

Global Forum of Chinese Political Scientists panel for APSA 2018

Chinese Foreign Policy In a New Era: Concepts, Measures, and Empirical Evidence

Chinese foreign policy has entered a new era under the strong leadership of Xi Jinping. This panel brings experts from both China and the United States to evaluate multiple new developments of Chinese foreign policy. Guoli Liu examines the fundamental causes and potential consequences of China's diplomatic adaptation in the new era. Evan Jones and Scott Kastner study how and why states vary greatly in their willingness to accommodate China's interests. Feng Liu and Ze Li investigate China's maritime policy. China's decision-makers attempt to balance the trade-off between two conflicting objectives: maintaining a relatively benign international environment (*weiwen*) and defending its sovereignty over disputed territories (*weiquan*). Through content-analyzing Chinese articles and documents, Xiaoyu Pu and Shiping Tang seek to provide a new theoretical typology of Chinese visions of the international order.

Chair: Susan Shirk

Professor, University of California, San Diego

Email: sshirk@ucsd.edu

Discussants:

* Susan Shirk

Professor, University of California, San Diego

Email: sshirk@ucsd.edu

*Yang ZHONG

Professor and Dean, Shanghai Jiaotong University

Email: zhongyang@sjtu.edu.cn

Paper 1: Diplomatic Adaptation and Governance Modernization for a New Era

Guoli Liu

Professor of Political Science

College of Charleston

liug@cofc.edu

Since the beginning of China's reform and opening to the world in 1978, a key mission of Chinese diplomacy has been creating a favorable environment for modernization. As China enters a "new era of socialism with Chinese characteristics," governance modernization has become a key task along with the long-standing emphasis on socioeconomic modernization. With its growing comprehensive national strength, China's diplomacy has expanded in scope and depth. This paper examines the fundamental causes and potential consequences of China's diplomatic adaptation in the new era. We also study the connections between diplomatic initiatives and governance

modernization. Governance modernization has two dimensions: structural reforms at home and institutional building/adjustment abroad. Chinese diplomacy confronts multiple new challenges as a result of domestic transition and regional and global shifts. Meeting such challenges is critical for building a sustainable future for China's modernization.

Paper 2: Accommodation in the Shadow of Hierarchy: Explaining Which Countries Welcome China's Rise

Scott L. Kastner
Professor of Political Science
University of Maryland, College Park
skastner@umd.edu

Evan Jones
PhD Student of Political Science
University of Maryland, College Park
Email: evan.a.jones3@gmail.com

Across the globe, states vary greatly in their willingness to accommodate China's interests. How can we explain this variation? Some recent studies look to economic dependence theories for answers, but the conclusions of these studies are mixed. We argue that states' accommodative postures are contingent upon two factors: their position in the US-led security hierarchy, and, for states outside of this hierarchy, their integration into the broader liberal world order. We test our hypotheses quantitatively using data that capture the degree to which individual countries accommodate PRC interests relating to Taiwan and Tibet. We supplement our quantitative analysis with short qualitative case studies that explore cross-national variation in how countries in the EU approach China. This paper furthers our understanding of which countries are most likely to accommodate rising powers during power transitions. In particular, the findings suggest that as a state's discontent with the current rules of international society and the distribution of its benefits grows, the more likely it is to recognize the interests of a rising power.

Paper 3: Weiwen vs. Weiwan: The Sources and Variations of China's Behavior in Maritime Disputes

Feng LIU

Professor and Associate Dean
Zhou Enlai School of Government
Nankai University
Email: liufeng00@gmail.com

Ze LI

PhD Candidate

Zhou Enlai School of Government

Nankai University

Email: lize94@163.com

China's recent assertiveness in managing maritime disputes has been considered puzzling and controversial by many foreign policy analysts and international relations scholars. However, China has not simply been employing coercive tactics to respond to these disputes. In many cases, China uses a combination of coercive and cooperative tactics to strengthen its position. To understand the apparent contradictions and outcomes of China's behavior, it is important to first examine the roles that both China and other claimants play in the escalation/de-escalation process. China's decision-makers attempt to balance the trade-off between two conflicting objectives: maintaining a relatively benign international environment conducive to China's continued rise (*weiwen*), and defending its sovereignty over disputed territories (*weiquan*). Concurrently, a regional rise in nationalism and shifts in the balance of power have forced other claimants into a dilemma of maintaining or challenging the status quo in maritime disputes. In turn, their choices influence whether China responds using economic or strategic coercion. China has employed various approaches to balance the trade-off, to varying degrees of success. This article explores the underlying causes of China's behavior in recent maritime disputes by examining its responses to three disputes: the Diaoyu Islands with Japan, the South China Sea with Vietnam and the Philippines, and the Suyan Islet with South Korea.

Paper 4: Deconstructing Chinese Visions of International Order: A Theoretical Typology

Xiaoyu PU

Assistant Professor of Political Science

University of Nevada, Reno

xpu@unr.edu

Shiping TANG

Distinguished Professor, Fudan University

twukong@yahoo.com

How does China view international order in a new era? To what extent China would challenge the existing order? Through content-analyzing Chinese articles and documents, this paper seeks to provide a theoretical typology of Chinese visions of international order. The critical question is: to what extent the Chinese elites see the existing international order as being legitimate? Radical international change is based on the premise that the international order is illegitimate, while reformist change assumes that

the existing order is generally legitimate. Through analyzing these different visions, the paper tries to provide a more nuanced analysis of Chinese approach to international order.