or tendency.[23] But this does not fully capture the essence of the word. Chinese linguists define it more precisely as the "strategic configuration of power" or "the potential borne of disposition."[24] The significance

of *shi* is that there is an inherent power in all things, which a good strategist or general or even artist can take advantage of by understanding and exploiting their circumstances. From this concept comes a more tangible one: "comprehensive national power." Such power is another uniquely Chinese concept that, through the country's traditionally broad perspective, takes all political, economic, military, scientific, historical, and societal factors into consideration in determining a nation's strength. In contrast to Chinese perceptions of the Western concept of national power, which emphasizes influence and force, comprehensive national power emphasizes survival, development, and international influence.[25]

Through a seemingly objective mathematical calculation (although allocating quantitative values to a nation's international influence is in fact highly subjective), the relative power of nations can be quantified based on more than their military strength. Li Changjiu described it this way: "Comprehensive national strength refers to the organic whole of various forces possessed by a sovereign state [containing] various elements including resources, economy, military, science and technology, education, politics, diplomacy, and national willpower and cohesive force."[26]

While the concept is an effort to look beyond military strength in determining a country's power, it is a concept that Chinese military thinkers utilize in defining their strategic outlook and determining their potential combat effectiveness. As Peng Guangqian and Yao Youzhi write in *The Science of Military Strategy*, comprehensive national power is "the source of combat effectiveness" and "the fundamental base for war preparations."[27] If a nation's comprehensive national power is strong, it can provide an effective deterrent

against attack. But "a nation of minimal strength . . . hardly can do something for crisis or war control, but also often becomes the first target to be invaded and controlled by hegemonists."[28] Thus, while it is far more than a military concept, it is very important in defining China's strategic outlook and determining its military strategy.

The concept of comprehensive national power originated in 1997, when the Chinese government set up a research group comprised of more than 100 scholars to calculate the comprehensive national power of various countries. The group's calculations determined that China ranked seventh in the world in its comprehensive national power. The more important conclusion derived from these calculations, though, is that the Chinese ranking will continue to ascend. As Li Zhongjie, director of the Central Party School's scientific research department, concluded from these results, "China's political status and influence in the world is constantly on the rise."[29]

Meanwhile, China's influential elite see an America that is losing some of its overwhelming advantage in comprehensive national power (it is ranked number one) as it pursues unpopular unilateral actions and isolates itself from the world community. China's influential elite often refer to the concept of "soft power." This is an American concept, but one that is similar to comprehensive national power in recognizing the importance of economics and diplomatic cooperation in addition to military power. The elites quote other scholars (often American) who recount the decline in America's soft power. Much of this decline, as China's influential elite sees it, is due to the perceived trend towards multipolarity in the world. So as China's stature and willingness to cooperate increase in the eyes of other nations, and the U.S. stature and cooperation

declines, China's comprehensive national power will only continue to rise while America's stagnates. Chinese scholars project that these changes will occur in the next 10 to 20 years—the period of "strategic opportunity" for their country.

This concept of strategic opportunity is the most important idea to grasp if we are to understand Chinese threat perceptions. It is this idea, that there is a brief window of opportunity in which China can maximize its circumstances (or its *shi*), that makes Chinese perceptions of threat so wide-ranging. The Chinese government has held fast to the proposition that "peace and development are the main themes of the era" ever since Deng Xiaoping proclaimed it as such in the 1980s. This enduring strategic judgment led to the declaration from the 16th Party Congress that the first 20 years of the 21st century are "a period of important strategic opportunity which China must tightly grasp and in which a lot can be achieved." China's official national security concept thus stresses capitalizing on it as much as it stresses sovereignty and territorial integrity, and it emphasizes economic and financial threats as much as military ones. As stated in the 2004 *Defense White Paper*:

> Proceeding from the fundamental interests of the country, China's national defense policy is both subordinated to and in service of the country's development and security strategies. Firmly seizing and taking full advantage of the important *strategic opportunities* presented in the first two decades of this century, China sticks to keeping its development in pace with its security and makes great efforts to enhance its national strategic capabilities by using multiple security means to cope with both traditional and non-traditional security threats so as to seek a comprehensive national security in the political, economic, military, and social areas.[30] (italics added)

China's national security concept thus is very comprehensive. It still includes sovereignty and territorial integrity as primary concerns. But American intervention in the Taiwan Straits or rising dissent in the countryside are not the only threats to China's national security. Anything that stands to impede the country's continued steady economic growth or its social and political transformation also is considered detrimental to China's stability and security. Even further, any threat to China's "national dignity" and "status of equality in the international community" is considered to endanger the country's security.[31] Consequently, perceived threats to China's national security include an over-dependence on foreign resources, America's increasing disregard for multilateralism, and China's own population's inability to get past historical disagreements with and hatred for Japan. Security is no longer limited to issues of sovereignty and territory. Economic and financial security and even international prestige are now just as important.[32] To be sure, China's influential elite say that the country is more stable and secure than at any time in the country's history. But given this broad, comprehensive view about what constitutes a threat to their nation's security, the Chinese have much to be concerned about.

China's Security Situation: Traditional and Nontraditional Threats and a Comprehensive Security Concept to Address Them.

One member of the influential elite summarized China's security environment this way:

> Many hotspot problems are located close to China, and the variables in China's peripheral environment have increased. Objectively speaking, at present there is no threat to China of large-scale invasion by an external

> enemy, nor will China easily become involved in conflicts and disputes in its peripheral regions, hence, China's security environment can in general be described as relatively good. However, taking a general look at the great powers in the world today, which country is facing such a complex and fragile peripheral security environment as is China (Russia is the only rival); from Kashmir and Afghanistan in the west to the Korean peninsula in the east, and then to the South China Sea and Taiwan strait, all the relevant problems are characterized by being hard to resolve over a long period and also by the possibility of breaking out at any time, and moreover all of them are closely connected to China's national security; what particularly merits attention is that "the American factor" is behind all these problems; of course, the existence of the American factor is not completely negative, and in many circumstances the American factor may be the constraining force preventing these crises from exploding.[33]

According to China's influential elite, the new security situation—the one that has arisen since the end of the Cold War and during China's era of reform and opening—has several characteristics. Many of them are illustrated by the quotation above. First, China's security situation is more complex and unpredictable than at any time in its history. While there is relative peace and "more factors for stability than instability," there also are a number of complicated, intractable problems on its periphery and a new interdependence with the rest of the world that makes China wary.[34] China has 15 neighboring countries, many of which are still undeveloped. China's relations with them include a "complex interweaving of border disputes; cross-border ethnic and religious problems, which are sure invitations to terrorism, extremism, and separatism; and the collusions among drug-trafficking, arms-trafficking, and transnational crimes."[35] East Asia is considered a

region fraught with "hot spots"—including a nuclear crisis on the Korean peninsula, simmering tensions in Kashmir, fragile political stability in Central Asia, and a Japan seeking "normalcy." Almost all the members of the world nuclear club are present in the region, not to mention those countries that strive to possess nuclear weapons, thus forming a "concentrated nuclear circle" around China.[36]

Another factor for unease stems from China's new interdependence with the rest of the world as a result of its opening up and the ramifications of globalization. Because it still lacks a solid economic structure, China is "vulnerable to the impact of international monopoly capital expansion," while its dependence on foreign funds, technology, resources, and markets has made it "subject to the embroilment into the outside economic situation and the risks of manipulation and restriction by outside forces."[37] The Director of China's Center for Contemporary International Relations referred to this as China's "reliance problems." He adds that "China relies quite a bit on foreign resources, on foreign markets, on the international situation and on the security and stability of the environment on China's periphery, and on domestic stability, too."[38] China cannot control the myriad factors that may cause instability and insecurity in the international marketplace, which contributes to the newly challenging and unpredictable security environment.

Another characteristic of China's security situation is a growing appreciation for the interconnectedness of internal and external security. The two influence, constrain, and permeate each other. As one of the most preeminent members of the influential elite said, "The factors that seriously may threaten China's national security are those problems that are capable of turning

'external worries' into 'internal troubles.'"[39] Prior to China's opening, the country was relatively insulated from the world's geopolitical fluctuations and did not have to consider international opinion when formulating domestic policy. As it continues to open, however, internal issues have increasing international consequences and vice versa. As one scholar described it, there is an "internationalization of China's domestic security" and a "domestication of international security":[40]

> China's domestic policies (including its development strategy, military strategy, nationalities policy, religious policy, and even social system and human rights policy) will be even more closely watched by the international community . . . . At the same time, certain domestic security issues not only affect domestic security and stability but also directly impact China's security relations with other countries and regions involved. Examples are the Taiwan question, the Falungong issue, religious and ethnic contradictions, the adjustment of the national economic structure, political reform, strategic petroleum reserve, large projects with environmental impact, and the development of oil and natural gas resources in the East Asia Sea. No longer are these issues merely domestic issues, but they also significantly constrain the development of China's relations with a number of countries.[41]

Further, there is a growing number of factors that pose a threat to the existence and development of China other than traditional military threats from other nations. There is a consensus among the elite that the likelihood of traditional military conflict has decreased and has been successfully managed through military deterrence. It is the nontraditional threats such as energy insecurity, environmental degradation, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), terrorism,

transnational crime, drug-trafficking, piracy, and the spread of disease that increasingly are threatening to China due to their potential to impede progress during China's period of strategic opportunity. Nontraditional security threats are thus of just as much concern, if not more, than traditional ones, in China's new security environment.

Perhaps the most worrisome characteristic of China's current security environment is the possibility for a confluence of traditional and nontraditional threats. There is an oft-stated concern that traditional and nontraditional threats will coincide or enable one another:

> In particular, we should be on guard against the possibility that nontraditional security threats, having built up over a long period of time and lacking an effective resolution, may lead to military, political, and diplomatic conflicts of the traditional variety, thus jeopardizing overall national security. The mishandling of traditional security, in turn, will enable unstable factors that are domestic in nature or that exist between two countries to cross national borders and become magnified through globalization, becoming a nontraditional security issue for the entire international community.[42]

China's arms control White Paper also warned of the intersection of traditional and nontraditional threats:

> The world is far from tranquil as traditional security issues persist, local wars and violent conflicts crop up time and again, and hot-spot issues keep emerging. Nontraditional security threats such as terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), transnational crimes, and infectious diseases are on the rise. The intertwined traditional and nontraditional threats pose severe challenges to international security.[43]

The potential for economic warfare to lead to military warfare, or for external instability to fuel internal instability, or for any other convergence of traditional and nontraditional crises, is one of the biggest threats perceived by China's influential elite. Such a perfect storm would threaten not only territorial integrity and sovereignty, it would push back economic and democratic reforms, diminish China's international stature, and threaten the very survival of the Communist regime. Several of the biggest traditional and nontraditional threats are examined one at a time, but it is important to keep in mind that it is the potential for them to feed one another and thus snowball that is of the utmost concern.

The development of China's new security concept can be traced back to the Asian financial crisis of 1997, a seemingly internal problem that had wide-reaching international repercussions. It was at this time that China began to redefine its national security concept to include economic and financial security. The 2000 *Defense White Paper* advanced the policy of "mutual trust, mutual benefit, and mutual cooperation," recognizing that common interests and cooperation were the only defense against such events in the future. The security concept was defined further in a policy statement to an Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) forum in 2002, again emphasizing "dialogue and cooperation as its main characteristics."[44] In addition to the concept of mutual benefit and common development, the policy now elevated the importance of nontraditional security: "Apart from the traditional security fields of preventing invasion by external enemies and safeguarding territorial sovereignty and integrity, attention must be paid to focusing on striking at terrorism, transnational crime,

and other nontraditional security fields."[45] The 2004 *Defense White Paper* elevated nontraditional issues even further, stating that "traditional and nontraditional security issues are intertwined, with the latter posing a growing threat."[46] An entire section of the White Paper was dedicated to highlighting cooperation China has undertaken in the nontraditional security field.

Thus, China's "new" security concept has evolved in response to its increasingly complex, interconnected security environment. China's policymakers have determined that the only way to address such a wide-ranging and unpredictable panoply of traditional and nontraditional threats is through increased international interaction. After all, these are issues that China cannot resolve alone or through the tried and true method of military deterrence. This is why China's foreign policies focus on trust, engagement, and cooperation to an extent never seen before.

As stated in the introduction to China's 2004 *National Defense White Paper*:

> A panoramic view of the present-day world displays the simultaneous existence of both opportunities for and challenges to peace and development, and of positive and negative factors bearing on security and stability. The opportunities cannot be shared and the challenges cannot be overcome unless diverse civilizations, social systems, and development models live together harmoniously, trust each other, and engage in cooperation. . . .[47]

The White Paper goes on to declare China's modernization during its period of strategic opportunity as the country's primary strategic goal:

> The development goal for China to strive for in the first two decades of this century is to build a moderately prosperous society in an all-round way. As a large developing country, China has before it an arduous task for modernization, which

> calls for prolonged and persistent hard work . . . . China needs a peaceful international environment for its own development, which in turn will enhance peace and development in the world.[48]

Chinese perceptions about its security environment are thus well-enunciated in official policy. Its policies also make clear both China's strategic goal—a peaceful environment for development—and its policy for achieving it—cooperation and engagement. There is an array of traditional and nontraditional security issues that threaten the realization of the strategic goal. Policies to address such threats are focused largely on increasing cooperation and engagement, working together in areas of "mutual benefit," and achieving a "win-win" solution. There also is an important element of military modernization in China's national security strategy, declaredly to deter aggression and independence movements by Taiwan and other "separatist forces," as well as to assure maritime security. Since this subject receives appropriate scrutiny elsewhere, this monograph will not attempt to treat the extent or intent of China's military modernization specifically.

Rather, to reiterate, this monograph will examine the multitude of threats to national security as perceived by China's influential elite. And in so doing, it will indirectly shed some light on the intent of China's military modernization, as well as on the motivations behind decisions and actions of the Chinese leadership more broadly. Taking a distinctly Chinese perspective will allow us to appreciate the array of traditional and nontraditional issues that threaten to adversely affect China's sovereignty, continued economic and social development, and growing influence on the world stage. As will be seen, the threats are numerous and

varied, while mitigating them requires cooperation, diplomacy, and serious internal reforms. The security environment the Chinese perceive is a complex and dangerous one. And in order to ensure China's security and stability, the Chinese government has a lot of work to do.

CHAPTER 2

TRADITIONAL SECURITY THREATS

Traditional threats, while never defined precisely by China's influential elite, are characterized loosely as threats to a nation emanating from other nations, and involving a military component. To begin examining China's traditional security threats, it is necessary to start with the most pervasive and enduring traditional threat to China's perceived territorial integrity—Taiwan. As stated in *China's National Defense in 2004*, "The separatist activities of the 'Taiwan independence' forces increasingly have become the biggest immediate threat to China's sovereignty and territorial integrity as well as peace and stability."[49] The subject of Taiwan is the first talking point in any Chinese discussion of national security. But in a 2004 survey of government officials and experts conducted by Beijing University, a Taiwan crisis was ranked last in a long list of possible crises to occur before 2010.[50] So while there is considerable discussion about the Taiwan issue, the possibility of a crisis is not likely in the minds of China's influential elite. As this monograph will show, there are many other more immediate and likely concerns for China's influential elite to entertain. Further, the cross-Strait situation has been analyzed thoroughly by both Chinese and American scholars and, except the 1996 incident, the situation has actually been managed successfully. Thus, despite Taiwan's rhetorical prominence, the Taiwan issue is not the highest concern of China's influential elite. Given the situation's perceived improbability and the sufficient

attention otherwise given to it, Taiwan will not be covered here.

We will begin instead with the United States, which pervades nearly all discussions of the security threats facing China today, and which is perceived as both a stabilizing and destabilizing factor in the region. The results of a 2005 public opinion poll, conducted by the *Global Times* with the help of the Institute of American Studies at the China Academy of Social Sciences, reflected both the positive and negative perceptions of the United States held by the Chinese public. Nearly half of the Chinese polled considered the United States as their main rival. Almost 60 percent thought the United States was doing its best to contain China. Simultaneously, those polled pointed to the United States as a model for China to learn from, admitting that good Sino-U.S. relations have contributed to China's economic development.[51] These results reflect how complicated and multifaceted the Sino-U.S. relationship is. (It also reflects the reality of the dialectic approach that allows Chinese to be comfortable holding multiple and conflicting viewpoints.) Because the United States is such a prevalent force in China's security considerations, the threats perceived from the United States will be considered first. We then will turn to the most prominent and enduring regional threats—those emanating from Japan and India. What is common to all of these traditional adversaries is their potential and their perceived willingness to contain China. Interestingly, it is the threat of economic and diplomatic containment more than the threat of traditional military containment that is most troubling to China's influential elite.

I. THE UNITED STATES: THE HEGEMONIC THREAT

As the public opinion poll mentioned above demonstrated, there are mixed feelings about the United States in China. But among China's influential elite, there is near unanimity on one point: America's global strategy is hegemony. Virtually every Chinese American scholar and news article regarding the United States begins with this statement of perceived fact. Below are just a few examples of this viewpoint, from several of China's leading America scholars:

> The core content of US global strategy since the 20th century has been to establish and consolidate its world leadership status, or in other words, to contend for and maintain its world hegemony status.
>
> Liu Jianfei, Professor,
> CPC Central Party School[52]

> By analyzing the words and deeds of America's political leaders as well as the trends in the news media, we see that the United States has made the maintenance of its hegemony the goal of its global strategy now and for a long time to come.
>
> Ruan Zongze, Deputy Director and
> Research Fellow
> China Institute of International Studies[53]

> Generally speaking, the national strategic goal of the post-Cold War United States has been relatively stable, that is, to maintain the U.S. "world leadership status" for as long as possible.
>
> Jin Canrong, Vice President and Professor
> School of International Relations, Chinese
> People's University[54]

> The United States is the sole superpower in the post-Cold War world, and will be the only nation with the capacity and the ambition to exercise global hegemony for quite a long time to come.
>
> Wang Jisi, former Director,
> Institute of American Studies,
> Chinese Academy of Social Sciences[55]

Hegemony is a concept that permeates Chinese thought. As far back as the Warring States period, rulers were seeking hegemony over "all under heaven."[56] The Chinese characters, *ba quan*, taken separately mean right or authority (*ba*) and rule by might rather than right (*quan*). The *Modern Chinese English Dictionary* defines *ba quan* this way: in the realm of international relations, to use force or power to control or contain another country. It also is translated as supremacy.[57] The term is never so clearly defined when it is used by China's influential elite; but this definition demonstrates why the word carries such a negative connotation. To the Chinese, a hegemon is a country that uses force to control or contain another country—thus interfering in other countries' internal affairs. Hegemonism is to blame for China's "century of humiliation." Thus, the Chinese aversion to hegemony is rooted deeply in their historical experience and national psyche and is not easily overcome.

The characterization of the United States as a hegemon pervades all Chinese perceptions about America today. From this, the Chinese influential elite draw two conclusions about the United States. First, they conclude that the United States feels threatened by any country that challenges their hegemony, and they will thus take action to contain any country that does so. A China rising in power and influence is just such a threat and thus the United States will act to

contain China . . . while it still can. America's policies regarding China and its recent military, diplomatic, and economic actions in East Asia all prove this point in the eyes of the Chinese elite. The writings of their counterparts in the United States, American China scholars, also support the containment conclusion. The second conclusion drawn from the hegemonic characterization of America is that the United States wants to continue to expand and solidify its supremacy in the international arena. America is thus striving for a new, America-centric world order. This is evidenced by America's foreign policy of promoting democracy, unilateralism, and preemption. This threat, of a new international order, will be examined first. Treatment of the threat of containment will follow, as will the threat perceived from the unpredictability and conservatism of American politics.

The Threat to the Current World Order.

From listening carefully to what American leaders are saying in official policy documents and in person (through speeches, interviews, testimony, etc.), China's influential elite find their fears about America's hegemonic nature confirmed. America's global war on terror, commitment to spreading democracy, and doctrine of preemption are perceived as evidence not only of America's intent to maintain global predominance, but to remake the world order with itself at the center. The current strategic balance has provided China the opportunity to open and grow amidst relative peace and stability; any upset to this balance thus is considered a threat to China's continued development.

Many of China's influential elite see the war on terror as America's current instrument to uphold and

extend U.S. hegemony. It is under the pretext of the war on terror that American military power extended into Afghanistan, Central Asia, and the Middle East. Liu Jianfei, professor at the CPC Central Party School, believes the war on terror has come to be a convenient means to reach America's desired hegemonistic end: "If the Afghan war was focused on fighting terrorism, and promoting hegemony was a case of 'incidentally hitting a rabbit while raking the grass', the Iraq war was to a very great extent fought in order to promote hegemonist strategy, and fighting terrorism and preventing proliferation just became a pretext for launching the war."[58]

To the influential elite, the recent U.S. national security strategies exemplify America's intent to redefine the international order. China's influential elite find the 2002 and 2006 versions threatening for two reasons: First, the emphasis they place on spreading democracy; and, second, the latitude they provide the United States in acting preemptively—or, in China's view, interfering in other countries' internal affairs. The focus on democracy emphasizes the ideological differences between the United States and China that had decreased in significance as China's economy opened, and our economic interests converged. But the Bush administration's strategies put the issue back in the spotlight. As Liu Jianfei observed:

> Proceeding from the U.S. national security strategy, the United States "hopes" that China can speed up its "democratization" process, but China's reality determines that it cannot copy western models of democracy, and in addition it must follow a path of gradual progress. There is quite a bit of distance between China's reality and America's "hope." This will affect U.S. China policy and will easily make Americans hostile toward China.[59]

Wang Pufeng, a senior officer with the Academy of Military Science, sees America's national security strategy as threatening because of the leeway it provides America in invading China.

> Right-wing personalities have contracted a stubborn case of "Cold-War thinking" and "they firmly believe that the values of China's social system and pursuits are fundamentally different than U.S. values." The swift growth of China's economy, its abrupt political rise, and its national defense modernization building inevitably will influence and hinder the power and pace of the U.S. leading the world. The way they consider China to be a potential enemy cannot be changed. Once Sino-U.S. relations become strained, it cannot be ruled out that the U.S. may wantonly find an excuse and carry out a "strike first" attack against China.[60]

General Wang's concern about preemptive U.S. military action against China is not shared widely. (His position within the Chinese military establishment likely explains his focus on this possibility.) Most of the Chinese influential elite do not believe a military attack by the United States to be likely. What they do worry about, however, is the broader threat that this policy poses to the international order. From the Chinese perspective, the international order is governed by international institutions that afford all countries equal footing and an inalienable right to sovereignty. It is characterized by a strategic balance that requires multilateralism. At an experts' forum sponsored by the China Institute for Contemporary International Relations in 2003, all of the participating Chinese scholars from a wide range of research institutes agreed: There was "change brewing in the international order."[61] Those changes were attributed almost exclusively to American actions. Ruan Zongze,

representing the China Institute for International Security, called the U.S. approach to national security a "grim assault on and challenge to the existing international order." He described the assault this way: "In the eyes of the United States, international treaties, mechanisms, and security arrangements get in the way of its right to act on its own. The Iraqi war shows that the modern international order, represented by the United Nations (UN), has become a constraint on America's pursuit of its single-pole strategy."[62] Gu Dexin, the director of the International Relations Studies Office at China's National Defense University, believes this negation of existing international norms rises to a "U.S. strategic concept," which he termed the "sole hegemonist" strategy. Instead of the UN-centered system, the United States is pursuing a new security structure with itself at its center. In this new structure, cooperation would revolve around the United States and its "mission-based" alliances.[63] It is "a so-called security system based on a coalition of the willing."[64]

This American quest for a new security construct also was enunciated by then U.S. National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice at a speech she gave in 2003 at the International Institute of Strategic Studies in London. While her words in English did not carry this meaning, Wang Yusheng's translation of her remarks had Rice urging everyone to "lay aside the quest for a multiplicity of new 'poles' and unite within the sphere of America's 'one pole' of freedom, peace, and justice."[65]

While American policies promoting democracy, unilateralism, preemption, and the war on terror are not policies directed against China (in fact, one could argue China hardly is even considered when making these decisions), from a Chinese perspective, they are a threat. That holistic Eastern perspective described by

Nisbett seems an apt explanation for this perception. China has staked its continued development to the current multipolar, cooperative, peaceful, international order. It is within this current international order that China found relative stability, comfort, and room to pursue both its economic modernization and an increasing role in the international arena. The U.S. strategies of unilateralism and preemption threaten to destabilize this system, producing unpredictability for China's security environment.[66] Thus, U.S. national security doctrine not only confirms U.S. hegemonic intent, it threatens the international balance of power on which China's continued stability, growth, and rising international stature depend.

The Threat of Containment and the "China Threat Theory."

China's influential elite coined a phrase that is used regularly in their writings, capturing both the American suspicion of a rising China and Chinese suspicion of American containment efforts: the "China threat theory." Calling it a theory indicates that the influential elite believe it is not a reality but a hypothesis, concocted and propagated to breed fear and mistrust about China's intentions. While Japan is sometimes credited with creating the theory initially, China's influential elite attribute the theory's recent resurgence to the United States. "The United States has whipped up an evil wave of the 'China threat theory' domestically and internationally, which has caught the widespread attention of the international community," wrote Qian Wenrong in the journal published by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.[67] Chinese publications describe the theory as one that has been

around since the Cold War, but its prominence ebbs and flows depending on the international situation and changes in Sino-U.S. relations. An editorial in a journal for mid-level party officials noted, "The new round of the 'China threat theory' bore down menacingly early this year, and it has gradually intensified, turning into the most 'all-round' anti-China wave in the United States since the end of the Cold War."[68] The reason cited for the theory's resurgence varies. Some attribute it to "antiterrorism fatigue," while others blame the influence of neoconservatives on the current administration.[69] Regardless of its origins, the spread of the China threat theory in itself is a threat to China.

The China threat theory is menacing to China for several reasons. First, the "theory" may gain traction, allowing the United States to define the world's perceptions of China as an aggressor, instead of the image that Beijing is working assiduously to promote of a China as a peaceful, cooperative, and responsible international partner. If the theory is believed, China's recent diplomatic drive to build trust and cooperation—through ASEAN, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, the Six Party talks—would be impeded. China's neighbors, already suspicious of China's intentions in the region, would only grow more wary, setting back substantial progress made in resolving historical border disputes and lingering grievances. The vigor with which China's "peaceful development" has been promoted (it even merited a Chinese government White Paper in December 2005) demonstrates the importance the Central Government has attached to countering the theory of the China threat. The promise that "China will unswervingly follow the road of peaceful development" is an unequivocal response to American and international concerns about a threatening China.[70]

Second, if this aggressive image of China takes hold, then China becomes the strategic rival of the United States. This is not a role in which China wants to be cast because it means that America will, in its classic Cold War fashion, take whatever actions are necessary to contain and defeat China. The influential elite often refer to this threat of the "Cold War mentality" and the danger it poses with its outmoded, zero-sum assumptions.[71]

While most of China's influential elite recognize that America's China policy is a mixture of both containment and engagement, their concern is that a spreading China threat theory affects that mixture, leading the United States to enact more policies of containment and less of engagement. This fear is confirmed as China's influential elite look to (1) American policy statements; (2) military, diplomatic, and economic actions that the United States has taken recently; and (3) American academia. The view of each of these from the influential elite's perspective will be examined in turn.

America's China Policy – Proof of the Threat Theory's Strength. While the broader U.S. national security policies of unilateralism and preemption are seen as evidence that America's grand strategy is hegemony, policies, and statements relating specifically to China demonstrate that there is not such a clearly defined and coherent China-specific strategy. Because the United States lacks a clear and consistent policy regarding China, the influential elite watch official speeches, statements, and reports closely to determine just what U.S. policy toward China is or will be. What they see is substantial proof that U.S. policymakers have widely accepted the "theory of the China threat." What is so frustrating to China's influential elite is the lack of

evidence on which the widespread acceptance of the China threat theory is based.

Former Secretary Rumsfeld's June 2005 speech to the Asian Security Conference in Singapore often is cited as an example of the threat theory's dissemination and acceptance by America. In China's backyard, to an audience of its neighbors, Secretary Rumsfeld labeled China's military buildup "a concern," questioning whether China really was facing any threats that would justify its military modernization.[72] To a country surrounded by fledgling states, historical invaders, nuclear powers, and in addition grappling with issues of terrorism and proliferation just as the United States is, this remark was considered insulting by Chinese news media and thinkers.

Another American policy considered rather insulting by China's influential elite is the publication of the Pentagon's *Annual Report to Congress*: *The Military Power of the People's Republic of China*. The existence of this report is the most widely referenced example of the propagation of the China threat theory and is credited in both scholarly writing and the news media for the theory's "comeback."[73] The report, which is mandated by Congress and has been published yearly since 2000, analyzes China's military modernization and spending. The report submitted to Congress in July 2005 found that the "pace and scope" of China's military modernizations is "ambitious" while its motivations are unknown.[74] The report concluded that China is at a "strategic crossroads"—facing a choice between a path of "peaceful integration and benign competition" with the world or a less peaceful, more aggressive one.[75] The 2006 Report, submitted to Congress a short 8 months later, again commented that "China's leaders have yet to adequately explain the purposes of desired end states of their military expansion."[76]

That the report is written at all is seen as evidence of American's adherence to outdated and dangerous Cold War thinking, trying to paint China as the strategic rival that the Soviet Union once was. Major General Peng Guangqian of the Chinese People's Liberation Army's (PLA) Academy of Military Sciences noted that there have been only two instances where a government has publicly published reports on the military power of another country: the U.S. reports on the military strength of the former Soviet Union, and the current reports to Congress on China's military strength. He continues, "Cooking up this kind of report on the military power of the so-called major opponent or potentially major 'challenger' of the future reflects typical Cold War thinking."[77] While the report is no different from a standard intelligence assessment on foreign capabilities that most countries produce, its unclassified nature and broad distribution does make it unique. And the fact that the United States does not publish such assessments on any country besides China is telling about our own threat perceptions.

Beyond the report's publication, China's government finds the content of the report to be an unfounded and unwarranted exaggeration of their military modernization. Beijing's official response to the 2005 report, delivered by Vice Foreign Minister Yang Jiechi, was that the report "groundlessly criticizes" China's defense modernization and seriously violates "basic norms governing international relations."[78] The official response in 2006 was similar. Commenting on the Pentagon's "Cold War mentality" and continued propagation of the "China threat theory," China's Foreign Ministry spokesman noted that China was "strongly resentful and firmly opposed" to the report.[79] In light of America's own military strength and

considerable defense spending, the report is viewed as an exaggeration. Major General Peng commented that the report "has more subjectivity than objectivity, more illusions than facts, and more bias than rationality."[80] The Chinese influential elite look at the technological and budgetary superiority of the U.S. military and question how America can possibly feel threatened by China.

The *People's Daily,* the Communist Party's newspaper, makes the following comparison about defense spending in an article titled "Pentagon's 'China Threat' Paranoia": China's military expenditure was about $25.5 billion in 2004, while the U.S. figure was $455.9 billion, 17.8 times that of China or 77 times on a per capita basis. China defends a territory largely the same size as the United States with military spending 6 percent that of the United States. How can China pose a threat to the US?"[81] The numbers are broken down in a variety of ways, all of which demonstrate the vast disparity between military spending in China and the United States. One compares the amount of money spent per square kilometer: China spends $2,645 per square kilometer on defense, while the United States spends $52,000. Another comparison: China spends $11,374 per service member, while the United States spends $350,000 per service member.[82] These numbers imply a degree of precision that cannot be confirmed; the exact amount China spends on national defense is not available publicly.[83] The point, however, is still valid: The United States spends far more on defense than China does—and will continue to do so, even as China's defense spending increases.

Another legitimate and oft-made distinction between the U.S. military and China's is the disparities in overseas troop deployments and military technological

advances. As an editorial in the *People's Daily* pointed out,

> The United States has troops stationed in well over 130 countries and regions and several hundred overseas military bases; while China does not have a single soldier stationed overseas. . . . The U.S. Army has realized mature mechanization and has initially completed information-oriented transformation; while the Chinese Army is far away from having gone through the road to mechanization, and it has just taken the first step toward information-oriented construction.[84]

It is such disparities in money, intent, and capabilities—in addition to the existence of the *Report to Congress*—that lead the Chinese to conclude that the United States is "paranoid" for buying into the "theory of the China threat," and is stuck in an outdated Cold War mentality. The "only military superpower in the world" cannot truly feel threatened by a less capable, technologically inferior force.[85] Thus, China's influential elite conclude that there must be another reason for America's declared concern about China. The Chinese news media offer several possible explanations for the publication of the Pentagon's *Report to Congress*. One perceived explanation: it is part of a plan to foment dissent and anti-Chinese sentiment in the Asia Pacific in order to maintain American power in the region. Other explanations are more profit-oriented. For instance, a modernizing Chinese military provides justification for continued and increasing arms sales to Taiwan as well as continued development of theater missile defense. Yet others point to the report and the "threat theory" as U.S. justification for intervention in China's affairs, for instance in negotiations for arms sales to China by the European Union (EU) and Israel.[86]

Surely the intent of the report is hardly so nefarious; the real reason it is published is the congressional requirement to do so. And Congress and the Pentagon certainly have reason to be concerned about China's growing military power and the lack of transparency in its motivations and intentions. But Chinese reaction to the report and to American concern over the so-called China threat also is understandable. As they are quick to point out in a variety of ways, America has an overwhelming military advantage and is more inclined to utilize it. To Americans, the Pentagon's report provides evidence of the China threat. To the Chinese, the report serves as proof of an American Cold War mentality and paranoia—a mindset that not only threatens further efforts to modernize the Chinese military but threatens to place the country in direct opposition to and competition with the United States for world status and state survival.

Because China's influential elite pays close attention to U.S. policymaking regarding China, they understand that the Pentagon report is not a complete reflection of U.S. policy toward China. Elements of both containment and engagement exist, depending on American interests. China's influential elite commonly refer to this combination of containment and engagement as "hedging." Most recently, the influential elite have paid particular attention to a speech given by former Deputy Secretary of State Robert Zoellick, which leaned toward engagement. Titled "Whither China: From Membership to Responsibility," the speech urged China to become a "responsible stakeholder" in the international system.[87] A rather vigorous and sophisticated discussion about just what this speech meant ensued in China. It has since gained traction in both American and Chinese policy. Whether the United

States and China agree on what exactly it means to be a "responsible stakeholder" is yet to be seen.

Since America's China policy is such a confusing and contradictory mix of containment and engagement, China's influential elite also look to just how these policies are implemented. Unfortunately, American actions are perceived as even more threatening than declared policy.

American Actions – Speaking Louder than Words. To the influential elite, the exaggeration of the China threat and the move to contain China evident in U.S. policy are confirmed in American actions. The changing force disposition of the U.S. military, the diplomatic efforts the United States has made in the Asia Pacific region, and the political interference allowed in economic affairs all validate China's perception that the United States is seeking to contain China.

Militarily, changes to United States force disposition lead the Chinese influential elite to conclude that the United States is shifting its focus to the Asia Pacific region. The American military physically surrounds China, with troops in Afghanistan, Kyrgyzstan, Japan, and Korea. Qian Wenrong, in the journal published by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, described U.S. military activity in the Asia Pacific this way:

> The United States has taken further steps to build an even tighter strategic ring of encirclement in China's neighboring regions. Over the past more than 1 year, the United States has significantly strengthened its network of military bases in the Asia Pacific region and its alliance relationship with China's neighboring countries; further strengthened the U.S. Pacific Fleet; and established forward military bases in Central Asia, which is contiguous to China's Western region, in the name of counterterrorism.[88]

Further, the United States is expanding its military cooperation with Japan as the two countries redefine their strategic security agreement. This compounds the perceived threat posed by a militarily resurgent and increasingly nationalistic Japan. (Threat perceptions relating to Japan are addressed in the next chapter.)

The buildup of theater missile defense (another example of military cooperation with Japan) also is seen as an effort to contain China. Xin Benjian, an instructor at the PLA Foreign Language College, wrote in *Contemporary International Relations* that the Americans and Japanese have "reached consensus on the excuse (guarding against Democratic People's Republic of Korea [DPRK]) and real cause (China) of deploying theater missile defense (TMD) and already have begun joint research and development of the system."[89]

America's growing diplomatic engagement in the region also is seen as an effort to contain China. Most threatening is the strengthened alliance with Japan, which for the first time engaged in the Taiwan debate, agreeing with the United States to treat the defense of Taiwan as their "common strategic objective."[90] Strengthened relations with Australia, Thailand, the Philippines, Vietnam, and India also are seen by China's news media and scholars as part of the containment plan. The involvement of the United States in dissuading the EU from lifting its arms embargo and discouraging Israel and Ukraine from selling weapons to China is yet another example of American efforts to spread the China threat theory and contain China.

The actions that the United States has taken in the economic realm are most convincing to China's influential elite that American policy is more concerned with containing than engaging China. As Yu

Yongsheng notes, "Economically, from crude treatment of the textiles dispute to exerting strong pressure for yuan revaluation, and to excessive concern over Chinese enterprises buying American businesses, each drip reflects the U.S. strategic intention to guard against and contain China."[91] The pressure to revalue the RMB and the restrictions on trade are not new to Sino-U.S. economic negotiations. But the extent of political involvement in the so-called free marketplace is new. Congress recently passed a foreign aid bill with provisions that ban U.S. banks from granting loans to American companies that build nuclear power plants in China.[92] Both houses passed resolutions preventing the sale of Unocal to China's National Offshore Oil Corporation. Fu Mengzi commented on the impact—and irony—of these actions: "Ordinary Chinese people see a business environment full of hostility in a country which advocates a free market."[93]

These actions seemingly to constrain China's economic growth are perhaps the most threatening of all of America's policies and actions. They signal to China's influential elite that slowing China's economic rise is how U.S. policymakers will pursue containment. One American scholar (John Mearsheimer, discussed below), who is outside of the government and arguably has minimal direct influence over official U.S. policy, has been a vociferous advocate of just such a policy of economic containment. Such thinking outside of official government channels is seen by China's influential elite as mainstream acceptance of the China threat theory and of the containment policy. China's influential elite devote considerable time and effort to understanding their American peers for this reason. An examination of what the influential elite of China see when they look at America's influential elite follows.

Proof from Peers. It is interesting to note the frequency with which China's influential elite turn to their American counterparts and cite them as evidence of what the Chinese assume is the U.S. leadership's intent and motivation. It may be an indicator of the significant influence the Chinese elite have on their own leaders.

That there are voices outside of the government that opine about the threat of China is construed as highly relevant by China's influential elite. It is evidence that the "theory of the China threat" has gained intensity and validation in mainstream America. "Whereas the previous clamors about the 'China threat theory' mainly came from non-mainstream figures, this time round we can find the voices of mainstream figures, from Congress to government, from the nongovernmental sector organizations to the news media, and from academic circles to think tanks," observes Yu Yongsheng.[94] Fu Mengzi, writing in *World Affairs*, also sees who is talking about the China threat as evidence of its strength. He notes that the "creators and supporters of the new round of the 'China threat theory'" come from a wide range of think tanks, interest groups, university scholars, and individuals in the Pentagon. "Their number is considerable . . . and they are continually expanding."[95] Yu concludes that such a wide array of theory proponents means that a push for containment policies will be very strong.

A U.S. scholar who receives an inordinate amount of attention from Chinese scholars is John Mearsheimer, a professor at the University of Chicago. As a political scientist who has spent his career in academia, without experience in an official government capacity and with less exposure in American mainstream news media than he seems to receive in China, Mearsheimer's

name may be more widely known in that country than in the United States. He is the originator of the school known as "offensive realism," believing that "the ultimate goal of every great power is to maximize its share of world power and eventually dominate the system"—in other words, to become a hegemon.[96] From this theory, Mearsheimer concluded that China and the United States are "destined to be adversaries" as China will try to dominate Asia the way the United States dominates the Western Hemisphere.[97] Thus, the United States should not act to engage China (a "misguided" policy), but act to contain—and weaken—China. In his book, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics,* Mearsheimer argued: "A wealthy China would not be a status quo power but an aggressive state determined to achieve regional hegemony . . . so it is not too late for the United States to reverse course and do what it can to slow the rise of China."[98]

Mearsheimer thereby validates both of the Chinese perceptions about the United States: (1) the United States seeks hegemony (because all states do), which means (2) the United States seeks containment of China. And containment, according to Mearsheimer, is not achieved through military policies, but through economic ones: "The United States has a profound interest in seeing Chinese economic growth slow considerably in the years ahead." It is this—the threat to its continued economic modernization and development—that concerns China the most.[99]

Robert Kaplan, author and essayist, is another civilian commentator referenced frequently by both the state news media and the scholarly elite. The story he published in the June 2005 issue of *Atlantic Monthly*, "How We Would Fight China," is considered one of the most overt propagations of the China threat theory.

Zhang Jiye and Chen Wenxin summarized the article by saying that Kaplan, "in all apparent seriousness, claimed that China would be a more powerful military opponent to the United States than the [former] Soviet Union."[100] The refrain, "in all apparent seriousness," goes to show the extent to which they believe the China threat is simply a theory.

In true dialectic fashion, Chinese authors also find voices within the American academic community that are not proponents of the China threat theory. Tao Jiyi, a professor at Jinan University, wrote: "At the same time that the right-wing conservative forces are exaggerating the 'China threat,' the United States actually has a number of fair-minded scholars who consistently refute and rebut the 'China threat' theory so prevalent in U.S. society."[101] China's scholars often remind their readers of Joseph Nye's 1995 warning, "If we see China as an enemy, China actually may become one."[102] Nye, who was serving in the Pentagon when he issued that warning, continues in academia today to take not only the military, but the economic and political arenas, into consideration when assessing China. He is an advocate for engagement with China and thus is often referenced by Chinese scholars.

Zbigniew Brezinski, Henry Kissinger, and Samuel Huntington also are commonly cited. Labeled realists by Zhang Liping, a Chinese expert on American politics, they also are seen as American scholars who refute the China threat theory. Their belief in power politics supports the perception that America's goal is hegemony, but they also focus less on ideology and the spread of democracy and conclude that China is not a threat to the current balance of power. Thus, they represent the middle road between neoconservatives like Mearsheimer and liberalists like Nye, advocating

a combination of containment and engagement (or the "hedging" policy).[103]

It is important to note that this ability to point out more conciliatory, pro-engagement scholars is representative of the dialectic approach taken by many of China's scholars. The concerns about containment raised by China's influential elite, validated by American policies, actions, and academic theorizing, often are balanced with more optimistic assessments. While many of the elite fret about the possibility of containment, they also conclude that the Sino-U.S. relationship is better than ever, and there is more opportunity for cooperation than ever before.

Another feature common to the assessments of China's influential elite is the rather comprehensive perspective they take when examining U.S. policies, actions, and academic statements. All of the statements made by American government officials and academics and all of the military, political, and economic actions taken are seen by China's influential elite as part of a broad-based U.S. effort to contain China. As Nisbett's research indicated, Americans likely see all of these events as individual incidents, with little consideration or appreciation for how they bear upon one another. The Chinese, on the other hand, are inclined to see them as all interrelated components of a big picture. From a holistic perspective, it is easier to understand how China can perceive the United States as a threat to their national security, peaceful development, and place in the world.

This comprehensive perspective also provides the influential elite an appreciation of other forces at work in the American policymaking community—such as politics. It is to their understanding of the U.S. political realm and the threats it poses that we will now turn.

The Threat of American Politics.

The attention China's influential elite pays to American politics and the understanding of its effects on policymaking is notable. David Shambaugh, the foremost American expert on Chinese perceptions of the United States, asserted that China's America watchers between 1972 and 1990 did not understand the United States very well. Their analyses were "shallow" and lacked "subtlety and sophistication."[104] This is no longer the case. Chinese America-watchers today recognize that there are varying schools of U.S. political thought and that the degree of influence these schools have on policymaking depends on the party in power, politics, and public opinion. They understand that the Defense Department, Congress, interest groups, and even the military-industrial complex have competing priorities and agendas, and that, along with the 4-year political cycle, all have an effect on U.S. policy toward China. They understand that our pluralist society encourages a vast marketplace of ideas and they look to their counterparts, U.S. China scholars, and to public opinion in order to understand the marketplace's broad array of ideas about China. They understand that all of these forces make it difficult for the United States to adopt a long-term, coherent, and broad "China strategy"—and most believe these forces are the reason the United States ends up with a "vacillating" and even "self-contradictory" muddle of policies, some of which promote cooperation and trade with China, and some of which stifle it.[105]

The influence of politics on U.S. policy is not itself perceived as threatening to the Chinese. The threatening aspects of American politics are the up-and-down unpredictability of the political cycle and

the increasing influence of neoconservatives and "hawkish" forces that are perceived to have a foothold in the highest echelons of decisionmaking, especially at the Pentagon. And because American politics is so unstable and unpredictable, many of the influential elite worry that the neocon influence, with its pro-democracy, preemptive, and anti-China agenda, could continue to increase.

The Threat of the "Neocon."

There are generally three schools of American political thought identified by Chinese scholars: the hardline, "hawkish," "neocon" influence that advocates preemption, unilateralism, democracy-building, and containment of China; the globalist, left-leaning "liberalist" position that advocates engagement with China; and a middle-of-the-road "realist" position which advocates a combination of these two. It is the neocons, their demonstrated power within the Bush administration, and their potential for future influence that Chinese perceive to be the most threatening. As scholar Jin Canrong stated, "There has always been a struggle between 'hawks' and 'doves' in U.S. diplomacy, but it is extremely rare for the 'hawks' to hold such a prominent position and have such great influence in the society as they do in the Bush authorities." [106] It is the neoconservatives who are credited with America's increasing "reliance on military force and the adoption of preemptive tactics." Naturally, therefore "the neoconservatives and their thinking which dominate the Bush authorities' strategic readjustment" evoke particular concern. [107]

Chinese scholars are in agreement that the influence neoconservatives have exercised on America's China

policy is considerable. Ruan Zongze, a scholar who participated in the 2003 Contemporary International Relations Expert Forum on "Assessment of U.S. Global Strategy," noted that "the rise of neoconservatism is an important factor shaping U.S. domestic and foreign policies."[108] Wang Jisi, one of the most influential Chinese America scholars, given his tenure as Director of American Studies at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, concluded that "conservative forces represented by Republican hardliners are at the apex of their power."[109] Zhang Liping, who conducted a thorough study of the ideological influences that shape U.S. China policy, described neoconservatives as "nationalists and ideologists, convinced that the U.S. values of liberty and democracy are the best in the world." Their emphasis on ideology makes them "anti-China, anticommunist," a position that Zhang believes puts the United States and China on an inevitable collision course.[110]

Neoconservatives also are considered threatening by China's influential elite because of the perceived influence they have exercised in the Defense Department. This is where Chinese scholars find the highest concentration of "Cold War thinking"—the containment philosophy that is the "trademark of American hawks" and a hallmark of neoconservative thought.[111] We should note, of course, that with the U.S. November 2006 election returns and the resignations of Rumsfeld, Doug Feith, and Paul Wolfowitz from the Pentagon's top echelon, the neocon influence may be waning. The reports published by the Defense Department on China's military strength, which the elite believe exaggerates Chinese military power and the threat it poses to the United States, and the Nuclear Posture Review, which they see as lowering the threshold for

tactical nuclear use, are indications to the Chinese of the extent to which the hardline, neocon influence has pervaded the Pentagon in the past.

The potential for further neoconservative influence—and hence more anti-China policies—has been reduced by the Republican Party's loss of control of both the House of Representatives and the Senate in the November 2006 elections, but a Republican administration remains. Wang Jisi perceived the broader effects of Republican control: "The influence of monopoly consortium corporations on economic policy, the influence of military industry interest groups on national defense policy, the influence of the right wing on ideology and political life, and the influence of so-called 'neocon' hardliners on policy."[112] All of these factors are problematic for improved U.S.-China relations.

From a Chinese perspective, big corporations can adversely affect the U.S. economic policy toward China, for instance, in promoting protectionist policies that do not allow Chinese products to compete or pushing currency revaluation onto the agenda. The military-industrial complex, in pursuing profit and budget allocations, also can negatively impact U.S.-China relations. Defense contractors and the military services stand to gain a greater share of the Defense Department's budget if China is considered a strategic rival. PLA Major General Peng Guangqian noted in an interview in July 2005 that "exaggerating China's military power and regarding China as a strategic opponent can stimulate the research and development of U.S. military industrial enterprises and win high-profit orders for U.S. military industrial enterprises."[113] The military complex also has a profit interest in selling arms and military technology to Taiwan—putting a

long-term strain on the U.S.-China relationship.[114] The ideological, human rights, democracy-promoting forces in U.S. politics also can create friction between the United States and China by forcing China's nondemocratic practices onto the agenda. Interest groups such as "AFL-CIO, human rights interest groups, right-wing Christians . . . latch onto certain problems in Sino-U.S. relations to create some noise."[115] So the greater the impact that the corporate, military, and human rights interest groups have on U.S. policymaking, the more threatened China feels.

Unpredictability: The Threat of the American Political Cycle. Chinese news media and scholars appreciate the ebb and flow of U.S. politics and find that, in the long term, American politics has a tendency to moderate itself. But the short-term political cycle often is destabilizing: "It often happens that when government power in the United States passes from one party to another, there is quite a long period of instability in Sino-U.S. relations."[116] The influential elite correlate this instability with the cyclical nature of American politics. Zhang Liping, a U.S. expert at the China Academy of Social Sciences, believes that the ups and downs of Sino-U.S. relations track the cycle of presidential power shifts. She described the cycle this way:

> Because of the cycle of electoral politics, when a new president comes to power, he always inclines to show differences of policy, distinguished from the former president. This is done out of the purpose of keeping the promises made in the campaign and rewarding the supporters and consolidating his political base. It is done also for the sake of clarifying his political ideas. Generally speaking, the first year can be termed the "intern year," particularly for a new president who lacks in the diplomatic experience and cannot understand the

> complex[ity] of Sino-U.S. relations . . . The second and third years can be called "the window of opportunity" to improve the relations between China and the US. During the period, the new president feels at home in the White House and has accumulated some sense through the summits. Now that his appointees have filled the positions, he has access to information necessary to decisionmaking. He then has a leeway power in handling foreign policy. In the 4th year of the term, the president has become "lame duck," and he has fewer resources to take the risky and aggressive maneuver. The president who wants to campaign for reelection sometimes makes "irrational" policy. As the head of the political party, he must defend his policy and try to leave nothing wrong for the challenging party to blame.[117]

Dr. Zhang's concern is that "the window of opportunity to make sound U.S.-China policy does not open wide frequently."[118] In an interview, Dr. Zhang admitted that the reelection of George W. Bush in 2004 was better for Sino-U.S. relations than the election of John Kerry would have been. Bush's reelection eliminated the destabilizing effects of the "intern year" and opened wider the window of opportunity.[119]

This perspective on American presidential politics is interesting. While few Americans would consider China a major political issue and would hardly cast a vote dependent solely on a candidate's China policy, Chinese scholars examine candidate rhetoric regarding China carefully and conclude that anti-China rhetoric often is "a trick used by politicians of the two major parties to win votes" in the run-up to a presidential election.[120]

In the long run, however, the Chinese elite find that the political cycle allows for stabilization of U.S.-China relations and a move toward the middle, away from extremes on either end of the political spectrum: "The United States is a country with a fairly strong capability

to regulate itself."[121] In keeping with their dialectical approach to analysis, after sounding the alarm about neoconservatives and the political cycle, the Chinese influential elite also recognize the limitations on these factors. For example, Ruan Zongze noted that "despite the sound and fury of neoconservatism, already there are signs it is overextended."[122] Tao Wenzhao, a U.S. expert at China's Academy of Social Sciences, wrote an article in a Hong Kong paper chronicling the "downhill" trend of neoconservatism of late. But he ended by warning that such political thinking still has influence; thus "we must keep our vigilance."[123] While Zhang Liping noted how threatening neoconservative thought was toward China, she also concluded that "neoconservatism is too extreme, too belligerent, and too inoperable in international political practice. . . . Thus, Bush's policy will continue to curb its influence."[124] Zhang believes the liberalists, who tend to promote engagement with China, and the realists, who tend to promote containment toward China, will continue to balance U.S. policy toward her country.

American public opinion also is seen by Chinese as a force for moderation in the long run, but something that can be unpredictable and manipulated in the short run. Several Chinese authors concluded that it was the fear generated in the public by the September 11, 2001 (9-11), terrorist attacks that allowed neoconservatives greater latitude in the administration and the opportunity to pursue policies of preemption and military force. Shi Yinhong, a prominent Chinese thinker, remarked that, in light of the nationwide security panic triggered by the terrorist attacks . . . the American public have so far given near 'carte blanche' support to an administration that . . . embraces an 'offense-minded' . . . concept of international politics

as well as strong nationalist, unilateralist, and even militaristic sentiments."[125] Jin Canrong, professor at China's People's University, observed both the long-term moderating effects of public opinion and how it can shift in the short-term, depending on events: "As a pluralist society, it is relatively difficult to get the (U.S.) public facing outward and to rally the whole country . . . the neoconservatives can succeed for a time in using people's fear of terrorism to write preemptive strike into U.S. global strategy, but in the end this will be in contradiction to the long-standing U.S. tradition of having the enemy strike first."[126]

The consensus among Chinese thinkers and most news media is that while neoconservative, hardline forces that advocate containment of China do yield influence in American politics, the moderating forces of liberals, realists, and public opinion temper this influence. They recognize that with "the variety of political power centers in the United States, the government's stance is always greatly constrained by other forces in society," and there is "a very big difference between the strategy sought by the government and the strategy actually carried out."[127] But they also recognize that if the party in power, public opinion, and the political cycle all tend toward an anti-China, pro-democracy, pro-human rights, preemptive, containment philosophy, the threat to China's economic modernization and peaceful development during its time of strategic opportunity could be significant.

Concluding Thought: Knowing Your Enemy.

Sun Tzu's most famous pearl of wisdom is: "Know the enemy and know yourself; in a hundred battles you will never be in peril."[128] If the Chinese take this to be

true today—and the countless journal articles paying tribute to the revered ancient strategist indicate that they do—their knowledge of the United States is an indication that it is a threat. In contrast to Americans' limited knowledge of Chinese history, culture, and political decisionmaking, China's influential elite demonstrate a comprehensive, in-depth, and carefully considered understanding of these aspects of America. Of course, our limited knowledge of China is not our fault alone. Chinese opacity and secrecy about their political system and their limited freedom of the press make understanding them much more difficult.

Chinese understanding of the United States has not always been so thorough, either. The sophistication of their understanding has emerged only in the last decade or so, likely an outcome of burgeoning cultural exchanges and a significant population of Chinese scholars studying in the United States. An excellent example demonstrating this knowledge of the United States is an article written by Colonel Ren Ziangqun, a researcher at the Military Science College. His article, "The Influence of Mainstream Cultural Traditions on U.S. War Decisions," explored American Puritanism, pragmatism, and social Darwinism, demonstrating a nuanced and studied understanding of the role of religion, enterprise, and individuality in American culture that could be gained only through spending time in the country and attempting to understand the world through our eyes (which, as a reminder, is what we are trying to do here with respect to China).[129]

The attention to American policy statements and maneuverings evident in the previous section and the understanding of political realities and the span of the political spectrum further exemplify the understanding that the influential elite have of the United States.

The United States is a factor in all of China's security considerations—be it regarding Taiwan, Japan, or issues of proliferation or terrorism. Because the "American factor" is so pervasive, it makes sense to pay close attention to it.[130] But the fact that China's influential elite "knows" the United States, especially compared to Japan or India, both of which also pose a threat (and will be examined in turn), is an important indicator of where the United States ranks in China's national security concerns.

While the United States technically falls into the "traditional" threat category, its military force is not what is perceived as most threatening to China's national security. To be sure, America's overwhelming military power is feared by China, and much of its military modernization is intended to deter the United States from bringing its military power to bear. But China's influential elite are less concerned about a direct military confrontation threatening China's sovereignty than they are concerned about the possibility of containment. Moreover, the threat of containment is less of a military threat and more of a diplomatic, political, and economic one. America's perceived desire for a U.S.-centric world order threatens the relatively stable international environment in which China has been allowed to flourish. It also puts China's growing stature and influence on the international stage at risk. In effect, this is the threat of diplomatic containment. But most worrisome is economic containment—impeding or reversing China's foremost strategic goal of continued growth and development. The only way for China to mitigate this threat of containment is by debunking the China threat theory through improved Sino-U.S. engagement. The American political arena makes this difficult, though. Its short-term, unpredictable,

and cyclic nature makes it hard to devise a coherent, long-term China strategy, while the power it affords neoconservatives makes American opinion susceptible to the threat theory. Thus, American domestic political dynamics, international diplomatic influence, and overall economic might all work toward containment of China, imperiling its economic and social development. It is no wonder that China's influential elite "know" American politics, culture, business, and international relations so well. For this is from where the American threat emanates.

II. THE THREAT FROM JAPAN

While much scholarly study in China has produced a nuanced understanding of and appreciation for the American political system, the same cannot be said of the Chinese influential elite's consideration of Japan. Their perceptions of Japan are colored by a strong and deep-rooted emotional loathing and an unwillingness to forget historical wrongdoings. Chinese perceptions of Japan are formed almost exclusively by the news media, according to opinion polls. Thus the influential elite are indeed influential. But the opinions of the influential elite are far less monolithic when it comes to Japan. Think tankers and academics have tried to pursue "new thinking" about Japan, proposing new ideas to strengthen the relationship and get past historical issues. But the newspapers, bloggers, and Chinese public reacted vehemently to such new thinking, seriously criticizing the ideas and the authors who proposed them. As a result, the public's vitriolic attitude toward Japan and the Chinese newspapers' encouragement of such emotionality have hamstrung the government's ability to pursue rapprochement with

Japan. Thus, it is interesting that the threat Japan poses to China may have as much to do with China itself as it does with Japan. While China's public and news media propaganda will cite rising militarism, nationalism, and an inability to learn from history as the threat that Japan poses, this author believes the biggest threat to China is its own inability to manage the public's outrage over Japan. This inability could have several adverse consequences: a cooling in the economic relationship as the public boycotts Japanese goods and Japan refuses further cooperation; an inability by the government to craft the policy toward Japan that they want and the public will support, limiting the Party's legitimacy and power; and a possibility for Chinese civil unrest. All of these scenarios jeopardize China's continued stability, development, and economic growth during their window of strategic opportunity. At the risk of exaggerating, this is the ultimate threat to China.

The threat to China is manifested in several ways. First, the threats of economic cooling and diminishing Party power are made possible by "old thinking" about Japan. This is the same paradigm the Chinese have hewed to since signing the Treaty of Peace and Friendship with Japan in 1978. Old thinking also limits the Party's ability to craft a new policy toward Japan that is more conducive to furthering economic ties. Second, excessive nationalism and the news media that inflame such nationalism make possible the potential loss of Party control over policy and civil unrest. There also is a traditional military threat from Japan's increasing military capabilities and expenditures. In addition to Japan's growing nationalism and political conservatism, the influential elite are concerned about Japan's increasing offensive capabilities and motivations. The U.S. factor plays into this traditional

threat, further complicating Sino-Japanese relations and the issue of Taiwan. Meanwhile, issues of legitimate dispute regarding the ownership of territory and potential resources in the East China Sea—issues that provide the greatest likelihood for military engagement—are not as threatening in the eyes of the influential elite as the threats to economic stability or Party control. The Chinese believe international law is on their side. Discussion of this issue, as well as that of the traditional military threat Japan poses, will follow an examination of the threat China poses to itself over Japan.

The History of Sino-Japanese Relations: It's Hardly History.

Before examining this internally generated threat, it is important to underscore just how emotional and nonobjective the feelings are that Chinese harbor toward Japan. To most Chinese, the 20th-century atrocities suffered at the hands of the Japanese may as well have occurred last year. A public opinion poll, conducted by *China Daily*, a Japanese think tank, and Peking University, from May to August 2005, found that the first thing coming to Chinese minds when asked about Japan is the 1937 Nanjing Massacre.[131] (The second thing is electric appliances.) There is a strong resentment toward the Japanese and a belief that they have not sufficiently atoned for their sins against China (or Korea) during their campaigns of expansion, occupation, and plunder that began in the late 1800s and continued until the end of World War II. The rape, murder, theft, and arson suffered by countless thousands of Chinese civilians in Nanjing came to symbolize Japanese aggression and ruthlessness

toward the Chinese. Thus, anything that reminds the Chinese of this history is akin to pouring salt on an open wound. Repeated Japanese presidential visits to the Yasukuni Shrine, where convicted World War II war criminals are enshrined (along with millions of other war dead), are a reminder not only of the past atrocities committed, but affirm the perception that the Japanese are not sufficiently sorry for them. Further, this lack of penitence serves to fuel Chinese fears that the Japanese will commit the same mistakes again as they allow rising nationalism and militarism to seep back into their "fundamentally ruthless" and "bloodthirsty" strategic culture.[132]

This fixation on history has prevented Sino-Japanese relations from maturing beyond the Treaty of Peace and Friendship agreed to in 1978. The squabbles—over shrine visits, history textbooks, territory in the East China Sea, the extent to which Japan can and should expand its military capabilities—are the same issues they were disputing 20 years ago. While the economies of the two have increasingly grown interdependent, the attitudes and people-to-people affinity for one another have not kept pace. As most Chinese influential elite characterize this dichotomy, their relationship is one of "economic warmth" and "political coldness."

Because of the perception by the Chinese that the Japanese have wronged them so severely in the past and then failed to acknowledge that fact and apologize sufficiently, there is an overriding belief that the responsibility for the troubled relationship rests solely with the Japanese. (It is worth noting, however, that much of the reason for the ongoing hatred is a result of China's "patriotic education.") As Deng Xiaoping said to Japanese cabinet officials in 1987, "Frankly speaking, the responsibility was never China's. Not one of the past and present troubles was caused by China."[133]

This attitude permeates scholarly and news media publications as well as public opinion to this day.

Such an attitude—that it is all Japan's fault—is combined with a longtime perception of inequality. Through China's lens of comparative power, there has always been a superior/inferior dynamic between China and Japan such that the countries have never perceived themselves as equals. Japan once revered China for its sophisticated culture and attempted to emulate its neighbor. China perceived itself as a bigger, stronger, more advanced country—until they were defeated soundly by the Japanese in the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-95. Despite China's larger and better equipped forces, the army and navy were routed by a more mobile and better trained Japanese force.[134] China thus looked to its conqueror as an example of the economic and political modernizations it needed to make.

But beyond the early years of the 1900s, the 20th century continued to be full of conflict and confrontation. The Chinese were often the losers, as Japan (following the lead of the other imperialist nations—Russia, France, Britain, and the United States) invaded, plundered, and "carved up" China. But in 1945, Japan finally experienced defeat (although not at the hands of the Chinese in Japan's eyes). Japan then allied with U.S. forces who fought Chinese "volunteers" in the Korean War. It was not until the 1970s that the two countries would try to get beyond this win-or-lose cycle and explore a more cooperative approach. They still were not equals, however, because Japan's rapid modernization and economic growth ranked them second only to the United States in China's calculus of comprehensive national power.

But today, for the first time in their tumultuous history, China's economic might is rivaling Japan's,

while Japan is striving for political and military power commensurate with its economic power. The two countries are more equal than they have ever been. It is an awkward, emotional, and distrustful relationship. The possibility of having to approach each other as peer-to-peer instead of student-to-teacher or victor-to-vanquished makes the relationship all the more complicated. China thus forms its perceptions of the Japanese threat from the vantage of unresolved historical animosity and a strategic balance that is equalizing steadily.

The Threat of Old Thinking.

In 2003, a rare debate erupted in China about national policy toward Japan. It began with a series of articles that were more provocative than usual. These articles were likely prompted, or at the very least approved, by the new administration of Hu Jintao, who seemed inclined to take a softer line toward Japan than his predecessor. The "new thinking" on Japan suggested getting past history, taking some responsibility for improving the relationship, and accepting Japan as a "normal" country (meaning one that has political and military power comparable to its economic power). This new thinking was met with harsh resistance and a series of unfortunate events made the implementation of this new thinking very difficult.

No member of the Chinese influential elite has written of any sort of threat posed by "old thinking" per se. Chinese writers do not admit that the "new thinking" was prompted by China's leadership itself, or that they agreed with it (although sources in the Japanese press, as well as members of the influential elite interviewed in Shanghai, did aver that the Chinese

leadership was responsible for it).[135] But by exploring the "new thinking" debate, the events that transpired after the new thinking was proposed, and the resulting Japan policy that was announced, we can gain a clearer view of how old thinking constitutes a threat.

In December 2002, just weeks after President Hu Jintao assumed power, Ma Licheng of *Renmin Ribao's* (*People's Daily*) Commentary Department published an article in *Zhanyue yu Guanli* (*Strategy and Management*) entitled "New Thoughts for China-Japan Relations—Worrisome Problems Among Chinese and Japanese People." It was an unusual article in that it was a personal account of his travels in Japan. His message also was atypical, both in its candor and the not-too-subtle blame it placed on the Chinese for the problems in the relationship. Ma wanted to give his audience an accurate portrayal of Japan, going so far as to claim: "To be honest, Japan is the pride of Asia."[136] He countered the "irresponsible sensationalism" that led the Chinese to believe that Japan is collapsing economically, refuted hyped military capabilities and intentions, and dismissed the perception of a rising Japanese militarism. Taking an honest look at his own country, he then noted "huge, thorny problems at home" such as corruption, income disparities, and a deteriorating environment. He scolded his fellow countrymen for confusing patriotism with ignorance and allowing nationalism to seep into foreign relations: "While we need to boost people's morale by publicizing the successes we have achieved in reforms and opening up, overdoing it is a sickness. . . ."[137] Ma concluded as follows:

> We must look forward. Building an efficient economic and market system is the new arena for wrestling. China and Japan are the pivots of Asia, and the two peoples should reflect on their nationalistic feelings, overcome

> their narrow-mindedness, and move ahead toward integration, expediting the formation of the China-ASEAN free trade zone, and concluding the China-Japan-South Korea free trade agreement. These are our responsibilities, the Asian people's aspirations, and the trend of development.[138]

The reaction to Ma's article was, in his words, "unbelievable."[139] The Chinese online community launched fierce attacks against him on the internet. He received "piles of letters, faxed messages, and emails" filled with "sharp-tongued threats like 'I will kill you' and 'I'll dig up your ancestors' grave.'"[140]

Despite the angry public response to Ma's argument, a series of scholars followed him into the debate. Shi Yinhong, a professor at Chinese People's University, published an article in March 2003 in the same journal. Entitled "Sino-Japanese Rapprochement and 'Diplomatic Revolution,'" Shi also argued that the Chinese should recognize their contribution to the beleaguered and worsening state of relations, putting forward rather dramatic proposals for Chinese actions that could lead to a diplomatic revolution and rapprochement. He proposed that (1) China take historical problems off the diplomatic agenda and quiet the corresponding propaganda; (2) strive for a big increase in Japanese imports and investment in China, perhaps to the detriment of U.S. and European trade and investment (and, along with this, show gratitude for the economic aid Japan already has provided); (3) be "inwardly vigilant" and outwardly magnanimous about Japan's military modernization; (4) welcome Japan as a great power; and (5) actively support Japan's UN Security Council membership application.[141]

Shi admitted that he made these proposals not as a Japan-watcher and not for the sake of good relations

in and of themselves. Instead, he saw it as a strategy that would allow China to focus on those policies that require greater attention: the situation with Taiwan and relations with the United States. As he told a Japanese journalist, "China is in a hostile relationship with the United States and Taiwan, and [relations with] India also hold the possibility of being hostile, so they don't have the ability to be hostile with Japan."[142]

Throughout the summer of 2003, other members of the influential elite entered the fray to debate how far China should go to improve Sino-Japanese relations.[143] However, the relationship continued to deteriorate. In 2005, coined the "year of many matters" in Sino-Japanese relations, Japan named China as a threat in its *National Defense Program Guidelines* for the first time.[144] Japan announced that it would stop extending new loans to China in 2008, ending 25 years of economic assistance.[145] Military activity, economic plans, and oil and gas exploration continued in the East China Sea, and no agreements were reached. The Japanese (again) approved history textbooks lacking sufficient accuracy regarding their role in World War II, according to the Chinese. Anti-Japan riots occurred across China, protesting a lost soccer game and Japan's bid for a seat on the UN Security Council. An incident involving left-over chemical weapons occurred (again) and Japanese President Koizumi (again) visited the Yasukuni Shrine, prompting sharp recriminations from China and a cancellation of bilateral talks (again).

While none of these events were new in themselves—this could just as likely have been 1985, with textbook disputes, shrine visits, boundary-testing in the East China Sea, and failed attempts at diplomacy—the frequency and intensity of these incidents in 2005 was noteworthy. The Chinese public's opinion about them,

the news media's selective coverage of the events, and the government's effort to control both public opinion and the news media demonstrate just how threatening old thinking is to the Communist Party.

Public Opinion and the News Media: Threat of "Excessive Nationalism."[146]

According to a poll conducted by *China Daily's* weekly youth newspaper, 80 percent of young people have never met anyone from Japan, and more than 60 percent said they formed their opinions about Japan through the press, TV, and the internet. It is understandable, then, why more than half of the respondents said they hated or disliked that country.[147] The news media's influence on public opinion may also be a reason why 90 percent of the Chinese blame Japan for their strained relationship in another poll,[148] why 64 percent said they disliked Japan in yet another poll, and why nearly the same percentage did not know about Japan's development assistance to China totaling 3.3 trillion yen.[149] Even when polled on specific issues the news media covers closely, the results were similarly striking. For instance, *Xinhua*, the PRC's official news agency, reported that 96 percent of those surveyed felt that the new Japanese history textbook "severely hurt the Chinese people's feelings."[150] Likewise, a similarly overwhelming majority, 91 percent, were opposed to Koizumi's shrine visits, according to a poll conducted jointly by a Japanese and South Korean newspaper and the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences.[151]

The bias in Chinese reporting goes beyond editorial decisions. The headlines alone demonstrate the blame accorded to Japan. In announcing the release of Japan's Defense White Paper, *Xinhua* used the headline,

"Japan's Official Paper Groundless in Exaggerating 'China Threat,'"[152] and *Ta Kung Pao's* shouted "Japan's Defense White Paper Will Further Worsen Sino-Japanese Relations."[153] While these articles are just reporting the news, the editorial headlines are even more slanted. After President Koizumi's fourth Yasukuni shrine visit in October 2005, *Xinhua* published a commentary titled "Koizumi Cannot Escape Historical Guilt," while *Renmin Ribao's* commentary was titled "Challenge to Human Conscience and International Justice."[154]

The internet is an even more outspoken source of Japanese criticism in China. A very vocal population of Chinese bloggers has devoted itself to spreading an anti-Japanese message. In 2003, seven websites launched a campaign to collect one million signatures (a goal reached in short order) expressing dissatisfaction with a Japanese response regarding the disposition of residual chemical weapons. An online petition launched in March 2005 on *Sina.com* opposing Japan's bid for a Security Council seat collected more than four million signatures in under a week.[155] There also is a more malign online community of Chinese hackers that prides itself on its violation and defacement of Japanese government and business websites, usually in retaliation for events such as shrine visits or East China Sea disputes.[156]

Both the Japanese and Chinese governments recognize that these strong and negative opinions, largely informed and inflamed by the news media, seriously impede mutual efforts to improve relations. This recognition was the reason behind the recent inauguration of an annual Beijing-Tokyo Forum on Japan-China relations that is scheduled to continue for 10 years. At the first meeting of this forum in August 2005, the editor-in-chief of the *China Daily* admitted

that, given the public's dependence on the news media for their opinions, news media organizations could and should do more to promote good relations.[157]

The Asian Cup Soccer Games which China hosted in 2004 put on public display several themes related to this discussion. Some Chinese soccer fans engaged in unsportsmanlike conduct at the outset of the tournament, booing and jeering the Japanese team during their national anthem.[158] But such behavior had been anticipated by the Chinese government, which attempted to preempt it through a large-scale publicity campaign in which it urged fans to have confidence in the Chinese government, view the match in a "civilized manner," and leave politics out of it.[159] Despite the government's efforts, however, after Japan defeated China in the finals, a demonstration erupted, and a car carrying Japanese diplomats was overturned.

While the Japanese press covered these events, including pictures and editorials, in all major news outlets, the Chinese public was privy to little or no reporting on the incident. Telephone interviews conducted by a Japanese newspaper found that most Chinese remained unaware of the uproar.[160] China's Foreign Ministry spokesman only had this to say in response to a question about the attack on the Japanese envoy: "It is obvious to all that China made enormous efforts to ensure that the Asian Cup soccer tournament would be held smoothly and successfully. We did not like to witness some individuals' extreme behavior."[161] This remark was reported without further explanation.

The most significant and yet underreported events were the large anti-Japanese demonstrations that spread throughout several major cities in April 2005, about a year later. They were not covered because the

Central Government prohibited it, due to the threat to stability and the economy that the protests posed. Earlier, in late March, online activists had launched a signature drive opposing Japan's bid for a seat on the UN Security Council. The news media fueled the flames by publishing reports on the success of this drive, as well as commentaries questioning Japan's qualifications for UN Security Council membership.[162] The well-respected Hong Kong newspaper, *Ming Pao*, reported on April 5 that a spate of spontaneous anti-Japanese activities occurred in a number of cities, prompting the Central Government to ask Party and local officials to "properly guide the patriotic fervor of the masses." Unnamed sources admitted that Beijing authorities were "deeply concerned and nervous" about the heightened anti-Japanese sentiment and were worried that the public "might spin out of control and give rise to other social problems." *Ming Pao* also reported that the news media received notice from the Central Propaganda Department to tone down reporting on the signature drives and to halt all reporting on other protest activities, specifically their threat to boycott Japanese goods.[163]

Despite the government's efforts to temper unrest, a 20,000-person demonstration organized over the internet erupted in Tiananmen Square on April 9. This was the biggest protest in China since the infamous student demonstration at the same location in 1989. The following day, a similar number of people participated in protests in Guangzhou and Shenzen. In accordance with the government's order, none of the mainland newspapers, television stations, or news websites covered these events.

These protests were mentioned regularly in the weeks following, however, serving as the backdrop

and reason for a full-fledged propaganda campaign. As reported in *Xinhua* on April 19: "In order to help the cadres and masses to get to know the international situation and the history and current state of Sino-Japanese relations and China's policy toward Japan, and correctly understand and support the central authorities' decisionmaking and arrangements," 3,500 party, government, and army officials were called to a meeting held by the Central Propaganda Department. Foreign Minister Li Zhaoxing addressed the crowd, cajoling it as follows:

> China is now in an important period of comprehensively building a well-off society and we must fully understand the importance of properly handling Sino-Japanese relations from the overall and strategic plane. We must believe that the party and government are completely capable of proceeding from the nation's fundamental interests in properly handling the various problems we face in relations with Japan. We must correctly understand the situation in the world today, get an accurate grasp of our basic national condition, resolutely implement the central authorities' series of important decisions and arrangements, consciously preserve the political situation of stability and unity, strengthen our concept of the legal system, and express our feelings in calm, rational, legal, and orderly fashion; we should not take part in processions and other activities that have not been approved, and do nothing to affect social stability. We must cherish and make good use of the period of rare historic opportunity, climb high and see far while also keeping our feet firmly on the ground, convert patriotic fervor into practical action in doing a good job at our work posts and in assiduous study, and contribute our effort to the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation.[164]

"Explanation and publicity teams" organized by the Propaganda Department then were sent to universities in Tianjin, Shanghai, and Guangzhou where protests

had occurred to provide the same educational lecture to students there. Concurrently, the Ministry of Public Security reminded citizens of the laws regarding demonstrations, the need for permission from public security departments, and the illegality of organizing such events over the internet or cell phones without prior approval.

A number of press commentaries and editorials echoed the message put forth by Li: stability is of utmost importance to a harmonious society and "cool judgment" and rationality are needed when expressing "righteous anger."[165] Boycotting Japanese products was discouraged frequently, reminding Chinese that such an act would "run counter to the masses' good aspirations" and seriously hurt their own economy and their goal of peaceful development during this time of strategic opportunity. [166]

This all-out offensive to quell anti-Japanese sentiment and the instability that "excessive nationalism" provoked, demonstrated the threat perceived by the Central Government.[167] As new thinker Shi Yinhong admitted in an interview with a Hong Kong journalist on the second day of protests, the Central Government would not allow such protests to go on for too long: "Some government officials may think this can be used as leverage against Japan but at the same time, it can restrict the government."[168] It is such restriction that the government fears.

China's Japan Policy: "New Thinking" Tempered by Public Opinion.

In the same month that the widespread anti-Japanese protests occurred—April 2005—as Sino-Japanese relations spiraled downward, worsened by

the news media's strong anti-Japanese slant and the public's vehemence, Beijing announced its first official policy toward Japan. Hu Jintao outlined his five-point proposal to develop and strengthen Sino-Japanese relations in a press conference following a meeting with President Koizumi in Indonesia. His five points were (1) strictly adhere to the three standing political documents (the Sino-Japanese Joint Statement, Treaty of Peace and Friendship, and Joint Declaration), (2) "persist in making history the mirror and looking forward to the future," (3) correctly handle the Taiwan issue, (4) properly handle differences between China and Japan by continuing dialogue and negotiations on an equal footing, and (5) further expand exchange and cooperation.[169]

The influences of both new thinking and public opinion are evident in these five points. History was not disregarded, despite the new thinkers' suggestion to do so. But it does temper the issue of history by using it to look forward to the future—a message likely directed at the Chinese public more than Japan. The five points also reflect the widely held assumption that the burden was on Japan to make amends—the only party with the potential to *in*correctly handle the Taiwan issue. This nod also was a blow to the new thinking that suggested China should start taking greater responsibility for the relationship's woes. But the emphasis on dialogue and cooperation did require that China act to advance the relationship as well. And dialogue and cooperation were certainly not the will of the people who were demonstrating even as this policy was pronounced. Points 4 and 5 demonstrate that the Central Government agreed with what all of the influential elite had concluded during their debate over China's Japan policy: worsening Sino-Japanese

relations would impact their economy negatively and impede China's economic transition and social reforms during its time of strategic opportunity. The policy was a reflection of new thinking, public opinion, Central Party objectives, and the complexity of the bilateral relationship. It was Beijing's attempt to diffuse the threat to its economy, to social stability, and to security posed not by Japan so much as by its own public and news media and their attachment to stagnant old thinking.

It is interesting to note that just two days prior to the new policy pronouncement, the most outspoken new thinker, Shi Yinhong, published an article entitled "The Immediate and Remote Causes of Deterioration in Sino-Japanese Relations." In it, he justified his own—and, in turn, the government's—movement away from "new thinking" toward a more hardline policy. The shift, he argued, came from the public's position, (informed by extensive news media coverage of Japan) which has "the right to shape" China's policy:

> Beginning roughly from the end of 2002 till recently, Chinese leaders headed by Hu Jintao, out of good will and consideration for the overall situation, took the initiative on several occasions to make gestures to Japan to ease tension and improve relations. However, the Japanese Government not only on the whole failed to counter with substantive (or even posturing) active responses, but also repeatedly adopted unilateral actions on disputed issues and even unprecedentedly butted against China's bottom line toward Japan over the particularly sensitive Taiwan issue, coupling it with the prime minister's repeatedly paying homage to the Yasukuni Shrine. Consequently, the Chinese Government's deep indignation and switch to an unprecedentedly hardline policy are understandable. *In recent months, the Chinese news media have given frequent, concentrated, and prominent coverage to negative reports and commentaries on Japan and its conduct toward China. In this way, "the right to shape"*

> *China's position toward Japan has partly been shifted to the people,* which objectively contributed to the anti-Japan marches in many Chinese cities.[170] (italics added)

Professor Shi, who had launched the debate about China's relationship with Japan, introduced innovative "new thinking," and actively promoted rapprochement just 3 years earlier, returned to old thinking. He did so due to a series of unfortunate events that impeded the possibility for warmer relations and because of the vocal and even vehement opinions of the news media and the public. His outlook, once optimistic, turned gloomy: "The increasing deterioration in Sino-Japanese relations, if unchecked, definitely will put the two countries' respective fundamental interests at risk and endanger stability and security in East Asia."[171]

The Traditional Military Threat.

While the threat ignited by anti-Japanese sentiment is significant, the threat posed by Japan's growing military capability and seeming willingness to use it should not be overlooked. In the words of Li Xiushi of the School of World Economy and Politics at the Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences: "Japan's military strategy and the U.S.-Japan alliance are currently forming a new challenge and strategic threat to China."[172] These two factors—Japan's changing military strategy and its alliance with the United States—often are seen as intertwined. One Chinese journalist noted that the Japanese military has become the combat force with the greatest degree of modernization in Asia, the development of which is "inseparably linked with its ample financial resources and ambitions, and it also is inseparable from the international support and encouragement from the United States."[173] As

Professor Wu Xinbo put it, from a Chinese perspective, the "silver lining" in the U.S.-Japan alliance has come to an end. In the past, the United States constrained Japan's rearmament; now, it is driving it.[174] Li Xiushi tracked the "continual upgrades" to the U.S.-Japan alliance and how Japan's military strategy and buildup progressively have become more evident.[175] Li argued that the alliance shifted from suppressing internal disorder in Japan in the 1950s to targeting the Soviet Union in the 1980s to controlling the Asia-Pacific region in the 1990s, when the treaty expanded to include joint action and involvement in Japan's periphery.[176] Further, Japan was no longer subordinate to the United States as they became equal partners in securing the Asia Pacific region. According to Michael Pillsbury, who had surveyed China's influential elite in the 1990s, there was at that time a consensus that the U.S.-Japan alliance was weakening as Japan's economic and technological gains were encroaching on and surpassing those of the United States.[177] This argument has disappeared from more recent writings, however, as the alliance strengthened in the wake of 9/11. After 9/11, Li contends that the two countries' integration of their military strategies expanded from "controlling the periphery" to a "comprehensive outward attack mode."[178] The consensus today among China's influential elite is that Japan has moved beyond voicing support for the United States and is becoming more actively involved in lending support to U.S. policy, especially in containing China:

> Figuratively speaking, Japan was the "concubine" in the U.S.-Japan alliance in the past. As such, it was basically at the beck and call of the United States and was totally dependent on the United States in security and defense matters. Today, its role has gradually been elevated to one of "lover" and its military independence

> and flexibility has been greatly strengthened. While shouldering more self-defense responsibilities, it also is enjoying substantially greater military freedom. As their military "integration" further deepens, Japanese and U.S. troops have virtually become two designations of a single armed service in Japan.[179]

The reason for this strained view is a series of changes in Japan's defense policies, all of which are seen as influenced by and serving the United States, and the expansion of the U.S.-Japanese alliance. Japan's Law on Special Antiterrorism Measures, involvement in the Proliferation Security Initiative, deployment to Iraq, and efforts to amend its constitution in favor of greater operational latitude by its military forces, all exemplify Japan's growing willingness and capability to project military power beyond its borders and to move beyond its strictly defensive posture. Further, Japan has involved itself in China and Taiwan affairs. Japan's *2005 Defense White Paper* publicly questioned China's military modernization and indicated that Japan would pay close attention to China's navy. And in the latest U.S.-Japan Security Statement, security in the Taiwan Strait is mentioned for the first time as a "common strategic objective." The troubling development of China's military power also is noted as a shared concern. The inclusion of Taiwan is the most disturbing aspect of the expanded U.S.-Japan alliance from the perspective of China, which already is concerned about U.S. intervention in this "internal" issue. Shi Yinhong, whose opinion toward Japan may have shifted most on this issue, termed the development "abominable," as Taiwan is far outside the bilateral affairs of Japan and the United States.[180]

In addition to Japan's more active, unrestricted military posture, China also sees Japan with resources,

a defense budget, and technological sophistication that surpass its own. One of China's indicators in calculating a country's comprehensive national power is "resources for national power," which is determined by quantifying a country's science and technology, human capital, and capital resources. Japan is ranked second in this category, behind the United States.[181] Japan's defense budget is 1.62 times the amount of China's, according to China's Foreign Ministry spokesman, even though Japan's forces protect a land area and population only 4 and 10 percent the size of China's, respectively.[182] This defense budget has allowed Japan to procure *Aegis* missile destroyers and collaborate with the United States in missile defense. An article in *Liaowang* noted that Japan,

> under the name of "Self Defense Forces," built land, sea, and air forces whose armaments have become more and more sophisticated, and Japan's military spending is second in the world. Japan has advanced rocket technology. Its H-2, M-5 satellites, and N-series rockets could be quickly converted into long-range missiles or cruise missiles. If Japan's M-5 rockets are turned into missiles, they can easily outperform the MX missiles of the United States, and they could reach the U.S. mainland, with a range between 12,000 and 16,000 km. Japan admits that it has the capability to develop nuclear weapons and that nuclear weapons can be produced in 7 days. In addition, the nuclear materials that Japan possesses are enough to produce 7,000 nuclear warheads. If these nuclear warheads are attached to missiles, they become nuclear weapons. Former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger pointed out long ago that "it will come as no surprise if Japan goes nuclear someday."[183]

This quotation demonstrates that beyond the conventional military threat posed by Japan, the possibility of Japan's nuclear armament also is a

serious concern to China's influential elite. In 2002, a Japanese Cabinet Secretary commented on the possibility of revising the three non-nuclear principles and the Peace Constitution so that Japan could pursue nuclear weapons. This prompted several Chinese journal articles about the Japanese capability to develop nuclear weapons rapidly. As Yang Yunzhong observed, Japan "possesses all conditions to develop nuclear weapons"—a capable cadre of scientists, plutonium for thousands of warheads, a powerful and sophisticated nuclear energy capacity, and a long-range delivery capability.[184] Yang further argued that the probability that Japan would pursue nuclear weapons was growing as efforts to amend its Constitution would remove legal obstacles, while Japanese public opinion was shifting toward tacit consent or even support for nuclear armament.

The only other barrier, American opposition, also was being removed as the Nuclear Posture Review "unequivocally points out that the United States will increase its nuclear military presence in the East Asia region." This changing American nuclear military strategy would serve to "loosen the United States nuclear shackles on Japan [that have existed] for half a century."[185] A front page *Renmin Wang* article in 2004 also concluded that Japan was "standing on the nuclear threshold."[186] Beyond the raw materials, Japan's technology, especially relating to the development of nuclear energy, is "world class." Its reactor capacity ranks third in the world, and it is leading the world in breeder reactor technology. The authors also noted that Japan possesses computer technology to simulate nuclear testing, eliminating the need to detonate a weapon.

The nuclear threat is not mentioned regularly along with the usual litany of concerns about Japan (rising

nationalism, failure to learn the lessons of history, repeated shrine visits), but the Chinese influential elite nonetheless recognize that the potential for a nuclear-armed Japan is a threat. Beyond the threat of a nuclear-armed Japan to national security, it also is considered a proliferation threat, making way for a possible nuclear domino effect in East Asia, with South Korea and Taiwan following suit.

Finally, it is interesting to note that Japan's military advancements, policy changes, and transformation to a "normal" country concern China for exactly the same reasons that China's military buildup is troubling to the United States. As a research fellow at the China Institute of International Studies (CIIS) lamented,

> the magnitude and nature of the changes in Japan's security policies and the level and degree of its military buildup will have a major impact on the regional security situation, and it is impossible for the countries in the region not to have doubts about where Japan's security policies are headed, while changes in political perceptions and the rise of nationalist feelings at home in Japan have exacerbated these concerns.[187]

The rapid transformation, changing regional power balance, and ambiguity of intentions all provide reason for concern by the Chinese; interestingly, they are the same concerns most often voiced by other countries with respect to China itself.

Japan's ambiguous intentions as perceived by China come from the rising conservative political faction in Japan. Combined with the military threat, a threat from political "neocons" emanates from Japan just as it does from the United States. Former President Koizumi's stubborn insistence on visits to the Yasukuni Shrine (despite the controversy it ignited in his own public and the fury it prompted in his neighbors)

effectively ground diplomatic exchanges to a halt until Shinzo Abe took office in 2006. Legislative efforts by Koizumi's Liberal Democratic Party have resulted in 21 major pieces of security-related legislation since 1992—nine in 2004 alone—legitimizing and legalizing the deployment of military forces abroad.[188] The party's efforts to revise Article 9 of the Peace Constitution is seen by China's influential elite as the last remaining obstacle to all-out, unrestrained Japanese military mobilization. This nationalist, conservative political force in Japan—characterized by an unwillingness to admit the wrongdoings of the past or learn from them, while aggressively reconstituting its military force—is the threat most felt by the influential elite.

The Real—But Not Perceived—
Threat in the East China Sea.

A threat not so frequently lamented is that of conflict over disputed territory in the East China Sea. Interviews with members of the influential elite in Shanghai demonstrated a certain confidence in China's ability to prevent military confrontation with Japan because they had been successful in deterring and preventing such an incident to date. Another reason this may not get too much attention may be the uneven news media coverage of events in this region. While Japanese actions perceived as hurtful and threatening receive abundant news media attention, Chinese actions that may be equally threatening to the Japanese do not. For instance, the intrusion of China's nuclear-powered submarine into Japanese waters near the Diaoyu Islands in late 2004 was not covered by the Chinese press.[189] An independent Hong Kong paper, along with the Japanese press, reported that the Chinese

expressed regret to the Japanese Foreign Minister and blamed the incident on a technical error; there was no such admission in the mainland press.[190] Chinese naval activity continued, however, with Japan's Maritime Self-Defense Forces reporting in July 2005 that 12 People's Republic of China (PRC) naval incursions into Japanese territory occurred since the beginning of the year. Chinese reconnaissance planes also repeatedly intruded into Japanese territory in the East China Sea. A Japanese television program reported that Japan's Self-Defense Forces scrambled their fighters to intercept Chinese aircraft 30 times between April and September 2005, double the number of such incidents in all of 2004.[191] The only mention of this in the Chinese news media: the Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman was quoted in the English version of *Xinhua* as saying that all Chinese activities in the East China Sea were in accordance with international law and conventions.[192]

While sensitive events often go unreported in mainland news media at the time of their occurrence, they are sometimes referenced in articles later, as if they are common knowledge. For example, nearly a year after the Chinese submarine was spotted in Japanese waters, a Chinese journalist made reference to the "so-called submarine invasion" as one of the events that President Koizumi had used to justify his hardline stance against China. Referring to it in this way, the journalist not only made the event seem like it was something everyone knew about, he also downplayed its significance.[193]

In contrast to the dearth of coverage on China's activities in the East China Sea, Japan's activities in the area receive plenty of attention. For example, the July 2005 decision to let a Japanese petroleum company explore parts of the area prompted two harsh editorials in the *China Daily*. Both editorials took very hard lines,

blaming Japan for the dispute while maintaining that China wanted to resolve the issues through consultation: "If a confrontation were to result, the blame would sit firmly with Japan."[194]

The frequency of military activity in this region should prompt concern on both sides about the real possibility of a misunderstanding or escalation leading to military engagement. And the issues—of who owns what, where the territorial lines are drawn, what can or cannot be claimed as territory—are very complicated. The fact that precious natural resources are (or at least are perceived to be) in dispute makes the stakes even higher. Yet China's influential elite do not convey significant concern over this possibility. Newspaper commentaries warn that the Chinese may be forced to act—but they do not fret over the consequences of conflict. Tian Zhongqing, director of the Asia-Pacific Office at the Shanghai Institute of International Studies, is one of the few scholars who worry that actions resulting from Japan's authorization for drilling may "sow the seed of real conflict between the two countries [and that] the possibility of an armed conflict cannot be ruled out."[195]

But Major General Yao Youzhi, head of Strategic Research at China's Academy of Military Sciences, said that Japan's authorization for drilling would not escalate to a military conflict. He takes a hard line on the issue but denies that military conflict will ensue—in the short term: "As long as the East China Sea issue is concerned, we will by no means tolerate Japan's behavior, neither will we give way to Japan's behavior. China will deal with the issue from the height of peace in East Asia and world peace, and will not bring the contradiction up to the level of military conflict in the short term."[196] This viewpoint overlooks the possibility

of Japan taking military action in response to Chinese actions in the disputed region. It also does not rule out military engagement in the long term. The real dispute over territory and resources in the East China Sea provides a venue for all of the other unresolved problems and emotion that taints the Sino-Japanese relationship to come into play. It is a threat that the Chinese and Japanese (and the rest of the region, along with the United States) should be concerned about—more so than they currently are—and should work aggressively to avert.

Conclusion: An Unresolved Past and Uncertain Future.

According to Jin Linbo, an expert with the China Research Institute, the ever-growing anti-Japanese sentiment in the Chinese public is putting serious pressure on the central authorities' foreign policy. Jin notes that "the 'new thought' on relations with Japan advocated by Shi Yinhong and other scholars enabled Chinese diplomats to achieve consensus among themselves on many issues." [197] However, Jin is careful to make a distinction between such diplomatic consensus and a very different consensus among the Chinese public. China's new Japan policy attempted to bridge this divide between the influential elite, who all agree that better Sino-Japanese relations are needed if economic "warmth" is to continue, and the public, which harbors historical resentment inconsistent with today's economic realities.

Despite the Chinese government's efforts to strengthen the relationship (in order to ensure continued economic development) and its efforts to quell anti-Japanese sentiment (in order to ensure

stability), neither is guaranteed. The threat to China's development, stability, and security posed by the Japan issue (if not Japan itself) is very real. Chinese policies for countering these threats are the same as the policies to counter the threat of American containment: increase mutual trust and maintain economic interdependence. Hu Jintao's declared Japan policy was an effort to do just that. (A deterrent military capability also is part of this strategy, but it seems there is very little in China's military strategy directly aimed at Japan. It is likely that the thinking is that if they can build capability to deter the United States, they can deal with Japan.) But it is hard to accomplish these goals of increased trust and economic cooperation with an unresolved history of animosity and an uncertain future of mutually mounting military capabilities and nationalism.

The threat from Japan is thus more of a traditional one than the threat posed by the United States. The likelihood that Japan and China could engage in military confrontation is considerable, given their mutual mistrust, proximity, and legitimate territorial disputes. Mutual military presences in the East China Sea and inadequate attention given to the possibility of conflict make it an all-too-likely venue for a military incident. Inadequate lines of communication and crisis management mechanisms make escalation a further concern. Public opinion and domestic politics in both countries also increase the possibility for military engagement and escalation.

But, interestingly, the threat Japan poses to China's economy and stability is more troubling to China's influential elite. If China's leadership is unable to temper or contain the public's anti-Japanese sentiment, Japanese investment could decrease significantly. Further, anti-Japanese protests and boycotts could

spiral out of control and ultimately target the Chinese government, especially if it is perceived as sympathetic to Japan due to new thinking and a softening policy position. Finally, there is a threat to the viability of the Party if it is unable to implement its Japan policy or persuade the public that the Party is acting in the nation's interest. China's territorial integrity, continued social and economic development, and a favored place in a peaceful international environment are all seen as endangered by Japan.

III. THE THREAT FROM INDIA

The year 2006 was the "Year of China-India Friendship." [198] The Chinese influential elite marked the occasion by reflecting positively on the history of the bilateral relationship and emphasizing the similarities of the two countries. Chinese and Indian leaders made regular exchanges and frequent declarations of the "good neighborliness, friendship, and mutually beneficial cooperation in which they are engaged."[199] But the history of the relationship is hardly so friendly, and the issues that historically prompted mutual suspicion remain unresolved. Further, competition for resources, market share, and international influence is intensifying between the two rising countries. The reason for the recent emphasis on cooperation is straightforward: If China and India do not cooperate, they compete. And competition makes China's preferred "win-win" situation untenable. As *Xinhua* declared after an Asian Conference in April 2006, "China, India Achieve Win-Win Through Co-op."[200] One of the conference's meetings even featured a session titled "India and China—Strength in Partnership."[201]

Beyond competition, there are other reasons China considers India a threat to its national security. The

warming U.S.-Indian relationship is perceived as an effort to contain China. China's territorial integrity and stability in its Western provinces also are at risk due to India. The Chinese elite see the ongoing India-Pakistan standoff as a regional "hot spot" that endangers China's peripheral security environment. There also is concern about the political and social instability of India, and the role India can play in destabilizing Tibet. Finally, India poses a conventional threat with its stronger navy, sophisticated arms acquisitions, and growing nuclear arsenal declaredly built in response to the China threat. A brief examination of India's threat to China as a competitor, destabilizing force, and military adversary will illuminate why China's elite so enthusiastically emphasize cooperation and friendship with India.

The Elephant vs. the Dragon.

Many members of the influential elite in China have written recently extolling the shared interests and similarities of China and India and their history of diplomacy and dialogue. "The friendly contacts between the two countries go back to ancient times," writes Zhang Chengming in the *International Strategic Studies* journal.[202] There was a degree of friendliness in the 1950s, when India was one of the first non-Communist countries to recognize the PRC, accepted China's occupation of Tibet, and invited China to attend the Bandung Conference. Their shared values were declared in 1954, when they signed the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence.[203] Their mutual respect for sovereignty, nonaggression, and noninterference remains relevant today. Chinese scholars invoke these principles as models that all countries should strive to

follow in their international relations. And in a recent joint statement, the countries agreed to establish a "China-India Strategic and Cooperative Partnership for Peace and Prosperity"—essentially a restatement of the 1954 agreement. The countries are similar in size, population, and age. But perhaps the most significant similarity is the two countries' simultaneous rise in economic power and international stature. Lan Jianxue with the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences reflected on all of these similarities:

> There are no two countries in the world that can be as similar to each other as India and China: India gained independence (1947) almost at the same time as the new China was founded (1949). The two countries have cultures that date equally far back, are equally self-respectful in national individuality, and have equally large populations and vast territories. At present, both basically are in the same development phase . . . .[204]

Despite these similarities and the countries' espousal of shared interests, there is a history of distrust, aggression, and animosity that lingers just below the surface. India's leadership only recently stopped referring to the 1962 Sino-Indian War as an act of aggression by China, and the resulting border dispute still is unresolved despite decades of negotiations. The 1998 Indian nuclear test was declared to be in response to the China threat, an accusation the Chinese still resent. And while the two countries' similarities are touted as a starting point for cooperation, the countries are not perceived as equals in China. Zhao Gancheng, the director of South Asia Studies at the Shanghai Institute for International Studies, examined the "simultaneous rising" of the two countries. He argued that because China "got on track" in developing its economy first and its progress is more remarkable,

India is targeting China as a competitor: "Compared with India, China started its reform much earlier, and what China has achieved seems also more outstanding, and hence a higher position and more important role in the world system."[205] They are not, then, equals. (Nor is the competition allowed as being China's fault, as discussed below.) Zhao further argued this point through an examination of foreign trade showing that the Indian economy has less impact on the world economy than China's.

In China's calculations of comprehensive national power, India's inferiority is demonstrated by its 10th place rank, behind China, which ranks itself as the world's 6th most powerful country.[206] This is due in part to India's perceived lack of diplomatic power compared to China's. The study noted that "India's diplomatic strength has none of the momentum it possessed in the 1960s and 70s, and its influence in the third world does not measure up to that of China. In terms of peripheral relations, India's foreign relations strategy lacks the spirit of sincere cooperation. . . . India's overall diplomatic strengths are thus lacking."[207]

Besides not being equals, the two countries also are not on warm terms. Despite the friendship rhetoric, the two cultures have very little influence on one another, and they conduct relatively little trade with one another. Trade was nonexistent for much of their history. It was suspended in 1954 as a result of the border war, and continually halted over various disagreements about the border, Tibet, and India's nuclear tests. It was not until 2002 that the two finally agreed to shelve the border dispute and resume trade. This explains why trade with India makes up only 1 percent of China's global trade. To say the least, China and India are "not intimate neighbors," and they "lack mutual trust."[208]

Thus, there is a concern among China's influential elite that India, the inferior country, has labeled China as a competitor. Their analysis of the relationship puts blame on the Indians for their misguided views of China as an aggressor and a threat. As one Chinese scholar put it, "India is screened with shadows at the bottom of its heart that China is 'the biggest potential threat.'"[209] They see this mistrust of China manifested in a competition for resources, influence, trade, and foreign direct investment. While China undoubtedly has been aggressive in its quest for regional influence and access to resources, the influential elite view these actions as a necessary response to the myriad threats China faces—competition from India being one of them.

In the last few years, India competed with China for oil and gas resources in Angola, Sudan, Ecuador, Nigeria, and, most recently, Kazakhstan. India was outbid in all of these markets. But the competition was good for neither country, as it pushed prices up. This explains why, in December 2005, the countries collaborated to acquire PetroCanada's Syrian oil and natural gas assets. While India has not prevailed in the bidding wars and is arguably more dependent on foreign imports than China, the rising prices as a result of their competition and the potential for being shut out of certain markets still pose a serious threat to China's continued economic development. China's intent in building cooperation with India is to mitigate this threat. (China's increasing reliance on foreign energy resources is perceived as a significant vulnerability; this issue is addressed separately as a nontraditional threat.)

The competition may be even fiercer in the arena of foreign relations as China strives to gain influence in

South Asia, while India vies for the same in East Asia. The rivalry is apparent in the efforts of both countries to join and direct various regional organizations, while limiting the influence of the other. China is working to maintain an edge in its influence over ASEAN and has been accepted as an observer in the South Asia Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC), much to India's chagrin. To China's displeasure, India is attempting to gain a seat on the UN Security Council and membership in the Nuclear Suppliers Group and has been accepted as an observer in the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO). China has continued close cooperation with India's rival, Pakistan, and deepened its engagement with Bangladesh, Nepal, and Sri Lanka, not to mention ongoing influence in Burma—all neighbors of India. Meanwhile, India engages with Russia, Japan, and the United States—all countries China perceives to be working to contain it. The recent U.S.-Indian deal regarding civilian nuclear cooperation demonstrated to China's influential elite the extent to which the United States will go in "maintaining regional strategic balance"—in other words, supporting India in order to contain China.[210] Chinese news media explained that the special treatment given to India occurred because India is a democracy, the Americans' preferred model for economic development, and therefore "is deemed the best bargaining chip and a counterweight to China."[211]

Despite the preferential treatment that foreshadows containment and the threat to the nonproliferation regime that the U.S.-Indian deal poses, Chinese coverage of the deal was surprisingly balanced and straightforward. An opinion piece in *China Daily* explained that the deal was limited to civilian nuclear cooperation (it was not about weapons) and recognized

that the American strategic interest and intent behind the deal really was nonproliferation. The author argued, as many American editorialists also did, that despite this worthy intent, the deal has repercussions for the international nonproliferation infrastructure, and the double standard will likely complicate such efforts in Iran and North Korea. Perhaps even more telling of the elites' measured response to the deal is the credit they afforded India for being an independent country that would act in its own self-interest and not fall prey to manipulation so easily: "India will still maintain an independent and all-round diplomatic posture to gain its own maximum state interest. India will not easily board any ship because India itself is a large ship."[212] This nuanced and muted response that was largely complimentary toward India is evidence of China's all-out diplomatic effort to promote friendship and cooperation with that country. While this deal is hardly satisfactory to China's influential elite, the threat of rivalry with India at this time is even less acceptable. Cooperation mitigates the threat that competition with India over resources or influence poses to China's continued economic development and international standing.

The Threat to Stability and Territorial Integrity.

The unsettled disagreements over the Sino-Indian border and Tibet may undermine China's new-found friendship with its neighbor. Both issues threaten China's territorial integrity and stability on its already tenuous Western front. India's own political and social instability and its ongoing dispute with Pakistan also increase the potential for conflict and chaos on China's border.

The disagreements between China and India first arose in the late 1950s, when China cracked down on the Tibetan protest movement. India granted sanctuary to the Dalai Lama in response. Border clashes erupted around the same time as China built a road on territory that India claimed. From the Chinese perspective, the boundary had never been demarcated officially. As Zhou Gang, the former Chinese ambassador to Malaysia, Pakistan, Indonesia, and India, explained, "In March 1914, the British colonialists cooked up an illegal 'McMahon Line' behind the back of the representatives from the Chinese Central Government."[213] China neither approved nor acknowledged this line, which was just further proof that the West was using every opportunity to carve up China.[214] After the public Sino-Soviet split (and China no longer had to heed Soviet interests), the skirmishes erupted into a full-fledged war as the PLA launched a "blitzkrieg-type offensive."[215] The PLA performed surprisingly well, announcing a cease-fire after gaining its territorial objectives.[216] A peace treaty could never be agreed upon, however, and remains unresolved to this day. (See Map 1.) It is the one issue that Chinese scholars admit could impede friendly cooperation with India. What is not admitted, however, is that China *was* an aggressor in 1962, and thus India's claims that China was a threat were well-founded. Chinese unwillingness to concede these points is an obstacle to resolution of the border dispute, which the influential elite predict will not be resolved anytime soon.

Much like the threat posed by the unpredictability of American politics, India's politics also are considered disturbingly unstable by Chinese observers. While Indian domestic politics are not analyzed to anywhere near the depth of their analysis of American politics,

Map 1. Disputed Territory between China and India.[217]

some concern over the volatility of India's democracy is evident, particularly due its perceived inability to deal with class and religious differences. This concern seems to have abated in recent years, but the "conflicts caused by caste and class contradictions have been eye-catching," concluded a PRC scholar in 2001. "The rise of Hindu fundamentalism" and "the issue of religious conflict within India [are] far from resolved," wrote another in 2002.[218] The "splittist" activities in Kashmir also are a force for instability. The potential for a Pakistan-India confrontation is often referred to as a "hot spot" that poses "major challenges and hidden perils" for China's peripheral security environment.[219] However, this concern also has lessened as the confrontation cooled in recent years.

In addition to the potential religious and separatist problems within India, China is concerned with India's involvement in aggravating similar problems inside

its own borders. India's provision of sanctuary in 1959 to Tibet's spiritual leader, the Dalai Lama, is still a contentious issue for China because he continues to be politically active in exile, along with approximately 130,000 other Tibetans living in India. These Tibetans carry out "splittist activities in India, directly threatening [the] stability of Tibet and endangering China's security in its southwest region."[220] India's perceived sympathy for Tibetan religious freedom and provincial independence only increases the possibility of another Tibetan independence revolt, a direct threat to China's territorial integrity. An independent Tibet would set a dangerous precedent for China. A slippery slope of independence declarations could begin with Tibet, lead through Xinjiang and Hong Kong, and end in Taiwan. Suddenly, nearly half of China's territory and the objective it holds dearest (reunification with Taiwan) could be lost. From this perspective, it is not hard to understand just how threatening any loss of territory would be.

The Traditional Military Threat.

Yet another lingering historical problem is the conventional military threat posed by India and the role of Russia in Sino-Indian relations. India's navy and its ability to project power in the Indian Ocean long has been both intimidating and an object of envy in the eyes of China's elite. (As China expands its naval capabilities, a reciprocal threat is now felt by the Indians as well.) Another concern of the influential elite is the procurement of arms and the modernization of India's nuclear program. As one analyst observed in 2001, "The momentum of arms procurement is violent," and of particular concern are "the agreements with Russia

to purchase aircraft carriers, tanks, and fighters."[221] Chinese India scholar Hu Shisheng noted that:

> military technology cooperation has all along been a vital pillar of Russia-India strategic ties. Over the last few years, the two nations have upgraded their defense cooperation agreements to an extent unknown in the past . . . signing more than 350 defense cooperation agreements. . . . Russia's "show of favoritism toward India at the expense of China" has precisely found expression in three major weapons systems, namely, multipurpose fighter jets, submarines, and antiaircraft missiles.[222]

Russia's perceived favoritism toward India has been a sticking point since the Soviet Union split with China and backed New Delhi in the Sino-Indian War.[223] But China's recent military cooperation with Russia has altered this dynamic and likely has shifted some of the threat perception to India in this arena as well. Finally, and perhaps most obviously, India's growing nuclear capabilities and modernizing missile force are perceived as a threat to China. Yet India's military threat consisting of a strong navy, cooperation with Russia, and a growing nuclear force is perceived as less menacing to China than the threat India poses to China's economy and stability.

Concluding Thought.

India is not an overwhelming or immediate threat to China. As Zhao Gancheng noted, the China-India relationship is marginalized in Chinese politics.[224] Lan Jianxue admitted that the Chinese society does little research on India and has far less understanding of India than of other countries in Asia.[225] The reason is that "China-India relations are neither on the basis of highly mutual trust with common strategic

interests nor in a state of crisis that easily could lead to confrontation."[226] Unlike the United States, which is studied rigorously and analyzed endlessly, India does not command such attention from China's influential elite. Nor does it arouse an emotional hatred like Japan does.

That said, the sense of calm and camaraderie portrayed currently in the writings of China's influential elite regarding India has more to do with China's self-proclaimed "charm offensive" than with the real outlook on India. The Sino-Indian friendship rhetoric also was common in the 1950s, right before their border tensions escalated, trade was halted, and war was declared.[227] Today's friendly overtones do not erase the unresolved issues and historical resentment between the countries. Rather, they are indicative of the threat China perceives from India as a competitor for vital resources and international influence, as a destabilizing influence on its western border, and as a conventional military and nuclear power. While India is not considered as much of a threat as either the United States or Japan, it does pose a threat to all three of China's major strategic interests: maintaining territorial integrity, continuing economic development, and safeguarding China's national dignity and equality on the world stage. The year 2006 is one of friendship not because China and India *are* friends, but because both countries fear the possibilities for competition and conflict if they do not seem to be.

IV. CONCLUSION: CHINA'S TRADITIONAL THREATS

This by no means has been an exhaustive survey of the traditional threats faced by China. Other nations

and other militaries surely pose a danger to China's national security. China is particularly concerned with its Western border and the "terrorist, extremist, and splittist" activities that could destabilize Xinjiang province. Further, it is concerned with the threat of a collapsed North Korea, which would prompt an influx of refugees in northeastern China. The focus of this monograph, however, is on the several countries that are considered both capable of and willing to endanger all three of China's components of national security: sovereignty, economic development, and international stature. The United States, Japan, and India have significant ideological, historical, or territorial disagreements with China and possess the military, economic, and diplomatic means to go to battle over such disagreements. Further, these countries are allies, with a shared commitment to democracy and a perceived interest in containing China. The United States has expanded its cooperation significantly with both Japan and India in the last year. Thus, cooperation among any or all of these countries in an effort to contain China militarily, economically, or diplomatically is not unrealistic. It is such a confluence of threats that China fears most.

It is evident from this analysis that the United States is of the utmost concern to the influential elite. Close attention is paid to all American policies, whether they are directly related to China or not. The focus of the influential elite is not limited to policymaking. Politics and even the American academic field also are analyzed closely. This provides for a holistic understanding of the United States—and leads to a perceived threat that is equally holistic. As a result, threats from the United States come not just from the military, but from the extreme forces and unpredictability of the political realm and the theories of our own influential elite.

In contrast, what is interesting about perceptions of Japan and India is that a similar understanding of Japanese and Indian domestic politics is lacking. Yet there is still a concern over the unpredictability of the democratic process in these countries. Neocons are a threat in Japan just as they are in the United States, and the diverse population of India makes its political stability seemingly fragile as well. This perceived instability and concern over the unpredictability of the democratic process are not surprising; they are reasons why China's leadership does not advance democratic reforms in their own country. The perception of democratic processes as destabilizing is different fundamentally from our own belief in the inherent stability and equilibrium that democracy provides. While the United States and China both agree on a democratic international order, our perceptions about domestic democracy vary considerably. This shared view of the world order and divergent view of internal order are important factors in understanding and appreciating U.S.-China relations.

Yet, as threatening as these three nations may be to China—politically, economically, militarily—nontraditional threats are still of greater concern. The disagreements with the United States, Japan, and India are not new. And they have been, for the most part, managed successfully. But nontraditional threats are new, and China has not yet proven that it can successfully manage them. Military deterrence and diplomatic skill are unlikely to prove completely sufficient in dealing with these threats. It is to these transnational, unpredictable, and intractable problems that we now turn.

CHAPTER 3

NONTRADITIONAL SECURITY THREATS

> While such traditional security threats as hegemonism and local wars are still casting a shadow on world peace and stability, events such as the 11 September [2001] terror incident, the atypical pneumonia epidemic, and the Indian Ocean tsunami have indicated that nontraditional security threats are becoming ever more prominent and are becoming interwoven with traditional security threats in threatening human survival and development. How to deal with such threats and challenges originating from nontraditional security areas has become a major issue of common concern to countries.
>
> PLA General Xiong Guangkai[228]

General Xiong Guangkai, perhaps China's preeminent strategic thinker, shifted his attention in the past year from "peaceful development" (the phrase he coined to counter the "China threat theory") and began talking instead about "nontraditional security threats." The concept has been gaining traction as many of China's influential elite are discussing these new threats to their national security. Yet despite frequent reference to "nontraditional security threats" and the development of a new security concept for China based on the need to address such issues, there is no formal, agreed-upon definition. Casual inquiries during my interviews with the influential elite in Shanghai who used the term elicited a wide range of explanations and examples. Instead of offering a definition, most offered examples. All mentioned

energy, the environment, bird flu, and terrorism as nontraditional issues that are of increasing concern. Beyond that, however, there were variations. One scholar from the Center for National Strategy Studies at Jiao Tong University included the news media and the growing elderly population as nontraditional threats to China's security.[229] An analyst at the Shanghai Institute of International Studies included drug trafficking, piracy, and WMD.[230] Members of the influential elite from the Shanghai Pacific Institute for International Strategy (editors of the controversial *Strategy and Management* journal) commented that the distinction between traditional and nontraditional threats lay in the *means* for resolving them, and that military means cannot resolve nontraditional issues.

General Xiong recognized the difficulty in defining nontraditional threats and tried to offer some clarity in a 2005 *Shijie Zhishi* (*World Affairs*) article. He offered the following four earmarks of nontraditional threats: (1) they transcend national boundaries and are thus transnational in nature; (2) they go beyond the military sphere; (3) they often are sudden and unexpected; and (4) they are frequently interwoven with traditional security threats.[231] He concluded that they are threats that more than one nation faces and cannot be solved by one country or by a single means. General Xiong explained their unpredictability this way: they often are crises that "explode in a sudden way, . . . lack clear signs, . . . or have a strong, random character."[232] For example, it is hard to pinpoint where and how an infectious disease starts, or when a natural disaster or act of terror will occur. And perhaps the most threatening aspect of nontraditional threats is that they are likely to occur in conjunction with or act as triggers for other crises. As General Xiong explained, "Nontraditional security threats and traditional security threats are

interwoven, affect each other, and may change into each other under certain conditions."[233]

Guo Xuetang of Shanghai's Tongji University offered a definition of nontraditional security that differed slightly from General Xiong's. While Guo's explanation also emphasized their nonmilitary nature, he incorporated a country's internal problems into the definition as well.

> There are many differences of view in China and outside over defining the concept of "nontraditional security." There are relatively many factors of nontraditional security; in general it refers to various conflicts closely linked to non-military threats; "apart from military, political, and diplomatic conflicts, it refers to other factors that compose a threat to the existence and development of sovereign states and the whole of mankind" . . . . Hence, nontraditional security can also be called non-military security, and a country's internal problems can also become national security problems. Compared with military threats whose content is relatively simple, nontraditional security factors are extremely wide-ranging, mainly including: economic security, financial security, ecological [and] environmental security, information security, resource security, terrorism, weapon prolifer-ation, the spread of epidemics, transnational crime, narcotics smuggling, illegal immigration, piracy, money laundering, and so on. A country's internal problems also come within the scope of national security.[234]

As discussed in the introduction to this monograph, the threat of nontraditional crises increasingly is seen as more likely and severe than those from traditional threats. As Yu Xintian of the Shanghai Institute of International Studies saw it:

> the likelihood that China is hit by [a] nontraditional threat is fairly high. China is vulnerable to nontraditional

> threats due to its insufficient institutional and physical preparedness. . . . Since the 1990s, China has been frequently hit by nontraditional security threats such as the threat to economic security (East Asian financial crisis), hygiene security (SARS, poultry flu, AIDS, and so on), and environmental security threat (flood, sandstorm, drought, and so on). Terrorism and transnational crimes have already done harm to China's security, and the degree of which will only grow than drop. Diseases and environmental problems are not new for China, but their risks have remarkably increased thanks to globalization and liberalization. Their internal impacts and international domino effect will be great. Their shock and destruction will greatly exacerbate. What are particularly notable are the unpredictable crises and conflicts, which are most difficult to tackle.[235]

This quotation captures the biggest concerns that China's influential elite share about nontraditional threats. First, the line between internal and external is blurred, and the likelihood that something completely external to China can foment a crisis internally—or vice versa—is very worrisome in a society that is still adjusting to its growing participation in a globalized world. Second, the potential for a crisis—something unexpected and unpredictable—also is frightening. A culture that emphasizes planning and preparation (maximizing its *shi*) does not always respond flexibly and responsively in a crisis.[236] This corresponds to a widely-held belief among the influential elite: *China's system of governance is inadequate in the face of a crisis.*

A survey of the influential elite conducted in 2004 asked experts what challenges China will face before 2010 that are most likely to impede economic and social development. While not included specifically as a topic for inquiry in the survey, the theme of crises of confidence came up repeatedly: "People's lack of confidence in governance, in the credibility of

enterprises and individuals, and in the government's credibility, policy efficiency, and transparency, as well as worries about falsification and exaggeration by enterprises and about the character and quality of some individuals" were seen as likely to have a direct impact on economic development as well as the successful implementation of reforms.[237]

The same survey found that the elite believed that the major areas of crisis in China before 2010 would be primarily social, followed by economic, and then political. In the social arena, widening social disparities, unemployment, and public safety were considered "high risk" areas. The environment was seen as the issue most likely to spur economic crises. This issue is seen as having a direct bearing on China's productivity. Oil and energy supplies, or "resource-related problems," also are considered an environmental issue with serious economic implications.[238]

Therefore, in order to get a glimpse of Chinese thinking on nontraditional threats, this section examines the pressing issue of social disparity and the economic issues associated with the environment and energy. While this hardly can be considered a comprehensive assessment of China's perceptions of nontraditional threats, it illuminates the way they are thinking about and approaching these disparate and complicated issues threatening China's social and economic development and stability. Also evident is that while the influential elite admit an increasing concern about nontraditional threats in general, there is far less analysis, debate, and recommendations about how to overcome specific nontraditional threats. This may be because most of the action necessary to mitigate nontraditional threats requires the Chinese leadership to implement serious internal reforms. The debate and

the recommendations are likely still being generated, though not in the public sphere.

I. CHINA'S THREAT FROM WITHIN: "DOMESTIC AND SOCIAL CONTRADICTIONS"

> China is in a critical juncture when two transitions coincide, one is the taking off of modernization; the other is the transition from planned economy to market economy. Both are inundated with contradictions and highly vulnerable to the outbreak of conflicts. The two transitions being so intertwined further enlarge the urban-countryside disparity, regional disparity, wealth disparity, and ethnic disparity, which will evoke turmoil if treated unskillfully."[239]

China faces a dizzying array of internal problems resulting from these "transitions." These include urban issues having to do with rapid industrialization and mass internal migration; rural issues having to do with land ownership, poverty, and the effects of globalization on agriculture; and issues surrounding unemployment, corruption, social security, health care, and education. But the condition internal to China that causes the most concern is the wide disparities that exist within its society—between the rich and the poor, urban and rural. There is a general inequality of opportunity or, as it is referred to in official Chinese policy statements, "domestic and social contradictions." If not addressed, these will be of great detriment to China's stability and security. That is why the government and the influential elite have paid so much attention to this issue recently, and why *The 11th Five Year Plan for National Economy and Social Development* is specifically devoted to overcoming such "contradictions." An examination of the extent of disparity, the elite and official attention devoted to the issue, and the manifestation of the

disparities as demonstrated by "mass incidents," will demonstrate how domestic and social contradictions can be considered such a threat to China's national security.

Evidence of and Attention to China's Disparities.

China's *Human Development Report*, published by the UN Development Programme in 2005, found that "China remains plagued by imbalances in development—most notably between urban and rural areas, between regions, between sexes, and between different population groups."[240] The development gap is largely a result of the growing income gap. The World Bank uses a calculation (called the "Gini coefficient") to determine the extent to which individual incomes deviate from a perfectly equal distribution. This measure indicates an individual's relative poverty, or how well-off one is compared to his/her countrymen. China's Gini coefficient has increased 50 percent in the last 2 decades, producing huge disparities.[241] For example, the bottom 20 percent of China's population accounts for only 4.7 percent of total income or consumption, while the top 20 percent of China's population account for 50 percent of the country's total income or consumption.

China's own official report on the state of Chinese society, published yearly by the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences and referred to as the *Blue Book of Chinese Society*, reaches a more dire assessment than that of the UN. Its calculated Gini coefficient showed an even more unbalanced distribution of income, producing growing instability as evidenced by mounting crime rates, land disputes, and public clashes with government officials. "The rich-poor disparity has led to the intensification of social disputes, mass protests, and criminal cases,"

wrote Zhu Qingfang, one of the study's authors.[242]

A journal sponsored by the Central Party School of the Communist Party also published a study with notably grim predictions. Citing a report from the Ministry of Labor and Social Security, the article warned of destabilizing social phenomena. It (somewhat surprisingly) acknowledged that many of the affluent population "gained wealth through collusion with officials in power-for-money deals" or "because they stole state assets."[243] Further, the study concluded that China's social troubles were only beginning, since the period when a country's economy is growing from $1,000 per capita gross domestic product (GDP) to $3,000 per capita GDP is likely to see increasing social conflicts. China is now just in that stage."[244]

This conclusion is cited repeatedly in elite writings and even in China's *11th Five-Year Plan*. The message from this finding is clear: the period of China's strategic opportunity also is a period of great risk. In Chinese culture, it is natural for the two dialectic opposites of danger and opportunity to coexist. The Chinese government's goal is to maximize the opportunities (or the *shi*) by minimizing the risk. That the Central Party School and the *Blue Book* are publishing such grim assessments is proof that the leadership wants its people to know that it is working hard to minimize the dangers resulting from the society's disparities.

Another example of this official attempt to mitigate the dangers is *The 11th Five Year Plan* itself. While laying out the direction and priorities for the next 5 years, it emphasizes "common prosperity," "sustainable development," and social services, rather than "growth rate." For the first time, the plan incorporates the ideas that "economic growth does not equal economic development, economic development does not necessarily result in society's development,

and . . . growth is not the goal, but the means of development."[245]

While official policy only recently has begun to address "domestic and social contradictions," the influential elite have been warning about the problem for some time. Sun Liping, a noted sociologist, has published a number of articles and books on the growing divisions within Chinese society. He argues that society is now more than simply polarized; it has become two separate fragments, incapable of joining together to form a cohesive whole. Sun recognizes that, as China opens up, the most advanced parts of society enter the world market, or "join the orbit." While this serves to advance even the most backward parts of the country, it also makes the most advanced parts of the society have more in common with the outside world than with other parts of its own country. These "fragments" no longer share the same concerns, values, or priorities. Further, Sun argues that those at the lowest rungs of society are actually *outside* the social structure—they have been "discarded" and left behind as their opportunities for reemployment or reintegration no longer exist. The needs of these two fragments are so diverse, the government cannot respond to them both.[246] In this "era of differentiation of interests," Sun advocates a system whereby people can express their varying grievances, so that conflicts can be avoided: "If different groups have good channels . . . [to voice their wants, needs, and concerns] conflicts will not be escalated."[247]

Manifestation of the Disparities: "Mass Disturbances."

The lack of an acceptable outlet for people to express their grievances is most evident in the number of "mass

disturbances" that occur with increasing regularity and severity throughout China. China's Ministry of Public Security reported that the total number of "mass incidents" rose to 87,000 in 2005. This was an increase from 74,000 incidents involving the masses in 2004 and from 58,000 the year before that. The number of people involved also increased—five-fold, from 730,000 in 1994 to 3.76 million in 2004.[248] According to a Hong Kong newspaper, the Ministry of Public Security defines four categories of mass disturbance: "taking shape" involves between 300 to 500 people; "mid-scale" involves over 500 but no more than 3,000 people; "large-scale" involves between 3,000 and 10,000 people; and "extra large scale" involves between 10,000 and 100,000 people.[249] Admittedly, China is an enormous country, and three million people are only a fraction of its 1.3 billion population. But that an unsanctioned gathering of 500 people is considered merely "taking shape" is telling. The rate of increase in incidents and the public admission by the government that such unrest is a serious problem also are notable.

There are a number of reasons behind the many public disturbances. A great majority are ignited by land requisitions in rural areas, or by urban buildings being dismantled and their tenants being forced to relocate. Many are disputes regarding pay or issues of employment (or more often, unemployment). Some result from accidents or over concern for public safety, or health, or the environment. Retired PLA service members occasionally ignite protests. Sometimes the target audience is external (e.g., Japan), but often it is local (the police and the local Party leaders). What they all seem to have in common is that such means are the only way for the public to air its grievances. There are few mechanisms in place to ensure a worker's

rights regarding issues of compensation, back pay, safe working conditions, or the justice of fines by local officials. Farmers have little recourse when their land is taken by the government; it is only by coming together in protest that they can draw the desired attention to their plight.

Land disputes seem to draw a large number of protesters: 10,000 in Guangzhou and "several thousand" in Shanwei in December 2005; "tens of thousands" in Guangdong province in July 2005.[250] While these episodes are not always covered in the official Chinese press, many such incidents make the news in Hong Kong news media. One incident covered in *Xinhua* was a riot in Anhui, where a large number of people became involved in an uprising which apparently started after a driver ran over and beat up a pedestrian. The incident was described this way:

> A mass incident occurred in Cizhou, Anhui province, on June 26[, 2005] between the afternoon and evening. The incident has basically been quelled thanks to the tremendous attention shown by the Anhui provincial CPC committee and provincial government. At 14:40 on June 26, four people who were riding in a car had an argument with Liu Liang, a pedestrian. They beat up and wounded Liu Liang, and the incident aroused the disgruntlement of the masses. The local police had the four culprits taken to the police station for investigation. Under the rumors and instigations of a handful of law-breakers, some people who did not know what had really happened amassed in front of the Jiuhua Road police station and demanded that the station hand over the four persons. The crowd of people who were ignorant of the facts grew in number and began beating, smashing, looting, and burning, resulting in several armed police and public security officers sustaining injuries and four vehicles being destroyed. The doors and windows of the Jiuhua Road police station were smashed, and one supermarket was looted. The incident drew a large crowd of spectators.[251]

While the veracity of this event cannot be confirmed and the coverage is clearly biased, it is remarkable that the seemingly small incident—having nothing to do with land reclamation, corruption, or unpaid compensation—triggered such an angry large-scale response.

Such escalations are not uncommon. Small protests or events often grow in scope and intensity quickly, seized on as an opportunity by the public to demonstrate its dissatisfaction. The government recognizes the need for the public to be able to voice their complaints; police around the country were tasked with "receiving letters and visitors" between May and September 2005 in hope of reducing the number of disturbances. *Xinhua* reported that 180,000 of the 200,000 grievances received during those 4 months were "dealt with."[252] Whatever this means, it is likely an unsatisfactory method and resolution for the public. Until an effective, credible judicial system, social safety net, and crisis management mechanism are established in China, individuals likely will continue to take to the streets to make their grievances known.

Another reason for these mass incidents may be that such wide social and economic disparities are more disruptive and unacceptable in China than in other countries. The society was relatively classless and had a fairly equal distribution of wealth not so long ago. As Li Qiang wrote in the 2000 *Blue Book*, "people have long become used to the egalitarian distribution system, and the notion in Chinese culture that unequal distribution is a bigger problem than scarcity is rooted deeply in people's minds."[253] The society is fundamentally communist in orientation and, while many today joke that the Chinese Communist Party should be renamed the Chinese Capitalist Party, the deep-seated ideals

of egalitarianism and Marxism-Leninism still remain. Thus, the gaping disparities that have emerged over the last 20 years are not only damaging from a social services/governance perspective, they create a crisis of identity that threatens the Party's legitimacy and power. This is yet another reason why the disparities are perceived as a menace to the nation's stability and security and why the government has devoted so much attention recently to solving society's "domestic and social contradictions."

II. ENVIRONMENTAL DEGRADATION: THE THREAT TO THE EARTH, ECONOMIC GROWTH, AND THE COMMUNIST PARTY

The effects of China's "pollute first, control later" philosophy are very real, since environmental pollution directly affects the lives and well-being of Chinese citizens.[254] The effects are different depending on where one lives: those in the city suffer under smog, those in the country lack potable water, those in the southeast endure typhoons, while those in the southwest experience severe drought. Environmental protection is now an "unswerving national policy" in China as a result.[255] The Hu administration has elevated environmental protection to a top priority, equal to that of economic growth. The leadership has demonstrated its commitment to the issue by promoting public involvement, the concept of a "green GDP," and greater accountability for those in the government who flout environmental regulations for the sake of profit. Yet despite such emphasis, implementation of environmental regulations remains difficult. As a result, not only is the environment in jeopardy, but so is the continuing economic growth of the country.

An examination of the environmental problem (in air, water, and land) and the way the problem manifests itself (in climate change, extreme weather conditions, and lack of safe drinking water) exposes the extent of China's pollution and the costs it imposes on China's development. Looking at the official policy and the politics exposes the more ominous threat from environmental degradation: the extent of corruption and the lack of effective enforcement mechanisms for implementing Party policy.

The Threat to the Earth and Economic Growth.

According to the head of China's State Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA), the number one Chinese environmental issue is clean water. Nearly 300 million rural residents drink polluted water, and 90 percent of the water passing through cities is polluted.[256] There is one "sudden environmental accident" every other day on average in China, and most of these accidents involve water pollution. Following the disastrous chemical spill in the Songhua River in November 2005, a spill that contaminated the drinking water of millions downstream, SEPA ordered a review of the safety of all chemical plants. This review concluded that nearly half of the country's chemical plants pose environmental risks. Another spill like that in the Songhua could prove highly detrimental to the country's water supply given that the vast majority of chemical plants are located along the two major rivers in China, which flow for thousands of miles and through densely populated areas.[257]

China's air quality is not much better. Largely due to its coal burning, China has been the world's largest emitter of acid-rain producing sulfur dioxide since

1995. SEPA estimated that as a result of these emissions, economic losses over the last decade equaled more than 500 billion RMB (equaling about 63 billion in U.S. dollars). Monitoring of air quality in 522 of the nation's cities revealed that nearly 40 percent of them had either "medium or serious" air pollution.[258] Air quality is even unsafe in office buildings. As the headline of an investigative article in the *China Daily* declared, "In Posh Office Buildings, Plenty of Bad Air Days."[259] Such conditions are blamed for lost profits due to decreased productivity and health care-related costs. Air quality also is diminished by frequent dust storms that are the result of desertification. Over 2.5 million square miles of land have turned to desert as a result of over-grazing and over-logging. More than 300,000 tons of heavy yellow dust fell on Beijing in April 2006, ironically, just days before their 37th Earth Day celebration.[260]

According to China's *National Environmental Statistics Bulletin*, such incidents are not rare. In 2004, some 1,441 "environmental pollution and destruction incidents" occurred, causing "direct economic losses of 363.657 million RMB," which equals approximately 45 million U.S. dollars. A further cost is the 190 billion RMB, or roughly 23 billion U.S. dollars, China spends on pollution management, which is 1.4 percent of the country's GDP.[261] The hidden costs of China's environmental degradation are the reason that China's leadership is promoting the concept of a "Green GDP" — a calculation that would reflect the negative impact pollution has on economic growth. By quantifying the costs imposed on the environment, it is estimated that between 15 and 25 percent of China's GDP would, in effect, be cancelled out. As much as 2 percent of China's annual growth rate, which exceeded 9 percent for the past 2 years, therefore would be deducted

with such a calculation.[262] Besides reflecting the costs of environmental damage, the concept is intended to counteract localities' overemphasis on economic development at the expense of environmental quality. By using such a measurement as an evaluation tool for local officials, the Central Government would be able to reassert control over those who compromise environmental quality for the sake of profit. But coming up with an accurate way to calculate the green GDP has proven difficult, and political infighting between SEPA (a strong advocate of the measure) and the National Statistics Bureau (tasked with coming up with the technical specifications for the measurement) has left the concept as just that—a concept. Despite the political controversy and technical challenges, the Central Leadership remains committed to an accounting method that reflects the adverse effects of development on the environment.

One of the most difficult effects to quantify is the extreme weather and the results of climate change on China. While the cause of global warming is debated in the United States, its effects are very real in China, an example being the unusually harsh typhoon season in 2006. The Vice Minister of the Ministry of Water Resources commented that "against the backdrop of global warming . . . the strength of typhoons [is] increasing, the destructiveness of typhoons that have made landfall is greater, and the scope in which they are traveling is farther than normal."[263] While excessive rain crippled some regions, excessive drought affected others. Southeastern China reeled from Typhoon Samoi in August 2006, the most severe storm in 50 years, at the same time that neighboring Sichuan province was grappling with a severe drought. More than 17 million people in southwest China suffered from an inadequate

water supply as a result of this drought and excessive heat. Economic losses were estimated at 1.5 billion dollars due to the lack of harvest.[264]

According to the Red Cross of China, 300 million people were affected by these and other natural disasters between January and August 2006—some 1,699 were killed, 415 were missing, and 5 million homes and more than 32 million hectares of farmland were destroyed. Losses totaled more than 16.25 billion dollars.[265] The future looks even more ominous if such trends continue. A Chinese meteorologist predicts that if greenhouse gas concentrations continue to rise, precipitation in China's major river valleys will decline by 30 percent by 2040.[266] Tibet is experiencing the opposite effect—roads, lakes, and homes are flooding as a result of rising ground temperatures. Known as the "roof of the world," the Tibetan plateau is very sensitive to climate changes and has been among the first regions to feel the effects of global warming.[267]

The Threat to Central Control.

Because the effects of environmental degradation are so visible and so clearly detrimental to the health and well-being of Chinese citizens, the population demands that attention be given to the issue. Many of the "mass disturbances" that occur are in protest of local industrial pollution and the lack of action taken by local officials to enforce regulations and impose penalties. As we have seen, the Central Government has taken action and responded to public protest by making the environment a clear policy priority. A White Paper on Environmental Protection from 1996 to 2005 touts the country's record of environmental protection policies over the last 10 years.[268] A commitment to "sustainable

development" and tough compulsory environmental protection targets as part of the *11th Five-Year Plan* also demonstrated the leadership's priorities. But local officials do not share the same priorities, and they have yet to implement environmental policies effectively. Pan Yue, the outspoken director of SEPA, made this observation about local priorities: "Many provinces failed to meet the major environmental protection targets of the *10th Five-Year Plan*, although they have met and exceeded the plan's GDP targets in advance."[269] Despite local governments and factories signing "responsibility pledges" committing to reduce pollutants, the total volume of major pollutants discharged rose during the first 6 months of 2006. The mandatory reduction of major pollutants by 10 percent in the next 5 years seems unlikely to be achieved.

The cover-up of the chemical contamination of the Songhua River in November 2005 is the most recent and well-known example of the competing priorities between local and Central governments. As the polluted water flowed towards neighboring Heilongjiang Province and ultimately Russia, the chemical plant and the local officials first denied and then downplayed the extent of the spill. Once its magnitude was exposed, local officials and business leaders received strong condemnation from the national leadership and from the influential elite. A high-ranking Party leader had this to say in relation to the incident:

> There is really no excuse for allowing a public safety and health crisis of such magnitude to happen in this day and age, after we have gone through the trials and tribulations of the "atypical pneumonia" outbreak, the development of an emergency response mechanism over a period of more than two years, and the gradual formation and extension of the accountability system. This incident tells us that besides making further improvements

> to the various contingency plans that industries and departments have drawn up and strengthening the development of related rules and regulations, our government officials and government departments also are required to improve their level of competence in their functions of governance in a substantive manner, so that they can truly get to the point of exercising their power for the people, concerning themselves with the well-being of the people, and working for the interests of the people.[270]

Calls for accountability and openness were widespread. While there are sufficient regulatory directives on the books to prevent such contamination and to punish those responsible for it when contamination does occur, enforcement and punishment are rare. As a professor of Political Science and Law from China University noted, "Despite the great losses resulting from last year's pollution of the Songhua River, no one has been made to pay. This is nothing but countenancing polluting."[271] The Central Government attempted to consolidate its regulatory power by opening several regional SEPA offices in order to bypass local protectionism and corruption. They also considered evaluating local officials based on their performance in balancing development and environmental protection. But enforcement of the already robust regulations and laws regarding the environment and punishment of offenders are still lacking.

Several of the influential elite recognized that the disconnect between Central and local leadership posed a threat to the environment as early as 1998. *Grave Concerns*, a book authored by two economists with China's Academy of Social Sciences, posited that poor coordination, structural problems, and corruption were the real threats to China's environment. They warned that corruption was the most serious form of pollution,

predicting that if coordination between Central and local governments was not increased, "sustainable development" would be unattainable.[272]

Such coordination is still lacking. The Central Government recognizes the threats that environmental degradation pose: First, to environmental quality; second, to sustaining the rate of economic growth; and, third, to its own control over the country. But it has been unable to implement its policies fully to minimize these threats. The country's lack of effective mechanisms for governance—in addition to local corruption—leave it vulnerable to increasing rates of pollution, decreased rates of economic growth, and potential instability as the gap between local and Central Leadership widens and the population's concerns fail to be addressed.

III. ENERGY INSECURITY: CHINA'S "SOFT RIB"

> The short supply of energy resources is a "soft rib" in China's economic and social development.
>
> Premier Wen Jiabao[273]

Government efforts to promote conservation in Chinese society are not simply about the environment. The Central Leadership's emphasis on building a "resource-saving society at an accelerating pace" also is about China's energy security. Wen Jiabao recognized in a 2005 Teleconference on Building a Resource-Saving Society that "energy, mineral, water, land, and other natural resources are the material foundations and guarantees for sustainable economic and social development." He criticized the country's "rather serious phenomenon of wastefulness in resources" which, "in addition to abetting unhealthy tendencies in society, aggravated the contradiction between supply

and demand of resources; caused coal, electricity, and oil shortages and transportation strains; worsened environmental pollution; and heightened the reliance on foreign countries for continuous imports of major resources." He called China's short supply of energy resources China's "soft rib" in its development, warning that the country's energy consumption was not sustainable. He encouraged "accelerating the building of a resource-saving society" as it is "a key measure to guarantee economic security and national security." He then provided a detailed list of reforms and regulations to promote conservation. Urging leading cadres at all levels to set the example "in practicing economy and opposing extravagance," the premier went so far as to suggest ideal temperature settings for government air conditioners (nothing below 26 degrees Celsius) and a relaxed dress code (no suits unless important events or meeting with foreigners).[274]

Wen Jiabao's speech and the extent of his recommendations reflect the importance China's Central Leadership places on the energy issue. This issue is considered a matter of national strategic significance and one that has considerable impact on whether or not China can sustain its development. It also is perceived as an issue over which the Chinese have little control, given their reliance on foreign imports and foreign security of their lines of transportation. These dependencies on foreign supply—the "reliance problem"—and security—"the Malacca dilemma" (so named because of the vast quantities of oil that must pass through the Malacca Strait, which is secured by other countries' navies)—are the main threats to China's energy security.[275] After examining these dependencies, we will consider what China is doing to minimize these threats and why, despite such

efforts, the lack of effective governmental mechanisms to respond in a crisis may still leave China's energy market insecure and vulnerable.

The Threat of Foreign Reliance.

China was a self-sufficient energy-producing country until 1993. But while its oil consumption grew by more than 55 percent from 1994 to 2000, its oil production increased by only 11 percent. Its imports grew more than 20-fold as it became the world's second-leading oil importer (behind Japan). Foreign oil imports now account for 40 percent of China's energy market, with the gap between supply and demand continuing to widen.[276] According to a report by China's Academy of Geological Sciences, by 2020 China will need to import 500 million tons of crude oil and 100 billion cubic meters of natural gas annually, which is 70 percent and 50 percent of its domestic consumption, respectively.[277] The huge extent to which China's energy market depends on foreign imports is thus a key indicator of China's lack of energy security.

Perhaps even more significant is the rate at which the country has moved from self-sufficient exporter to overdependent importer. To a country that is still new to market economics and globalized trade, such newly emergent dependence on the unpredictable and uncontrollable "free market" is unnerving. Price fluctuations have an immediate impact on all national economies and easily can halt China's stable rate of economic growth. While China imported 3.9 percent more oil in the first half of 2005 than during the same period the year before, the cost of the imports was 42.2 percent higher.[278] As one member of the influential elite noted, "The expense of China on the import of crude

and refined oil is drastically increasing, mainly resulting from the rise of oil prices, [which] has led to tremendous pressure on the economic development of China."[279] Another observer noted, "Energy supply disruptions and unpredictable price soar could undermine China's rapid economic growth and job creation, and in turn raise the real specter of social instability and [impaired] national security."[280] There is no shirking this issue; the influential elite and the policymakers both concede the adverse impact that problematic energy supplies can have on China's national security.

More worrisome than an over-reliance on foreign imports is the extent to which the reliance is confined to one region—the Middle East. Not only is this region the most volatile part of the world, it is embroiled in geopolitics and is the centerpiece of American foreign policy. While 18 percent of U.S. oil comes from the Gulf, 60 percent of China's imported oil comes from there, and most of that comes from just three countries: Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Oman. Because import sources are limited and the United States and Japan have a lock on much of the oil market, China is forced to find alternate suppliers. The result is a Chinese energy policy that not only competes with U.S. energy demands, but comes into conflict with U.S. containment policies in Iran and Sudan.

The "Malacca Dilemma."

The over-reliance on oil from the Middle East and Africa leads to an over-reliance on the Malacca Straits, considered by the influential elite to be highly susceptible to blockade, as China's shipping route. Without any pipelines to route its oil through and only a small portion of oil coming from Venezuela (and thus

crossing the Pacific Ocean from the east), 85 percent of China's oil passes through the Indian Ocean, Malacca Strait, and the South China Sea. Thus, any interference in this "strategic passageway" by nations trying to contain China or by pirates or terrorists intent on disrupting the global market could halt nearly all of China's energy supply. President Hu Jintao expressed his concern over the "Malacca dilemma," noting that "certain powers have all along encroached on and tried to control the navigation route through the strait."[281] Along with China's influential elite, President Hu recognizes that normal oil imports "may not be guaranteed and China's daily life, economy, and even defense may be greatly impacted."[282]

Insufficient Efforts to Overcome Energy Insecurity.

Even more threatening is China's inability to do anything about this foreign reliance. China lacks the naval power to patrol the sea lanes and thus depends on other littoral states in the region, plus the presence in the area of the American, Indian, and Japanese navies, to do this for them. While Chinese ships account for nearly 60 percent of the ships passing through the Strait of Malacca each day, it is not Chinese ships that protect them.

Both of these dependency problems—supply and security—are so troubling to China's influential elite because of China's lack of military and diplomatic means to overcome them. While the influential elite usually boast of China's growing global influence, when it comes to energy security, the scholars' assessments of the extent of China's military and diplomatic influence are much more sober. The influential elite are critical of their country's ability to secure sea lanes or develop new markets, especially in contrast to the United States.

For example, one scholar looked at Central Asia and marveled at the influence the United States has in the region (due to taking advantage of "the opportunity created by the antiterror war") and its ability to develop the market for its own needs. While he admitted that China is "a player in the competition for oil in Central Asia, its influence is rather limited."[283] Another scholar based his comparison on an "energy security index," which assumes that energy security is proportional to a country's diplomatic and military influence over world affairs and inversely proportional to its dependency on foreign oil. Thus, while the United States depends more on foreign oil than China, it has more influence over world affairs, thus making it less vulnerable to risks than China.[284]

There also is a certain stigma that the influential elite attach to the energy issue and the prominent role it plays in geopolitics, which makes China's lack of clout on this issue so unnerving. China's influential elite perceive energy as an issue over which countries fight wars. They point to the war in Iraq as proof of this: "Oil is the crux in the rivalry between various forces in the world."[285] Wang Haiyun, a member of the influential elite with the State Council, argued that energy as an issue has risen in status and is being used increasingly as a "strategic weapon in the pursuit of national political, economic, and security interests."[286] He warned that, for energy-exporting states, the "power of the energy weapon can be placed on par with that of nuclear weapons," as it can be used as both a deterrent and a weapon in warfare, can be used strategically or tactically, and can be used as a carrot or a stick. The dispute between Russia and Ukraine over natural gas is an example of the use of the energy weapon—and proof that Russia is an "energy

superpower." Wang also examined U.S. policies of promoting the "China energy threat theory," which included criticizing Chinese energy cooperation with Iran and Sudan, obstructing the purchase of Unocal by a Chinese corporation, and maintaining its worldwide military presence as efforts "to control the energy lifeblood of a rising China."[287] These actions serve to remind the influential elite of U.S. power regarding the energy issue and the vulnerability of their country to the "energy weapon."

This vulnerability has prompted the influential elite to be openly critical of their country's lax energy security and to recommend numerous policy changes to the Central Leadership. (This is in contrast to their silence on recommendations for overcoming societal disparities or pollution.) Many opinion writers emphasize the need for—and China's right to—ensure its own energy security. Most elite recommendations include developing new markets and transit routes, enhanced cooperation, and an enhanced naval capability. Above all else, though, the influential elite overwhelmingly agree that cooperation is needed in order to increase energy security. In all the discussions that this author had with members of the influential elite in Shanghai, cooperation with the United States over energy security was advocated. The Chinese elite recognize the similar concerns of the United States and China over energy security: a mutual interest in fair energy prices, a stable supply, secure transit routes, and development of clean alternative sources of energy. To the Chinese elite, it seems like a natural opportunity for "win-win" collaboration.

Therefore, it is puzzling to many of the elite as to why the United States seems intent on portraying China as a competitor on this issue. Numerous congressional

hearings, as well as the U.S.-China Economy and Security Committee, concluded that China's increasing energy demands are a security concern for the United States. These conclusions only confirm Chinese fears that the United States intends to use the "energy weapon" and "impose strategic energy containment" on China.[288] This concern, that the United States might try to cut off China's oil lifeline in order to destabilize the country, is widespread.

China's leadership has taken many of the influential elite's recommendations for enhancing energy security, but they also are trying to downplay the "China energy threat theory" and prove to the United States that they are not a competitor. They, like the influential elite who advise them, have determined that cooperation is key: "In order to prevent the possibility of some big power's using the energy weapon to counter China's further rise, China must thwart some countries' attempts to contain us on the energy issue and hinder China's rise. The method is to unfold effective bilateral or multilateral cooperation on energy sources."[289] The Chinese thus have engaged vigorously in "energy diplomacy" to develop new markets, promote energy cooperation, and find new transportation routes. (American criticism of this also is perplexing; the Chinese consider this to be free market activity, demonstrated and promoted by the United States.) According to Pang Zhongying, "The fundamental goal of China's energy diplomacy is to achieve a win-win situation. In other words, China wants to have joint stability, prosperity, and development with concerned energy supply countries, regions, and companies."[290] It also is trying to diversify sources internally (to include investments in wind, solar, and nuclear energy); build a strategic reserve; and build naval and air capacity so

it has the capability to project power in the Malacca Strait and perhaps fulfill offers to cooperate in Strait security with Indonesia and Malaysia.

While diplomacy may prove fruitful in expanding markets, routes, and relationships, there is still concern that China's governance in relation to energy is inadequate. The government dismantled the Ministry of Energy in 1993, and energy-related policymaking has been diffuse and disjointed ever since. The government's think tank, the Development Research Centre of the State Council, after conducting 2 years of research, concluded that China's energy challenges went beyond soaring consumption and environmental degradation, and included as well "an inefficient decisionmaking process, poor efficiency, and growing exposure to the global market."[291] The council recommended reestablishing a cabinet ministry to oversee energy security. A National Energy Leading Group headed by Wen Jiabao was set up to reestablish a comprehensive energy strategy. But the oft-mentioned "mechanisms" needed to regulate the market are still lacking. There are no means to stabilize market development of China's energy industry (it was deregulated much later than most). There is insufficient ability to monitor and analyze market supply and demand, which is important in regulating the market effectively.[292] Again, the leadership has recognized the threats posed to China's energy security and demonstrated its commitment to addressing it. But whether the leadership's priorities can be implemented is yet to be seen.

Thus, similar to the threats from China's internal disparities and environmental degradation, the threat to energy security is two-fold. While China's supply of energy resources is vulnerable to foreign intervention, given its reliance on foreign markets and vulnerable sea

lanes, it is the lack of internal structural mechanisms to enforce central leadership priorities and regulate the domestic market effectively that may prove most threatening to China's energy security.

IV. CONCLUSION: CHINA'S NONTRADITIONAL THREATS

This examination of several of China's most pressing nontraditional threats demonstrates that they are of increasing concern to China's influential elite not only because of their transnational nature, unpredictability, and intractability. Nontraditional threats also expose the extent to which China's central leadership is unable to implement its policy priorities. While the government should be given due credit for recognizing and admitting the problems China is facing with regard to social and economic disparities, the environment, and its lack of energy security, it has yet to prove that its focus on the problems and commitment to resolving them are sufficient. It is true that mitigating nontraditional threats will take transnational cooperation, and that China has made great strides engaging in relationships of "mutual benefit." But if China is going to reach its desired goals of continued economic and social development during its window of strategic opportunity, it also will need to make internal reforms. It will need to strengthen its social safety net, judicial system, and its mechanisms for resolving public concerns. It will need to become more flexible in responding in times of crisis. It will need to more effectively enforce penalties for corruption and pollution. China's nontraditional threats are more menacing than traditional ones because they require China's leadership not only to look outward, but to look inward as well.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

This monograph was meant to provide, first, a survey of several of the myriad traditional and non-traditional threats facing China as perceived by the Chinese themselves. By taking a strictly Chinese perspective, it demonstrated that despite China's secretive nature, much can be understood about how the Chinese perceive themselves, the world, and their role within it. Official Chinese actions and motivations are not opaque or difficult to understand when we take the time to see the world as China does. Seeing the world from China's vantage is not difficult, either, since many of China's influential elite are willing and eager to engage candidly with their American counterparts. If we took the time and effort to understand Chinese society, history, and culture in the same way they understand ours, seeing the world through China's eyes would come naturally.

Second, the monograph has demonstrated that China's national security concept is very comprehensive. Analysis has proven that China's national security threats are wide-ranging and are not limited to the threat of military confrontation. While sovereignty and territorial integrity are a significant national priority, continuing economic and social development and maintaining its status on the world stage also are strategic priorities. Thus, any effort to undermine China's economy, inhibit its flow of strategic natural resources, incite its public, or even undermine its international influence are considered threatening to

China's national security. With such a broad national security concept, the threats that China faces are not only numerous, they also are very difficult to ameliorate.

Thus, the Chinese government has its work cut out for it. In addition to building a military capability that can deter aggression, assure maritime security, and dissuade Taiwan from declaring independence, it must convince the United States that its containment policies are founded on a flawed theory of the China threat. It must convince its own public that its historical hatred of Japan is doing more to threaten its national security than Japan itself. It must convince India that it is a friendly neighbor who would rather cooperate than compete. And it must convince its own local Party officials that the Central Government's policies are the best course in assuring national security and stability. Internally, it must make serious reforms in order to be able to implement national policies intended to address disparities, reduce pollution, and punish corruption.

Therefore, China must work assiduously on international diplomacy and internal reforms in order to minimize the various risks posed during China's period of strategic opportunity. This is what Chinese policymakers have set out to do. Their actions are not inconsistent with this analysis of their perceptions. The Hu administration's pursuit of policies to ensure peaceful, sustainable development at home and cooperation on behalf of mutual benefit on the world stage are not aggressive policies cloaked in rhetoric; they are an attempt to address the security threats China considers most troublesome. The motivations of the Chinese leadership therefore are not completely hidden or incomprehensible.

Finally, this monograph has shown that the Chinese perspective is very different from our own, borne of

different histories, experiences, and priorities. But it is not necessarily one with a different view of the future. Both the United States and China aspire to a future with a free, open, and robust economic marketplace and an international order where all nations contribute to peace, development, and prosperity—in other words, a world where we are all "responsible stakeholders." We should pursue these common objectives together and work to maintain the current international order that benefits us both. Further, many of the nontraditional threats that China faces—terrorism, WMD proliferation, environmental degradation, resource dependency, and even social disparities—are threats the United States faces as well. Instead of focusing on the potential threat we are to one another, perhaps our time, energy, and resources could be better spent cooperating to overcome mutual threats. In so doing, the threat we pose to each other might not seem so ominous.

ENDNOTES

1. "Executive Summary," *Annual Report to Congress: The Military Power of the People's Republic of China 2005*, Washington, DC: Office of the Secretary of Defense, July 2005.

2. See Robert Jervis, *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976.

3. Fan Chie Yi, Sun Jian Shiang, and Yan Quan Hui, *The Outer Brain of the Leader*, Beijing: China Social Science Press, 2000. Sergeant Ching Tuan of the Foreign Military Studies Office (FMSO) translated the title and table of contents. The term "external brain" also is used in *The Science of Military Strategy*, Peng Guangqian and Yao Youzhi, eds., Beijing: Military Science Publishing House, 2005, p. 175.

4. Credit goes to Robert Putnam for coining the phrase, "influential elite." According to David Shambaugh in *Beautiful Imperialist: China Perceives America 1972-1990*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991, Putnam so termed a cohort of specialists in his book, *The Comparative Study of Political Elites*.

5. See Michael Pillsbury, *China Debates the Future Security Environment* [book on-line], Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 2000, available at *www.ndu.edu/inss/books/books%20-%202000/China%20Debates%20Future%20Sec%20Environ%20Jan%202000/pills2.htm*. See also David Shambaugh, *Beautiful Imperialist.*

6. Donald Rumsfeld, "Remarks to the International Institute for Strategic Studies," Singapore, June 4, 2005, available at *www.defenselink.mil/transcripts/2005/tr20050604-secdef3002.html*.

7. Richard Nisbett, *The Geography of Thought: How Asians and Westerners Think Differently . . . and Why*, New York: The Free Press, 2003.

8. It should be noted that exceptionalism is not unique to China. American, Russian, and Japanese exceptionalism also have been extensive subjects of study.

9. Speech by Lieutenant General Li Jijun, *Traditional Military Thinking and the Defensive Strategy of China: An Address to the U.S. Army War College*," Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, August 29, 1997. Li was the Vice President of the Academy of Military Science, but has retired

since making this speech. However he is still considered one of China's most respected and influential strategists.

10. *Ibid*.

11. Lieutenant General Li Jijun, "Notes on Military Theory and Military Strategy," as quoted in Michael Pillsbury, ed., *Chinese Views of Future Warfare*, Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1997. General Li's article is excerpted from his book, *Military Theory and Conflict*, Beijing: Academy of Military Science Press, 1994. For more insight into China's self-perceptions and perceptions of the West in the 19th century, see John G. Stoessinger, "China and America: The Burden of Past Misperceptions," John C. Farrell and Asa P. Smith, eds., *Image and Reality in World Politics*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.

12. Speech by Lieutenant General Li Jijun.

13. "Voyages Reflect Desire to Grow Peacefully," *China Daily*, July 12, 2005, provided by Open Source Center. *China Daily* is China's official English-language newspaper.

14. Qu Xing, quoted in online discussion, "China, Is It a Threat or an Opportunity?" *People's Daily,* August 23, 2005, available at *english/peopledaily.com.cn/200508/23/eng20050823_204164.html*.

15. *Ibid*.

16. Paul Christopher, *The Ethics of War and Peace: An Introduction to Legal and Moral Issues*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, 2004, p. 8.

17. Zhang Xiaojun and Xu Jia, "A Comparison of the Features of the Traditions of Chinese and U.S. Strategic Culture," *China Military Science*, No. 2, 2004, pp. 112-119, translated for the Foreign Military Studies Office. *China Military Science* is published by the People's Liberation Army's Academy of Military Science.

18. Peng Guangqian and Yao Youzhi, *The Science of Military Strategy*, Beijing: Military Science Publishing House, 2005, p. 151.

19. *Ibid*., p. 448.

20. See Alastair Iain Johnston, *Cultural Realism: Strategic Culture and Grand Strategy in Chinese History*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995. Johnston concludes that despite China's espoused and idealized Confucian-Mencian culture, the real operational culture is in accordance with the *realpolitik* model. In that view, China is likely to use force in the face of security

threats. This distinction is important in perception analysis. It does not impact Chinese perceptions of their strategic culture as defensive—but it further illuminates why we must understand their perceptions—and recognize that they may be at odds with their actions. See also Andrew Scobell, *China and Strategic Culture*, Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, May 2002. Scobell argues that it is a combination of the Confucian-Mencian and *realpolitik* strategic cultures that disposes Chinese leaders to pursue offensive military operations while rationalizing them as defensive actions.

21. Interview with Ye Zicheng by Chuang Yu-hui and Hsu Ting, "China Replaces Peaceful Rise with Peaceful Development to Allay International Doubts," *Hsiang Kang Shang Pao* (*Hong Kong Commercial Daily*), March 14, 2005, translated by Open Source Center.

22. *Ibid*.

23. *Xinadaihanyu*, Modern Chinese English Dictionary, 2004.

24. Ralph Sawyer defines it as "strategic configuration of power" in his translations of the *Seven Military Classics*. Francois Jullien wrote an entire book on the concept called *The Propensity of Things*. The phrase "potential borne of disposition" is one of the many ways he attempts to capture the concept.

25. "Comparison of Comprehensive Power of Major World Countries," Wang Ling, ed., *Yellow Book of International Politics Reports on International Politics and Security*, Beijing: Social Sciences Academy Press, 2006.

26. Li Changjiu, "Commentary: Augmenting Comprehensive National Strength, Safeguarding World Peace," *People's Daily*, June 30, 1999, available at *english.people.com.cn/english/199906/30/enc_ 1999063001058_TopNews.html*, accessed September 13, 2005.

27. Peng Guangqian and Yao Youzhi, p. 177.

28. *Ibid*, p. 210.

29. Li Zhongjie as quoted in "Interview by Reporter Yu Chunguang," *Jiefangjun Bao*, September 16, 2002, p. 4, translated by Open Source Center.

30. *China's National Defense in 2004*, Beijing, China: Information Office of China's State Council, December 27, 2004, available at *english.gov.cn/official/2005-07/28/content_18078.htm*, accessed August 7, 2006.

31. Peng Guangqian and Yao Youzhi, p. 445.

32. Interviews by author at Shanghai Pacific Institute for International Strategy, Shanghai, China, June 8, 2006.

33. Dong Fangxiao, "Knowing and Seeking Change," *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi* (*Contemporary International Relations*), No. 4, April 20, 2003, p. 26-28, translated by Open Source Center.

34. Yu Sui, "Some Fundamental Assessments," *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi*, No. 22, November 20, 2002, pp. 3-4, translated by Open Source Center.

35. Yu Xintian, "Understanding and Preventing New Conflicts and Wars: China's Peaceful Rise as a Strategic Choice," *International Review*, Vol. 35, Summer 2004, available at *www.siis.org/cn/english/journal/2004/2/Yu%20Xintian.htm*, accessed November 8, 2005.

36. Peng Guangqian and Yao Youzhi, p. 439.

37. *Ibid*., p. 437.

38. Lin Limin, quoted in Sun Chao, "Develop Great Periphery Diplomacy, Participate Actively in Regional Cooperation," *Zhongguo Jinji Shibao*, December 6, 2004, translated by Open Source Center.

39. Wang Jisi, "Some Evaluations of China's International Environment and U.S. Strategic Direction," *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi*, No. 11, November 20 2002, pp. 1-3, translated by Open Source Center. Wang Jisi was the Director of the Institute of American Studies at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences; he is now the Dean of the School of International Studies at Beijing University.

40. Meng Xiangqing, "Domestic Security and International Security Will Become More Interwoven and Interdependent in the Future as China Faces Growing Traditional, Nontraditional Security Threats," *Shijie Zhishi,* June 1, 2005, translated by Open Source Center.

41. *Ibid*.

42. *Ibid*.

43. *China's Endeavors for Arms Control, Disarmament and Non-Proliferation*, Beijing: Information Office of the State Council of the People's Republic of China, September 2005, available at *www.china.org.cn/english/features/book/140320.htm*, accessed July 20, 2006.

44. "Chinese Delegation Submits Position Document on New Security Concept to ASEAN Forum," *Xinhua*, August 1, 2002, translated by Open Source Center.

45. *Ibid*.

46. *China's National Defense in 2004*, Beijing, China: Information Office of China's State Council, December 27, 2004, available at *english.gov.cn/official/2005-07/28/content_18078.htm*, accessed August 7, 2006.

47. *Ibid*.

48. *Ibid*.

49. *China's National Defense in 2004*, Beijing, China: Information Office of China's State Council, December 27, 2004, available at *english.gov.cn/official/2005-07/28/content_18078.htm*, accessed August 7, 2006.

50. Ding Yuanzhu, "2010: Three Types of Possible Prospects for China—Based on Surveys and Inquiries of 98 Government and Nongovernmental Experts," *Zhanlue Yu Guanli*, August 6, 2004, translated by Open Source Center.

51. Zhong Wu, "China Takes on America," *The Standard*, March 14, 2005, available at *www.thestandard.com.hk/stdn/std/Opinion/GC14Df01.html*. The poll, conducted in five major Chinese cities, is believed to be the first-ever large-scale opinion poll on Chinese views of the United States.

52. Liu Jianfei, "Trends in Changes in U.S. Strategy Toward China," *Shijie Jingji Yu Zhengzhi*, February 14, 2005, translated by Open Source Center. The Central Party School is the Communist Party's ideological research institute and training facility for the Party's future leaders.

53. Ruan Zongze, "Change and Constraint," *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi* (*Contemporary International Relations*), No. 8, August 20, 2003, p. 17-19, translated by Open Source Center. The paper was presented at the Contemporary International Relations Experts Forum on "Assessments of U.S. Global Strategy." The author is the deputy director and research fellow with the China Institute of International Studies (CIIS) which supports and is funded by the Foreign Ministry.

54. Jin Canrong, "Uncertainties Brought About by Going Against Tradition," *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi,* August 20, 2003, p. 19-21, translated by Open Source Center. This journal is published

by the China Institute for Contemporary International Relations (CICIR) which is affiliated with the Ministry of State Security.

55. Wang Jisi, "Sino-U.S. Relations: Seeking A Stable New Framework," *Zhongguo Dangzheng Ganbu Luntan*, January 6, 2005, translated by Open Source Center. The Institute of American Studies at China Academy of Social Science (CASS) is the preeminent institute for Chinese America-watchers. Wang Jisi recently left his post at CASS and is now the Dean of the School of International Studies at Beijing University.

56. "All under heaven" is a phrase used in China's ancient military classics to denote the kingdom of China. Those beyond the Middle Kingdom were considered barbarians and were not considered "under heaven."

57. Translation assistance came from MDBG Online Chinese Dictionary, *www.xuezhongwen.net*, accessed December 21, 2005; *Xinadaihanyu* (Modern Chinese English Dictionary) 2004; and Scott Henderson of the Foreign Military Studies Office.

58. Liu Jianfei, "Trends in Changes in U.S. Strategy Toward China" *Beijing Shijie Jingji Yu Zhengzhi*, February 14, 2005, translated by Open Source Center.

59. *Ibid*.

60. Wang Pufeng, "Reviewing the U.S. 'Stike First' Strategy"; Chapter 10 in Shen Weiguang, ed., *On the Chinese Revolution in Military Affairs*, Beijing: New China Press, pp. 187-198. Translated for Foreign Military Studies Office. According to Michael Pillsbury in his book, *China Debates the Future Security Environment*, Washington, DC: National Defense University Press: January 2000, General Wang Pufeng is one of five senior officers at the Academy of Military Sciences to be put in charge of the doctoral program there. He is the former director of the Strategic Research Department.

61. Lin Limin, "Seizing Opportunities, Settling China's World Relations," *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi*, No. 4, April 20, 2003, pp. 24-26, translated by Open Source Center. The author is a research fellow with the World Politics Office in the China Institute of Contemporary International Relations, CICIR.

62. Ruan Zongze.

63. *Ibid*.

64. Gu Dexin, "The U.S.-Iraq War and China's National Security," *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi*, No. 4, April 20, 2003, pp. 20-22, translated by Open Source Center. This paper was presented at the Contemporary International Relations Experts Forum in March 2003 on "China's Diplomacy Under New Circumstances." Xia Liping also concludes: "It [the U.S.] has made efforts to strengthen alliances with itself playing the leading role." See "US National Security Strategy and China-U.S. Strategic Stability Framework," *SIIS Journal*, Vol. 2, 2003, available at *www.siis.org.cn/english/journal/2004/1/InterReview/contents.htm*.

65. Wang Yusheng, "The Old Historical Concepts and Cold War Mentality of the U.S. Neocons," *Renmin Wang*, July 11, 2005, available at *theory.people.com.cn/GB/49150/49152/3532034.html*, translated for the Foreign Military Studies Office. The remarks to which Wang is referring are as follows: "Let us, then, lay aside the quest for new 'poles' and turn our energies to creating what President Bush has called a balance of power that favors freedom." Remarks by Dr. Condoleezza Rice, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, International Institute for Strategic Studies, London, UK, June 26, 2003, available at *www.iiss.org/showdocument.php?docID=220*.

66. Yang Yunzhong, a professor at the Jinan Army School, argues that there is a "fundamental antagonism" between the American unilateralist approach to foreign policy and that of the Chinese:

> Opposing hegemonism and building a multipolar world of equality and democracy is the basic goal of Chinese foreign policy. The United States on the other hand vigorously pushes its basic strategy to seek hegemony over the world, goes all-out to preserve its 'sole superpower' status, and tries to build a U.S.-dominated unipolar world….China has consistently advocated a new-style security concept with mutual trust, mutual benefit, equality, and cooperation as the core, seeking security through mutual trust and seeking cooperation through mutual benefit in order to achieve universal security and true peace throughout the world. The United States on the other hand vigorously practices 'new interventionism,' waving the banner of 'fighting for values' and the war on terror, and frequently engaging in 'gunboat diplomacy,' in a bid to achieve a

> 'pax Americana.' The conflicts and arms races stirred up by the United States under the impetus of old security concepts all pose a threat to China's security.

Yang Yunzhong, "Some Strategic Reflections on the Main Threats to China's Security in the Early 21st Century," *Dangdai Yatai*, Vol. 10, October 15, 2002, pp. 3-12, translated by Open Source Center. The journal is a publication of the Chinese Academy of Social Science.

67. Qian Wenrong, "The Evil Waves of the 'China Threat Theory' Are Rising Again," *Beijing Shijie Zhishi (World Affairs)*, September 1, 2005, translated by Open Source Center.

68. Wang Honggang and Yu Xibin, "Why Has the 'China Threat Theory' Again Been Stirred Up in the United States?" *Banyue Tan*, Vol. 9, August 29, 2005, translated by Open Source Center. Other opinions on the "China threat theory's" reemergence: "The United States frequently preaches the 'China threat' theory, maybe the root cause of which lies in its ambition to seek world domination and its quest for the practice of power politics and containment of China." "How There Comes 'Chinese Military Threat' Theory," *People's Daily*, Overseas Edition, March 24, 2005, available at *english.peopledaily.com.cn/*. "With the growth of China's comprehensive national strength, the 'China threat theory' has also appeared with frequency in some words and statements from overseas, and it seems to be quite fashionable in the United States in recent years." Weng Hansong, "China Threat Theory is Reflection of the Dark Side of U.S. Politics," *Renmin Wang*, August 26, 2005, translated by Open Source Center. "From the 1990s to now, the 'China threat theory' had emerged once every 2 to 3 years. The U.S. rightist forces and the U.S. military are accustomed to using it . . . in order to consolidate their sphere of influence and position in the U.S. political arena." Zhang Jiye and Chen Wenxin, "Why is the U.S. Military Playing Up the 'China Military Threat Theory'?" *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi,* July 20, 2005, translated by the Open Source Center.

69. "Anti-terrorism fatigue" comes from Tao Wenzhao, "Sino-U.S. Differences Are Manageable," *Huanqiu Shibao*, September 2, 2005, translated by Open Source Center. An example of the notion that the United States has turned away from its war on terror and back to China: "The reappearance of the 'theory of the China threat' in the United States is not unexpected . . . 9/11 had not fundamentally changed the U.S. strategic basis . . . goals, and

global strategic deployment. . . . Fighting terrorism is a partial, technical, and temporary strategic focus for the United States, and as soon as there is definite progress in the fight, the United States is bound to aim the spearhead afresh at geographical powers." Chu Shulong, "The Importance of the United States to China Has Declined," *Huanqiu Shibao*, July 22, 2005, translated by Open Source Center.

70. *White Paper: China's Peaceful Development Road*, Beijing: Information Office of China's State Council, December 22, 2005.

71. Wu Jianmin, president of Foreign Affairs University, describes the Cold War mentality this way: "They hold the view that the communist-led Soviet Union wanted to expand and threaten, and now China, which has already grown strong, also is a country led by the communist party and also will pose a threat. It is precisely because of such inert mental considerations that some people harbor suspicions about China's development." Wu Jianmin interviewed by Yuan Yuan, "Use the Facts to Defuse the 'China Threat Theory'—Exclusive Interview with Foreign Affairs President Wu Jianmin" *Liaowang*, Vol. 37, September 12, 2005, pp. 12-14, translated by Open Source Center. *Liaowang* is considered an influential weekly news magazine.

72. Donald Rumsfeld, "Remarks to the International Institute for Strategic Studies" Singapore, June 4, 2005, available at *www.defenselink.mil/transcripts/2005/tr20050604-secdef3002.html*.

73. In fact, China's official news agency, *Xinhua*, began its commentary about the 2002 report with this statement: "The essence of the recently published China's Military Strength in the United States contains only one word: threat," July 25, 2002, available at *Xinhuanet.com*. "Comeback" comes from Yuan Yuan.

74. *Annual Report to Congress: The Military Power of the People's Republic of China 2005*, Washington, DC: Office of the Secretary of Defense, July 2005, pp. 13-14.

75. *Ibid.*, p. 7.

76. *Annual Report to Congress: The Military Power of the People's Republic of China 2006*, Washington, DC: Office of the Secretary of Defense, March 2006, p. 1.

77. Interview of Major General Peng Guangqian by Chen Zewei, "The Development of China's National Defense Capability Is Appropriate," *Liaowang*, Vol. 30, July 25, 2005, pp. 37-38, translated by Open Source Center.

78. "China Refutes U.S. Report on Chinese Military Power," *Xinhua*, February 21, 2005, available at *english.people.com.cn/200507/21/eng20050721_197358.html*.

79. "FM Spokesman: China 'Strongly' Opposes 2006 U.S. Annual Report on PRC Military," *Xinhua*, May 26, 2006, translated by Open Source Center.

80. Interview of Peng Guangqian by Chen Zewei. An article carried in the state-owned newspaper *People's Daily* days after the release of the report was even harsher: "The carefully fabricated military strength report is . . . filled with groundless attacks. . . . Those paranoia sufferers had better seek treatment to stop turning the world upside down with their 'sick eyes.'" Xin Benjian, "Pentagon's 'China Threat' Paranoia," *People's Daily*, July 22, 2005, available at *english.people.com.cn/200507/22/eng20050722_197800.html*, accessed September 12, 2005.

81. Xin Benjian.

82. Interview of Peng Guangqian by Chen Zewei.

83. It should be noted that the exact amount the United States spends on defense also is not known because portions of the budget (including the entire section on defense intelligence) are classified. It is still likely that the disparity between China's publicized budget and actual budget is greater.

84. "How There Comes 'Chinese Military Threat' Theory," *People's Daily*, March 24, 2005, available at *english.peopledaily.com.cn/*, accessed August 24, 2005.

85. Zhang Jiye and Chen Wenxin, "Why is the U.S. Military Playing Up the 'China Military Threat Theory'?" *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi,* July 20, 2005, translated by the Open Source Center. Zhang is from the Center for American Studies, and Chen is from the Chinese Institute for Contemporary International Relations.

86. Xin Benjian, in his July 22 article in the *People's Daily*, says the report is "obviously an attempt to lure Taiwan authorities into buying more U.S. weapons, and more quickly." With all American arms producers standing behind it, the Pentagon naturally will not miss any opportunity to promote arms sales. Meanwhile, the playing up of "China threat" also serves to keep the EU arms sales ban on China and oppose Israeli arms sales to China.

87. Robert B. Zoellick, "Whither China: From Membership to Responsibility," Remarks to the National Committee on U.S.-China Relations, September 21, 2005.

88. Qian Wenrong, "What Has Influenced Bush?" *Shijie Zhishe*, September 1, 2005, translated by Open Source Center.

89. Xin Benjian, "Security Dilemma, Balance of Power vs. U.S. Policy Towards China in the Post-Cold War Era," *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi,* September 2001.

90. Qian Wenrong, "What Has Influenced Bush?"

91. Yu Yongsheng, "Is the United States Readjusting Its China Policy Again?" *Shijie Zhishi*, August 1, 2005, translated by Open Source Center.

92. H.R. 3057, H. Amendment 381, introduced June 28, 2005, by Rep. Bernard Sanders. Amendment passed by a vote of 313 to 114. Further information on the bill can be found on the website at *thomas.loc.gov*.

93. Fu Mengzi, "'China Threat' or 'Threatening China,'" *Shijie Zhishi*, September 1, 2005, translated by Open Source Center.

94. Yu Yongsheng, "Is the United States Readjusting Its China Policy Again?" *Shijie Zhishi*, August 1, 2005, translated by Open Source Center.

95. Fu Mengzi.

96. Zbigniew Brzezinski and John J. Mearsheimer, "Clash of the Titans," *Foreign Policy*, Vol. 146, January/February 2005, available at *www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story_id=2740*, accessed September 20, 2005.

97. John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, New York: Norton and Co., 2001, p. 4.

98. *Ibid*., 402.

99. *Ibid.* Texts that reference Mearsheimer include "For What Does U.S. Overestimate China's Military Power?" *People's Daily Online*, May 28, 2005, available at *english.people.com.cn/200505/24/eng20050524_186532.html*. Wang Jisi, "Sino-U.S. Relations: Seeking a Stable New Framework," *Zhongguo Dangzheng Ganbu Luntan,* January 6, 2005, translated by Open Source Center. Wang Jisi, "China's Search for Stability with America," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 84, No. 5, September/October 2005, pp. 39-48. Gao Zugui, "An Analysis of Sino-U.S. Relations on the 'Western Front,'" *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi*, No. 12, December 20, 2004, pp. 1-7, translated by Open Source Center. Fu Mengzi, "'China Threat' or 'Threatening China'"; Wang Yusheng, "The Old Historical Concepts and Cold War Mentality of the U.S. Neocons," July 11, 2005, available at

theory.people.com.cn/GB/49150/49152/3532034.html, translated by the Foreign Military Studies Office.

100. Zhang Jiye and Chen Wenxin, "Why Is the U.S. Military Playing Up the 'China Military Threat Theory'?" *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi,* July 20, 2005, translated by the Open Source Center. Zhang is from the Center for American Studies, and Chen is from the Chinese Institute for Contemporary International Relations, CICIR. Contemporary International Relations is published by CICIR, which is affiliated with the Ministry of State Security.

101. Tao Jiyi, "US Fair-Minded Scholars' Analysis and Rebuttal of the 'China Threat' Theory," China Institute of International Studies, June 2, 2005, available at *www.ciis.org.cn/item/2005-06-02/51002.html*, translated by Foreign Military Studies Office.

102. Joseph Nye, "The Case for Deep Engagement," *Foreign Affairs,* July/August 1995.

103. Zhang Liping, "Basic Lines of Thinking Underlying United States' China Strategy," *Guoji Wenti Yanjiu*, (*International Studies)*, May 13, 2005, translated by Open Source Center. It should be noted that Mearsheimer's categorization as a neoconservative and Nye's as a liberalist are Dr. Zhang's.

104. David Shambaugh, *Beautiful Imperialist: China Perceives America 1972-1990*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991, p. 41.

105. Niu Xinchun, "US China Policy Will Remain a Self-Contradictory Policy, Mixing Cooperation with Conflict, but Bush Administration Will Resist Demands for Extremist Actions by Ultra-Conservatives," *Guoji Xianqu Daobao*, June 6, 2005, translated by Open Source Center.

106. Jin Canrong, "Uncertainties Brought About by Going Against Tradition," *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi*, No. 8, August 20, 2003, pp. 19-21, translated by Open Source Center. The author is vice president and professor at the School of International Relations at Chinese People's University.

107. *Ibid.*

108. Ruan Zongze, "Change and Constraint."

109. Wang Jisi, "Sino-U.S. Relations: Seeking A Stable New Framework," *Zhongguo Dangzheng Ganbu Luntan,* January 6, 2005.

110. Zhang Liping.

111. Xue Xiang and Luo Yuan, "Cold War Corpse: A Commentary on the U.S. Defense Department's Report on the PLA Military Strength," *Xinhua*, July 25, 2002, available at *news.Xinhuanet.com/zonghe/2002-07/25/content_4967.5.htm*, accessed September 1, 2005.

112. Wang Jisi.

113. Interview of Peng Guangqian by Chen Zewei.

114. "For What Does U.S. Over-estimate China's Military Power?" *People's Daily Online*, May 24, 2004, available at *english.people.com.cn/200505/24/eng20050524_186532.html*, accessed August 24, 2005.

115. Tao Wenzhao.

116. Jin Canrong, "An Assessment of Two Types of New Factors in China's International Environment," *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi*, No. 2, November 20, 2002, pp. 7-9, translated by Open Source Center. The author is a professor at the School of International Relations, Chinese People's University, and presented this paper at a Contemporary International Relations Experts Forum held November 5, 2002 on the topic "Assessing China's International Environment."

117. Zhang Liping, "The Models of Power Shifts: An Explanation for the Cycle of Ups-and-Downs in Sino-U.S. Relations," *Contemporay Asian-Pacific Studies*, Issue 12, 2002, Chinese Version; or Seoul: *Pacific Focus*, No. 1, Spring 2004, English Version, available at *ias.cass.cn/en/show_project_1s.asp?id=492*, accessed January 9, 2006.

118. *Ibid.*

119. Dr. Zhang Liping, interview by author, Washington, DC, January 13, 2006. Dr. Zhang was a Fulbright/Congressional Fellow at the time of the interview. She has since fulfilled her fellowship in a Congressman's office in the House of Representatives. Zhang is a research fellow and deputy director of the Department of American Politics at the China Academy of Social Sciences.

120. Shih Chun-yu, "Anti-China Sentiments Flooding Washington Again in the Lead-up to the Presidential Election in November," *Ta Kung Pao*, June 21, 2004, translated by Open Source Center.

121. Jia Zingguo, "Unilateralism or Multilateralism?" *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi*, No. 8, August 20, 2003, pp. 8-10, translated by Open

Source Center. The paper was presented at the Contemporary International Relations Expert Forum on "Assessments of U.S. Global Strategy."

122. Ruan Zongze, "Change and Constraint."

123. Tao Wenzhao, "US Neoconservativism Goes Downhill," *Ta Kung Pao*, November 17, 2005, translated by Open Source Center.

124. Zhang Liping, "Models of Power Shifts."

125. Shi Yinhong, "China's External Difficulties and Challenges Faced by the New Leadership—International Politics, Foreign Policy, and the Taiwan Issue" *Zhanlue Yu Guanli, Strategy and Management*, No. 3, May 1, 2003, pp. 34-39. *Strategy and Management* is known for publishing unorthodox articles, some of which are critical of PRC policies. See upcoming discussion on Japan for more on this journal and the controversies it has ignited.

126. Jin Canrong, "Uncertainties Brought About by Going Against Tradition," *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi,* August 20, 2003, pp. 19-21, translated by Open Source Center.

127. *Ibid.*

128. Sun Tzu as translated by Samuel B. Griffith, *The Art of War*, Oxford University Press, 1963, p. 84.

129. Ren Xiangqun, "The Influence of Mainstream Cultural Traditions on U.S. War Decisions," *China Military Science*, Vol. 17, 2004, pp. 127-136, translated by the Foreign Military Studies Office.

130. "The American factor" is a phrase by Dong Fangxiao in "Knowing and Seeking Change," *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi*, No. 4, April 20, 2003, pp. 26-28, translated by Open Source Center.

131. Qin Jize, "Poll: China-Japan Ties Need Mending," *China Daily*, August 24, 2005, available at *www.chinadaily.com.cn/english/doc/2005-08/24/content_471671.htm*, accessed November 16, 2005.

132. Lieutenant General Li Jijun as quoted in Michael Pillsbury, *China Debates the Future Security Environment*, Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 2000, available from *www.ndu.edu/inss/books/books%20-%202000/China%20Debates%20Future%20Sec%20Environ%20Jan%202000/pills2.htm*, accessed December 14, 2005. General Li was Vice President of the Academy of Military Science when quoted; he has since retired. For more on China's

perceptions of Japan's strategic culture, see Andrew Scobell, *China and Strategic Culture*, Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, May 2002.

133. Deng Xiaoping as quoted in Allen S. Whiting, *China Eyes Japan*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989, p. 149.

134. For a comprehensive analysis of the Sino-Japanese war and the beginning of the era of "carving up" China, see Bruce Elleman, *Modern Chinese Warfare: 1975-1989*, New York: Routledge, 2001.

135. It is reported in Japanese media that the articles in *Zhanlue yu Guanli* were approved by the government. Koji Uemura, *Mainichi Shimbum*, August 12, 2003, translated by Open Source Center. It was reported widely that the Hu administration wanted to differentiate its Japan policy from that of the Jiang administration, which held that historical problems were the political basis for Sino-Japanese relations. Jiang Lifeng, chief of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS) Japan division, granted an interview to *Yomiuri Shimbun* in June 2003, where he noted that the Hu administration was making adjustments to its Japan policy so that the perception of history would not be the most important factor, unlike the Jiang administration's position, June 6, 2003, translated by Open Source Center.

136. Ma Licheng, "New Thoughts for China-Japan Relations—Worrisome Problems Among Chinese and Japanese People," *Zhanlue yu Guanli*, *Strategy and Management*, December 1, 2002, pp. 41-47, translated by Open Source Center. *Strategy and Management* is a journal known to be more provocative than the mainstream media. Articles occasionally question government policy. An article critical of China's policy toward North Korea led to the journal's shutdown in 2004. According to an interview with its editors, the journal will reopen in Shanghai in 2006.

137. The quote continues,

> In recent years, one noted scholar's observation—that "this [Western] civilization resembles an arrow at the end of its flight" is being quoted again and again everywhere . . . [these] are arbitrary conclusions not substantiated by facts and studies. The fact that some people are calling such ignorance and falsehood as "patriotism" fully shows how mentally confused they have become.

138. Ma Licheng.

139. Interview with Ma Licheng by Satoshi Tomisaka, "Japan Apologized 21 Times to China: Japan Should Become a 'Normal' Country' and Strive to Become a Political Power," *Bungeishunju*, October 2003, translated by Open Source Center.

140. *Ibid.*

141. Shi Yinhong, "Sino-Japanese Rapprochement and 'Diplomatic Revolution,'" *Zhanlue Yu Guanli*, March 1, 2003, pp. 71-75, translated by Open Source Center.

142. Interview with Shi Yinhong, "'Sino-Japanese Rapprochement' the New Mission of China's Diplomacy," Sekai Shuho, May 6, 2003, pp. 46-49, translated by Open Source Center.

143. Others who entered the debate included Feng Zhaokui and Jin Xide from the China Academy of Social Sciences; Lin Zhibo, a *People's Daily* columnist; and student Xue Li. For their arguments in the July 1, 2003, edition of *Zhanlue yu Guanli,* see Feng Zhaokui, "On the New Thinking on Sino-Japanese Relations"; and Xue Li, "Can Sino-Japanese Relations Go Beyond Historical Issues?" in the August 1, 2003 edition; see article by Jin Xide, Cui Shiguang, Lin Xiaoguang, Wang Xinsheng, and Jiang Ruiping, "Reorienting Sino-Japanese Relations." As author of "Doubts of 'the New Idea on Relations with Japan," July 22, 2003, and "Further Questioning of the 'New Thinking on Relations with Japan,'" August 15, 2003, Lin Zhibo takes a strong stand against "new thinking" in *Renmin Wang*.

144. See "National Defense Program Guideline for FY 2005 and After," December 10, 2004, available at *www.jda.go.jp/e/defense_policy/japans_defense_policy/4/ndpgf2005/1.pdf*.

145. Sun Zhi, "To Analyze and Explain the Crux of Sino-Japanese Relations We Need To Treat the Disease by Looking at the Symptoms and the Root Cause," *Ta Kung Pao,* December 13, 2005, translated by Open Source Center.

146. Yoshihisa Murayama, "A New Direction Is Being Sought for the Japan-China Relationship—China's Strategy Behind the Emphasis on the Importance of Its Relationship with Japan," *Sekai Shuho,* November 9, 2004, translated by Open Source Center.

147. Liao Meng and Zhu Ting, "Poll: 51% of Chinese Youths Say They Want to Make Friends with Japanese," *China Daily*, July 6, 2005, provided by Open Source Center.

148. Qin Jize, "Poll: Japan-China Ties Need Mending," *China Daily*, August 24, 2005, available at *www.chinadaily.com.cn/english/doc/2005-08/24/content_471671.htm*, accessed November 16, 2005.

149. "Japan Disliked by 60% of Neighbors," *Asahi Shimbun*, April 28, 2005, provided by Open Source Center.

150. "Survey: Chinese Indignant at Japanese Government's Approval of History Textbooks," *Xinhua*, April 11, 2005, provided by Open Source Center.

151. *Ibid.*

152. *Xinhua*, August 2, 2005, provided by Open Source Center.

153. Ma Hao-liang, *Ta Kung Pao*, August 3, 2005, translated by Open Source Center.

154. *Xinhua*, October 17, 2005, provided by Open Source Center. *Renmin Ribao*, October 18, 2005, translated by Open Source Center.

155. Websites that display strong anti-Japanese fervor include the popular Patriots' Alliance Network, *www.1931-9-18.org*, China 18 September Patriotic Network, *www.china918.net*, and Wu Wang Guochi Net, *www.wwgc.cc*.

156. For an in-depth look at Chinese hacker activity, organization, and connection to the PRC government, see Scott Henderson's forthcoming *Dark Visitor.*

157. "Forum Told: Respect Could Help China-Japan Ties," *China Daily,* August 23, 2005, provided by Open Source Center.

158. It is worth noting that Japan's national anthem, *Kimi ga Yo*, was written in 1880 as part of the Meiji restoration and is the same song that was played by victorious Japanese troops all over China and Asia. It has the same effect as *Deutschland über Alles* on some European victims of German aggression.

159. Examples of this campaign to quell public unrest include two articles in *Wen Wei Po* on August 7. One quotes Shi Yinhong as saying, "The public should understand that ball-game fans may have excessive acts during a contest, but more importantly, they should have confidence in the Chinese government's efforts and the good character of Chinese soccer fans." See "Scholar Analysis: Two Major Reasons for Contradictions Between Two Countries." In the same paper, an editorial was entitled "Soccer Fans Should

View Match in Civilized Manner; Japan Must Profoundly Reflect on Itself." Both articles translated by Open Source Center.

160. Satoshi Saeki, "Chinese Kept In Dark Over Fans' Bad Behavior at Asia Cup Soccer Games," *The Daily Yomiuri*, August 11, 2004, provided by Open Source Center.

161. "Kong Quan Says: It Is Obvious to All That China Has Made Enormous Efforts for the Asian Cup Tournament," *Zhongguo Xinwen She*, August 9, 2004, translated by Open Source Center.

162. Jin Xide, "Is Japan Qualified to Become a Permanent Member of the United Nations Security Council?" *Huanqiu Shibao,* March 28, 2005, translated by Open Source Center.

163. Zhong Guohua, "Beijing Instructs Media to Tone Down Anti-Japanese Reporting Lest Public Ire Turn Toward Government," *Ming Pao*, April 5, 2005, translated by Open Source Center.

164. Tan Jingjing, "Six Departments and Committees Including Central Propaganda Department Hold Situation Report Meeting; Li Zhaoxing Reports on Situation in Sino-Japanese Relations," *Xinhua*, April 19, 2005, translated by Open Source Center.

165. "Righteous anger," is obviously a part of the Party taxonomy as it was used regularly when sympathizing with the public's anti-Japanese sentiment. See, for example, Ding Gang, "How Should We Express Patriotic Fervor," *Renmin Wang*, April 16, 2005; and Shen Jiru, "The Most Effective Method of Striking at the Anti-China Forces: Boost National Strength," *Renmin Wang*, April 22, 2005, both translated by Open Source Center.

166. Shen Jiru, "Always Remember that Development Is the Number One Important Task; Clear Away Interference and Wholeheartedly Pursue Development," *Renmin Ribao*, April 27, 2005, translated by Open Source Center.

167. Yoshihisa Murayama, "A New Direction Is Being Sought for the Japan-China Relationship—China's Strategy Behind the Emphasis on the Importance of Its Relationship With Japan," *Sekai Shuho,* November 9, 2004, translated by Open Source Center.

168. Cindy Sui, "China Rocked by Second Day of Anti-Japanese Rallies, Japan Protests," *Agence France-In Presse*, April 10, 2005, provided by Open Source Center.

169. "Hu Jintao Gives Important Speech on Sino-Japanese Relations," *Xinhua*, April 23, 2005, translated by Open Source Center.

170. Shi Yinhong, "The Immediate and Remote Causes of Deterioration in Sino-Japanese Relations," *Ming Pao*, April 21, 2005, translated by Open Source Center. It also is interesting to note that Ma Licheng, the other controversial and ground-breaking new thinker, did not change his progressive views on Japan. Shortly after writing his article in 2002, he left *People's Daily* and went to work as a broadcaster at Hong Kong's Phoenix TV. He resigned from Phoenix TV in September 2004 after his book, *Japan Does Not Need to Apologize to China*, was published in Japan. According to a diplomatic source quoted in the Japanese press, Beijing wanted to restrict his freedom in writing as a freelancer in Hong Kong. See "Former RMRB Commentator Ma Licheng Resigns From Job At Phoenix TV," *Kyodo World Service*, September 28, 2004, provided by Open Source Center. Ma's banishment, in contrast to Shi's continued role in the media spotlight, offers a pretty clear indication of the PRC government's ultimate position.

171. *Ibid.*

172. Li Xiushi, "Discussion of the Outward Transformation of the U.S.-Japan Military Alliance and Japanese Military Strategy," *Facing the Pacific*, Vol. 2, 2004, pp. 84-91, translated by Foreign Military Studies Office.

173. Xu Feng, "US Factor in Japan Becoming a Military Power," *Liaowang*, No. 32, August 8, 2005, p. 46, translated by Open Source Center.

174. Wu Xinbo, "The End of the Silver Lining; A Chinese View of the U.S.-Japanese Alliance," *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 29, Winter 2005-06, p. 199-130. Wu Xinbo is a professor at the Center for American Studies and associate dean of the School of International Relations and Public Affairs at Fudan University in Shanghai.

175. Li Xiushi.

176. It is worth noting that the Chinese were supportive of Japan's defense buildup in the 1970s and into the 1980s, when they viewed Japan as a potential partner in resisting the Soviet threat.

177. Michael Pillsbury, ed., *Chinese Views of Future Warfare*, Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1997.

178. *Ibid.*

179. "Japan-U.S. Relations: Japan Turns From 'Concubine' to 'Lover,'" *Xinhua Wang*, November 15, 2005, translated by Open Source Center.

180. Wang Te-jun, "China Must Work Out Countermeasures as Japan and Taiwan Draw Close Together," *Ta Kung Pao*, February 21, 2005, translated by Open Source Center.

181. "Comparison of Comprehensive Power of Major World Countries," Wang Ling, ed., *Yellow Book of International Politics Reports on International Politics and Security*, Beijing: Social Sciences Academy Press, 2006.

182. "Japan Motive for Huge Military Expense Questioned," *China Daily*, December 14, 2005, provided by Open Source Center.

183. Tang Tianri, "The 'Nuclear Weapons Theory' Runs Counter to the Trend of the Times," *Liaowang*, No. 24, June 10, 2002, p. 56, translated by Open Source Center.

184. Yang Yunzhong, "Somebody is Behind 'Nuclear Armament Talk' Within Japan's Political Circles," *Liaowang*, June 17, 2002, translated by Open Source Center.

185. *Ibid.*

186. Zhang Zhiyu and Xia Qianyong, "The Right to Possess Nuclear Weapons? How Far is Japan from the 'Nuclear Threshold,'" *Renmin Wang*, April 27, 2004, translated by Open Source Center.

187. Sun Cheng, "Lagging Security Relations and Ways Out," *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi*, No. 10, October 20, 2003, pp. 5-7, translated by Open Source Center.

188. Wu Xinbo, p. 125.

189. The Chinese refer to the islands as Diaoyu or Diaoyutai; the Japanese call them the Senkaku Islands. Since the intent of this article is to capture the Chinese perspective, this author will hereafter adhere to the Chinese naming.

190. "FM Machimura Says PRC Submarine Entered Japan Due to 'Technical Error,'" *Agence France-Presse*, November 16, 2004, provided by Open Source Center.

191. NHK General Television, November 8, 2005, broadcast translated and reported on by Open Source Center.

192. "Chinese Flight Training in East China Sea in Accordance with International Law: FM Spokesman," *Xinhua*, November 15, 2005, provided by Open Source Center.

193. Zhang Yueting, "Behind Koizumi Cabinet's Hardline Foreign Policy Against China," *Liaowang*, No. 26, June 27, 2005, pp. 50-51, translated by Open Source Center.

194. "Japan's Dangerous Move and the East China Sea," *China Daily*, July 16, 2005, available at *www.chinadaily.com.cn*. The other editorial was by Bian Yi, "Defending Rightful Sea Territory," July 28, 2005, available at *www.chinadaily.com.cn*.

195. Lin Chuan, "If Japan Unilaterally Exploits Oil and Gas in the East China Sea, It May Trigger a Military Conflict Between China and Japan," *Zhongguo Tongxun She* (*China News Agency*), July 16, 2005, translated by Open Source Center.

196. *Ibid.*

197. Jin Linbo as quoted in Wang Dejun, "1.12 Million People Signed Their Names to Protest Against Japan on 18 September," *Ta Kung Pao*, September 19, 2003, translated by Open Source Center.

198. "Full Text of Joint Statement of China, India," *Xinhua*, April 12, 2005, provided by Open Source Center.

199. *Ibid.*

200. "China, India Achieve Win-Win Through Co-Op," *Xinhua*, April 23, 2006, available at *news.Xinhuanet.com/english/2006-04/24/content_4464931.htm*, accessed April 24, 2006.

201. *Ibid.*

202. Zhang Chengming and Cheng Xizhong, "Establishment of New Type of Sino-Indian Relation and Its Perspective," *International Strategic Studies*, No. 4, October 2003, p. 24. Zhang is the Secretary General of the China Institute for International Strategic Studies, the organization that publishes the journal.

203. The Five Principles are (1) mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, (2) mutual nonaggression, (3) non-interference in each other's internal affairs, (4) equality and mutual benefit, and, (5) peaceful coexistence.

204. Lan Jianxue, "Sino-Indian Relations Need to Transcend," *Huanqiu Shibao*, January 7, 2005, translated by Open Source Center. *Huanqiu Shibao* is an international affairs paper by *People's Daily*.

205. Zhao Gancheng, "China-India Ties: Simultaneous Rising and Peaceful Coexistence," *International Review*, Vol. 35, Summer 2004, available at *www.siis.org.cn/english/journal/2004/2/Zhao%20Gancheng.htm*, accessed November 8, 2005.

206. "Comparison of Comprehensive Power of Major World Countries," Wang Ling, ed., *Yellow Book of International Politics Reports on International Politics and Security*, Beijing: Social Sciences Academy Press, 2006. Ten countries were considered in this study, ranked in this order: United States, United Kingdom, Russia, France, Germany, China, Japan, Canada, Korea, and India.

207. *Ibid.*

208. *Ibid.*

209. Ma Jiali, "Vajpayee's China Tour and the Sino-Indian Relations," *Peace and Development*, No. 3, 2003, p. 62.

210. Hu Shisheng, "Strategic Gains at Heart of Bush South Asia Trip," *China Daily*, March 7, 2006, provided by the Open Source Center.

211. Lin Chuan, "Bush Will Start to Visit India Tomorrow to Woo India in Attempt to Contain China," *Zhongguo Tongxun She* (*China News Agency*), February 28, 2006, translated by Open Source Center.

212. *Ibid.* See also Hu Shisheng, "Strategic Gains at Heart of Bush Trip," and Zhao Yi "Nuclear Cooperation, Anti-terrorism Top Bush Agenda During Trip," *Xinhua*, March 4, 2006, provided by Open Source Center.

213. Zhou Gang, "The Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence Guiding Continuous Improvement in Sino-Indian Relations," China Institute of International Studies, available at *www.ciis.org.cn/item/2005-02-16/50793.html*, accessed March 2, 2006. The McMahon Line, named after India's foreign secretary who negotiated the treaty with the UK, was agreed upon in a treaty between Britain and Tibet. The agreement is not recognized by China, which does not consider Tibet an independent country with authority to enter into such international agreements.

214. Zhao Gancheng.

215. Bruce Elleman, *Modern Chinese Warfare, 1795-1989*, New York: Routledge, 2001, p. 255.

216. *Ibid.*

217. "China and India Sign Border Deal," *BBC News*, April 11, 2005, available at *news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/4431299.stm#map*, accessed May 5, 2006.

218. Tang Shiping, "China's Peripheral Security Environment in 2010-1015: Decisive Factors, Trends and Prospects," *Zhanlue yu Guanli* (*Strategy and Management*), October 1, 2002, translated by Open Source Center.

219. Gao Zichuan, "An Analysis of the Basic Situation of China's Peripheral Security Environment," *Dangdai Yatai*, January 1, 2004, translated by Open Source Center.

220. Ma Jiali, "Vajpayee's China Tour and the Sino-Indian Relations," *Peace and Development*, No. 3, 2003, p. 61.

221. Ma Jiali, "Review and Forecast India's Situation," *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi*, February 20, 2001, translated by Open Source Center.

222. "CICIR Scholars Discuss Sino-Indian, U.S.-Indian Relations," *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi*, August 20, 2003, translated by Open Source Center.

223. See Bruce Elleman, *Modern Chinese Warfare, 1795-1989*, New York: Routledge, 2001, for a further elaboration of Sino-Indian-Russian relations during the Sino-Indian War.

224. Zhao Gancheng.

225. Lan Jianxue.

226. Zhao Gancheng.

227. Bruce Elleman, p. 259.

228. Xiong Guangkai, "Joint Efforts to Deal with the New Challenge of Nontraditional Security Threats," *Shijie Zhishi*, August 1, 2005, translated by Open Source Center.

229. Interviews with author at Shanghai Jiao Tong University Center for National Strategy Studies, Shanghai, China, June 5, 2006.

230. Interviews with author at Shanghai Institute for International Studies, Shanghai, China, June 9, 2006.

231. Xiong Guangkai.

232. *Ibid.*

233. *Ibid.*

234. Guo Xuetong, "Nontraditional Security and China's Rise," *Mao Zedong Deng Xiaoping Lilun Yanjiu*, December 30, 2005, pp. 24-28, translated by Open Source Center.

235. Yu Xintian, "Understanding and Preventing New Conflicts and Wars: China's Peaceful Rise as a Strategic Choice," *International Review*, Vol. 35, Summer 2004, available at *www.siis.org/cn/english/journal/2004/2/Yu%20Xintian.htm*, accessed November 8, 2005.

236. For more on China's crisis management, see Andrew Scobell and Larry Wortzel, *Chinese National Security: Decisionmaking Under Stress,* Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, October 2005.

237. Ding Yuanzhu, "2010: Three Types of Possible Prospects for China—Based on Surveys and Inquiries of 98 Government and Nongovernmental Experts," *Zhanlue Yu Guanli*, August 6, 2004, translated by Open Source Center.

238. *Ibid.*

239. Yu Xintian, "Understanding and Preventing New Conflicts and Wars: China's Peaceful Rise as a Strategic Choice," *International Review*, Vol. 35, Summer 2004, available at *www.siis.org/cn/english/journal/2004/2/Yu%20Xintian.htm*, accessed November 8, 2005.

240. *China Human Development Report 2005*, United Nations Development Program, December 2005, available at *hdr.undp.org/docs/reports/national/CPR_China/China_2005_en.pdf*, accessed August 4, 2006, p. 2.

241. *Ibid.*, p. 2.

242. Zhu Qingfang quoted in Josephine Ma, "China Wealth Gap Fueling Instability, Studies Warn," *Hong Kong South China Morning Post*, December 22, 2005, provided by Open Source Center.

243. "Party School Warns Against China's Widening Income Gap," *People's Daily*, September 21, 2005, available at *english.people.com.cn/*, accessed July 27, 2006. The original article, which I have not seen, was published in *Study Times* in September 2005. My information was taken from news reports on the article.

244. *Ibid.*

245. "The New Five Year Plan," November 9, 2005, available at *china.org.cn*, accessed July 28, 2006.

246. Sun Liping, "Are We Starting to Face a Fragmented Society?" *Zhalue yu Guanli*, April 30, 2002, translated by Open Source Center.

247. So A-ti, "Scholar Advocates System of Interest Expression," *Ta Kung Pao*, March 25, 2006, translated by Open Source Center.

248. Tracy Quek, "China Hit by Rise in Social Disturbances," *The Straits Times,* January 20, 2006, provided by Open Source Center.

249. Chen Yi-yuan, "Mass Resistance Topped 20,000 Each Month," *Tung Hsiang*, (*Trend)*, August 15, 2005, translated by Open Source Center.

250. "Nearly 10,000 Protest in Guangzhou Against Private Roads Being Made Public," *Tung Fang Jih Pao*, December 12, 2005; "Protestors Die in Police-Civilian Clash Over Land Dispute in Shanwei," *Ming Pao*, December 8, 2005; "Land Acquisition Row Sparks Violent Police-Civilian Clash in Guangdong, Involving 'Tens of Thousands of Villagers,'" *Ping Kuo Jih Pao*, July 28, 2005, all translated by Open Source Center. It should be noted that these are all Hong Kong newspapers; only the Shanwei incident was covered in the official Chinese press. For an analysis of civil disturbances in 2005, see Open Source Center report, "Highlights: Reports on PRC Civil Disturbances for 2005," February 2, 2006.

251. Dai Qun, "Anhui Quells Mass Incident in Chizhou," *Xinhua*, June 29, 2005, provided by Open Source Center.

252. "China Handles 87,000 Public Order Disturbance Cases," *Xinhua,* January 19, 2006, provided by Open Source Center.

253. Li Qiang, "New Changes in the Stratified Structure of the Chinese Society," in *Year 2000: Analysis and Forecast of China's Social Situation, Blue Book on Chinese Society,* Ru Xin, Lu Xueyi, Li Peilin, *et al*., eds., January 1, 2002, translated by Open Source Center.

254. "Take the Law Seriously," Opinion in *China Daily*, June 6, 2006, provided by Open Source Center.

255. *Ibid.*

256. SEPA Deputy Director Pan Yue as quoted in "On Energy, Pollution Control, Going Green," *The Straits Times*, June 17, 2006, provided by Open Source Center.

257. "Nearly Half of China's Chemical Plants Pose Environmental Risks," *Xinhua*, July 11, 2006, provided by Open Source Center.

258. "Hard Battle on Pollution," *China Daily*, June 1, 2006, provided by Open Source Center.

259. Jiao Xiaoyang, February 21, 2006.

260. Li Shi, "Rational Policy Making Vital," *China Daily*, April 29, 2006, provided by Open Source Center.

261. *2004 PRC National Environmental Statistics Bulletin*, June 2005, available in Chinese at *www.lnepb.gov.cn/look.asp?id={144A0552-0A90-4A4B-8B4F-BB76740F383B*, translated by Open Source Center.

262. "Green GDP Calculation Piloted," *China Daily*, March 1, 2005, available at *www.china.org.cn/english/2005/Mar/121445.htm*, accessed July 24, 2006.

263. E. Jingping as quoted in Robert Saiget, "Global Warming Behind Disastrous Typhoon Season," Hong Kong service of *Agence France-Presse*, August 14, 2006, provided by Open Source Center.

264. "Over 17 Million People Suffer Drinking Water Shortage in SW China," *Xinhua*, August 12, 2006, provided by Open Source Center.

265. "A Terrible Year for Natural Disasters in China," *Xinhua*, August 10, 2006, provided by Open Source Center.

266. "Less Greenhouse Gases to Help Balance Precipitation in China's Major Rivers: Expert," *Xinhua*, July 8, 2006, provided by Open Source Center.

267. "Global Warming Swells Tibetan Lakes," *Xinhua,* April 11, 2006, provided by Open Source Center.

268. "Full Text: Environmental Protection in China, 1996-2005," *Xinhua,* June 5, 2006, provided by Open Source Center.

269. Pan Yue, "Take Urgent Measures to Protect our Environment," *China Daily*, July 19, 2006, provided by Open Source Center.

270. Ren Yuling, member of the National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference and Counselor to the State Council, as quoted in Feng Yichun and Wan Xingya, "Ren Yuling, Member of CPCC National Committee and Counselor to State Council, Says Disclosing Truth is Government Responsibility," *Zhongguo Qingnian Bao*, November 25, 2005, translated by Open Source Center.

271. Jiang Ping, "Give Law Greater Clout in Battle Against Pollution," *China Daily*, July 31, 2006, provided by Open Source Center.

272. Zheng Yisheng and Qiang Yihong, *Grave Concerns*, Today's China Publishing House, 1998, translation and summary provided by U.S. Embassy Beijing, accessed in Open Source Center.

273. Speech at National Teleconference on Building a Resource Saving Society, "Attach Great Importance to, and Strengthen Leadership over the Building of a Resource-Saving Society at an Accelerating Pace," *Xinhua*, July 3, 2005, translated by Open Source Center.

274. *Ibid.*

275. The phrase "reliance problems," comes from Lin Limin, as quoted in Sun Chao "Develop Great Periphery Diplomacy, Participate Actively in Regional Cooperation," *Zhongguo Jinji Shibao*, December 6, 2004, translated by Open Source Center.

276. Liu Jianfei and Qi Yi, "China's Oil Security and Its Strategic Options," *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi*, No. 12, December 20, 2002, p. 35-46, translated by Open Source Center.

277. Zhang Wenmu, "China's Energy Security and Policy Choices," *Shijie Jingji Yu Zhengzhi*, May 14, 2003, translated by Open Source Center.

278. Xia Yishan, "China-U.S. Cooperation in Maintaining Energy Security," *A Presentation Collection for the International Conference on Energy Security: Implications for U.S.-China-Middle East Relations*, Shanghai: Shanghai Institute for International Security, 2005, p. 89.

279. *Ibid.*

280. Wang Jian, "Search for Oil: Confrontation and Cooperation Between China and the United States in the Middle East," *A Presentation Collection for the International Conference on Energy Security: Implications for U.S.-China-Middle East Relations*, Shanghai: Shanghai Institute for International Security, 2005, p. 54.

281. Wen Han, "Hu Jintao Urges Breakthrough in 'Malacca Dilemma'," *Wen Wei Po*, January 14, 2004, translated by Open Source Center.

282. Liu Jianfei and Qi Yi.

283. *Ibid.*

284. Zhang Wenmu.

285. Wen Han.

286. Wang Haiyun, "Energy Has Become 'Diplomatic Currency,'" *Huanqiu Shibao*, April 25, 2006, translated by Open Source Center.

287. *Ibid.*

288. Ma Xiaojun, "Conflict or Cooperation? Strategic Energy Choices Facing China and the United States, an Analysis of Factors in Potential Sino-U.S. Conflicts in the Field of Energy," *Xuexi Shibao*, *Study Times,* December 12, 2005, translated by Open Source Center.

289. Pang Zhongying, "Peaceful Development and Energy Diplomacy," *Liaowang*, February 13, 2006, translated by Open Source Center.

290. *Ibid.*

291. Fu Jing, "New Ministry Recommended to Handle Energy," *China Daily*, June 2, 2006, provided by Open Source Center.

292. Chen Zhongtao, "Study of Prospect of China's Energy Supply and Demand in the 11th Five Year Program," *Zhongguo Nengyuan*, May 25, 2006, translated by Open Source Center.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

SUSAN L. CRAIG is currently a Red Team Leader at the Joint Intelligence Operations Center of U.S. Pacific Command in Hawaii. This monograph was written while she was a China analyst at the U.S. Army's Foreign Military Studies Office (FMSO) at Fort Leavenworth, KS. She also worked for the Defense Intelligence Agency as a staff officer and counterproliferation analyst in Washington, DC. Ms. Craig has an M.P.A. in international security policy from Harvard's Kennedy School of Government and an M.A. in political management from George Washington University. Her undergraduate degree in political science and history is from Carroll College, Waukesha, WI.