



Journal of Current Chinese Affairs

China aktuell

Zhang, Baohui (2010),
Chinese Foreign Policy in Transition: Trends and Implications, in: *Journal of
Current Chinese Affairs*, 39, 2, 39-68.

ISSN: 1868-4874 (online), ISSN: 1868-1026 (print)

The online version of this and the other articles can be found at:

www.CurrentChineseAffairs.org

Published by

GIGA German Institute of Global and Area Studies, Institute of Asian Studies
in cooperation with the National Institute of Chinese Studies, White Rose East Asia
Centre at the Universities of Leeds and Sheffield and Hamburg University Press.

The *Journal of Current Chinese Affairs* is an Open Access publication.

It may be read, copied and distributed free of charge according to the conditions of the
Creative Commons Attribution-No Derivative Works 3.0 License.

To subscribe to the print edition: <ias@giga-hamburg.de>

For an e-mail alert please register at: <www.CurrentChineseAffairs.org>

The *Journal of Current Chinese Affairs* is part of the GIGA Journal Family which includes:
Africa Spectrum • Journal of Current Chinese Affairs • Journal of Current Southeast
Asian Affairs • Journal of Politics in Latin America • <www.giga-journal-family.org>



German Institute of Global and Area Studies
Institute of Asian Studies

Chinese Foreign Policy in Transition: Trends and Implications

Baohui Zhang

Abstract: Chinese foreign policy has been transformed in recent years. This article seeks to provide a systematic analysis of the most salient features of the new Chinese foreign policy. It identifies five such features. Based on these features, the article suggests that China is poised to become a true global power. This view differs significantly from Gerald Segal's famous claim in 1999 that China was no more than a middle power. The article utilizes many current Chinese sources to help readers understand China's new motives and goals in international and regional affairs.

■ Manuscript received 24 September 2008; accepted 21 September 2009

Keywords: China, China-US relations, diplomatic relations, foreign policy/ foreign relations, the rise of China

Dr. Baohui Zhang is an associate professor of political science and director of the Centre for Asian Pacific Studies at Lingnan University in Hong Kong. His research interests include Chinese foreign policy, U.S.-China relations and Hong Kong's democratization.
E-mail: <bzhang@ln.edu.hk>

Introduction

Recent Chinese diplomatic activities have attracted a lot of attention among China watchers. This article suggests that new trends in Chinese foreign policy have contributed to China's rapid rise as a global power. These trends demonstrate an unprecedented level of confidence, assertiveness and skill in promoting China's worldwide influences. This is a significant change from the Chinese foreign policy defined by Deng Xiaoping's teaching of "Lay low, never take the lead, and bide our time". Equally important, the emergence of the new trends is rapid. As observed by Shi Yinong, a leading international relations expert in China, Chinese elites and the Chinese public now see "a sudden need for a proactive and outward-looking foreign policy" (Shi 2006).

There is widespread evidence to support this view. China has shown great interest in many hot spots of the world. It was instrumental in the Six Party Talks on the North Korean nuclear issue. Top Chinese leaders now travel all over the world. By some accounts, President Hu Jintao and Premier Wen Jiabao visited around 60 countries in 2005 and 2006 (*Xinmin Zhoukan* 2005; *Liaowang Zhoukan* 2006). China is also far more assertive now in the UN: It played major roles in recent deliberations and resolutions on Iran, Burma, North Korea and Sudan. Perhaps the most dramatic evidence for China's diplomatic assertiveness is the three multilateral meetings that it hosted in 2006 and that involved leaders from over 60 countries. These were: the Sixth Annual Meeting of Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) in June; the China-ASEAN Commemorative Summit in October; and the China-Africa Cooperation Forum in November. In these cases, China used so-called "forum diplomacy" to engage a large group of countries in selected regions of the world.

China's new diplomacy is characterised by rising confidence and assertiveness in projecting and protecting Chinese national interests. The latest signs of China seeking major roles in world affairs are its calls for reforming global institutions such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Trade Organization (WTO). Indeed, China has even proposed using a new supranational currency to replace the US dollar as the international reserve currency.

Willy Wo-Lap Lam, a seasoned China observer, suggests that the new posture in Chinese foreign policy became apparent in 2004 and 2005. As he notes, "[t]he years 2004 and 2005 would go down in history as a turning point in Chinese diplomacy" (Lam 2007: 160). I argue here

that the blossoming of the new Chinese foreign policy occurred in 2006 and was symbolised by the three aforementioned multilateral summit meetings hosted by China. Indeed, leading Chinese foreign policy experts have marked 2006 as the beginning of China's new role in world affairs. As observed by Jin Canrong, Deputy Dean of the School of International Relations at Renmin University, "[t]he greatest change of international relations in 2006 was the ascendance of the China factor. Its diplomatic results reached unprecedented levels" (Jin Canrong 2007: 1). Yuan Zongze, Deputy Director of the China Institute of International Studies, a think tank for the Foreign Ministry, even claimed that 2006 represented "the year of China" in world affairs (Yuan 2006).

Although Chinese foreign policy has seen massive shifts in recent years, there is a shortage of systematic studies that analyse the key features and consequences of China's new diplomacy. Thus, there is a critical need to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the most salient features of the new Chinese foreign policy that have contributed to the rise of China as a global power. This article argues that there are five such features that define the new posture of Chinese foreign policy: the pursuit of full partnership with the United States of America in a new bilateral relationship; a rising tendency of soft-balancing in great power relations, which is represented by a deepening strategic partnership with Russia; efforts to re-shape the orders of multiple regions of the world, including those that are outside China's natural geographical context of East Asia, such as Africa and Central Asia; a global economic security strategy that has contributed to China's worldwide diplomatic presence and impact; and finally, the pursuit of soft power, a mixture of economic diplomacy and cultural and ideological appeals, to promote China's global and regional influence. I argue that due to the aforementioned trends in Chinese foreign policy, China has rapidly increased its profile in international affairs. Using a model proposed by political scientist Lawrence Freedman, this article suggests that China is poised to become a true global power (Freedman 2004: 35).

The article employs the latest analyses by leading Chinese experts on international relations and foreign policy. They reflect how Chinese foreign policy elites perceive China's new role in the world and its national interests on various global and regional issues. These views are crucial to the outside world's understanding of China's motives and goals in international and regional affairs. Indeed, many of these Chinese experts frequently consult with the Chinese government and participate in inter-

nal policy deliberations. And yet, due to a lack of proper translations, their views are largely unknown to foreign observers of Chinese foreign policy. Although Chinese scholars are writing increasingly in English in recent years, English-language scholarship and English translations of Chinese works remain limited.

Pursuit of Full Partnership with the United States

Until recently, the United States constituted the key factor in China's foreign policy considerations. In fact, one could even say that China was obsessed with how the United States might interpret its actions and behaviours. Its US policy was thus designed to pre-empt the United States' fear that China might in the long run challenge the United States' role as a global powerhouse. Therefore, since the mid-1990s, Chinese foreign policy has evolved around the central goal of diffusing potential containment action by the United States. As a result, until recently, China rarely openly challenged the United States on global, regional, or bilateral issues.

However, as one would expect, the rise of China as a confident global power is having a profound impact on its relations with the United States. In fact, this relationship has been redefined. Although China still pursues a strategy of cooperation, it has also become more assertive in its dealings with the United States. For example, the January 2007 Chinese anti-satellite test was the mark of a new Chinese approach toward the United States, i.e. China is no longer obsessed with whether its actions would invite US retaliations. Indeed, in the same month, China vetoed a US-sponsored UN resolution sanctioning Burma for its human rights abuses. It was the first veto by China in the UN Security Council since 1997 and only the fifth veto ever exercised by China. These assertive actions directly against the United States represented a newly confident China that believes the unipolar system has come to an end.

We can also see this new Chinese assertiveness with the US if we study the recent economic relationship between the two nations. For example, just before the Fourth China–U.S. Strategic Dialogue held in June 2008, the *New York Times* reported that “economic observers are noting that the Chinese posture toward the Americans has decidedly shifted”. As the story goes,

[n]ot long ago, Chinese officials sat across conference tables from American officials and got an earful. The Americans scolded the Chinese on mismanaging their economy, from state subsidies to foreign investment regulations to the valuation of their currency. [...] But in recent weeks, the fingers have been wagging in the other direction. Senior Chinese officials are publicly and loudly rebuking the Americans on their handling of the economy and defending their own more assertive style of regulations (Wong 2008).

Indeed, the China News Agency *Xinhua*, in an analysis titled “A Changing Posture for Sino–U.S. Economic Dialogue: Toward a Better Offense–Defense Balance”, summed up the new Chinese attitude toward the United States this way:

The changing posture is related to the new reality. The depreciating U.S. dollars, sub-prime crisis, and financial market instability have weakened the American position when dealing with China. In the meantime, its high speed economic growth has massively increased China’s confidence (*Xinhua* 2008).

The recent change in China’s US policy is not motivated by an anti-American agenda. Rather, it reflects China’s desire for a more equal relationship as its power grows. China has lost its fear of the United States, which is seen by China to be in a process of relative decline. Indeed, Chinese experts have concluded that the unipolar system has come to an end. For example, Fu Mengzi, a leading Chinese expert on the United States and Assistant President of the China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations, the pre-eminent Chinese foreign policy think tank, argues that the world has already entered the post-American era and that the new order is defined by multipolarity (Fu 2008).

Inevitably, the perceived shifts in the balance of power have led China to seek a more equal relationship with the United States. The mechanism preferred by China to pursue such a relationship is the so-called “strategic dialogues”, which supposedly put China on an equal footing with the United States when they discuss joint responses to global and regional problems. Indeed, the United States has accepted China’s quest for a more equal relationship. Former Secretary of the Treasury Henry Paulson, Jr played a key role in using the strategic dialogue to establish a full economic partnership with China. He and other pragmatists in the Bush administration, such as Robert Zolleick, recognised China as a vital player in the global economy and thus recognised

the necessity to enlist Chinese cooperation in resolving many issues concerning US interests.

The Obama administration has expanded its strategic dialogue with China: Previously the Sino-US dialogue focused almost exclusively on economic matters, but now it includes matters of security and politics as well. According to Dennis Wilder, the Obama administration wants to show “that the new dialogue will seek to take the relationship to a new level” (Wilder 2009). In the last week of July 2009, China and the United States conducted their first joint strategic and economic dialogue. While US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton discussed political and security issues with Chinese officials, US Secretary of Treasury Timothy Geithner focused on bilateral and global economic issues.

Although the Chinese leadership has refrained from discussing the so-called G-2 arrangement, which supposedly establishes a co-super-power mechanism between China and the United States, the quest for a more equal relationship with the United States has been an important goal of China. In many ways, beginning in the latter half of Bush’s second term, China has been making steady progress toward this goal. The 2008 global financial crisis, which further eroded the perceived power of the United States, has greatly helped China in establishing a more equal relationship with the United States. However, although China seems to be succeeding in constructing a more equal relationship with the United States, some Chinese experts caution against being overly optimistic in assessing the changing balance of power between the two countries. For example, Yan Bingsi, a scholar at China’s Institute of International Studies, the Foreign Ministry’s think tank, argues that the United States remains the world’s only superpower and it will take a long time before China can overtake it in terms of comprehensive national power. To support his view, Yan provides a list of ten areas of national power, such as technology and research, international institutional power, and soft power, where the United States still enjoys an overwhelming lead over other countries (Yang 2008). Wang Jisi, one of the most well-known Chinese experts on the United States, also presents a sober assessment of the shifting Sino-US balance of power. Although China has made notable accomplishments, such as economic and military modernisation, Wang argues that “in the foreseeable future, the power gap between China and the United States will not rapidly shrink”. In fact, as he argues, China is more fragile than either the United States or Japan due to

a vast range of domestic problems. China is more likely to see its process of ascendance curtailed by domestic instabilities (Wang 2009).

Soft-balancing in Great Power Diplomacy

While China is seeking equality with the United States, it has also been more active in using strategic alliances with other major powers to improve its position in the world: China's deepening strategic partnerships with Russia are the best example.

Strategic partnership in fact has been a Chinese foreign policy practice since the 1990s. At the time, however, the policy was used to indicate a high-level, bilateral, cooperative relationship with other countries. It did not seek to balance against a third party (for a survey of China's strategic partnerships, see Jin Zhengkun 2007). Although some did have an anti-hegemony rhetoric, China's strategic partnerships typically refrained from any concrete actions that could be perceived as unfriendly by the United States.

Scholars of international relations once suggested that due to either benign interpretation of American intentions or fear of retribution by the United States, other major powers did not seek to balance the world's only superpower. These considerations certainly could explain China's lack of balancing efforts during the 1990s, when it treated the United States with extreme caution. Recently however, there have been studies of soft-balancing actions by other countries to contain American global influences (for a representative study, see Pape 2005). Soft-balancing is defined as a major power or group of major powers coordinating its/their strategic policies with the aim of impeding or frustrating the policies of another major power or superpower – in this case, the United States. Soft-balancing does not involve traditional military alliances or specific security obligations. Instead, it emphasises shared strategic goals and coordinated policies to weaken American global dominance.

Consistent with this new trend, China's strategic partnership with Russia has shown increasing soft-balancing tendencies. One contributing factor is the Chinese perception that American global hegemony has come to an end. The disintegration of the unipolar system has given other major powers greater room for balancing. Another contributing factor is China's growing realisation that the United States is in fact incapable of retaliating against major powers it considers uncooperative. Fu Mengzi argues that the United States has proven unable to take con-

crete measures to punish either France or Germany after their open and persistent opposition to the Iraq War (Fu 2007). Thus, to a significant degree, China has lost its fear of American punitive abilities, a fear that had deterred China from balancing actions during the 1990s.

Since 2004, China's strategic partnership with Russia has been increasing both in depth and in scope. The two countries have expanded trade with each other, settled territorial issues, institutionalised visits by top leaders, and adopted common positions on many international issues, such as the Iranian nuclear issue and planned US deployment of anti-missile capabilities in Europe (for a survey of China–Russia strategic partnership, see Wu 2006). Indeed, China and Russia jointly exercised a veto against US-sponsored UN resolutions to place sanctions on Burma and Zimbabwe. At the February 2008 UN Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, China and Russia jointly proposed a treaty for banning weapons in outer space.

On the military and security fronts, the two countries have also been engaging in new types of strategically-oriented cooperation. In 2005, Russia and China conducted a large joint military exercise. This was the first time the two conducted an exercise that involved land, air and naval forces. The *Jiefangjun Bao* claimed that the exercise clearly demonstrated strategic intentions and sent a strong signal to other countries (*Jiefangjun Bao* 2005). Russian analyses also note the strategic intention of the exercise, stating that

the war games sent a clear message to Washington: The strategic ties between Russia and China have reached a point where the two nations are in a position to take joint control of strategic regions in Eurasia (Abdullaev 2005).

In 2007, the military dimension of Sino–Russian strategic cooperation progressed to a higher level. China, together with other members of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, participated in a high-profile military exercise in Russia. The exercise carried historical significance in that it was the first time that China sent its military in large formations to a foreign exercise. Also, Chinese troops travelled over 10,000 kilometers to reach the Ural region of Russia, which represented the longest power projection by the Chinese military ever. It was also the first time that a top Chinese leader, in this case President Hu Jintao, made a high-profile personal appearance at a war game in a foreign country. The strategic implication of this exercise cannot be underestimated. For example, a strategist from the PLA National Defense University claims the exercise

allows member states to “display [...] power and deter [...] potential opponents” (Sohu.com 2007).

Another area where China is deepening its strategic cooperation with Russia is in their joint efforts to use regional institutions to counter or offset American influence. The most important example is the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), which includes Russia, China, and some Central Asian countries. American experts suggest that the SCO clearly seeks Russian and Chinese dominance over Central Asia and wants to keep the United States out of the region. Indeed, the August 2007 joint military exercise in Russia included all member states of the SCO. According to Xinhua, the war game represented “a historical leap” in institutionalising military cooperation by member states (Sina.com 2007).

Due to the deepening of strategic cooperation, a new Chinese term has recently been injected into the definition of Sino–Russian partnership, which is *zhanlüe xiezuo* or “strategic coordination”. Almost all recent Chinese studies have begun to use the term (for a representative recent Chinese study, see Yu 2007). For example, one of China’s most influential current affairs magazines has this view of the new phase of the strategic relationship:

Sino–Russian relations have never been so close since the days of Mao and Stalin: large scale space cooperation programs, a new 4.3 billion USD trade deal, and comprehensive energy cooperation. Most importantly, ten years after China and Russia announced their strategic partnership, this strategic cooperation has begun to generate important impact on the global balance of power. [...] Sino–Russian relations have become an important political factor in world politics. They have been playing a solid role in the ending of the American unipolar system and the advancement of multipolarization (*Nanfengchuang* 2007).

Russia’s forceful resurgence in recent years, both diplomatically and economically, and its growing rift with the United States have given China the motivation and the opportunity for closer and very strategic ties with its northern neighbour. Russia is now perceived by Chinese strategists as more likely than ever before to stand up against the United States. For example, according to Wang Haiyun,

Russia has finally walked out of the post Soviet era. Its great power status is largely restored. Within years, Russia will become a country that befits the title of a great power. [...] Since Russia’s fundamental

goals are the multipolarization of the world and its own peaceful development, the geo-strategic impact of its resurgence will thus be positive and conducive for constraining U.S. hegemony” (Wang 2007: 3).

Wang believes that “China and Russia need to forge closer coordination, mutually support each other, and rise up together” (Wang 2007: 7). Although China and Russia have established greater strategic coordination on a broad range of global and regional issues, the problems between the two countries should not be overlooked. For example, Li Jingjie of the Chinese Social Science Academy recognises constraints on the further deepening of a Sino–Russian strategic partnership (Li Jingjie 2007). The most important constraining factor, he argues, is the perception of many members of the Russian elite that China could pose a long-term threat to its national security. The rise of China, especially the expansion of its military power, has alarmed some members of Russia’s ruling class. Further, some Russians have become concerned with the immigration issue along the border regions, where the number of Chinese immigrants working inside Russia, legally or illegally, has risen sharply in recent years. Finally, Russia could be concerned with China’s expanding influence in Central Asia, its traditional backyard. Li Jingjie argues that this last concern could compromise the productivity of the SCO.

It should also be made clear that China and Russia do not always share the same goals and interests in global and regional affairs. China has far greater dependence on the Western markets than Russia. Thus, during Moscow’s war against Georgia in the summer of 2008, China withheld support for Russia. In June 2009, the leaders of the newly rising countries, including Russia, China, India, and Brazil, held a summit to coordinate their strategies for the reform of global institutions. After the meeting, a Chinese analyst suggested that although China and Russia want to increase their influence in global institutions, China has more limited goals since its economic modernisation has benefited tremendously from the existing global institutions and rules. Therefore, it would be difficult to imagine China and Russia adopting joint and coordinated positions on global governance reform (*Zhongguo Xinwen Zhoukan* 2009).

Therefore, based on the above analyses, there will be limits to China’s soft-balancing activities. Its strategic partnership with Russia may not go as far as some people in both countries would like. In particular, it is difficult to imagine China and Russia uniting in their push to overthrow the existing global system that has so far been controlled by the West. Their different perceptions on the legitimacy and functions of the

existing global power structure are constraining the possibility of a joint, exclusively non-Western alliance. This explains why China is still seeking a cooperative relationship with the West on many important bilateral and multilateral issues.

Reshaping Regional Orders

China's increasingly proactive and self-confident foreign policy is also demonstrated by a new attitude toward its role in regional affairs. In particular, China is pursuing a strategy of reshaping the orders of multiple selected regions that are strategically important to its national interests. At this time, these regions include Southeast Asia and Central Asia. In Southeast Asia, China has proposed a variety of new cooperative frameworks to pursue a *de facto* leadership role in the regions. In Central Asia, China's approach is to create and direct a new, regional cooperative institution that reflects its own vision of international relations.

China's view on its own role in regional orders has lately undergone major changes. Until recently, Chinese discussions on the issue have evolved around how to blend in with existing regional cooperative institutions so that China would not be seen as a threat to others. Thus, the role of China in regional orders has been largely confined to increasingly institutionalised participation. It did not actively seek to influence the directions, agenda or operations of specific regional institutions (for a survey of the evolution of Chinese attitude toward regional cooperation, see Shambaugh 2004). Now, with its rising power and confidence, China has been pushing for greater regional leadership and even the reshaping of regional orders.

As pointed out by Zhang Yunling, a scholar from the Chinese Social Science Academy and a leading expert on regional cooperation,

Through proposing new ideas and suggestions, China has attempted to move regional orders toward the direction that favors itself. In recent years, China has used all imaginable occasions, which include economic, political, security, and cultural ones, to advance new ideas and proposals. In fact, China has not only proposed new ideas but also supplied finance to support them (Zhang 2008: 256).

In an important book on the grand strategy for the rise of China, Men Honghua, a scholar at the Institute of International Strategy of the CCP Central Party School, argues that regional primacy should be the foundation of the rise of China as a global power. To achieve this, China needs

to create regional institutions to facilitate the integration of East Asia and the incentives for other countries to jump on the bandwagon with China. The idea is that vast economic opportunities offered by China-led regional integration will discourage other countries from opposing China. Men Honghua thus suggests that China's regional strategy toward East Asia should evolve from one of participation to one of leadership (Men 2005a).

With the perceived end of the unipolar system, some Chinese experts have begun to reject the role of the US in East Asian regional affairs. For example, Xiao Huanrong says that within the East Asian regional order, "the participation by the United States needs to be limited to that of a guest". In contrast, "China should attempt to become the leading country or at least play the role of a coordinator" (Xiao 2005: 189). Pang Zhongying, in an influential article on the transformation of Asian regional order and the role of China, contends that the current US-centred regional system is illegitimate, since it reflects the private interest of a country that is not even Asian. He further suggests that

China cannot simplistically recognize, accept and participate in the American order in the region. This option does not possess any legitimacy, since it is not right to let the majority of the world population obey the order imposed by a minority. China's population is four to five times that of the United States while the Asian population is ten times bigger (Pang 2006: 16).

The Chinese discussion of regional primacy is no longer limited to policy discussions. Recent Chinese policies are showing efforts to cultivate China-centred regional orders in selected regions. This is firstly reflected in China's policy toward Southeast Asia. Until recently, Chinese strategy was one of maintaining systematic communication with ASEAN in order to reduce the latter's worry about the rise of China. As a result, China became a partner with ASEAN through regimes such as ASEAN Plus Three (APT) and ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), which provides security dialogue, confidence-building, and preventive diplomacy between Asian and Pacific countries. China's increasing engagement with ASEAN has succeeded in reducing ASEAN's worries about expanding Chinese economic and military power (Shambaugh 2004).

Now, due to newly found confidence and the perceived decline of US influence in the region, China's approach toward Southeast Asia has become one of seeking regional leadership. This strategy has been reflected in recent Chinese discussions on the need for creating a China-

led regional order. As observed by Tang Xiaosong, a Chinese expert on regional integration,

The model of ASEAN Plus Three is driven by ASEAN countries. This implies that the process of regional cooperation is defined by the rules set by small and weak countries. This model naturally has its weakness, which is that ASEAN's feeble leadership cannot generate sufficient centripetal forces. Moreover, ASEAN's efforts to balance major countries against each other have also prevented the latter from engaging in deeper cooperation (Tang 2008).

Tang concludes therefore that major powers, especially China, need to play the leadership role in the regional cooperation of Southeast Asia.

This new vision of China playing a central role in regional affairs started in 2004 when China initiated the Free Trade Agreement with ASEAN, which sought to pull countries in the region toward a China-centred economic order. Men Honghua believes that the agreement "is the most creative Chinese proposal and strategic action for creating new multilateral economic order". He also notes the political impact of the agreement:

Although it is an economic agreement, it has shifted the decision centre for East Asian regional affairs northward to China. It provides China with major opportunities to reshape the East Asian order (Men 2005a: 274-275).

A major recent Chinese initiative for a China-led regional system was the East Asian Summit (EAS) at the end of 2005. The idea was proposed by China at the ASEAN Plus Three summit meeting in Laos in November of 2004. The forum did not intend to include non-Asian countries in the Pacific such as the United States and Australia. Further, according to the Chinese plan, the EAS would eventually lead to an East Asian Community, in which China would undoubtedly play the leading role (for more discussion on China's failed agenda for the East Asian Community, see Ren 2007: 49-54). The US eventually convinced ASEAN countries to accept Australia, New Zealand, and India as members of EAS, hoping that they could offset China's attempt to lead the group.

Another recent Chinese policy to limit US influence in the region is its rejection of the American proposal for a massive Pacific Rim free trade zone under the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) framework. The US first proposed this idea at the 2006 APEC summit meeting. However, China proposed a counter plan to separate the free trade arrangements into two different systems, the Free Trade Area of

Americas and the East Asian Free Trade Area. China's intention is to keep the US influence within the former while it can dominate the latter (*The Associated Press* 2006). It was the first time that China boldly challenged a US-initiated free trade proposal for the Pacific region.

Central Asia is the other region where China has shown systematic efforts to reshape the regional order. Through cooperative effort with Russia, China is actively using the SCO to define a new regional order. Strategically, Central Asia is important for China for both economic and security reasons. Central Asia's richness in natural resources, particularly oil, is important for China's sustained rapid economic growth. Militarily, controlling Central Asia will help China contain its Muslim separatists who have extensive links to the region. For this security purpose, the SCO has initiated yearly anti-terrorist military exercises.

With regard to the SCO, China has shown increasing leadership. According to Zhao Huasheng, a leading Chinese expert on Central Asia, traditional Russian influence over the region poses a challenge for China. Due to historical and cultural legacies, countries in the region tend to look toward Russia for leadership and protection. China is sometimes viewed with suspicion. Therefore, Zhao argues that China must try to gradually correct the situation to achieve an equal status with Russia in regional affairs (Zhao 2007: 25).

For this purpose, China hosted the Six Summit Meeting of the SCO in June 2006 and used the occasion to promote a Chinese view of international relations. The communiqué of the summit emphasised that no country has the right to impose its political values on others and that each country has the right to choose its own political system. These principles represent the so-called "Shanghai Spirit", which claims to charter a new course in the conduct of inter-state relations. The message was clearly intended to keep US-inspired democratisation out of the region.

China believes that the SCO is of profound political and strategic importance. Feng Yujun, an expert at the China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations, suggests that the SCO champions a new geo-strategic concept called "New Euroasianism". It envisions a unified geopolitical block that includes China, Russia, Central Asian countries, India, Pakistan and Iran (Feng 2006: 14-15). According to Feng, the block can serve as a "stabiliser" for Euroasia and will profoundly affect the global balance of power.

Jiang Yingwei emphasises the importance of the SCO for its efforts to keep the United States out of the region. “The SCO”, as he points out,

under the guidance of China and Russia, has effectively stopped attempted penetration into Central Asia by the United States. This has significant meanings for regional stability and balance of power.

Jiang further suggests that the SCO

is the only security organization for Euroasia in which China plays the leading role and serves as a land bridge to extend China’s strategic influence westward toward the Middle East and North Africa (Jiang 2007: 34).

Although China has been attempting to reshape the order of selected regions, its achievements in this realm need a more sober assessment. For example, even in Southeast Asia, China’s efforts to become the driving force of regional cooperation have been compromised by rising conflicts in the South China Sea: Recently, tensions seem to have rapidly increased between China on one side and Vietnam, the Philippines, and Malaysia on the other. The contests over the control of many individual islands and reefs in the South China Sea, coupled with China’s increasingly harsh rhetoric, have ignited the security concerns of these countries – even members of the Chinese elite have been considering taking military action if necessary. The result is that these countries have recently begun to bolster their naval capabilities. For example, Vietnam, Malaysia and Indonesia have all decided to purchase submarines to counter China’s rising military presence in the South China Sea. Moreover, Australia’s 2009 Defence White Paper also hinted that China could pose a long-term security threat to the region. As a result, it proposed substantial expansion of the Australian defence capability.

This trend of balancing by China’s neighbours is contrary to China’s goal of binding regional countries together through a China-led regional cooperation mechanism. In addition, ASEAN countries clearly prefer the United States to be involved in regional affairs as a counter force to the rising influence of China. Although no nation wants to face the situation of having to choose between China and the United States, ASEAN countries’ preference of continuous US presence in the region reflects a hedging strategy against China.

Thus, according to a survey of strategic thinkers in Asia by the Center for Strategic and International Studies, a weighted average of 65.5 per

cent of those surveyed expect China to be the strongest power in Asia in the future, compared to only 31 per cent who saw the United States in this way. However, China also topped the list of countries that are seen as a potential threat to regional peace and stability with a weighted average of 38 per cent. In contrast, only 12.9 per cent of strategic thinkers in Asia listed the United States as a threat. Moreover, 40 per cent of respondents cited the United States as the greatest force for peace and stability in the region in the future, compared to only 26 per cent that picked China (for a summary of the survey, see Gill et al. 2009).

A Geopolitically Oriented Economic Security Strategy

Another salient feature of the new Chinese foreign policy is its strong geopolitical interpretation of its own economic security. China's various external economic vulnerabilities are now considered challenges to national security. This geopolitically oriented economic security strategy has contributed to China's expanding global activities and influences. On one hand, the new economic security strategy involves truly global activities. Chinese companies, especially oil companies, are pursuing business in many regions of the world, such as Africa, the Middle East, Central Asia and Latin America. On the other hand, the strategy has influenced various aspects of Chinese foreign policy, including regional strategies, great power diplomacy, and its role in the UN Security Council.

China's obsession with its global economic security is best demonstrated by its comprehensive pursuit of energy security. To keep a constant supply of oil, China adopted the Going Out strategy in 2002, which aims to increase Chinese access to oil production in other countries. Its three large, state-owned companies – the China National Petroleum Corporation, the China National Petrochemical Corporation, and the China National Offshore Oil Corporation – have purchased equity shares in overseas exploration and production projects around the world. Further, China has built new pipelines, mostly through Siberia and Central Asia, to secure its oil supply.

The most important link between China's global search for oil and Chinese foreign policy is the sharp rise of energy security concerns. The oil issue is analysed in a geopolitical context to highlight China's national security vulnerability. As observed by Shi Yinhong, there is now “a sudden collective obsession with energy security among the Chinese elite”

(Shi 2006: 42). Many, including both scholars and government officials, see China's energy issue as a national security challenge. This perception has profoundly impacted Chinese foreign policy in recent years. For example, as one Chinese expert argues,

Without exaggeration, China's energy strategy has become an important factor that influences Asian and even global geopolitical balance. Half a century ago, a rising Japan invaded Southeast Asia due to energy insecurity. Energy issues therefore became an important cause of the Pacific War. [Thus,] energy security is not simply an energy issue or an economic issue. It involves national security, strategic economic interests, and diplomacy (Men 2005b: 33).

And, as suggested by Che Xiangming, a strategist from the PLA,

No developed country can survive without oil. Therefore, there will not be a more important factor than oil that could induce wars between nations. Competition over oil will become a major characteristic of future international security (Che 2005: 201).

Most Chinese analysts view the greatest Chinese national security concern to be the vulnerability of the oil supply due to the United States' worldwide political and military dominance. One fear is that the United States could pressure oil-producing countries to stop exporting oil to China. Another fear, as shown by an article in the PLA's *Chinese Military Sciences*, is that 50 per cent of the oil China imports passes through the Indian Ocean, Malacca Strait and South China Sea. In a war, the United States could use its sea dominance to choke off the oil supply along these routes (Guo 2006: 78).

Chinese strategists thus recommend both diversification of oil supply sources and reduction of dependence on key waterways such as the Malacca Strait. For example, Men Honghua argues that China must expand beyond its traditional oil dependence on the Middle East to consider obtaining oil from places like Africa, Central Asia, Russia and Latin America. Further, China must develop a land strategy to bypass its vulnerability on the Indian Ocean and at the Malacca Strait. This would involve building more pipelines in Central Asia and Russia (Men 2005b: 33). A PLA strategist also suggests other ways to bypass the Malacca Strait: One option involves digging a canal through Thailand, a country that has proven to be a great ally of China. Another option is to lay a pipeline from Burma, another close ally, to the southwestern part of China (Xu 2006: 214-215).

The need for diversification and reduction of vulnerability have influenced many aspects of Chinese foreign policy lately, including its regional policies, its great power diplomacy and its increasing assertiveness in the UN Security Council. For example, these needs have motivated China to exercise influence and diplomacy in regions that were not traditionally of central importance for Chinese foreign policy, including Africa, the Middle East, Central Asia and Latin America. President Hu Jintao paid visits to Africa and the Middle East in 2006 and 2007. In addition, Premier Wen Jiabao also visited Africa in 2006. Chinese media dubbed these “energy trips” (*Pingguo Ribao* 2006).

China’s energy security policy has also influenced its great power diplomacy. In particular, it has contributed to the strengthening of China’s strategic partnership with Russia, which is now a major energy supplier for China. Russia figures prominently in China’s efforts to diversify oil supply and to fight its transportation vulnerability. The newly planned trans-Siberia pipeline that ends in northeastern China is, according to Chinese analyses, an important sign of the maturing Sino–Russian strategic partnership. In fact, as Leverett and Noel suggest, China has formed an “axis of oil” with Russia, and this axis is becoming increasingly assertive on security issues that concern the Caucasus, Central Asia and Iran (Leverett and Noel 2006).

Energy factors can also explain China’s increasing willingness to risk its relations with the United States by developing close ties with Sudan, Iran and Venezuela. In fact, to protect its access to oil in these countries, China has become more active in UN Security Council deliberations on Sudan and Iran. As observed by Leverett and Noel, China has consistently shown opposition to UN sanctions on energy-producing states in which its companies operate (Leverett and Noel 2006). In January 2007 China exercised a rare veto in the Security Council on a US- and British-proposed sanction on Burma. In recent years, China has attached great geopolitical importance to Burma due to its ability to offer China a land route to the Indian Ocean, therefore bypassing the Malacca Strait. As for Venezuela, China invited Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez for a state visit in 2006. According to reports, Chávez, angry at American political pressure, plans to sell 45 per cent of the country’s oil to China by 2012 (Sohu.com 2006). To that end, Venezuela signed an agreement with China to buy 18 Chinese-built oil tankers at a cost of 1.3 billion USD.

However, China’s energy-centred global economic security strategy has its critics. Its doomsday views of the United States using oil as a

weapon to strangle China's rise clearly exaggerate external threats to Chinese national interests. Zhao Hongtu, a scholar at the China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations, points out that the drive for energy security has overblown the vulnerability of China (Zhao 2008). He argues that the scenario of the United States Navy blocking China's oil importation could only happen during times of direct military conflict between the two countries. In peacetime, Zhao argues, the international oil market is not subject to any one country's control, so China can well expect a healthy flow of oil. Therefore, Zhao suggests that China has no need to attempt to physically control oil production in other countries.

Another strand of criticism of China's economic security strategy states that China's ties to many rogue states have damaged its international image as a "responsible great power". For example, one Chinese analyst points out that Sudan has become a major negative factor in Chinese foreign policy (He 2008: 45-46). It remains to be seen whether energy diplomacy can even co-exist with China's search for soft power, which intends to project China as a well-behaving country that contributes to the global public good.

A third criticism of China's economic security policy points to increased backlashes against China among many developing countries. The people of many of these countries have begun to see Chinese companies, which often disregard international labour and environmental standards, as plundering their resources. A Chinese analysis suggests that although China has massively expanded its economic assistance to Africa, backlash from local communities has also become common. The analysis recommends that China search for new ways, including international energy cooperation with Western countries, to secure its supply of oil and natural gas (He 2008: 45-46).

The Centrality of Soft Power

Another trend in Chinese foreign policy is the increasing emphasis on soft power, which is generally seen as the ability to wield influence by indirect, non-military means. In recent years, China has put great energy into analysing how soft power, which includes cultural and ideological appeals on one hand, and economic and financial incentives on the other, can promote its regional and global influence. In fact, many Chinese analysts now confidently believe China can become a global role model

for countries that are not satisfied with Western, liberal economic and political systems.

Indeed, China seems to believe that it has discovered the secret of what constitutes international influence. Until recently, Chinese studies of power tended to focus on hard powers, such as economic, military, and scientific and technological capabilities (Huang 1999). This was no different from the US government's view of power. However, the recent setbacks for American global influence (most well-represented by the international backlash against the Iraq War and the Bush Doctrine) have given Chinese analysts a new perspective on what really constitutes influence and power in international politics.

In addition to how loss of soft power has contributed to the relative decline of the United States, Chinese foreign policy experts have also analysed how soft power affects the international influence of other major powers. For instance, Li Jie, Director of Policy Planning in the Chinese Foreign Ministry, argues that Japan's weakness in global influence is a result of its lack of soft power, even though it is the world's second-largest economy (Li Jie 2007).

The Chinese definition of soft power can be viewed one of two ways: One view sees soft power as the attractiveness of one country's ideology, political system and culture. Li Jie also includes a country's ability to shape international norms and rules (Li Jie 2007). Another view among Chinese scholars is that soft power is a broader concept that includes economic and diplomatic influences (for this broader Chinese view of soft power, see Liu 2006). In recent years, China's push to promote its soft power has seen systematic practices of both definitions.

Regarding the first definition of soft power given above, China has been actively promoting Chinese culture to other countries. For example, China has already established 80 Confucius Institutes in 36 countries. The Confucius Institute resembles the UK's British Council, with the goal of promoting foreigners' understanding of Chinese culture and language. The Institutes often have a local partner and in general they are well funded by the Chinese government. According to one study, over 90 local institutions in 38 countries have applied to set up new Confucius Institutes (Lai 2006). Due to the rising influence of China in world affairs and the spread of Confucius Institutes, there are now over 30 million people learning Chinese outside China.

China is also promoting the appeal of its model of development. For example, China has recently started to market the so-called Beijing

Consensus as an alternative to the Washington Consensus, the latter of which promotes democracy and capitalism to the developing world. China claims that its economic miracle, amid political stability, is an alternative to the Western model. Indeed, even Joseph Nye, who invented the theory of soft power, recognises that

in parts of Asia, Africa and Latin America, the so-called ‘Beijing consensus’ on authoritarian government plus a market economy has become more popular than the previously dominant ‘Washington consensus’ of market economics with democratic government (Nye 2005).

Randall Peerenboom, an American scholar, also points out that China’s sustained success in modernisation could well establish a concrete, alternative model of successful development, which may appeal to other countries with similar socio-economic and political conditions (Peerenboom 2007).

Recently China has shown increasing self-confidence in the appeal of its own political and economic model, or the Beijing consensus. Shi Yinhong, one of China’s most influential international relations scholars, claims that China’s success comes with important normative consequences. He suggests that the rise of each great power is associated with the rise of a particular set of values. Currently, China’s rise is helping to project its values into the international system. In particular, Shi argues that China’s development strategy, which is focused on the pursuit of economic success, is going to replace the “Washington consensus” as a universal value for the world. He even claims that “China is projecting a new value tendency that has historical consequences” (Shi 2007: 10-12).

China also practises the broader concept of soft power – namely, economic and diplomatic influence in regional and global affairs. This can be seen in various recent Chinese diplomatic initiatives, often backed by economic incentives. Examples include the China–ASEAN Free Trade Agreement and the China–Africa Cooperation Forum, where China provided economic incentives to recipient countries in order to further enhance its regional and global influence.

According to Josh Kurlantzick, China’s exercise of this type of soft power has profoundly changed international relations in Southeast Asia. China has emerged as the most influential country in the region at the expense of the United States. According to him, China has successfully used economic assistance, public diplomacy, and other economic tools such as investment and regional free trade agreements to cultivate an image as a benign power (Kurlantzick 2006). Moreover, the Chinese

model of development has also appealed to some Southeast Asian countries, which do not fully embrace the Western-style, democratic political system.

In his new book on the subject, Kurlantzick claims that Chinese soft power, which includes diplomatic, economic and cultural components, is transforming the world. In fact, China is poised to become a global power as a result of its soft power influence (Kurlantzick 2007). Thus, Kurlantzick shares the Chinese perspective that soft power is critical for national influence in world affairs. He even predicts that China may become the first country after the Soviet Union to rival the United States in international influence.

However, China's rising soft power should not be exaggerated. One way to gauge China's soft power is to analyse global public opinions of China. Survey results show that China still has a long way to go before it is seen as a positive force in global and regional affairs. For example, according to a 2008 public opinion survey of more than 6,000 people in China, Vietnam, South Korea, Indonesia, Japan and the United States of America, strong majorities in South Korea (74%), Japan (74%) and the United States of America (70%), as well as a plurality in Indonesia (47%), are worried that China could become a military threat in the future (Chicago Council on Global Affairs and East Asia Institute 2008).

China also has a shaky image outside East Asia. According to a 2008 survey by the Pew Research Center on public opinions of China, in many of the 23 countries surveyed, China is viewed unfavourably either by a majority of the population (Spain 56%, France 72%, Germany 68%, Poland 54%, Jordan 52%, Turkey 50%, Japan 84%) or by a substantial percentage of the population (the United States 42%, Australia 40%, Brazil 40%, South Korea 49%, India 45%, Lebanon 42%) (The Pew Global Attitudes Project 2008).

Wang Jisi, Dean of the School of International Relations at Peking University, argues therefore that China must be realistic with its soft power strategy. He points out that many of China's internal problems, such as its rising socio-economic inequalities, its record of environmental abuse, and its lack of respect for the rule of law all limit China's global appeal (*Nanfengchuang* 2009). Wang suggests that instead of a state-sponsored propaganda campaign to promote China's image, its own self-improvement will be the most effective way to achieve this goal. In fact, Wang cautions that overly aggressive promotion of China's soft power may trigger backlashes from other countries.

The Significance of the New Trends

This article has identified five salient trends in Chinese foreign policy. These trends indicate that China has become far more proactive, bold and confident in expanding its global and regional influences. As a result, China is now poised to become a true global power. After the 2008 global financial and economic crises, which are widely seen to have further eroded the power of the West and elevated the power of “the rest”, more and more analyses have begun to include China as a new global power. This is best put by British Foreign Secretary David Miliband after the G20 summit meeting in London in April 2009, when he commented that China has become one of the “two powers that count” (the other being the United States). As he observed, “China’s indispensability in part comes from size, but a second part is that it wants to play a role”. However, in contrast to America’s twentieth-century ascent, which eclipsed Britain, Miliband contended that China would not displace the US but rather join it at the “the new top table” (Borger 2009).

Global public opinion also indicates increasing perception of China as a global power. For example, a survey by the Pew Research Center in 2008 found that China is widely seen as a rising superpower. Indeed, “most of those surveyed in Germany, Spain, France, Britain and Australia think China either has already replaced the United States or will do so in the future” (The Pew Global Attitudes Project 2008).

This article suggests that although China may not eventually emerge as a superpower, it is poised to become a global power. After all, a global power is defined by its spatial dimension: It must have the capacity to engage in extra-regional affairs, and it must have extra-regional interests. The main features of the new Chinese foreign policy all point China seeing itself as a rising global power. Its pursuit of a more equal relationship with the United States in many ways demonstrates China’s rising importance in world affairs. Indeed, the G2 idea comes from members of the US foreign policy elite, who now see China as an important partner in global governance. China’s new soft-balancing tendency also testifies to its attempts to influence the structure of global power distribution. Its efforts to reshape orders in multiple regions of the world reflect the beginning of a new extra-regional agenda. The pursuit of global economic security has also caused China to be involved in many distant regions and has influenced the goals and conduct of Chinese foreign policy.

This view of China as a global power is clearly different from the “Does China Matter?” perspective that was once an issue of debate among scholars of international relations. In 1999, Gerald Segal published a controversial article in *Foreign Affairs*, questioning China’s great power status. He suggested that China was at best a middle power with only regional influences. China’s global economic power, such as in trade and investment, was limited, and its political power and influence were “clearly puny” (Segal 1999).

In 2004, amid the rise of China, Segal’s thesis was re-examined in a book of compiled essays (Buzan and Foot 2004). Interestingly, several contributors to the book at the time still viewed China as a strong but only limited player in the international system. For example, noted British scholar Lawrence Freedman mentioned four reasons China was still a regional power: (a) China had little soft power, which is broadly conceived by Freedman to include cultural appeal, diplomatic competency and capacity to dole out economic incentives; (b) China’s involvement with the UN and other international bodies was minimal; (c) China had a rather parochial sense of its interests; and (d), China was not actively reshaping the contemporary international system (Freedman 2004: 35).

This article indicates that on all these accounts China is now a very different country. China now wields considerable soft power in both regional and global contexts. In fact, China is perhaps the only country in the world that has a coherent and strategic plan for how to promote its soft power. In many parts of the world, China uses a sophisticated package, which combines promotion of Chinese culture with massive economic incentives to advance its interests in the region. Its involvement with the UN has dramatically increased as well. In fact, it has become a key player in the UN Security Council in recent years. Currently, China contributes more peacekeepers than any other permanent member. It has also been instrumental in recent UN deliberations on Sudan, Iran and North Korea. China has also left behind the parochial view of what constitutes its interests. Now, China likes to talk about its “great power responsibility” to the world community. China’s positive role during the recent round of global financial and economic crises testifies to its new willingness to contribute to the global public good. Finally, China is also trying to reshape the international order through various proposals to reform global institutions such as the IMF and the World Bank. The vast difference between the China described by Freedman

and the one analysed in this article indicates the rapidity and magnitude of the changes in China's role in the world in the last three years.

References

- Abdullaev, Nabi (2005), *Unprecedented War Games*, online: <www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/Current-Affairs/Security-Watch/Detail/?id=107183&lng=en> (19 August 2009).
- Borger, Julian (2009), David Miliband: China Ready to Join US as World Power, in: *The Guardian*, 17 May.
- Buzan, Barry and Rosemary Foot (eds.) (2004), *Does China Matter? A Reassessment*, London: Routledge.
- Che, Xianming (2005), Cong junshi jaodu kan wo guo nengyuan anquan (A Military Perspective of Our Country's Energy Security), in: Ba Zhongyan (ed.), *Da guo singqi zhong di guojia anquan* (National Security for Rising Great Powers), Beijing: Beijing Daxue chubanshe (Beijing University Press), 200-205.
- Chicago Council on Global Affairs and East Asia Institute (2008), *Soft Power in Asia 2008*, January/February, online: <www.asiaing.com/asia-soft-power-survey-2008.html> (17 June 2009).
- Feng, Yujun (2006), Shanghai hezuo zuzhi di zhanlüe dingwei yu fazhan fangxiang (Strategic Identity and Directions for the Shanghai Cooperation Organization), in: *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi* (Contemporary International Relations), 11, 12-17.
- Freedman, Lawrence (2004), China as a Global Strategic Actor, in: Barry Buzan and Rosemary Foot (eds.), *Does China Matter? A Reassessment*, London: Routledge, 21-36.
- Fu, Mengzi (2008), Shijie jinru duo yuan duo ji shidai (The World Has Entered a Multipolar Era), in: *Huanqiu Shibao* (Global Times), 9 September.
- Fu, Mengzi (2007), Meiguo chuyu buqingyuan di zhanlüe yintui zhong (The United States in a Reluctant Strategic Retreat), in: *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi* (Contemporary International Relations), January, 22.
- Gill, Bates, Michael Green, Kiyoto Tsuji, and William Watts (2009), *Strategic Views on Asian Regionalism: Survey Results and Analysis*, online: <<http://csis.org/files/media/isis/pubs/pac0912.pdf>> (17 February 2010).
- Guo, Xuetang (2006), Zhong Ou ya diqu di nengyuan yu diyuan zhengzhi (Energy Security and Geo-Politics in Euroasia), in: *Zhongguo Junshi Kexue* (China Military Science), 19, 3, March, 74-81.

- He, Jingjun (2008), Nengyuan waijiao he chu tuwui? (Where to Find Breakthroughs for Energy Diplomacy?), in: *Nanfengchuang* (Nanfengchuang Biweekly), 24 September, 45-46.
- Huang, Shuofeng (1999), *Zonghe guoli xinlun* (A New View of Comprehensive National Power), Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe (China Social Sciences Press).
- Jiang, Yinwei (2007), Shanghai hezuo zuzhi kuangjia xia di Zhong E guanxi (Sino-Russia Relations under the Framework of Shanghai Cooperation Organization), in: *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi* (Contemporary International Relations), 3, 33-38.
- Jiefangjun Bao* (PLA Daily) (2005), Lianhe jun yan shi dui qianzai duishou di weishe he qianzhi (Joint Military Exercise Is a Deterrence against Potential Adversaries), 17 August.
- Jin, Canrong (2007), Guoji xingshi huigu yu zhanwang (International Outlook), in: *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi* (Contemporary International Relations), January, 1.
- Jin, Zhengkun (2007), Zhongguo huoban waijiao zhanlüe chutan (An Examination of China's Partnership Diplomacy), in: Wang Jisi (ed.), *Zhongguo xuezhe kan shijie* (World Politics: Views from China), Beijing: Xin shijie chubanshe (New Century Press), 3, 177-188.
- Kurlantzick, Joshua (2007), *Charm Offensive: How China's Soft Power Is Transforming the World*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kurlantzick, Joshua (2006), China's Charm: Implications of Chinese Soft Power, in: *Policy Brief*, 47, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Lai, Hongyi (2006), China's Cultural Diplomacy: Going for Soft Power, in: *Background Brief*, 308, Singapore: East Asian Institute.
- Lam, Willy Wo-Lap (2007), *Chinese Politics in the Hu Jintao Era: New Leaders, New Challenges*, Armonk, N.Y.: M. E. Sharpe.
- Leverett, Flynt and Pierre Noel (2006), The New Axis of Oil, in: *The National Interest*, Summer, 62-70.
- Li, Jie (2007), Ruan shili jianshe yu Zhongguo di heping fazhan (Constructing Soft Power and China's Peaceful Development), in: *Guoji Wenti Yanyiu* (International Studies), 1, 19-24.
- Li, Jingjie (2007), Kuaru xin shiji di Zhong E guanxi (Sino-Russia Relations in the New Century), in: *Eluosi Zhongya Dong Ou Yanjiu* (Russian, Central Asian, and East European Studies), 2, 55-65.

- Liaowang Zhoukan* (Liaowang Weekly) (2006), Zhongguo waijiao ba da liang dian (Eight Bright Spots in China's Foreign Policy), 18 December.
- Liu, Jian (2006), Zhongguo ruan lilian: yaosu, ziyuan, nengli (China's Soft Power: Components, Resources, and Capabilities), in: The Institute of World Economics and Politics, Shanghai Social Science Academy (ed.), *Guoji tixi yu Zhongguo di ruan lilian* (International System and China's Soft Power), Beijing: Shishi chubanshe (Current Affairs Publishing House), 116-133.
- Men, Honghua (2005a), *Gou jian Zhongguo da zhanlüe di kuang jia* (Defining Parameters for the Chinese Grand Strategy), Beijing: Beijing Daxue chubanshe (Beijing University Press).
- Men, Honghua (2005b), Quebao Zhongguo nengyuan anquan di zhanlüe yiyi (The Strategic Significance of Ensuring China's Energy Security), in: *Taipingyang Xuebao* (Journal of the Pacific Ocean), 1, 33-44.
- Nanfengchuang* (Nanfengchuang Biweekly) (2009), Xing su Zhongguo dui wai xuanchuan shi ci yao di (Selling China: Propaganda Is Secondary), 1 July, 32-35.
- Nanfengchuang* (Nanfengchuang Biweekly) (2007), Zhong E guanxi: tan cheng, zai tancheng (China-Russian Relations: Frankness Plus Frankness), April, B Issue, 73-74.
- Nye, Joseph (2005), The Rise of China's Soft Power, in: *Wall Street Journal Asia*, 29 December.
- Pang, Zhongying (2006), Yazhou diqu zhixu di zhuanbian yu Zhongguo (China and Transformations in East Asian Regional Order), in: *Zhongguo Waijiao* (Foreign Relations of China), April, 11-18.
- Pape, Robert A. (2005), Soft Balancing Against the United States, in: *International Security*, 30, 1, Summer, 7-45.
- Peerenboom, Randall (2007), *China Modernizes; Threat to the West or Model for the Rest?*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pingguo Ribao* (Apple Daily) (2006), Hu zong fang Fei tuo zhanlüe ziyuan gongying (General Secretary Hu Visits Africa to Seek Supply of Strategic Materials), 24 April.
- Ren, Xiao (2007), Lun dongya fenghui yu Meiguo di guanxi (East Asian Summit and Its Relations with the United States), in: *Guoji Wenti Yanjiu* (International Studies), 4, 49-54.
- Segal, Gerald (1999), Does China Matter?, in: *Foreign Affairs*, 78, 5, September/ October.

- Shambaugh, David (2004), China Engages Asia: Reshaping the Regional Order, in: *International Security*, 29, 3 (Winter), 64-99.
- Shi, Yin hong (2007), Zhongguo ren shili yu heping jueqi (China's Soft Power and Its Peaceful Rise), in: *Zhongguo Pinglun* (China Review Monthly), October, 118.
- Shi, Yin hong (2006), Zhongguo bianqian yu Zhongguo waijiao zhanlüe fenxi (China's Transformation and Its Diplomatic Strategy: An Analysis), in: *Guoji Zhengzhi Yanjiu* (International Politics Quarterly), 1, 42.
- Sina.com (2007), *Shang he liu guo yuanshou guanmo jun yan zhangxian gongtong zhenzhi yiyuan* (Leaders of Six SCO Members Inspect Joint Military Exercise and Demonstrate Common Political Wills), online: <<http://mil.news.sina.com.cn/2007-08-13/1151459481.html>> (13 August 2009).
- Sohu.com (2007), *Guofang daxue jiaoshou lin dong jiangshou lianbe jun yan kan dian zai nali* (Professor Lin Dong of National Defense University Analyzing Prominent Aspects of the Joint Exercise), online: <<http://mil.news.sohu.com/2007-810/n251515713.shtml>> (10 August 2009).
- Sohu.com (2006), *Weineirila yao ba yiban shiyou gei Zhongguo Meiguo zhenjie da shou ciji* (Venezuela Plans to Sell Half of Its Oil to China, The United States Are Deeply Worried), online: <www.news.sohu.com/20060516/n243258562.shtml> (16 May 2009).
- Tang, Xiaosong (2008), San qiang gong zhi dong ya quyu yitihua di biran xuanze (The Inevitable Strategy of Major Powers Leading Regional Integration Process in East Asia), in: *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi* (Contemporary International Relations), February, 10-15.
- The Associated Press* (2006), APEC Puts Off Consideration of Region-wide Free Trade Deal, online: <www.bilaterals.org/article.php3?id_article=6475> (15 November 2009).
- The Pew Global Attitudes Project (2008), *Global Economic Gloom – China and India Notable Exceptions: 24-Nation Pew Global Attitudes Survey*, online: <<http://pewglobal.org/reports/pdf/260.pdf>> (12 June 2009).
- Wang, Haiyun (2007), Eluosi chongxin jueqi di qianjing jiqi shijie yingxiang (Prospect for Russia' Resurgence and Its Global Impact), in: *Eluosi Zhongya Dong Ou Yanjiu* (Russian, Central Asian, and East European Studies), 1, 1-7.

- Wang, Jisi (2009), Cong Zhong Ri Mei liliang duibi kan san jiao guanxi di fazhan qushi (Balance of Power among China, Japan and the United States: Analyzing Trends in the Trilateral Relationship), in: *Zhongguo Waijiao* (Foreign Relations of China), January, 33-39.
- Wilder, Dennis (2009), The U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue: Continuity and Change in Obama's China Policy, in: *China Brief*, Jamestown Foundation, 9, 10, 15 May.
- Wong, Edward (2008), Booming, China Faults U.S. Policy on the Economy, in: *The New York Times*, 17 June.
- Wu, Dahui (2006), Zhong E zhanlüe huoban guanxi: shi nian shijian di lishi kaocha (China-Russia Strategic Partnership: An Analysis of Its Ten Years of Practice), in: *Zhongguo Waijiao* (Foreign Relations of China), October, 15-23.
- Xiao, Huanrong (2005), Zhongguo di daguo zeren yu diqu zhuyi zhanlüe (China's Great Power Responsibility and Its Regional Strategies), in: Xiao Huanrong (ed.), *Heping di dili xue-Zhongguo xuezhe lun dongya diqu zhuyi* (Chinese Scholars on East Asian Regionalism), Beijing: Zhongguo Chuanmei daxue chubanshe (Communications University of China Press), 174-189.
- Xinbua* (China News Agency) (2008), Zhongmei jingji duihua geju shengbian gongshou geng pingheng (A Changing Posture for Sino-U.S. Economic Dialogue: Toward a Better Offense-Defense Balance), online: <www.finance.sina.com.cn/roll/20080619/10452285542.shtml> (19 June 2009).
- Xinmin Zhoukan* (Xinmin Weekly) (2005), 2005 nian Zhongguo meili gongshi (2005: The Year of China's Charm Offensive), 23-29 December.
- Xu, Guangyu (2006), Shijie nengyuan jiegou di yanbian qushi ji wuo guo di nengyuan zhanlüe di duice (Changes in Global Energy Structure and Our Country's Energy Strategies), in: Ba Zhongyan (ed.), *Da guo xingqi zhong di guojia anquan* (National Security for Rising Great Powers), Beijing: Beijing Daxue chubanshe (Beijing University Press), 206-216.
- Yang, Bingxi (2008), Shijie xin geju xia Meiguo shili di bianhua (The Changing Power of the United States in the New Global Posture), in: *Guoji Wenti Yanjiu* (International Studies), 4, 32-39.
- Yu, Sui (2007), Lun Zhong E zhanlüe xiezuo woban guanxi (China-Russia Partnership of Strategic Coordination), in: *Guoji Wenti Yanjiu* (International Studies), 3, 4-9.

- Yuan, Zongze (2006), Changxiang Zhongguo shengyin (China Singing Loud), in: *Liaowang Zhoukan* (Liaowang Weekly), 17 November.
- Zhang, Yunling (2008), Goujian Zhongguo yu zhoubian guojia zhijian di xinxing guanxi (Constructing a New Relationship with China's Neighbouring Countries), in: Wang Jisi (ed.), *Zhongguo xuezhe kan shijie* (Perspectives from Chinese Scholars), Hong Kong: Heping tushu youxian gongsi (Peace Books), 247-262.
- Zhao, Hongtu (2008), Maliujia kunju yu Zhongguo nengyuan anquan zai sikao (Rethinking China's Energy Security and the Malacca Dilemma), in: *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi* (Contemporary International Relations), 6, 36-42.
- Zhao, Huasheng (2007), Zhongguo zhong ya wajiao di lilun he shijian (Theory and Practice of China's Diplomacy Toward Central Asia), in: *Guoji Wenti Yanjiu* (International Studies), 4, 19-25.
- Zhongguo Xinwen Zhoukan* (China Newsweek) (2009), Jin zhuan si guo di weilai dongxiang (Future Strategies of the BRIC Four Countries), 22 June, 48-49.

Contents

Research Articles

- Michael B. Griffiths
Lamb Buddha's Migrant Workers:
Self-Assertion on China's Urban Fringe 3
- **Baohui Zhang**
**Chinese Foreign Policy in Transition: Trends and
Implications** 39
- Arjan de Haan
The Financial Crisis and China's "Harmonious Society" 69
- Jianhong Zhang and Haico Ebbers
Why Half of China's Overseas Acquisitions Could Not Be
Completed 101
- Jian Sun and Lin Ye
Mega-events, Local Economies, and Global Status: What
Happened before the 2008 Olympics in Beijing and the 2010
World Expo in Shanghai 133

Analyses

- Sara Hsu, Shiyin Jiang, and Halcott Heyward
The Global Crisis' Impact upon China's Rural Migrants 167
- Dafydd J. Fell
Taiwan's Democracy: Towards a Liberal Democracy or
Authoritarianism? 187

- Contributors 202