Lecture December 30

Rise of China and Individualized International Relations

Chih-yu Shih

The meaning of the concept of Sinicization is complicated, multidimensional, and

contested. It refers to conceptions of self and other that are typically deeply intertwined.

The practices it represents, discursive and otherwise, can signify either the broadening or

the narrowing of social and cultural distances. Many of the developments that are

currently shaping the contemporary world – such as globalization, capitalism, nationalism,

and multiculturalism – provide the context in which China encounters and engages both

East and West, often but not always in what one might call Anglo-China. The lives and

scholarship of the four individuals examined in this chapter represent clearly the

complexity of these processes.

Sinicization in its various guises, involving Self and Other, is about influence and

interaction among people as much as states;[1] the Chinese and their self-understanding as

much as China and its sphere of influence;[2] and China and its diaspora conceived of

beyond the category of territorial China.[3] Moreover, Sinicization focuses our attention on

those mediating between China and the world. Consumers of goods made in China,

Taiwanese pro-independence advocates, Chinese villagers fighting for rights, and

indigenous Chinese loyal to Southeast Asian states can all act as cultural brokers involved

in processes of encounter, engagement, and clash between different civilizational complexes.[4] Sinicization is a concept that summarizes important processes leading to self-discovery and self-interpretation. Without it, the economic, security, and political dimensions of Sinicization are devoid of meaning. In this chapter, I focus attention on four well-known academics whose lives and works display clearly the importance of processes of Sinicization and of Anglo-China.

Specifically, I track the identities and associated practices of four Asian diasporic academics – John Wong, Chung Tan, Samuel Kim, and Akira Iriye – who generally present their scholarship on China's economy, politics, history, and culture in English. Their careers and intellectual evolution, and the simplifications and complexifications in their work, offer us a window into their understanding of identities and practices in the perceived Sinic world constituted by the Chinese. Their careers are not representative in any way. But they do illustrate well the possibilities that structures provide for self-reflexive agents to make meaningful choices and thus to shape, at least to some extent, their environments, without ever fully determining them. Writing outside of China and for an English-speaking audience, these four academics illustrate with particular clarity the liminal positions they occupy between China and Asia and between East and West. Their lives and work thus illustrate Sinicization as a set of multi-directional, multi-sited, discursive processes, including variants of de-, re-, and self-Sinicization. In short, Sinicization presupposes agency and the appropriation and re-appropriation of Chinese phenomena by Chinese and non-Chinese agents, for their self- and group-interested use in an Anglo-Chinese world.

These four academics illustrate in their lives a variety of geographical, linguistic, as well as temporal possibilities, illustrating the multi-sited and multidirectional character of Sinicization. They were born into different Asian communities – Korea, China, Hong Kong, and Japan. They lived and worked in different countries – the United States, Singapore, and India. And while they read and wrote for the most part in English, their occasional reliance on other languages teaches us that Sinicization does not have to proceed in either Chinese or English.[5] Rather, the use of third languages can be a statement of who one is, from where one comes, and where one is heading.[6] In brief, Sinicization reveals, in one person, the existence of multiple cultural-geographical selves. Later in their careers, all four experienced a rising concern over their home countries, often reflected in the shift, undertaken consciously and rationally, of their academic and political agendas and frequency of visits. This fact is a healthy antidote to the common preconception that structures are all-determining and that Sinicization is a unilinear process that radiates from China outward. As these four individual lives show, nothing could be further from the truth.

Even far-reaching views that seek to associate China with very specific images, such as "rise," "all under heaven," or "Chinese characteristics," represent choices, not inevitabilities. The lives and works of these four academics contradict any such notion. If one insists on the nation state as the only viable civilizational actor in world politics, Huntingtonian clashes of civilizations may have some plausibility. Academics living and working in transnational careers, however, have been free to choose practices unrelated,

even resistant to the constraints and opportunities that nation states provide.[7] Promotion or denial of Chinese distinctiveness always involves choices. Thus, no view on China can be politically neutral. Sinicization is unavoidably shaped and impacted by conceptions of identity and political practice.

This does not mean that actors have full control over their scholarship on China or over the self-identifications that implicitly or explicitly inform their perspectives. None of the four academics could control either the larger forces that prompted their civilizational encounters, or the liminal positions they held.[8] Their choice of language, for example, would not go unnoticed by one community or the other. Home and host countries posed structural constraints simply because they differed from one another. Any narrative strategy about China could not help but activate those differences. Yet, meaningful choices persisted, including both choosing sides and avoiding the choosing of sides. Structural determinacy thus fails to remove the capacity for strategic indeterminacy.

Discursive analysis shows that these four academics consciously manage their liminal positions through the discursive and practical aspects of their scholarship: Kim's synthetic analysis, Iriye's centrist mediation, Tan's geocivilizational critique, and Wong's scientific Chineseness. In their work on China, we see at least two common puzzles that call for answers. How do they place themselves in the perceived Sinic world constituted by the Chinese: does China belong to an identical or a different ontological order? How do they want China to be evaluated: should China conform to a Western standard expressed in values that are claimed to be universal? Kim's and Iriye's professional

affiliations in the United States seem to push for a universalist prescription for China's place in the world; the peripheral relationship between Kim's and Wong's homes on the one hand, and China on the other, pushes instead for a shared ontological identity. By contrast, freed from both American affiliation and a sense of belonging to the periphery, Tan has a different and more innocent sense of China. Given the constraining civilizational positions in which they found themselves and the empowering cultural resources at their disposal, each of the four scholars has to decide, discursively, professionally, as well as personally, how to formulate their own identity strategy and style.

Two Diasporic Dimensions of Asian Scholars' Views on China

Peter Katzenstein argues in Chapter 1 that the processes of Sinicization that accompany the rise of China have triggered a recombination of, rather than a rupture with, established patterns and practices.[9] Although Sinicization is not just a territorial expansion of influence, recombination is more visible in areas located close to China's territorial state. It proceeds in the mind rather than through territorial changes.[10] Sinicization is thus composed of processes of increasing mutual self-knowledge as well as increasing knowledge about China. Since one needs to make sense of China's rise and its implications for one's relationship with China, the understanding of China is intimately tied to self-understanding. Mutual constitution is normally invoked as an abstract category and is rarely itself analyzed as I do here.

The responses of Asian diasporas outside Asia can offer valuable insights into the multi-directional character of processes of Sinicization. Mutual constitution is central for Asian diasporic scholars, who usually take on identities addressing their relationships with China and the country of origin or residence. Their home and host countries are important geo-cultural contexts for Sinicization at the micro level. However, the designation of home country is often a complicated matter, since in many cases a person may have lived in many different places; home identity is a complex and situational choice, complicated further when it involves territorial China: self-identity can then become a matter of the periphery or the center.

More specifically, the cultural dimension of Sinicization invites us to answer two questions: how does one view China, and how does one think that others view China. The two answers focus, respectively, on identity and image. A comparison of each of the four possibilities thus generated permits me to make some conjectures about processes of Sinicization. Cultural Sinicization concerns discourses, and how these discourses emerge from a specific social and cultural context. Since individuals make strategic choices, their decision to move in one direction or another is never simple or neat. Illustrating a key feature of Sinicization, the interaction between individual strategy and a larger conjuncture are unavoidable.

I am not arguing that the background of these four scholars is sufficient for characterizing their thematic choices. I show instead that their choices are well-grounded, without precluding that other choices might have been possible. In short, background gives

meaning to texts, and so do recollections in subsequent years. I rely on a comparison of their writings as well as interviews to accomplish two tasks: to gather evidence that their intellectual position can be traced to a larger context *and* that their position always rests on meaningful choices. Methodologically, this means that scholarly texts on China or Asia and their reinterpretations at a later career stage, expressed in interviews, represent equally meaningful possibilities of understanding individual choices, each illustrating a decision to adapt to or resist social contexts – understood here either as agreeing with or dissenting from conventional views of China rising. The open-ended character of Sinicization is richer if we shift between rather than seek to reconcile texts, interviews, and life histories. The meaning of Sinicization, I argue, cannot be determined in advance. Sinicization proceeds through the mechanisms of encounter or engagement at the collective level and choice at the individual level. In brief, Sinicization is made possible through mutual constitution of China, China scholar, and China scholarship.

Asian diasporas have generally experienced an identity dilemma involving home and host country.[11] On issues involving their home country, members of the Asian diaspora should think and act like fellow citizens in the host country. At the same time, they need a home country that enjoys respect in their host country so as to reduce the anxiety that their status as a diaspora might become a liability. The worst case occurs when the host and the home country are in conflict. Were it to involve a serious conflict, the rise of China could put Asian diasporic scholars under the scrutiny of colleagues and readers,[12] who would interpret their views of China as revealing their choice between home and host country.

The identity strategy of diasporic scholars and the social image of China they portray in their scholarly writings are connected.[13] First, they need to decide if China should be evaluated by the often universal standards accepted in the host country. These standards typically concern democracy, human rights, capitalism, and peace. Second, if these norms are not applicable, then they need to make sure the other norms are intelligible to the host country. In brief, diasporic scholars incur social costs for any analysis that gives the impression that China does not have to conform to widely accepted norms. By no means do diasporic scholars have to agree with the mainstream view of the host country; but invoking a cause larger than China is essential to demonstrating independent scholarship to the audience in the host country.

In brief, the authors' portrayal of China involves questions of personal identity and social image. Identity concerns itself with the type of home country, image with the type of host country. If the home country used to be peripheral in the Sino-centric world, the need to differentiate from China should be comparatively weak on questions of identity; if equivalent in status, that need should be stronger. Diasporic Korean scholars, for example, should be less interested than diasporic Japanese in differentiating China from their respective home countries. Analogously, if the host country is a Western state, the expectation that China should conform to specific and allegedly universal norms should be relatively strong; if not, it should be weaker. Thus, the Chinese diaspora living in North America or Western Europe would probably be more attuned to China's failure to abide by the norms of liberal democracy.

Mutual constitution of self-knowledge and knowledge about China thus involves personal identity and social image, with self-knowledge telling the actor how to view China, and knowledge of others about China telling the actor how China is viewed. The actor's conception of the rise of China thus involves his or her judgments on questions of both identity and image. To understand how individual judgments are embedded in a scholar's background, I rely on interviews with four Asian China experts, all teaching outside of their countries of birth: Samuel Kim (an "idealistic" Korean living in the US), Akira Iriye (a "defeated" Japanese also living in the US), Chung Tan (a "betraying" Chinese living in India) and John Wong (an "objective" Hong Kong China watcher living in Singapore). Note that these individuals are not samples as defined conventionally. Rather, like any other individual, each of these four is treated as a bundle of possibilities of placing the self in larger social contexts. In short , I study these individuals because they illustrate the range of individual choices and because I know and like them. I construct Table 6-1 based on my reading of their work rather than on any abstract principles.

I argue that their different conceptions of China reflect both their diasporic social positions and hybrid cultural bearings, and their specific choices about their identities. Multidirectional Sinicization processes expand the China discourse in ways determined partly by individual biography and partly by individual choice.

[Table 6.1 about here]

Originally from Japan – which is relatively equal to China in status – but living in the United States, Akira Iriye sees China as different and ready to conform. Iriye's position is in line with, as well as different from, that of Hedemi Suganami. Born in Soviet-occupied Korea, which is peripheral to China, and now living in the United States, Samuel Kim views China as similar and ready to conform. Kim's views are in line with and also different from David Kang's Sino-centric analysis. John Wong came originally from peripheral Hong Kong and lives in Singapore. He sees China as quite similar to other states and does not insist that China should conform to the universal standards defined by others. Wong's view is in line with as well as different from Yongnian Zheng's nationalism metaphor. Chung Tan originally came from China and lived in India before his retirement. He sees China as different from other states and sees no need for China to conform to the norms propounded by others. Tan's views both agree with and differ from Wang Gungwu's commonwealth metaphor.

Akira Iriye[14]

A Diasporic Japanese on China

Iriye calls himself a centrist, placing himself between the United States, Japan, and China. Committed to individual diplomacy, he points in his scholarship to possible avenues to accommodate seemingly irreconcilable positions. Arguing that culture offers such an avenue since the love of culture is universal, he uses music as the quintessential example.

Iriye does not attempt to mediate through consensus building. Rather, he seeks to breed confidence in a universal humanity that transcends mundane conflicts of interest. His scholarship expresses the view that conflict among states takes place over superficial issues that are based on ignorance. A deeper sharing of common values is made possible by redirecting attention away from political and economic, and toward cultural issues. Other than reducing enmity, Iriye does not want to change anyone else's position. He resorts to simple facts and logics that may have limited theoretical appeal, insisting on the simplicity of a universal human spirit. Iriye's self-described "centrist" scholarship avoids controversial issues in an effort to reduce the salience of existing and at times bitter policy disputes.

Iriye is therefore more ready than many of his Japanese colleagues to sympathize with China's nationalist mood, rooted in deeply felt grievances caused by the violence Japan inflicted on China during World War II. However, Iriye's scholarship on Japan shows no sign of placing blame for its past policies.[15] For him, misunderstanding is the root of all problems, with cultural exchange the only avenue to resolution. China is an important place to begin retrieving universal humanity. If Japan and the US are to achieve genuine peace, he argues, then East and West must come together, specifically through the building of an integrated and unified Asian Community;[16] this would require the reconciliation of China and Japan. To achieve that end, Iriye's scholarship does not advocate a change in or transformation of China. History shows how misunderstandings have emerged. And history shows why China possesses a character different from Japan and quite legitimately adheres to policies informed by China's own interests.

Understanding and respecting China in the context of the historical evolution of its policy choices is the first step to bridging the gap that separates China from its opponents. China's rise is a phenomenon of globalization, not a threat or disruption to it. In short, Iriye's centrist position makes him see China as ontologically different. But he does believe that China could achieve a deeper self-confidence if it were to retrieve some universally shared values. Both Japan and the US should and could accomplish this as well.

In contrast to Iriye's centrist approach, which resolves conflict by recognizing a shared humanity, other scholars stress China's distinct status and insist on conformity with specific principles. The UK-based English School solidarist Hidemi Suganami, for example, does not support the creation of a Japanese or a Chinese school of International Relations. Although he rarely touches on China in his writings, Suganami notes the different international principles that pervade ancient Chinese history.[17] His reflections on a national school of International Relations and his appreciation of these national histories allow him to readily accept China as a distinct nation. His solidarism, however, predisposes him to advocate for China's conformity with globally shared human rights standards.[18] A comparison of Iriye with Suganami shows similarity in their designation of China in accordance to their home (equal with China) and host (in the West) country identities. Nevertheless, their expectations differ. Iriye stresses peace more than the kind of human rights that Suganami cherishes. Furthermore, for Suganami, war is not unthinkable. Iriye prefers micro-level communication, while Suganami focuses on macro-level management. Sinicization would compel Suganami to think seriously about

intervention in China's human rights policy. It poses a practical challenge to solidarism and the principles that define him as a solidarist. In comparison, for Iriye, Sinicization means a more urgent need to help China to establish mutual appreciation and cooperation with solidarists like Suganami.

The Personal and National Context

Although a pacifist, Iriye takes an epistemological stance quite similar to that of the Kyoto School of Philosophy. Some members of that school supported the war fought in the name of the Great East Asian Co-prosperity Sphere.[19] According to their philosophy of nothingness, Hegelian contradiction needs no synthesis. To be universal is the ability to be both Oriental and Occidental. This means that one must exist in a place of nothingness. Retreat to nothingness philosophically brings one back to the origin of civilizations and enables re-entry into a differing cultural context, leading one to appreciate all without changing any. In its time, the Kyoto school inspired important scholars such as Takeuchi Yoshimi, once Japan's most influential literary critic. He suggested that Asia should be conceived of as a method of self-denial to shield us from preoccupation with any specific values or commitment to any specific standpoint.[20] Today, Nobukuni Koyasu, in particular, carries on the legacy of the Kyoto School legacy. He argues that East Asia is a method that reveals itself through an unending process of becoming.[21] Since it is a process, East Asia can never be a piece of territory to be occupied. Hence there exists no conceptual room for a revival of imperialism. The late Yuzo Mizoguchi similarly advocated treating China rather than East Asia as a method,

enabling the Japanese to learn to view others without considering Japan's own condition. Thus, Japan can aim to become truly universal.[22] This preoccupation with attaining the universal without resolving obvious contradictions echoes the Kyoto School's view of both Orient and Occident as partial. To follow the logic of nothingness, the rise of China is a development that does not affect Japan, as it occurs in an altogether different context. Although Iriye is not necessarily fully cognizant of their various political varieties, the philosophy of nothingness and the world history standpoint are epistemologically embedded in his centrism, his idea of the importance of inter-cultural relations, and his commitment to an Asian Community. His determined pursuit of peace through regional and global community-building gives this seemingly passive philosophy a fresh meaning and an impulse for political action diametrically opposed to the support of imperialist policies that the Kyoto School represented before World War II.

Iriye's scholarship owes a great deal to his mentor, John K. Fairbank, who helped him throughout his career. World War II presented the question of whether Japan (his home country) or the United States (where he made his life) was to blame for the war. He resolved that difficult question by insisting that the war resulted mostly from colossal misunderstandings on both sides, thus sidestepping the issue of who was right and who was wrong. Even at a time when war between China, Japan, and the United States is highly unlikely, Iriye continues to advocate for peace as if the threat of war were real. It is, of course, real for anyone who bears the burden of war in his or her choice of identity. Without China's participation, Japan can never become the representative of the East, seeking genuine peace with the United States and the West. The rise of China could pose

an intellectual threat if China does not support the goal of Asia joining the world, since there would be no East to engage in cultural exchange with the West. That should be sufficient reason for Iriye's attempt to persuade his audience that China is a rising civilization that poses no threat whatsoever. Rather, it offers a historic opportunity. Iriye's favored civilizational relationship preserves all cultures and could not become a reality if China's rise were political. Conceived of as a bridge, Japan facilitates inter-civilizational understandings. It thus might lessen the chances of a future confrontation that would force Japan, and Iriye, to choose sides.

Along with other prewar thinkers who reappropriate the retreat discourse, each on their own terms, to overcome Japan's war legacy, Iriye distinguishes himself by associating the retreat/centrist discourse with peace activism, a personal cause throughout his scholarly career. He thus develops an earlier anti-China narrative into a brand new, morally infused scholarship that reconnects China, the Pacific, and the world. The cognitive capacity of the pre-war Kyoto School to tolerate the incongruence between an older China-oriented Japan and a modern Western-oriented Japan does not yield the same bridging result. Iriye thus clearly differs from the Kyoto philosophers. To favor Orient at one time and Occident at another is not simply a spontaneous act. Consciousness has to be taught and cultivated. Iriye appreciates the merits of both sides of this civilizational divide. His peace is not as bitter as that of the war-accepting Kyoto School. For Iriye, war would betray consciousness, which should validate and secure all sides to all possible conflicts. Furthermore, war would threaten his relationship with his mentor. Iriye is thus very insistent on preaching peace and on teaching his audiences everywhere how to appreciate

other civilizations. He tackles directly the mutual animosities in Chinese and Japanese society, urging both sides to adopt an inter-civilizational rather than a national perspective and thus transcending his Japanese identity by making it politically irrelevant or universal. Iriye respects all perspectives, potentially including both the Kyoto School and his own contrarian position that advocates personal diplomacy. The rise of China confirms his view of China as a civilization rather than a state. This helps him to appreciate Japan and China as civilizations that need their inter-civilizational relationships, thus protecting his own centrist position.

Samuel Kim[23]

A Diasporic Korean on China

Kim likes to combine all of the analytical perspectives on China into one composite model. He began his career by writing about the Christian missionary Anson Burlingame, who later served as China's ambassador to Europe.[24] If China could be represented in Europe by an American missionary, he posited, it simply could not be all that different from the West. Kim's moral commitment to his subject implied that China could join a world of likeminded countries. This interest led him to the study of peace and war, international organization and world order.[25] His involvement in world order studies fostered the argument that China has to fulfill its duty when conducting its international affairs, and an interest in the study of how China had acquired its sense of membership in international organizations and sought to fulfill its international obligations. In contrast

with conventional opinion prevailing in the 1970s, he argued that China was not a troublemaker in the United Nations. To the contrary, it painstakingly chose political gestures that signaled its disagreement with specific policies without disrupting UN procedures.[26] Even in areas in which a legacy of deep conflict remained, China acquiesced and gradually came to adopt UN procedures it had vehemently opposed. At the same time, it tried hard to adhere to the stance of most Third World countries. Kim also notes China's attentiveness to improving its own image. From the perspective of world order studies, there is no great difference between China and other states. Kim edited a book on conflict that incorporates virtually all related theories. His other edited volumes similarly address most of the existing theories about China, covering a broad spectrum of bilateral and multilateral arrangements.[27] Specifically, Kim sees different theories as accounting for different aspects of Chinese foreign policy.

Kim characterizes his scholarship as "synthetic," using the arenas of world order and China to display his collection of theories. To the extent that Kim does not support or oppose specific theories, his work resembles Iriye's. But synthesis differs from centrism. Kim develops his own theoretical perspective, typically well-rounded and rarely provoking others. In this, too, he is similar to Iriye. However, in contrast to Iriye, Kim does not hesitate to articulate his own position. Kim's quest in scholarship is to combine and reconcile different intellectual positions and thus to transcend the limitations specific theoretical perspectives inevitably entail. In his writings, Kim does not view China as a country seeking to demonstrate its uniqueness. Instead, he attempts to understand how China adapts to new challenges such as the rules of the World Trade Organization in the

era of globalization. Kim's focus on the negotiation process suggests that he views China as just another state.

In comparison to Kim's synthetic approach, US-based David Kang is an ardent defender of a Chinese worldview unfamiliar to Western theories informed by the Westphalian state system. As a Californian, Kang develops an argument that is critical of popular notions of the balance of power. Furthermore, he considers China's neighbors to agree with, indeed embrace, a hierarchical worldview.[28] This agreement generates collectively shared expectations about relationships with which even China, located at the top, must comply. Both US scholars, Kim and Kang are critics of all versions of realism. Instead, Kang argues that the East Asian order has been maintained not by balancing, but by bandwagoning. Located at the center, China has always been a familiar phenomenon to its East Asian neighbors, who began engaging in conflict only during China's periods of weakness. Although far from a synthesis, Kang's criticism of realism is a plea for peace, stability, and prosperity[29] – everything that Washington would cherish. For Kim, the establishment of a world order requires practical work. For Kang, realism is the main danger, threatening conflict and war. For Kim, Sinicization offers opportunities to incorporate previously excluded regimes such as Pyongyang into the world order. For Kang, it consolidates an alternative to realism that promises a world order actually desired by today's major powers.

The Personal and National Context

Samuel Kim made his career choices on the background of the Cold War, the division of Korea, and containment policy. Shaped by a mixture of cultural and social forces, this context offered numerous opportunities, which Kim seized with alacrity. He learned English on his own so that he could teach Koreans and translate for Americans, scraping together enough funds for a trip to America. Kim supported himself from the beginning as he entered the field of China studies. Later, he became the first American Fulbright professor teaching in China. Throughout his career, he has had no enemies. When he was upset about the Tiananmen uprising, as a scholar he did not act. Kim has always looked for the confluence of diverse factors that would help him to explain complicated events. Concerns over human rights in China simply could not yield one general assessment. Similarly, the rise of China does not push Kim to embrace one simple theory as many other intellectuals do. During the last decade, his attention has shifted away from Chinese to Korean politics. If Communist China failed in shaping China's destiny in the past, China's rise surely would not have a teleological destiny either.

Before settling in the United States, Kim was constantly on the move. Born in what later became North Korea, he learned Japanese as his first and Russian as his second foreign language. But he was determined to live in the United States. To improve his chances of finding a job, he made the shrewd decision to avoid a focus on Korea at the outset of his career. China appeared to be a better choice. Thus, he began to learn Chinese as his fifth language – having studied English and French in college. Later, he shied away in his scholarship from a power politics perspective and instead favored a normative approach. The normative high ground allowed him to avoid making judgments about political

developments that had previously pushed his personal life in directions not under his control. Not surprisingly, Kim insists that China is simply too complicated a subject to be encapsulated in a nutshell. A description of China must be nuanced and qualified. This approach mirrors his own career. Kim is very much aware of the puzzle posed by his own identity, and he is cognizant of and sensitive to his seemingly inferior social position. In North Korea, he seems to recognize something of himself when he says that North Korea is no longer a shrimp because the shrimp has learned multiple languages. Kim is a self-professed pacifist. He wants China to become a democracy, but without external pressure. He pays great attention to China's increasing conformity to the norms of international organizations.[30] Unlike realists, and especially offensive realists, he is not alarmed by China's rise. In his writings he shuns extreme positions such as "China threat" or "China collapse." Instead of adhering to a neutral and centrist position like Iriye, Kim draws useful lessons from all sides. Since his scholarship on China is always synthetic, Kim's understanding of China does not point to one clear path. Interestingly, his self-conscious avoidance of teleologies is rooted in the combining of many different teleological arguments. Kim is comfortable with the notion of Sinicization, which for him is an open-ended process. And he readily acknowledges that Korea and Japan were both deeply influenced by China. His attention to and sympathy for North Korea is embedded in his never-alarmist views on China.[31]

John Wong[32]

A Diasporic Cantonese on China

John Wong's China is usually placed in a macro-structural context often reflected in the titles of his many publications. Taking a problem-solving approach, he puts himself as much as possible in the shoes of Chinese leaders. Wong addresses China's economic, social, and political problems using a scientific methodology, often relying on statistics as well as models that seek to describe the situation faced by Chinese leaders in objective terms. Occasionally, he is willing to propose policy solutions. He is particularly sensitive to China's relationship with its Southeast Asian neighbors.[33] John Wong publishes more on China's economic development than on any other issue. Although his analysis is always problem-centered, Wong rarely, if ever, shows any interest in the notion of China's collapse. Instead, he is interested in why and how Chinese leaders cope with difficult challenges. And he does not romanticize their ability to resolve any of them.

Wong wants to understand the contemporary challenges Chinese leaders face because this kind of knowledge is put in the service of the Singapore government. His analysis rests on the recognition that China's rise offers Singapore a unique opportunity.[34] In their Chineseness, Singapore and China share common sensibilities. Singapore's relationship with its Southeast Asian neighbors is vulnerable to domestic ethnic quarrels that center on the existence of important Chinese minorities. Wong understands and presents China's policy toward its Southeast Asian neighbors as one of caution. In his depiction of East Asian international relations, there exists no Sino-centric world. For Wong, China is just another country. His analysis is based on national statistics. However, to the extent that China could not simply apply experiences gained elsewhere to resolve the problems it

faces, China's experience and capacity are specific and distinctive, illustrated by issues such as leadership succession, socialist reform, and crisis management of issues such as SARS.[35] China's distinctiveness, not its uniqueness, thus makes it possible for Singapore, with easy access to Chinese informants, to contribute to English-language social science scholarship on China.

In comparison to Wong's treatment of China as an object of scientific analysis, China-born, US-trained, and currently Singapore-based Yongnian Zheng takes Chinese scholars very seriously as a vital source of knowledge. Zheng argues that Chinese nationalism has both pragmatic and emotional aspects.[36] Both Wong and Zheng agree that China can be studied objectively. China is not any different from other countries that similarly abide by realist logic (for Wong) or subscribe to nationalism (for Zheng). However, the two scholars differ on the subject of empathy with Chinese feelings as an essential ingredient to the understanding of China. Sympathy with China could mean deep trouble for Wong's Singaporean host. Zheng is less sensitive to the ethnic issues that surround the position of Chinese in Southeast Asia. Both agree, however, that China has its own way of doing things. This explains why both rely on Chinese sources. Neither lives in the West now, and both have lived in Chinese settings – Wong's Hong Kong and Zheng's Zhejiang. For Wong, Sinicization is illustrated by Singapore's greater sensitivity toward and compliance with Chinese practices. For Zheng, it is demonstrated by China's pragmatic nationalism.

The Personal and National Context

Since 75 per cent of Singapore's multi-ethnic population is Chinese, Singapore's relations with China are delicate. Some scholars of Chinese origin, writing in Singapore on Southeast Asian Chinese affairs, dispute the very notion of a Chinese diaspora, insisting that Southeast Asia's Chinese are native. Because of China's potential intervention in local ethnic politics,[37] Singapore's government has traditionally tended to discourage the study of China, in large part due to its anti-Communism and ethnic sensibilities. However, facing the rise of China, this city-state, which so heavily relies on international management and financial flow, simply cannot afford to lag behind in the analysis of developments in China. Such analysis was first disguised as Confucian studies and subsequently carried on under the name of East Asian Studies. In fact, East Asian Studies is primarily about China and secondarily about Taiwan. To desensitize further the study of China, the Institute of East Asian Studies now virtually monopolizes all of Singapore's resources in the field of China studies. To this end, Singapore's government has decided to rely exclusively on overseas Chinese, temporary appointments, English writing, and social science approaches. In focusing on these four institutional traits, it hopes to prevent Singapore-produced knowledge on China from becoming a political linkage to China. Born in China, raised in anti-Communist Hong Kong, trained in English, and accustomed to annual reunions with his emigrant family in Canada, John Wong offers an ideal fit to assuming a leading position in the field.

Both Wong's Hong Kong background, in which individuals had no say about their political future, and his experience as an immigrant cultivated a self-awareness of having

escaped from a Communist takeover, helping to create a feeling of distance from the object of his studies. Recruited from a foreign country, with little intellectual connection to the local community, and without the protection of tenure, Wong could rely on no one but his direct superior, former Deputy Prime Minister Keng Swee Goh and, indirectly, on then Prime Minister Kwang Yew Lee. Wong recruits researchers – increasingly from China – who stay for no longer than five years and receive coaching to write policy papers. His superiors expect a pragmatic approach in the EAI's publications so that the institute's research is of benefit to the government. Anti-China sentiment has never factored into Wong's research, which also includes the study of Southeast Asian Chinese. His interest in and concern for Chinese and China is very evident in his policy analysis. To him, the rise of China is largely a Chinese matter. China's rise has caused Chinese problems and Chinese ways to resolve them.

Wong has shown little nationalist emotion in his writing. He began to recruit Chinese scholars only because Goh insisted on the importance of developing perspectives on China from within China. Goh's belief that anti-Communism would not work has also affected Wong's approach. He has faithfully observed Lee's pragmatism and Goh's strategic thinking. Consequently, EAI's research on China has no connection to Singapore's society. Wong thinks that Southeast Asian Chinese are increasingly becoming less Chinese, while his work brings him increasingly in touch with China. Wong sees it as his main task to present China to Western audiences.[38] Like Lee, his position on China is friendly and neutral. Lee wants the EAI to copy neither Western nor PRC perspectives. Wong is able to achieve this objective because he can justifiably claim that the EAI

knows more about China through its Chinese researchers, and that their objectivity results from reliance on social science models and English language. However, the more the EAI's research succeeds in preparing Singapore's participation in China's rise, the less Wong is keeping Singapore away from China. In short, the rise of China is enticing Chinese identity consciousness and eliciting responses from neighboring states.

Chung Tan[39]

A Diasporic Chinese and China

Chung Tan's father, Yun-shan, helped Rabindranath Tagore to establish the first China studies institute in India. He has adopted Tagore's conviction that China and India are two civilizations that could not possibly threaten each other. Tagore treated individuals as meeting places of civilizations, and Tan expanded on that theme. Chung Tan began and ends his professional career by criticizing John Fairbank's study of the tribute system, and he is very critical of Samuel Huntington's thesis of the clash of civilizations.[40] Tan believes that both have misread China profoundly, consistently arguing how harmonious and peaceful Chinese political thought and practice has been. He debates some of his Indian colleagues about their concerns over the threat China may pose to India. For Tan, the historical relationship between the two countries centers on two civilizations, each one capable of giving to and learning from the other. It is inconceivable to him that either China or India could pursue imperialist or hegemonic policies and become enemies. At the same time he debates his Chinese and Taiwanese colleagues by insisting that, besides

exporting Buddhism, Indian civilization is an important source of Chinese civilization, illustrated by its export to China of the image of the dragon and the idea of equality. He likes to evoke the image of an Indian elephant dancing together with a Chinese dragon.[41]

After his retirement, as a critique of the concepts of geo-politics and geo-economics, Tan developed the concept of "geo-civilization."[42] Although he criticizes geo-politics for its obsession with power competition, he agrees with the geo-economic perspective about the importance of interconnections between China and India. Tan looks to the Himalaya as the origin of four great river systems, two of which laid the foundation for Indian and two for Chinese civilization. He develops the concept of "Chindia" to convey the existence of "great harmony between China and India." In the rise of China, Tan discerns a different model of international behavior that will show the world how it is possible not to challenge anyone. For example, in its long history and despite its superior strength, China has never tried to conquer India. China does not have to treat India or any other state as a rival. Instead, China is a civilization with its own inner logic and spirit. Civilizations highlight rather than threaten one another. Neither India nor America needs to worry that a powerful China would compel them to adopt a specific lifestyle.

In comparison with Tan's strident anti-imperialism, Wang Gungwu – born in Indonesia, raised in Malaysia, trained in England, and having taught in Australia, Hong Kong, and Singapore – shows no stridency in his scholarship. Yet he sees China as inhabiting a different world that contrasts with the West. Wang views the Chinese in Southeast Asia as fractured into different kinds.[43] For the sake of convenience, one could categorize his

approach to China with a "commonwealth" metaphor, as he recognizes differences in each locality without denying that they share a thin layer of Chinese identity. For Wang, it is a mistake to judge all Chinese by one standard. As a concept, "Chinese'" is much broader than the notion of a territorial state and thus not suitable for judgment based on a single standard. Through his scholarship, Wang personifies a perspective that is very tolerant of hybridity, fluidity, and uncertainty. Tan defends strongly China's uniqueness. In contrast, Wang would like to see hybridity as a result of local conditions evolve into difference. Tan argues that the intermixing of civilizations stems from all kinds of interconnections. For Tan, Sinicization bears witness to China's enhanced capacity for learning. For Wang, it could yield a thickening of Chinese identity and a reversal of hybrid identities.

The Personal and National Context

Tan began his career in Tagore's tradition. The outbreak of the Sino-Indian war in 1962 cost him his job as interpreter for the National Defense Ministry, as his Chinese origin was thought to be incompatible with the loyalty required by his position. Chung Tan has devoted his career to criticizing imperialism and American scholarship on China. He succeeded in convincing his Indian colleagues that it was possible to use Chinese history to establish a perspective outside of the mainstream literature – an orientation that is appreciated in the Indian academic world, where intellectuals are especially sensitive to their indebtedness to the British perspectives that many struggle to resist. Specifically, he demonstrates that the pre-modern tribute paid to the Chinese court was sheer etiquette

rather than a system of trade.[44] Chung Tan shows how the imperialist desire for trade had

led Fairbank to misunderstand the meaning of tribute for the Chinese. Through his

historical scholarship on China, after the 1962 war, Chung Tan reoriented Indian

perspectives on China in general toward an anti-imperialist approach to China studies.[45]

The historiography of Tan's anti-imperialist epistemology preserved the civilizational

sensibility in Tagore's worldview and that of his father, Yun-shan. His politically

incorrect ethnic identity was neutralized by his politically correct anti-imperialist

standpoint.

Tan has not only tried to improve China's image in India. He also tries to encourage his

Chinese colleagues to take India seriously. In their times, Tagore and Yun-shan tried to do

the same with little success. Tan follows Tagore's approach by tracing India's

contribution to Chinese civilization, drawing serious criticism from Chinese and

Taiwanese colleagues but fascinating his audience nonetheless. Tan wants to prove that

Chinese civilization is capable of learning and adapting without sacrificing its

authenticity. The first argument reconnects China with India; the second assures China's

independent position outside the West. Tan wants his Chinese colleagues to be mindful of

the rewards that China has reaped by learning from India. His lifelong struggle for better

Indo-Chinese relations rests on his insistence that ancient China borrowed from Indian

civilization to become today's China. Furthermore, India has much to learn from China in

order to make a genuine break from its painful experience with Western imperialism and

colonialism. This is a remarkable parallel with Tagore and Yun-shan, who cherished the

fact of Buddhism's original export from India to China and promoted the return of

Buddhism to India from China in the future.

Four decades after the 1962 border war, which created enormous pressure on anyone who wanted to prevent further confrontation, the rise of China provides Tan with a new opportunity to reconnect the two civilizations. His writings on geo-civilization have, since his retirement, been hastily published in a number of books that reiterate his long-held views.[46] The Shanghai Academy of Social Science's bi-annual World China Forum, initiated in 2004, has featured Tan as a keynote speaker addressing over one thousand participants. Here, Tan enjoys the opportunity to be part of China's rise amongst Chinese colleagues enjoying improved self-image and self-confidence. His writings have gained attention as he has introduced his civilizational analysis through book and newspaper publications and, most efficiently, through Chinese Web pages.[47] While others see China's rise as posing a challenge to India, Tan sees a new opportunity to remind his audiences of the importance of civilizational interconnections.

Sinicization: Embedded and Multiplying in Individual Careers

Asian diasporic scholarship typically is written in English. Even though it does not determine its impact, this language prerequisite shapes the audience it will primarily serve. While this common feature is shared by almost all diasporic scholars, those involved in Sinicization differ in at least two ways. First, sensitivity, if not sympathy, toward Chinese history among Asian diasporic scholars gives substance to the process of Sinicization. Second, this sensitivity has repercussions inside and outside of territorial

China. Chinese audiences thus appropriate and re-appropriate the interpretations and insights diasporic scholarship provides, with the effect that China and so-called Chinese concepts encounter all kinds of interventions that can lead to processes of re- as well as de-Sinicization.

Part-time Sinicization in the Anglo World

The Anglo aspects of these scholars' careers make Sinicization a total experience. Each of the four scholars discussed in this chapter has his own intellectual agenda. In addition, each spends a good deal of his professional career as well as leisure time in either his home or his host country. That said, the Anglo-Chinese scholarship of Tan and Wong differs from the Anglo-Asian scholarship of Iriye and Kim. Anglo-Chinese scholarship deals with the English world, the hosting society, and China; Anglo-Asian scholarship with the English world, the home society, and China. Sinicization processes that make the world adapt to Chinese values are only one part of the lives of these four scholars. There are also attempts at influencing those acting on behalf of China by supplying them with certain larger analytical causes, chosen to represent the four scholars' academic independence. Nonetheless, Wong's preoccupation with greater China's economic development, Iriye's insistence on the necessity of a Japanese apology to China for wartime crimes, Tan's celebration of Chinese anti-imperialism, and Kim's support of China's entry into international organizations all share, to different degrees, a profound sensitivity and at times sympathy for China. When they contribute in their writings to the scholarship on China, they take an active part in processes of Sinicization.

The engagement with other, larger causes differs among these four scholars and illustrates processes of recalibration. Wong stresses scientism to justify his core proposition that China's distinctive national conditions call for indigenous treatment; Iriye emphasizes peace and humanist values to support his criticism of the insensitivity of American and Japanese conservatives to different national and cultural perspectives; Kim articulates an idealist world order to justify his refusal to support either China after the suppression of the pro-democracy movement or Western sanctions imposed on China in the aftermath; and Tan supports a geo-civilizational connectivity to justify his optimistic articulation of the hope for a long-term human evolution away from egoistic nationalism. These larger causes, more than their substantive interest in and preoccupation with China, also help define their scholarship. This is not to deny that Wong's preoccupation with the greater China is shared by many who do not trust Western scientism; that widespread Japan-phobia in China might not be assuaged by the kind of apology that Iriye is advocating; that China's participation in international organizations has failed to bring about the world order Kim is advocating; and that anti-imperialism has been used to justify China's confrontation with India, putting into doubt Tan's central claim.

Furthermore, beyond their interests in and preoccupation with China, all four scholars have felt some professional or personal duty toward their respective host or home countries, leading to the waxing and waning of de- and re-Sinicization processes during their careers. Wong must pay heed to Singapore's strategic objective, participation in the Chinese market; Tan has endeavored to establish respect for India in China; Kim wishes

to rectify the distorted image of Pyongyang; and Iriye wants to persuade the Japanese people not to change the Peace Constitution. All four feel a profound obligation to help their Asian home or host country. For the two Anglo-Asian scholars, Kim and Iriye, their connections to China are linked intimately to their personal identities. For Kim, China and North Korea are basically in the same camp in world politics. For Iriye, China is a somewhat foreign land to be managed by means of an idealist and personal diplomacy. For the two Anglo-Chinese scholars, Wong and Tan, their self-image is deeply implicated by their relationships with China and their respective Asian host country. For Wong, professional work and emotional loyalty have led him to discover a China that the West does not fully understand. And for Tan, the West embodies an imperialism that should be eliminated in Asia.

Historicized China in Four Life Histories

Our four diasporic scholars have generally avoided direct involvement in the politics of their host societies. Dealing with China has remained for all of them a strictly academic subject. This was less true, however, when they were connected back to their home countries, either while visiting or while greeting visitors from back home. But since all four spent most of their careers abroad, this tended to be the exception. Nonetheless, their frequent travels and their stature as internationally renowned scholars has confronted them with all kinds of practical inquiry, often political in nature, thus illustrating the non-linear feature of Sinicization processes. This was the case, for example, when Iriye began to return to Japan regularly as a university guest lecturer, in the course of his

globe-spanning travels, and when he accepted invitations to China where he agreed to interviews. The same has been true for Kim, who is often in South Korea; Tan, who now lives in Chicago while also organizing and attending events in China and India; and Wong, with his frequent professional meetings in China, regular engagements with Chinese scholars in Singapore, annual family reunions in Canada, and Canadian academic position following his retirement from the EAI.

Iriye's guest teaching career in Japan began in 1997. While there, he has consistently expressed strong disagreements with Japanese nationalism, military build-up, and constitutional revision. He once criticized former Premier Abe Shinzo as a second George W. Bush Jr. and expressed his preference for the peace advocate Yasuo Fukuda over nationalist Aso Taro, both former premiers. He also has rejected the impression of the United States' decline and noted the vibrancy of American civil society and the civil society as the future of the world.[48] He specifically welcomed the more recent Premier Yukio Hatoyama's call for an East Asian Community which, Iriye argued, should include the United States. In fact, he hopes that the East Asian Community might eventually evolve into an Asia-Pacific Community. Interestingly, in speaking to a Chinese audience, he argued that a still powerful United States would no longer be a superpower. His Chinese hosts are invariably interested in his criticism of Japanese nationalism. However, when in China, Iriye encourages his audiences to focus on China's civilizational rather than its political influence; in that spirit, he describes this as "China's 21st century."[49] In his early scholarship, Iriye had written about what had gone so terribly wrong to cause war in Asia. Later, while travelling especially in China, he encountered the very same

forces still at work. Continuing to view China as a victim is no longer an adequate response to the forces transforming world politics. Rather, the most urgent task is to persuade China away from the path of political competition by showing how other states, especially the US and Japan, are not fearful of China's rise. Promoting the civilizational correlates of a rising China thus substitutes for earlier empathy with China's victimization over the last two centuries.

Kim's increasing contacts with Korea are also reflected in his increasing interest in and concerns over policy issues on the Korean Peninsula. In contrast to Iriye, however, this shift in attention has led him a step away from China, since few Koreans regard China as an actual or potential threat. Kim's analysis of the Korean situation is subtly critical of US policy.[50] On the one hand, this is made easier because China's rise restrains Washington's dominance in the region. On the other hand, US dominance is taken for granted. In contrast with Kim's ambivalence about the US, Tan's anti-imperialist engagement shows some ambivalence about China's rise. Tan welcomes the rise of China because, he believes, it embodies a non-imperialist way of being a great country; yet he also worries about the negative attitudes toward India that it may engender. Since settling in Chicago, Tan has primarily written articles for Chinese Web pages, criticizing the United States and promoting India. Among our four scholars, Wong is the only one who has found complete satisfaction in his increasing contact with China, where he is able to receive respect, meet key policy makers, and make policy suggestions openly without worrying about anxious Southeast Asian neighbors. More recently, he has organized delegations to China, spending weeks there each time.

In the form of rupture or return, the subject of China appears to provoke anxiety in Iriye and Tan, and passion in Kim and Wong as well as Tan. This anxiety centers on a possible confrontation between host and home country – the United States and China for Iriye, and India and China for Tan. Passion reflects the presence of growing opportunities. For Tan, it is the opportunity for China to fulfill its civilizational ideal and for him to continue his father's legacy in China. For Kim, it is the opportunity to give fair treatment to North Korea. And for Wong, it is the opportunity to celebrate his identification with China. Both Iriye and Kim had their host societies, Japan and the United States, in mind in the early stages of their careers as they self-consciously refused to take a specific theoretical and political position. Now they do not question China's rise, demanding that the US and Japan adapt. Tan and Wong are facing China when they travel from India or Singapore. English plays a smaller role in their China travels than for Iriye and Kim. Iriye operates in English when in China and in Japanese when in Japan, while Kim lectures in English wherever he goes. In form as well as content, Sinicization thus has changed over time for all four.

Finally, our four scholars treat China differently over time. To different degrees in the early stages of their careers, they have viewed China as an object – of imperialism, misperception, Cold War, or ignorance of how to get things done internationally. But with China's rise, their perceptions have shifted, leading them all to recognize a specific form of return: China has again become the subject of its own future. Iriye and Tan are very sensitive to the openness of that future, which for Iriye swings between the poles of

civilization and power politics. Although Japan has a clear responsibility to prevent China from choosing the path of power politics, Iriye is telling his Chinese audiences that the choice is theirs alone. Similarly, Tan leaves no doubt that China has taken full ownership over its India policy. Despite his advocacy of a harmonious order of "Chindia," he is keenly aware of a possible future filled with conflict and recrimination. Kim and Wong take China's rise very much for granted. For Kim, what matters is not his support of China but the support the world assumes China gives to Pyongyang; this is what makes his writings about Korea so useful for American audiences. Wong is the only one of the four who feels clear support in China. Both Kim and Wong thus view China as having unquestioned and rightful agency over its own future.

Conclusion: Sinicization as Mutual Constitution

Sinicization describes processes of civilizational evolution. These processes adapt both internal needs and external contacts with various agents (here, four diasporic scholars) who substantially, though not fully, share worldviews, values, self-understanding, and life practices. Appropriating knowledgeable practices across civilizational boundaries encourages adaptation. Sinicization thus rests on the readiness of its agents to conceptualize and practice new ways of self-understanding.

Encounter and choice are the mechanisms that define agency. Sinicization is premised upon the encounter between Chinese and other civilizations. Encounters push agents to adapt, as they must choose between resistance, teaching, learning, or a combination of all

three. Consciously or not, each agent is constantly involved in choosing different strategies of adaptation. If encounters thus can generate fresh possibilities for innovation and re-combination, Sinicization is multi-sited. In processes of cross-civilizational encounters, no two agents will adapt their practices in exactly the same way. And although such encounters are occurring all over the world, because of the size of China's population and its peaceful rise, Sinicization is of increasing significance.

Sinicization has grown in vitality and resonance. It has facilitated the spreading of American practices of market capitalism to China's economy, nationalism and rights rhetoric to Chinese politics, balance of power to China's foreign policy, and multiculturalism to China's global diasporic communities. Conceptual and institutional adaptations to Sinicization and the different forms of resistance, re-appropriation, and feedback they engender have made Sinicization more important. All responses push agents to be cognizant of the positions they occupy between different civilizations, and all require knowledge of both Euro-American and Chinese civilizations. Invariably, agents of Sinicization cannot do without the use of English, with unavoidable ideological, practical, and institutional consequences. Sinicization often implicates not simply China as a nation state, but also the Chinese in Indochina and Taiwan, who mediate between Chinese and their various forms of identity. They act as both producers and consumers of civilization who maneuver among collective, familial, and individual centers of allegiance. Self-knowledge is the foundation of Sinicization. Sinicization consists of multi-sited processes that deconstruct stereotypical notions of China's rise in the twenty-first century. Our four scholars have actively participated in Sinicization disguised

as social science (Wong), wished for an improved geo-civilizational Chindia (Tan), managed from an imagined place of mediation to achieve peace (Iriye), and explored as a harbinger for an order in which the world could accommodate North Korea (Kim). Since their strategic choices are shaped by specific historical contexts, these adaptations have varied widely. Positioned at different sites, I conclude, individual agents respond differently to China's rise.

Notes

[1] Callahan 2004, 39, 45.

[2] Fitzgerald (1996, 94-5) argues that, for the Chinese nationalists to face the world, the assumption must be that there has been an authentic Chinese people beyond doubt.

[3] Wang Gungwu 2000.

[4] Goodman and Zang 2008, 1; Ling et al. 2010, 39; He 2009; Suryadinata 1997a, 21-2.

[5] For discussions on the politics of China studies in the Anglophone and Sinophone communities, see Shih and Chang 2011; Barmé 2005.

[6] Bloom and Bloom 1981, 31-2; Kim-Rivera 2002, 261-81; Chan 2002, 271-85.

[7] Chen et al. 2009, 749; Chen 2002, 79.

[8] One version of the mix of these larger forces includes realism, idealism, Confucianism, and Islamism (Wang 2008). Another version is Korea between China and Japan, Socialism and Capitalism, and East and West (Kim and Hodges 2006, 513-45).

[9] See Katzenstein and Shiraishi 2006. Incidentally, Prasenjit Duara (2009) argues that the rise of China is a replacement of one configuration by the other that is characterized by transnational forces including religion and capitalism.

[10] For example, the return of Hong Kong to China marked such a psychological process (Ma and Fung 1999).

[11] See Kuo 2008, 112-6.

[12] For a vivid example, see Ray Huang's recollection of his position facing the charge of American imperialism (Huang 2001, 284, 521).

[13] Ding 2008a; Tsai 2009, 172-5.

[14] Unless otherwise specified, the source is an interview with Akira Iriye on 17-18 October 2007 (Iriye 2007).

[15] Iriye 1998, 139-41.

[16] Iriye 1997, 60.

[17] Linklater and Suganami 2006, 192.

[18] Ibid., 254; Suganimi 1989.

[19] Williams 2005; Goto-Jones 2005.

[20] Takeuchi and Calichman 2005, 164-5.

[21] Koyasu 2004.

[22] See Yūzō 1989.

[23] Unless otherwise specified, the source is from an interview with Samuel Kim on 5, 7, and 12 June 2007 (Kim 2007).

[24] Kim 1966.

[25] Falk and Kim 1981; Falk, Kim, and Mendlovitz 1991.

[26] Kim 1979.

[27] In the first of four editions on the state of the art in Chinese foreign policy, two of his authors criticize that those who cannot analyze, write about the state of the art (Babrow and Chan 1984).

[28] Kang 2007, 4.

[29] Ibid., 201.

[30] Kim 2009, 36.

[31] For example, Kim's *The Two Koreas and the Great Powers* (2006), in which he

formally claims a synthetic approach, and *Korea's Democratization* (2003b).

[32] Unless otherwise specified, the source is from an interview with John Wong on 5-9 November 2007 (Wong 2007).

[33] Wong 1984; Wong and Lai 2006.

[34] Wong, John 2003; 2004, 31-44.

[35] Zheng and Wong 2004.

[36] For example, see Zheng 2007; 1999.

[37] Suryadinata 1997b, 15-22; 1997, 2-4.

[38] Chen and Yang 2009, 158.

[39] Tan is the family name. Although Chung Tan always goes by the style of family name first in all his professional activities, this book expediently adopts the standardized form of placing the given name first. Unless otherwise specified, the source is an interview with Chung Tan on 18, 19, and 30 May 2008 (Tan 2008).

[40] Huntington 1996.

[41] Tan and Uberoi 2009.

[42] Tan 2008.

[43] Malvezin 2004, 49-57.

[44] Tan 1978.

[45] Tan and Thakur 1998.

[46] Tan and Uberoi 2009, 231.

[47] Among them, the two most popular with Chinese readers are probably www.zaobao.com and www.chinareviewniews.com, based in Singapore and Hong Kong

respectively.

[48] Iriye 2006, 38.

[49] Liu, Xuan 2006; Liu and Ma 2006.

[50] Kim 2003a.