

International Studies in China: Origins and Development*

Gerald Chan

This article represents a first attempt to give an overview of the origins and development of international studies in China. The studies of international relations (IR) were introduced to China about a hundred years ago. At present, four tertiary institutions—Beijing University, Fudan University, Renmin University, and the Institute of International Relations—have international politics departments. The power approach is the dominant school of thought, and the bulk of research on international studies has been carried out by the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences and its regional affiliates. Since the adoption of the open-door policy in 1978, international studies have become relatively more pluralistic, but remain highly politicized, with the Communist Party exerting strong influence to ensure conformity to the Marxist line of thinking.

Keywords: China; international studies; international relations; international politics; universities; Marxism

* * *

“International political study is a ‘danger zone’ within a ‘danger zone’.”¹

This article attempts to give an overview of the origins and development of international studies in China. The emphasis is on events that have occurred since 1949, and the analysis follows a roughly chronological order. Here, the subject “international studies” is broadly

Gerald Chan is senior lecturer in International Relations and co-editor of *Political Science* journal, Department of Politics, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand.

***Acknowledgments:** An early version of this paper was presented in a China workshop held at Hong Kong Baptist University on November 18, 1995. I wish to thank Professors Herbert Yee and Ting Wai, and other workshop participants for their constructive criticisms and comments. I would also like to thank the head of the Beijing University Department of International Politics, Professor Liang Shoude, and his colleagues, especially Professor Zhang Xizhen, for facilitating my stay and research in Beijing, and the Universities Service Center at the Chinese University of Hong Kong.

¹Chu Feng, “International Political Studies and Contemporary China,” *Beijing daxue yanjiusheng xuekan* (Journal of the Graduate Students, Beijing University), 1988, no. 4:14.

defined as the studies of international relations, international politics, and world affairs. First, let us very briefly review the practice of diplomacy in premodern China in order to show the relevance of the past to present academic studies in China.

Premodern China

A current debate among some Chinese scholars will aid our understanding of the origin of the modern international system. The debate concerns the question as to whether or not international relations (hereafter referred to as IR) existed in premodern China, that is, before the mid-nineteenth century.² Those who argue that they did exist often refer to the systems that prevailed in imperial China during the Spring and Autumn Period (770-476 B.C.) and the Warring States Period (475-221 B.C.). At one point during those periods, China was divided into over one hundred small, self-contained states in which statesmen used such military strategies as *hezong lianheng* (vertical and horizontal alliances, a “balance-of-power” strategy in present-day terminology) to manage their external relations. They also used conflict resolution mechanisms (mostly domination of small states by large ones) to regulate and stabilize state-to-state relationships.³ A recent study in the West has pointed out that warfare in China began more than four thousand years ago: the first Chinese civil war occurred in 2193 B.C. and the first interstate war in 2146 B.C.⁴ A recent study in China has also pointed out that this geographically confined “Chinese village” shares some interestingly similar features with the contemporary “global village,” such as colonization, independence, bilateral wars, regional wars, alliances, peace negotiations, disarmaments, the rise and fall of hegemons, etc.⁵ However, scholars who argue otherwise point out that the system referred to was only an

²See Xi Laiwang in *Shijie lishi yanjiu dongtai* (Study of World History), 1988, no. 6, and *Huang Huai xuekan* (Huang Huai Journal), Social Science Edition, 1991, no. 1; and Yang Zheng in *Shijie lishi yanjiu dongtai*, 1989, no. 3.

³K. J. Holsti, *International Politics: A Framework for Analysis*, 7th edition (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall International, 1995), 35.

⁴Claudio Cioffi-Revilla and David Lai, “War and Politics in Ancient China, 2700 B.C. to 722 B.C.,” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 39, no. 3 (September 1995): 467-94.

⁵Pang Yu, *Shijie zhengzhi daqushi* (Great trends in world politics) (Beijing: Chinese Academy of Social Sciences Press, 1994).

interstate system within a *regional* or *subregional* context, and certainly not *global* in the true sense of the word.⁶

Some of the Chinese viewpoints on what constitutes IR in this debate clearly differ from the contemporary, general concepts of IR, the latter of which can be traced to the beginning of the world capitalist system and the state system that emerged in Europe around the time of the Industrial and French Revolutions. The kind of interstate and transnational relations at the global level that emerged afterwards certainly did not exist in premodern China. During those historical times in China, a Chinese emperor would often reign over territories that had a strong Chinese Confucian influence, sometimes with rival kings, princes, or warlords competing with one another over land and resources. The small states that they controlled could be regarded as sovereign states in modern-day terms, as those states satisfy the definition of sovereignty as a government exercising political control over a population within a geographically defined territory.⁷ However, the states only existed in a regional or subregional context, not a global setting.⁸ Chinese history has witnessed periods of unity under one emperor or ruler with alternative periods of disunity in which systems of states competed with each other for control and influence.

The debate among Chinese scholars hinges on the definitions of international relations and sovereign state, and whether or not a regional scope and preindustrial European experiences are deemed as necessary and sufficient conditions for these definitions. Surely the current literature and scholarship on IR in the wider world would find it difficult to accept such a Chinese historical interpretation of the above-mentioned terms, given the fact that contemporary IR studies are dominated overwhelmingly by the West, especially the United States,⁹ and trace the origin of mainstream IR only to the modern

⁶A scholar in the West refers to ancient China's political structure as a multi-state system. See Richard L. Walker, *The Multi-State System of Ancient China* (Hamden, Conn.: The Shoe String Press, 1953).

⁷This situation has been acknowledged by some scholars in the West. Apart from Holsti (cited in note 3), Charles Tilly has said that "an internally hierarchical and externally autonomous Chinese empire [has been in existence] for a millennium." See Tilly in *American Political Science Review* 89, no. 3 (September 1995): 811.

⁸Xi in *Huang Huai xuekan*, 1991, no. 1:47-48.

⁹Ken Booth and Steve Smith, eds., *International Relations Theory Today* (University Park, Penn.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995). Stanley Hoffman once said that the discipline of IR was "born and raised in America" and dominated by the United States because of the "political preeminence of the United States. . . ." See

European state system,¹⁰ paying little attention to indigenous scholarships elsewhere other than America, Britain, and Australia.¹¹ However, most historians tend to agree that power politics were actively at play during those historical times in ancient China.

According to Professor Chen Lemin of the Institute of European Studies at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS), the first time that China encountered anything resembling "international" was when it came into conflict with Western imperialism in the mid-nineteenth century.¹² This is quite accurate when viewed from the global political perspective in which the issue of competing sovereignties comes to the fore. However, from the perspective of transnational relations, the history of China's international relations can be dated back much earlier to the trading links established between China and the outside world through the Silk Road to the west of the country and the sea routes to the south and southwest, a situation which occurred much earlier than the formation of the European state system. The rise of capitalism and trading networks on a global, though limited, scale thus preceded the West's gun-boat diplomacy in the mid-nineteenth century.¹³

Modern China

IR studies were first introduced to China about a century ago.

Stanley Hoffman, "An American Social Science: International Relations," in *International Theory: Critical Investigations*, ed. James Der Derian (New York: New York University Press, 1995), 240.

¹⁰Perhaps a case of cultural imperialism, this is a term used aptly by Johan Galtung in his essay "A Structural Theory of Imperialism," *Journal of Peace Research* 8, no. 2 (1971): 81-118.

¹¹In reviewing Stephen Chan's chapter on "Beyond the North-West: Africa and the East" and A. J. R. Groom's chapter on "The World Beyond: The European Dimension" in *Contemporary International Relations: A Guide to Theory*, ed. A. J. R. Groom and Margot Light (London: Pinter Publishers, 1994), both of which look beyond the Anglo-American tradition, Steve Smith, Professor of International Relations at the University of Wales, Aberystwyth, says that "many readers of the book will doubtless feel somewhat embarrassed, as I did, about knowing so little about what was being done outside a small geographical area." See his book review in *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 24, no. 1 (Spring 1995): 154.

¹²Chen Lemin, "International Relations Studies in the West," *Guowai zhengzhixue* (Foreign Political Studies) (Beijing), 1987, no. 1:57.

¹³See Andre Gunder Frank and Barry K. Gills, eds., *The World System: Five Hundred Years or Five Thousand?* (London and New York: Routledge, 1993).

Their subsequent development can be divided into five periods:¹⁴ (1) the late Qing period from 1839 to 1911; (2) the May Fourth Movement period in the 1920s and early 1930s; (3) the period of resistance against Japanese invasion from 1937 to 1949; (4) the period from 1949, when the People's Republic of China (PRC) was established, to 1978, when it decided to adopt an open-door policy toward the outside world; and (5) the period of reform and openness since 1979.

The Late Qing Period, 1839-1911

An official in the Qing government named Lin Zexu was instrumental in introducing some elements of IR studies from the West to China. In 1839, while in charge of banning opium imports in Guangzhou, he instructed a number of Chinese scholars to translate certain aspects of (Western) international law into Chinese. Early in 1861, the Qing government established the Zongli Yamen (or Office for General Administration) as its first formal and permanent central organ for handling foreign affairs. A year later, the government set up an academy called Tongwenguan (or College of Foreign Languages) to train translators to deal with external affairs. With the help of several Chinese colleagues, an American missionary named W. A. P. Martin translated several international law texts into Chinese, including Wheaton's *Elements of International Law*. This translated text, distributed in 1864 under the title *Wanguo gongfa* (Public law of all states), became an important reference for conducting Chinese diplomacy. Martin was appointed Professor of the Law of Nations at Tongwenguan and students were sent to Europe and the United States to study international law.¹⁵

As a result, some IR concepts were brought to China, the most important one being the balance of power. This concept quickly

¹⁴The following historical analysis draws its sources from: Yuan Ming in Liang Shoude et al., eds., *Guoji zhengzhi lunji* (Collective essays on international politics) (Beijing: Beijing chubanshe, 1992); Zhang Lili, Yang Chuang, and Zhou Qiming, *Xiandai guoji guanxixue* (Contemporary international relations studies) (Chongqing: Chongqing chubanshe, 1989), 276 ff; Ni Shixiong, Feng Shaolei, and Jin Yingzhong, *Shiji fengyun de chan'er—Dangdai guoji guanxi lilun* (An offspring of the turbulent century—Contemporary international relations theories) (Hangzhou: Zhejiang renmin chubanshe, 1989), chap. 3; and Zhao Baoxu, "The Revival of Political Science in China," *PS (Political Science)* 17 (Fall 1984): 745-57.

¹⁵Gerrit W. Gong, "China's Entry into International Society," in *The Expansion of International Society*, ed. Hedley Bull and Adam Watson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), 180-81.

took hold among a number of intellectuals and elites, who favored the introduction of Western learning. Li Hongzhang was a notable representative; it was reported that he used the concept on many occasions to conduct the diplomacy of the Qing government.¹⁶ Chinese diplomats employed their newly-acquired knowledge of international law to defend their country against the encroachments of Western imperialism. Examples are the references made to the “most-favored-nation status” and “extraterritoriality.” In 1910, the Commercial Press in Shanghai listed ten translated books on politics and law written by European and American scholars, including the works of Herbert Spencer, Baron de Montesquieu, and Woodrow Wilson, and eleven translated books on law by Japanese authors.¹⁷

The May Fourth Period, 1920s and 1930s

The May Fourth period saw an upsurge in liberal thinking among intellectuals in modern China. The introduction of IR studies took several routes. The first was through the writings of Chinese scholars who had studied in the United States or Europe and of those who had had intimate experiences of World War I. Some of their writings introduced the League of Nations and Wilsonian idealism. Others gave an account of European diplomatic history. Zhang Zhongfu published several books, including *Zhongguo guoji guanxi* (Chinese international relations) and *Ouzhou waijiaoshi* (European diplomatic history) in 1933,¹⁸ and *Zhonghua minguo waijiaoshi* (The diplomatic history of the Republic of China) in 1936. Earlier on in 1926, Zhou Gengsheng, a Chinese scholar on international law, published *Jindai Ouzhou waijiaoshi* (The diplomatic history of modern Europe).¹⁹

During this period, a large number of Chinese students were sent on government scholarships to the West to study international law and relations and other subjects. Many returned to enter the diplomatic service, and a few joined academia. The intellectual movement at that time was led by people like Chen Duxiu, who helped

¹⁶Yuan Ming in Liang, *Guoji zhengzhi lunji*, 82.

¹⁷*Xiuzhen riji 1910-1911* (Mini diary 1910-11) (Shanghai: Commercial Press, [1910]). Thanks go to Professor Ting Wai of Hong Kong Baptist University for showing me this original source.

¹⁸Yuan Ming in Liang, *Guoji zhengzhi lunji*, 83.

¹⁹Zhang, Yang, and Zhou, *Xiandai guoji guanxixue*, 276. For further details, see V. Zhuravlyor, “Chinese Studies of International Relations (Late 1970s-Early 1980s),” *Far Eastern Affairs* (Moscow), 1984, no. 2:135.

found the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) in Shanghai in 1921; Cai Yuanpei, who became president of Beijing University; and Hu Shi, a noted liberal scholar who later became an ambassador to the United States.²⁰

Among institutions of higher learning in China, Wuhan University and Beijing University were the first to offer some rudimentary courses on IR. Zhou Gengsheng taught at the former institution and Zhang Zhongfu the latter. In the late 1920s and early 1930s, Professor Quincy Wright of the University of Chicago was invited by Qinghua University in Beijing to teach international law to a small cohort of students. In addition, at the end of World War I, many publications on international law and European diplomatic history in the West found their way to the libraries of Beijing and Qinghua universities, including the works of British historians George P. Gooch and Harold W. V. Temperley.

In another stream of development related to the establishment of the CCP, some Party members went to Moscow University and Zhongshan University (in Moscow) to study Marxist theory and IR theories in the 1920s,²¹ although they received revolutionary rather than academic training.

In 1934, a journal entitled *Shijie zhishi* (World Affairs) first appeared in Shanghai. Despite some ups and downs in its publication in the following years, the journal has remained one of the most informed magazines on China's current affairs up to this day. In recent years, its publishing house has produced important books and references on the subject,²² including *Shijie zhishi nianjian* (Yearbook of world affairs)²³ and a quarterly journal entitled *Guoji wenti yanjiu* (International Studies).²⁴

The Period of Resistance Against Japanese Invasion, 1937-49

During this period, China was engulfed in a national resistance

²⁰Immanuel C. Y. Hsu, *The Rise of Modern China*, 4th edition (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 496.

²¹Zhang, Yang, and Zhou, *Xiandai guoji guanxixue*, 277.

²²My visit to the bookstore of World Affairs Press in Beijing on March 13, 1995.

²³It was first published in 1936, and has appeared regularly since 1982.

²⁴Its publication started in 1959, but was disrupted during the Cultural Revolution. Restarted in 1987, it came under the sponsorship of the China Institute of International Studies, Beijing.

and IR studies came to a halt. However, some Chinese commentators on international affairs continued to work in Hong Kong and Southeast Asia. Well-known writers included Qiao Guanhua,²⁵ who later became China's foreign minister in the 1970s, Hu Yuzhi, and Yang Chao. Yang's posthumous book on Europe, published by World Affairs Press in 1946, covered areas such as great-power politics, the balance of power, case studies of European countries, and idealism and realism in the United States.

IR studies were also disrupted in the West during World War II, but were revived and flourished thereafter. In China, IR studies underwent extremely difficult times from the end of the war until 1978.

From 1949 to 1978

The establishment of the PRC in 1949 brought forth a gush of national animosities toward the West and an abrupt severance from Western scholarship. Many of the IR courses that were established before 1949 were banned. Chinese political leaders turned their attention to what they regarded as major contradictions in world politics, especially the conflict between capitalism and communism, and the shifting of the global power balance.

In 1950, Renmin University of China (or the People's University of China) was established in Beijing by the CCP as a "socialist university," with a teaching program focused on philosophy and the "social sciences."²⁶ A department was founded to teach diplomacy, and IR history was made a compulsory subject.²⁷ In 1955, the department was expanded and branched out to form the Foreign Affairs College to train diplomats and translators,²⁸ with the recommendation of Premier Zhou Enlai and approval of Chairman Mao Zedong.²⁹

²⁵Qiao Guanhua, *Guoji shupingji* (Commentaries on international affairs) (Chongqing: Chongqing chubanshe, 1983), which is a collection of Qiao's commentaries in *Xinhua ribao* (New China Daily) from 1943 to 1946.

²⁶It was closed down at the height of the Cultural Revolution and reestablished in 1978. When the university was closed, many politics professors there moved to teach in nearby Beijing University, and moved back when the university was reestablished. Thus, a close relationship has been forged among some teaching staff of the departments of international politics at both universities (interview, February 8, 1995).

²⁷Feng Tejun et al., *Guoji zhengzhi gailun* (Introduction to international politics) (Beijing: Renmin University of China Press, 1992), 36; Zhang, Yang, and Zhou, *Xiandai guoji guanxixue*, 280.

²⁸Chu, "International Political Studies," 14.

²⁹Foreign Minister Chen Yi was the president of the college from 1961 to 1969. See *Waijiao xueyuan xuebao* (Journal of Foreign Affairs College), 1995, no. 4:2, 4.

The college, under the control of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, has remained active up to this day, except for a period of time during the Cultural Revolution when it was forced to close down. China also invited Soviet specialists to teach in the country and, at the same time, sent students to the Soviet Union to study the Soviet view of the world.

In the early 1960s, Zhou Enlai and Foreign Minister Chen Yi encouraged the studies of international affairs, and in late 1963, Mao Zedong personally instructed "the strengthening of international studies."³⁰ The timing of these developments closely followed the beginning of a split between the PRC and the Soviet Union, and it can be seen as the PRC's effort to free itself from Soviet ideological control and the Soviet conceptualization of the world. In 1964, departments of international politics were set up at Beijing University,³¹ Renmin University of China, and Fudan University in Shanghai. At that time, the three departments offered courses on national liberation movements, international communist movements, and "study and education in capitalist countries."³² Research centers of area studies were established, including the institutes of Soviet and East European Studies, Asia and African Studies, and Japanese Studies at Beijing University; the Institute of American Studies at Wuhan University; and the Institute of Soviet and East European Studies at East China Normal University.³³ Government agencies such as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of State Security, the International Liaison Department of the CCP Central Committee, and the CASS all set up their own centers for international studies. Other organizations such as the New China (Xinhua) News Agency, the *People's Daily*, the central committee of the Communist Youth League, and the All-China Federation of Trade Unions also established their re-

³⁰Ibid.

³¹In 1903, a Department of Politics was established at Beijing University. This was the first department of politics to be established at a Chinese university. In 1952, the department stopped functioning and in 1960, it was reestablished. In 1964, the name of the department was changed to the Department of International Politics. In 1988, a new Department of Politics and Public Administration was established. See Beijing University's Department of International Politics, ed., *Guoji zhengzhi zongheng* (International politics) (Beijing: Beijing University, 1990), 1-2. In 1996, a College of International Relations was formally established, grouping together, among other units, the Department of International Politics, the Department of Politics and Public Administration, and the Institute of International Relations.

³²Ni, Feng, and Jin, *Shiji fengyun de chan'er*, chap. 3.

³³Ibid.

spective offices to conduct research on international affairs.

In 1965, the Institute of International Relations (Guoji guanxi xueyuan) was formally established under the Ministry of Public Security. (Formerly, it was a school set up in 1949 to train foreign affairs cadres and was merged with the Foreign Affairs College in 1961.³⁴) A teaching and research group in IR theories was formed at the Institute. The call for the establishment of an IR theory with Chinese characteristics under the guiding principle of Marxism was first circulated at this time.³⁵

During the early 1960s, efforts were made to translate foreign books and to interpret Marxist classics. Under the influence of the extreme left, IR studies became politically very sensitive, and no academic creativity was possible. The onslaught of the Cultural Revolution soon wiped away any initial work done to develop international studies, and all academic work came to a complete stop, with social sciences being the hardest hit. Maoist fanaticism reached its climax during this period with slogans such as “better to be on the left than to be on the right (*ningzuo wuyou*).” Any deviation from the Maoist line ran the risk of incurring severe criticisms and personal danger. As a result, social sciences took refuge under the slogans of the central Party propaganda machine. The only revolutionary theory that was churned out during this period (1966-78) was Mao’s “Three Worlds” theory, which provided the principle for the theory and practice of Chinese foreign policy during that time.

In the West, however, the end of World War II heralded a new stage of active development in IR studies. Realism overshadowed idealism in the 1950s, but came under some significant challenges from behavioralism and then post-behavioralism. The late 1970s and early 1980s saw the strengthening of realism in the form of neorealism, which focused on complex interdependence and the impact of international structures on political actors when analyzing the behavior of states

³⁴Zhao Lianghong, Zhao Xuewen, and Han Zhenqian, *Zhongguo gaoxiao* (Universities in China) (Beijing: Zhongguo dabaiketuanshu chubanshe, 1993), 41. There is another key institute also known as the Institute of International Relations under the People’s Liberation Army. It was established in 1951 and is now based in Nanjing. See *ibid.*, 734.

³⁵Zhang, Yang, and Zhou, *Xiandai guoji guanxixue*, 280. For a detailed analysis of this development, see Gerald Chan, “Towards an International Relations Theory with Chinese Characteristics” (Paper presented at the International Studies Association and Japanese Association of International Relations joint convention held in Makuhari, Japan, September 20-22, 1996).

and, to a lesser extent, non-state entities. As far as scope is concerned, apart from international law and diplomatic history, IR studies had expanded to cover comparative foreign policy analysis, area studies, strategic studies, international political economy, IR theories, and (since the 1980s) critical theory, normative theory, and postmodernism. The gap in IR studies between China and the West thus widened beyond recognition.

It is useful to briefly mention the development of IR studies in the Soviet Union during this period, too, because of the Soviet influence on international studies in China. Soviet and East European studies of IR developed much later than those in the West.³⁶ Before the end of the 1960s, Soviet studies approached IR mainly from the perspectives of international history and international law, but more recently, Soviet scholars began to make a greater effort to theorize. Soviet theory exhibited three main characteristics: Soviet scholars used Marxism as the philosophical base in their studies; they stressed that IR theory should serve the country's foreign policy; and they tended to concentrate on the analysis of individual international problems rather than on making generalizations across problems and issues. All these characteristics have exerted considerable influence on IR studies in China up to this day, including the dominance of Party lines and the use of similar organizational structures such as academies to conduct policy research.³⁷

Reform and Openness Since 1979

The open-door policy adopted by China in late 1978 helped to revive IR studies in the country. Universities that were forced to close down during the Cultural Revolution began to reopen. For instance, Renmin University of China reopened in 1978. In 1979, some teachers at the Beijing Foreign Languages Institute, who transferred from the Foreign Affairs College when the latter was dissolved temporarily during the Cultural Revolution, designed a postgraduate course on "the basic theory of international struggle." A course bearing the same title was offered by the Foreign Affairs College when it reopened

³⁶This paragraph is largely my summary of Feng Tejun et al., eds., *Dangdai shijie zhengzhi jingji yu guoji guanxi* (Contemporary world politics, economics, and international relations), 2nd edition (Beijing: Renmin University of China Press, 1994), 33-36.

³⁷Margot Light, "The Study of International Relations in the Soviet Union," *Millennium* 16, no. 2 (Summer 1987): 287-96.

in 1980. Courses on IR theories were also run by the departments of international politics at Beijing and Fudan universities.

In early 1983, Hu Yaobang encouraged young cadres to widen their learning to include “international politics.”³⁸ Subsequently, the Propaganda and Organization departments of the CCP Central Committee started to organize a course called *guoji zhengzhi* (international politics) as part of the political theory course for Party and government cadres.³⁹ Apparently, the course survived its political test, because in September 1985, the CCP Central Committee issued instructions about education reform⁴⁰ directing the country’s institutions of higher learning to offer courses on *shijie zhengzhi jingji yu guoji guanxi* (literally translated as world politics, economics, and international relations).⁴¹ Before 1985, political theory courses in Chinese universities were mainly focused on the relationship between China and socialism, and little attention was paid to the outside world or to the capitalist system. The 1985 Party directive helped to address some of these biases.

In the 1980s, Chinese students were allowed to go overseas to study, with many going to the United States. Some studied IR theories and IR history, and began to introduce Western studies of IR by translating some IR books into Chinese. In 1984, China also resumed its program of exchange of scholars and students with the Soviet Union. In 1986, the Foreign Affairs College introduced a course on “an appraisal of Western IR theories.” From March to July 1990, at the behest of the State Education Commission, Renmin University of China organized the first training course entitled “world politics, economics, and international relations” for teachers from thirty tertiary institutions around the country. Most of them were teachers of Marxist theory courses at the time. At the end of the course, they decided to write a new textbook on IR,⁴² based on their own experi-

³⁸Tian Zhili in *Beijing ribao* (Beijing Daily), November 25, 1985, 3.

³⁹Feng Tejun, *Dangdai shijie zhengzhi jingji yu guoji guanxi* (Contemporary world politics, economics, and international relations), 1st edition (Beijing: Renmin University of China Press, 1988), 2.

⁴⁰This is an important document as far as the development of IR studies in China is concerned. A full text can be found in Zhang Nianfang et al., eds., *Zhongguo jiaoyu baikequanshu* (Encyclopedia of Chinese education) (Beijing: Haiyang chubanshe, 1991), 515-16.

⁴¹See note 38 above.

⁴²The result was Xiao Guangwu et al., eds., *Dangdai shijie zhengzhi jingji yu guoji guanxi* (Contemporary world politics, economics, and international relations) (Beijing: China Outlook Press, 1990), 380.

ences, their perceptions of recent changes in world politics, and the conditions set by the Ideological and Political Work Department of the State Education Commission. The result was yet another textbook among many similar texts that were published in China in recent years.⁴³

By 1995, some fifty to sixty textbooks bearing a similar title had been published.⁴⁴ A representative work is Professor Feng Tejun's *Dangdai shijie zhengzhi jingji yu guoji guanxi* (Contemporary world politics, economics, and international relations), with the first edition published in 1988 and the second in 1994.⁴⁵ The publication of IR books and the translation of Western literature on IR have started in earnest.⁴⁶ So far, works that have been translated include those by John W. Burton, Karl Deutsch, Robert Gilpin, Stanley Hoffman, Morton Kaplan, Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye, James Rosenau, Hans Morgenthau, Susan Strange, Kenneth Waltz, and others. Two-way visits of IR scholars between China and the outside world have also steadily increased.

Four major conferences were held in Beijing among Chinese IR scholars and specialists in March 1986, August 1987, October 1987, and May 1994 to discuss IR theories under the guidance of Marxist-Leninist-Maoist principles.⁴⁷ The China Research Society of History

⁴³I have compiled elsewhere a list of forty-two titles of these textbooks and another list of forty-three titles which I judge to be more academic in nature.

⁴⁴Interview with Professor Feng Tejun of the Department of International Politics at Renmin University of China, in his office in Beijing on February 16, 1995. Feng is the principal author of a number of these textbooks.

⁴⁵Both editions were published by Renmin University of China Press. It is interesting to note why there are so many IR textbooks in China bearing similar titles. First of all, there is a "guide" book which sets out the parameters for the compilation of IR textbooks in China: Social Science Section, State Education Commission (commissioned), *Shijie zhengzhi jingji yu guoji guanxi* (World politics, economics, and international relations), 2nd edition (Beijing: Jingji kexue chubanshe, 1994). The principal author and editor of this book is Professor Feng Tejun, a senior academic in the Department of International Politics at Renmin University of China. Second, China is so geographically huge and diverse that it is difficult to reinforce the adoption of a single textbook. Third, the idea of copyright is still culturally alien and legally vague to most Chinese scholars that duplication by authors and publishers is a common practice. Fourth, academics are tempted to earn some extra money to supplement their meager pay by compiling popular textbooks while publishers are eager to profit by pushing their sales (interview with Feng Tejun).

⁴⁶I have also compiled elsewhere a list of over twenty books on IR in the West that have been translated recently into Chinese and published in China.

⁴⁷See Chan, "Towards an International Relations Theory"; and Zhang Jiliang et al., eds., *Guoji guanxixue gailun* (Introduction to the studies of international relations) (Beijing: World Affairs Press, 1989), 29.

of International Relations also organized academic meetings in Beijing in November 1986 and December 1987, in which debates within the theory group were reportedly the most heated.⁴⁸

The first nationwide conference on IR, held in Shanghai in August 1987, brought together eighty scholars from around the country to discuss some forty to fifty papers. This occasion marked a new phase in the development of IR studies in China because of debates surrounding the revival of an IR theory with Chinese characteristics. It is not exactly clear what these characteristics are, but the general understanding among those who favor the development of such a theory is that the guiding principles of Marxism, Leninism, and Mao Zedong Thought as well as Chinese culture are emphasized. The basic assumption underlying the various arguments in favor of such a theory is that Western IR theories reflect the national interests of the countries from which they are developed and therefore should not be adopted lock, stock, and barrel by the Chinese academic community. Those who have expressed doubts over such a line of reasoning basically think of IR theories as an academic subject which is universal and general and therefore should not be confused with the policy analysis of individual countries.

The year 1987 was also marked by the CCP Central Committee reiterating its instructions to China's institutions of higher education to offer courses on "world politics, economics, and international relations." By the end of 1988, the number of institutes and centers of international studies totaled over fifty and there were about twenty journals on the subject.⁴⁹

Events in 1989 leading up to the Tiananmen Incident in June threatened these new developments in IR studies. Some scholars questioned whether courses on "world politics, economics, and international relations" should be offered at all, claiming that they "mainly introduced the situation in developed capitalist countries."⁵⁰ Others, however, insisted that there was a need to carry on offering the courses, for three reasons: first, present-day China should be made aware of what was happening around the world; second, the courses covered not only capitalist countries, but also socialist and *minzuzhuyi*

⁴⁸Zhang, *Guoji guanxixue gailun*, 283.

⁴⁹Ni, Feng, and Jin, *Shiji fengyun de chan'er*, chap. 3.

⁵⁰Feng, *Dangdai shijie zhengzhi jingji yu guoji guanxi* (2nd edition), 3.

guojia (nationalist countries); and third, political theory courses in China supposedly served the purpose of criticizing capitalism and, as such, students should understand the capitalist system before they could criticize it.⁵¹

Momentous events such as the fall of communism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, civil wars in Yugoslavia, and the Gulf War left Chinese students, academics, cadres, the military, the Party, and the general public at a loss to understand what had happened in the world and why, as well as what the implications were for Chinese socialism. These factors indicated the need for acquiring an intimate knowledge of current affairs and IR. For these and other reasons, the courses survived the attack of their critics for being *zibenzhuyi jieji ziyouhua* (liberalizing along capitalist class lines).⁵²

A review of the above five periods shows that the first can be seen as a time of germination of IR studies in China. The May Fourth period and the open-door period, however, represent two different waves of new developments. When IR studies were first introduced to China, the country took a largely reactive response, but currently it is taking a more proactive stance. In the former period, China took in IR studies as a way to safeguard its national security and preserve its sovereignty, and in the latter period, to protect its national interest. By and large, IR studies in China have been highly politicized, far more so in the earlier periods than in the current period. On the whole, IR studies, including the study of foreign policy, have remained a politically sensitive (*min'gan*) area in China.⁵³

One of the sources for China's diplomacy during the early part of this century is the memoirs of former diplomats. So far, the most comprehensive memoir that has been found is perhaps that of

⁵¹Ibid.

⁵²Ibid., 4. Recently, the title of the course "world politics, economics, and international relations" has come under criticism from some quarters for being too cumbersome and nebulous, as its scope and contents are difficult to define. As it currently stands, the course consists of three distinct areas: international politics, world economy, and international relations.

⁵³Wang Jisi, "International Relations Theory and the Study of Chinese Foreign Policy: A Chinese Perspective," in *Chinese Foreign Policy: Theory and Practice*, ed. Thomas W. Robinson and David Shambaugh (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 483. However, Professor Jia Qingguo of the Department of International Politics at Beijing University thinks that domestic politics are more sensitive than international politics because domestic politics deal with issues directly affecting the power and control of the central authorities, while international politics deal with things "outside" of China and so are less politically sensitive (interview with Jia in Beijing, March 8, 1995).

Gu Weijun (Wellington Koo), who served as a diplomat, an ambassador, and a judge of the International Court of Justice at The Hague, spanning the period from 1912 to 1966. His memoirs were originally written in English, and subsequently translated into Chinese and published under the title *Gu Weijun huiyilu* in thirteen volumes by China Bookshop (Zhonghua shuju) in Beijing. Volume one was published in 1983 and volume thirteen in 1994.

Yuan Ming, the director of the Institute of International Relations at Beijing University, has made three sharp observations on contemporary IR studies in China.⁵⁴ First, Chinese IR scholars readily accept the balance-of-power concept, and since 1978, IR studies in China have concentrated on its practical applications and ramifications. The reason for its popularity is that Chinese scholars find many parallels in the practice of diplomacy in traditional China. The ideas of power politics during the Warring States Period, as detailed in *Zhanguo ce* (Annals of the Warring States), and in Chinese classics such as *Sanguo yanyi* (The romance of the Three Kingdoms),⁵⁵ *Shuihu zhuan* (The story of Water Margin), and *Sunzi bingfa* (Sun Zi's The art of war),⁵⁶ share similar strains with the Western balance-of-power concept.

The second observation is that Chinese scholars and students of IR find the British school of IR, which generally employs a more historical approach in its analysis, more amenable than the American school of IR, which uses a far greater amount of modeling and quantitative analysis. At the risk of gross generalization, traditional Chinese scholarship puts greater emphasis on intuition, experiences, and macro-analysis, whereas Western scholarship stresses linkages, systemicism, and micro-analysis. In this respect, most Chinese scholars feel more comfortable working within a historical paradigm.

The third observation is that the introduction of IR studies in China has undergone numerous shifts and setbacks. There has been

⁵⁴Yuan Ming in Liang, *Guoji zhengzhi lunji*.

⁵⁵Luo Guanzhong, *Three Kingdoms: A Historical Novel*, translated with an introduction and notes by Moss Roberts (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994). In reviewing this book, American Sinologist Frederic Wakeman says that "... this 15th-century novel [has] strategically shaped the political world-view of generations of Chinese." Also see Wang, "International Relations Theory," 502; and Chan, "Beyond the North-West: Africa and the East," 245-46.

⁵⁶It has been translated into twenty-nine languages, according to *Beijing daxue xuebao* (Journal of Beijing University), Philosophy and Social Science Edition, 1994, no. 1:30.

little continuity and no systematic or comprehensive way to introduce studies from the West. This state of affair renders the development of the studies very difficult. Other problems include methodology, studies' scope, and technical problems in translating foreign texts into Chinese.⁵⁷

Current Development

As of 1993, ten universities in China had politics departments: Beijing, Nankai, Jilin, Fudan, Hangzhou, Nanjing, Xiamen, and Zhongshan universities, the China University of Political Science and Law, and the Zhongnan Institute of Nationalities.⁵⁸ Most of their teaching curricula have to be approved by the State Education Commission or its local offices. Four tertiary institutions also had international politics departments: Beijing University, Fudan University, Renmin University of China, and the Institute of International Relations. The academic strength of the departments at the former three, which were established in 1964, is much stronger than that of the latter, which was established in 1984.⁵⁹ As far as area studies are concerned, apart from the CASS and Beijing University, where the bulk of research on area studies in China is carried out, there has been a kind of division of labor based on the geographic distribution of various universities and local academies. Those in the northeast of the country tend to focus on Japan, the two Koreas, and Russia; those in the south tend to concentrate on countries and territories in Southeast Asia; those in the southwest on Indochina and the Indian subcontinent; and those in the west on Middle Eastern countries (see appendix 1 for a selective list of area studies in Chinese universities).

The two main centers of IR studies in China are Beijing and Shanghai. The former, being the capital of the country, is the center

⁵⁷In Japan's case, there is a substantial amount of indigenous publications on IR in the Japanese language (communication with Kamiya Mataka, assistant professor in IR, National Defense Academy, and visiting fellow, Center for Strategic Studies, Victoria University of Wellington, on December 13, 1994 in Wellington). To give one example, the Japanese Association of International Relations was established in 1956. Since then, it has published nonstop an in-house journal called *Kokusaiseiji* (International Relations). The 100th issue was published in 1992. It is now published three times a year.

⁵⁸Zhao, Zhao, and Han, *Zhongguo gaixiao*, 879.

⁵⁹*Ibid.*

of politics, whereas the latter is a major commercial municipality. In comparison, Beijing is far more important than Shanghai as a center of IR studies; the IR studies community is much larger and far more scholars are engaged in IR studies in Beijing than in Shanghai. For example, about half of the seven hundred members of the China Research Society of History of International Relations, the only nationwide association of IR scholars in the country, are based in Beijing.⁶⁰ Apart from Beijing and Shanghai, other big cities beginning to establish themselves as centers of international studies include Nanjing and Guangzhou. An Institute of International Studies was established at Nanjing University in April 1994,⁶¹ and an APEC Studies Center to study Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation was set up at Nankai University in March 1995 (see appendix 2 for a list of major institutions of IR studies in the PRC).⁶²

As far as disciplinary subjects are concerned, studies of international political economy (IPE) are attracting increasing attention in China. Beijing, Renmin, and Fudan universities have all established research streams in IPE, and the State Education Commission and the CASS have set up sponsorship funds to finance such studies. In addition, some introductory publications on IPE have started to appear.⁶³

New scholars have also been more daring in IR studies. For example, Ni Shixiong of Fudan University has been the most prolific writer in recent years to introduce Western (particularly American) IR studies to China, having published numerous articles and books

⁶⁰Interviews with Professor Feng Tejun of Renmin University of China and Professor Lu Yi of the Foreign Affairs College in their offices in Beijing on February 16 and March 9, 1995, respectively. Professor Lu is the president of the China Research Society of History of International Relations. According to Jia Qingguo, an IR association was formed in 1988 among some young scholars who had either studied or done research overseas, but was disbanded subsequent to the Tiananmen Incident in June 1989 (personal communication with Jia in Makuhari, Japan, September 21, 1996).

⁶¹*Sheke xinxi* (Information on Social Science) in *Fuyin baokan ziliao* (Reprints of materials from books and periodicals), published by Renmin University of China Press, D7, 1994, no. 8:32-33.

⁶²*Shijie jingji yu zhengzhi* (World Economics and Politics), 1995, no. 6:74.

⁶³Jia Yongxuan, "New Realism in IR and IPE," *Guoji guanxi xueyuan xuebao* (Journal of the Institute of International Relations), 1994, no. 4:12; Song Xinning, "The IPE Studies in China: Challenges, Dilemma, and Solution," in *Kua shiji de tiaozhan: Zhongguo guoji guanxi xueke de fazhan* (Facing the challenge of the twenty-first century: International relations studies in China), ed. Yuan Ming (Chongqing: Chongqing chubanshe, 1992), 343-68.

in this regard. Ni's works appear regularly in *Guoji zhanwang* (World Outlook), a monthly magazine on world affairs published in Shanghai. In a series of three articles appearing in 1993, he introduced concepts and issues such as ecopolitics, feminism and IR, international order and polarity, Joseph Nye's "soft power," Samuel Huntington's "clash of civilizations," and so on.⁶⁴ In an article to mark the fiftieth anniversary of the Sino-Japanese War which appeared in another Shanghai journal in 1995, he gave an up-to-date review of Western developments in IR theories.⁶⁵ Although his name and those of his like-minded colleagues such as Feng Shaolei and those in the "Shanghai school" (my terminology) have not been singled out, criticisms have been voiced by elderly scholars such as Chen Lemin, He Feng, and Feng Tejun on the "negative" effects of the proliferation of these introductory works by these relatively younger scholars.

In Beijing, a number of young IR scholars are already making their presence felt through publications and academic activities both inside and outside of China. These include, among others, Wang Jisi of the Institute of American Studies, Wang Yizhou of the Institute of World Economics and Politics, Liu Jinghua of the Institute of European Studies (all belonging to CASS), and Jia Qingguo of the Department of International Politics, Beijing University.⁶⁶

As a result of the open-door policy, there has been a dramatic increase in various contacts between China and the outside world, and these interactions are increasingly impinging on the work and activities of most Chinese. For practical as well as other reasons, there has been a need among cadres, Party members, academics, and students to enhance their understanding of international affairs and relations. To cope with the demand, since the early 1990s the Department of International Politics at Beijing University has organized short courses on international affairs to train personnel working in external propaganda departments and in business management.⁶⁷

Given the structure of China's political system, the bulk of re-

⁶⁴Ni Shixiong, "International Relations Theories in the West After the Cold War," *Guoji zhanwang* (World Outlook), 1993, no. 17:23-24; no. 18:25-26; no. 19:22-24.

⁶⁵Ni Shixiong, "World War II and International Relations Theories in the West," *Guoji guan cha* (International Survey), 1995, no. 3:1-7.

⁶⁶Interviews with Wang, Wang, and Jia in Beijing in February and March 1995, and with Jia again in Makuhari, Japan, in September 1996.

⁶⁷*Guoji zhengzhi yanjiu* (Studies of International Politics) (Beijing University), 1995, no. 1:58; no. 2:87.

search on international studies is carried out in the research institutes of the Party and the government, as well as the military and in the academies of social sciences.⁶⁸ In comparison, the research done in universities in this area is small. However, international studies in universities concentrate more on theories while those in the research institutes of the Party, the government, and the military are solely concerned with current affairs and policy analysis. The research focus in the academies of social sciences lies somewhere in between.

Conclusion

The year 1978 represents a watershed in China's social, economic, and political developments which have since provided a congenial environment for the development of IR studies. Zhang Lili and his colleagues summarize the main characteristics of the development of IR studies in two phases, using the year 1978 as a dividing line: one period from 1949 to 1978 and the other from 1979 onward.⁶⁹

In the first phase, the development of IR studies was constricted by a single ideology. Little variations existed in the methodology used, and the scope, subject-matter, and depth of the studies remained more or less stagnant. Five features characterized the developments during this phase: (1) the chief proponents of political and IR theories were the top Chinese leaders, Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai; (2) IR theories served the Party and the country's foreign policy in their international struggles; (3) theorizing was simplistic and came under the strong influence of the extreme radical left; (4) macro-analysis was the major approach, with little work done at the micro-level; and (5) Marxism was the guiding principle, and historical materialism and dialectic materialism were the only analytical tools.

Since 1979, development has taken a relatively more open and pluralistic path. Five features have been apparent: (1) in comparison with the previous phase, there has been a liberalization of thought; (2) more scholars have been engaged in studies than before; (3) more

⁶⁸Chu Shulong, "Some Problems Concerning the Development of IR Studies," *Xiandai guoji guanxi* (Contemporary International Relations), 1995, no. 4:62. Interview with Gao Heng, senior research fellow, Institute of World Economics and Politics, CASS, March 6, 1995.

⁶⁹Zhang, Yang, and Zhou, *Xiandai guoji guanxixue*, 284 ff.

efforts have been made to introduce and absorb foreign theories and, in the process, the Chinese perception of IR is shedding some of its extreme views; (4) emphasis has been placed on practice and the analysis of the fundamental changes in the world's political economy; and (5) a more even balance has been struck between macro- and micro-analyses.

On the whole, the development of IR studies in China has become moderately more pluralistic. There is greater room for research in one's area of interest, apart from fulfilling research programs assigned, approved, supervised, or screened by officials of the CCP Central Committee Propaganda Department through heads of research departments or programs. This controlled situation is still in place in some of the institutes which comprise the CASS,⁷⁰ which is regarded as one of the top think-tanks in China. Marxist and non-Marxist views coexist with each other,⁷¹ but this coexistence is fragile. The official line, handed down by the Party through the State Education Commission, is still decisive. This can be likened to the bird-cage analogy of China's economic development advanced by Chen Yun, a senior Chinese leader who died in April 1995, when he referred to the liberalization of China's economic system. The size of the cage is the limit or the boundary within which the encaged bird can fly. The cage may be larger these days and provide more room for maneuvering, but the cage is nevertheless still there. Such is the nature of pluralism and freedom of academic pursuit in China: a kind of pluralism within a milder form of authoritarianism. The development of international studies in China remains dependent on the thinking and behavior of the Communist Party and its top leaders.

⁷⁰My visit to the academy in early 1995. See Su Shaozhi, "The Structure of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences and Two Decisions to Abolish Its Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought Institute," in *Decision-Making in Deng's China: Perspectives from Insiders*, ed. Carol Lee Hamrin and Zhao Suisheng (Armonk, N.Y. and London, England: M. E. Sharpe, 1995), 111-17.

⁷¹I wish to thank Professors Werner Meissner and Ting Wai of Hong Kong Baptist University for reminding me at the China workshop that to use the terms "Marxist" and "non-Marxist" to describe most Chinese scholars may not be entirely accurate. Terms such as "controlled" and "less-controlled" may be more appropriate.

Appendix 1

Area Studies in Chinese Universities, 1995

Universities (U)	Provinces	Research Institutes
Anhui U	Anhui	Institute of Russian Studies
Central China Normal U	Hubei	Research Center for American Studies
Dalian U	Liaoning	Japanese Studies Institute
East China Normal U	Shanghai	Shanghai Research Institute of Soviet Union & East European Countries
Fudan U	Shanghai	Institute of Taiwan and Hong Kong Cultures
Hainan U	Hainan	Institute of Asian & Pacific Economy
Hangzhou U	Zhejiang	Institute of French History Institute of German Studies Institute of International Studies Institute of Italian Culture Institute of Japanese Culture
Hebei U	Hebei	Institute of Japanese Studies
Henan U	Henan	Institute of Japanese History
Heilongjiang U	Heilongjiang	Institute of American Studies Institute of Russian Studies
Hunan U	Hunan	Institute of Japanese Language & Culture
Jilin U	Jilin	Institute of Japanese Studies
Jinan U	Guangdong	Institute for Overseas Chinese Studies Institute for Southeast Asian Studies Institute for Studies on the Economy of the Special Economic Zones and Hong Kong and Macao
Liaoning U	Liaoning	Institute of Japan
Nanjing U	Jiangsu	Institute of Sino-German Economic Law Institute of Taiwan Studies
Nankai U	Tianjin	APEC Studies Center Institute of Taiwan
Beijing U	Beijing	Center of Asian Pacific Studies Center of Hong Kong and Macao Studies Center of International Politics Center of Italian Culture Center of Japanese Studies Center of Korean Studies Center of Law in Hong Kong, Macao and Taiwan Center of Sino-Canadian Studies & Academic Cooperation Center of Taiwan Studies Center for Soviet and East European Studies Institute of Afro-Asian Studies Institute of Russian Studies Institute of South & Southeast Asian Studies Research Center of World Socialist Parties Yenching Center for American Studies
Shandong U	Shandong	Center of Japanese Studies Institute of Korean Economy

Appendix 1 (Continued)

Universities (U)	Provinces	Research Institutes
Shantou U	Guangdong	Research Center on Taiwan, Hong Kong, Macao and Southeast Asia
Shanghai International Studies U	Shanghai	American Studies Center Canadian Studies Center Institute of German-Speaking Areas Institute of Middle East Cultures Institute of Russian Studies International Studies Association New Zealand Studies Center
Shanxi U	Shanxi	Institute of Japan Study
Shenzhen U	Guangdong	Hong Kong Law Institute Institute for Special Economic Zone Studies
Sichuan U	Sichuan	Institute of South Asian Studies
Wuhan U	Hubei	Institute of Law in Hong Kong and Taiwan Institute of U.S. and Canadian Economy
Xiamen U	Fujian	Institute of Southeast Asian Studies Taiwan Institute
Xinjiang U	Xinjiang	Research Institute of Central Asian Cultures
Yunnan U	Yunnan	Institute of Southwest Asian Studies
Zhejiang U	Zhejiang	Institute of Taiwan
Zhongshan U	Guangdong	Southeast Asian Studies Institute Hong Kong & Macao Studies Institute

Notes: The Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS) in Beijing has the most comprehensive coverage of area studies research in China. Local academies show an interest in countries and areas which are geographically close to them.

Sources: Mainly from Chinese Education Association for International Exchange, comp., *Chinese Universities and Colleges*, 2nd edition (Beijing: Higher Education Press, 1994) and internet website at < <http://www.pku.edu.cn> > as of November 1996.

Appendix 2

Major Institutions of IR Studies in the PRC, 1995¹**Beijing:**

Beijing Research Society of International Politics
Center for International Studies, State Council
China Center for International Studies
China Institute of Contemporary International Relations
China Institute of International Strategic Studies
China Institute of International Studies
China Research Society of History of International Relations
Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs
Department of International Politics, Foreign Affairs College
Department of International Politics, Beijing University
Department of International Politics, Renmin University of China
Department of Strategic Studies, China Academy of Military Sciences

Institute for Strategic Studies, National Defense University, the People's Liberation Army
Institute of International Relations
Institute of International Relations, Beijing University
Institute of International Relations History, Foreign Affairs College
Institute of Peace and Development
Institute of World Economics and Politics, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences
Research Office of International Politics, Central Party School
World Affairs Press

Shanghai:

Department of International Politics, Fudan University
Institute of International Strategy, Fudan University
Institute of World Economy, Fudan University
Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences
Shanghai Institute for International Studies
Shanghai Institute of Peace and Development
Shanghai International Relations Association

Nanjing:

Institute of International Studies, Nanjing University

South China:

At least three universities and two provincial academies of social sciences have strong academic strengths in the studies of Southeast Asian countries, including, to a lesser degree, IR studies among these countries and between them and China. They include:

Institute for the Research of Southeast Asia, Guangxi Academy of Social Sciences
Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Jinan University, Guangzhou
Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Yunnan Academy of Social Sciences
Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Zhongshan University, Guangzhou
Nanyang Research Institute, Xiamen University
Yunnan Institute of International Studies

As of early 1995, efforts were being made to establish centers of IR studies in Zhongshan and Jinan universities.²

Apart from the above institutions and centers, those with a strong emphasis on international studies include the Johns Hopkins University-Nanjing University Center for Chinese and American Studies and an American Studies Center at Wuhan University. Other centers and institutions such as those in Japanese studies are less internationally oriented.

In general, institutes of international studies in China fall into four major categories:³

- (1) Those which belong to the CASS system, such as the CASS Institute of World Economics and Politics, the Institute of Asia and Pacific Economy in Fujian Academy of Social Sciences, and the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies in Yunnan Academy of Social Sciences;
- (2) Those which belong to government departments: for example, the Institute of International Trade in the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Cooperation;
- (3) Those institutes and research centers which belong to departments with a strong policy orientation, such as the Institute of International Studies in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Policy Research Institute in the Office of the Overseas Chinese Affairs in the State Council; and
- (4) Those in universities and colleges, such as the Nanyang Research Institute at Xiamen University and the Institute of International Relations at Beijing University.

Notes:

¹This list is indicative rather than exhaustive. I have included a few area studies institutions with a strong international emphasis.

²Communication with an anonymous scholar in Hong Kong in January 1995 and September 1996.

³Chen Qiaozhi et al., *China's Southeast Asian Research: The Status Quo [sic] and Prospect* (Guangzhou: Jinan University Press, 1992), English section, 29.