

---

## China Debates Its Future

*Many countries in the world have paid a very high price and learned a very painful lesson in transforming their economic systems. . . . We have to learn from these mistakes and keep them in mind at all times. To carry on walking the path leading to socialism with Chinese characteristics, we have to find a Chinese way to carry on economic reform, political reform, cultural reform and social reform.*

—China Reform Times, May 21, 2008<sup>1</sup>

To understand the challenges facing China and US-China relations and consider potential US policy responses to them require insight into the context in which they will evolve, resolve, or dissolve. One critically important—but underappreciated—way to grasp this context is to observe the dynamic intellectual debate in China that now swirls around the most fundamental political, economic, and foreign policy questions confronting the country’s future. China’s intellectual atmosphere—reflecting the country as a whole—is far more open, diverse, and in flux than most outsiders appreciate. The answers and policies that flow from this diverse intellectual debate will shape China’s future and, for better or for worse, influence the world as well.

Scrutinizing this debate in China is important because China’s top leaders are increasingly paying attention to the intellectuals and their divergent views in setting policy. Absent formal, and politically institutionalized, channels for the expression of public opinion, Chinese intellectuals continue in their traditional behind-the-scenes role of articulating diverse social interests. Historically, these debates have also served as a window into the opaque world of China’s elite politics. Individual intellectuals and the arguments they champion have often served as proxies for the differences over ideology, policies, and plans among China’s top leaders, official airing of which has been proscribed by the Chinese Communist Party (CCP).<sup>2</sup>

President Hu Jintao’s work report to China’s 17th CCP Congress in October 2007, emerged in part from the intellectual and ideological ferment of the past several years. The report charts a pragmatic but cautious mid-

dle course that has some comparatively progressive elements but for the most part stays true to the status quo while accommodating some “new leftist” and nationalist sentiments. On the economic front, Deng Xiaoping’s “basic line” of prioritizing economic development set more than 15 years ago at the 13th CCP Congress has been strongly reendorsed and features prominently throughout Hu’s work report. It is significant that the CCP’s most authoritative ideological document, the Party charter, was amended at the 17th Party Congress to formally enshrine Hu’s Scientific Development Concept—an overarching strategy that endorses continued development, but development that acknowledges and addresses the downsides of overly rapid growth, is “people centered,” and is sustainable—as part of the Party canon.

At the same time, on the political front, Hu even put forward certain modest political reforms, acknowledging the “growing enthusiasm of the people to participate in political affairs.” However, the Four Cardinal Principles (upholding the socialist path, people’s democratic dictatorship, CCP leadership, and Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought<sup>3</sup>), traditional ideological tenets not used widely for many years, also reappear in the work report. As to foreign policy, the guidance of opening to the outside world and pursuing “peaceful development” is clearly articulated, even as a more assertive approach to economic and security matters is more evident.

In straddling this middle ground, Hu Jintao apparently attempted to quell and settle much of the ongoing intellectual debates by killing three birds with one stone. The “Right” was firmly reminded that economic reform would precede political reform and that any political reform would proceed incrementally and absolutely under the leadership of the CCP. The “New Left” was put on notice that market-oriented reforms, opening up, and economic development remained the Party’s central task and that there was no going back. And, by reclaiming ownership of the Four Cardinal Principles and enshrining the Scientific Development Concept, Hu also managed to outmaneuver those on the “Old Left” who had begun to accuse the leadership of abandoning the Party’s core principles.

With these critical recent developments in mind, the following sections describe the economic, political, and foreign policy debates in China—and the leadership’s responses to them—during the past several years, especially before, during, and after the 17th CCP Congress. These debates are shaping and will continue to shape Beijing’s responses to the many fundamental and vexing challenges it faces at home and abroad. Americans and their leaders need to understand and follow these debates to be able to cooperate with China in constructing new, forward-looking, and sustainable institutions and rules to effectively meet the challenges facing these two countries and the world—from energy security, corruption, and human rights to sustainable development and regional stability.

## Role of Policy Intellectuals

The contribution of intellectual debate to policy decisions is a venerated and often high-stakes tradition in Chinese political culture dating back to ancient times. While intellectual activism was tightly and at times ruthlessly manipulated and controlled during most of the Maoist era, a far livelier environment has steadily emerged to accompany the course of China's reforms since 1978. Such debates typically intensify in the run-up to the Party Congress, held every five years. The eventual "winners" and "losers" in these debates become apparent when the policies adopted at the Party Congress—which guide China's development for the ensuing five years—are made public. For example, following economic and political retrenchment in the wake of the 1989 Tiananmen Square crackdown, the 14th Party Congress in 1992 signaled that the reformers led by Deng Xiaoping had prevailed over the conservatives led by Chen Yun. After a bitter proxy debate among intellectuals over "what is socialist and what is capitalist?" the Congress endorsed the creation of a "socialist market economic system," heralding a new era of rapid market reform. Once the Party sets the political and economic "line" at the Congress, however, it traditionally signals an end to the debate; those who continue to overstep this line face rebuke from the Party, or worse. Following the 14th Party Congress, conservative leaders including Yao Yilin and Song Ping lost their positions on the all-powerful Political Bureau Standing Committee, and the director of the Party's mouthpiece *Renmin Ribao* (*People's Daily*), Gao Di, was removed.<sup>4</sup>

In short, debates among intellectuals in China are not simply "academic," but often prove to be important early indicators of divergent interests and, ultimately, policy outcomes. A number of intellectuals and Chinese "think tanks" are assuming increasingly important roles in policymaking: Many leading intellectuals serve as advisers to China's leaders, and their ideas are often clearly discernible in government policies.<sup>5</sup> Despite facing sensitive political limitations and being vulnerable to manipulation by the Party, intellectuals are increasingly mediating between state and society as a subtle dance plays out among political thinkers, policy-makers, and the public. Wang Shaoguang, a Yale-educated, leading Chinese intellectual based in Hong Kong, commented that "the breadth and depth with which intellectuals today participate in politics is unprecedented . . . . In setting the orientation of their policies, the leaders listen to the intellectuals directly or indirectly."<sup>6</sup> The United States must carefully observe these debates to improve its understanding of both how and why the Chinese leadership will choose to address the many economic, political, and diplomatic challenges it faces.<sup>7</sup> In addition, as China's global influence grows, understanding the country's intellectual debate and how it

influences policy will be critical to informing effective policy responses in capitals around the world.

## Current Dynamics

In the run-up to the 17th CCP Congress in October 2007, a confluence of social, political, economic, and cultural developments produced one of the most open and wide-ranging intellectual debates on the country's economic and political future yet in post-1949 China. The debate was remarkable in several respects. First, in what the CCP acknowledges is a "new historical starting point" in the "new period" of 29 years of reform,<sup>8</sup> the increasingly apparent downsides of rapid economic development—including corruption, income inequality, regional economic disparities, environmental degradation, increased demand for public goods and decreased ability of the state to supply them, and the social unrest all these problems have spawned—have prompted an unprecedented reevaluation of Deng Xiaoping's legacy and pose fundamental questions about China's current growth path and the nature of reform going forward. At the same time, the CCP leadership is well aware that to stay in power it has to formulate the correct policy responses to these pressing issues as it continues to lead China's development. Given the stakes, it is not surprising that China's top intellectuals were engaged in an often rancorous debate aimed at influencing the leadership prior to the 17th Party Congress. Many critical and strategic questions—settling on a proper model for sustainable growth, opening up the governance system to accept greater transparency and accountability, and determining China's role in regional and global affairs—were vigorously deliberated but not fully resolved, assuring that policy debate will continue.

Second, apart from the intensity of the current debate, what also marks this latest "Beijing Spring"<sup>9</sup> is that not all of the intellectuals engaged in it work within the system of official and semiofficial "think tanks" and Party-state organizations.<sup>10</sup> China's expanded education system and the commercialization of culture have opened up opportunities for "non-establishment" intellectuals working outside this system to take part in the discussion.<sup>11</sup> The ongoing marketization of Chinese media and explosion of the internet in the country have dramatically opened avenues through which a wide range of views are communicated, including in newspapers, journals, and online sources, often well before the CCP Propaganda Department can clamp down on or prevent such public airing of controversial debates and opinions. The current debate on China's future goes well beyond a simplistic dichotomy between "reformers" and "conservatives," reflecting the growing pluralization of opinion and interests that has taken place in China in the last decade.

Third, the lively intellectual discourse in the country underscores that China cannot be perceived as a rigid, monochromatic state. Such a perception fails to account for the divergence of views and pressures on China's leadership, and how these forces increasingly affect an already complex decision making process. As Wang Shaoguang writes:

Intellectuals play a large role in influencing public opinion and thus influencing public policy. All public policy changes in recent years were basically preceded by shifts in public opinion. Take the migrant worker issue, the 'three rural issues' [*san nong*—agriculture, peasants and rural areas], and health care reform. In all cases, the issues first took off on the internet before being picked up by the print media and even television. From there it made its way onto the public agenda and became a policy issue and ultimately public policy.<sup>12</sup>

Finally, and perhaps most remarkably, the scope of the current debate has expanded to encompass discussion of political reform and steps toward "democratization." While this discussion can proceed only within certain limits, these topics are no longer taboo. China's top leaders now routinely express their interest in seeing China move toward greater openness and democracy—though definitely not in the Western sense and definitely with the leadership of the CCP intact.

## Reevaluation of Reform

One of the most important economic turning points for China emerged amid lively intellectual debate in the run-up to the 14th CCP Congress in 1992, as Deng Xiaoping sought to reassert his control over policymaking, which he had lost to his conservative rival Chen Yun after the Tiananmen Square crisis. The Congress' historic decision to back Deng's economic policy line set China on the path of rapid market reform and delivered a virtually irreversible setback for Party conservatives, who had argued in favor of a "planned economy with market regulation." Although heated discussions about the economy continued among intellectuals throughout the 1990s, these discussions concerned the scope and speed of reform and not a fundamental reevaluation of Deng's reform project itself.

Today, however, a more fundamental reevaluation is beginning to take place within intellectual circles. This reevaluation has been prompted by the realization that, unlike in the 1980s and 1990s, when reform benefited nearly all Chinese, today the gap between "winners" and "losers" in China is widening. Increasing resentment among marginalized groups toward those whose political and economic connections ensure that they profit from reform is spilling over into the streets: China has seen an unprecedented increase in the number and size of protests, demonstrations, and incidents of social unrest.<sup>13</sup> Concerns over the impact of China's entry into the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the negative impact of

globalization, and the return to China of many Western-educated intellectuals infused with postmodernist ideas, have led to a critique of the neoclassical, neoliberal economics that had provided the ideological underpinning for reform policies promoting China's rapid economic development.<sup>14</sup> Amid increasing concerns about widening income gaps, regional disparities, pervasive corruption, environmental degradation, and deteriorating social services, as well as the debates over private property protections and the admission of entrepreneurs into the CCP, intellectuals have raised fundamental questions about China's current development path, asking whether it is negating Chinese socialism and whether it is time to consider alternatives.

## Debating Development

The intellectuals who provoked the latest major debate over China's economic line have become known as the "New Left"<sup>15</sup>—a pejorative term in China because "Leftists" have long been associated with the radicals of the Cultural Revolution<sup>16</sup> or more recently with the "Old Left" conservatives, who opposed market reform and opening in the 1980s.<sup>17</sup> Many on the "New Left" are critical of neoclassical, neoliberal economics identified with the so-called Washington Consensus<sup>18</sup> and blame China's social ills on the rapid reform policies of Deng Xiaoping and former president Jiang Zemin. However, "New Left" intellectuals do not advocate a return to orthodox Marxism, as some of their "Old Left" predecessors did. Rather, they have more in common with international critiques of globalization and neocolonialism.<sup>19</sup>

A number of "New Left" thinkers are concerned with social justice issues, particularly the so-called *san nong* or "three rural" issues pertaining to hardships faced by peasants (*nongmin*), the agricultural sector (*nongye*), and rural communities (*nongcun*). Others promote the rights of migrant workers, and still others are involved in China's nascent environmental movement. In challenging Western models of development, some "New Left" and other intellectuals are actively exploring a "third way" for China, akin to what has been called the Beijing Consensus.<sup>20</sup>

The issue that brought the "New Left" into the limelight was their critique of state-owned enterprise (SOE) reform in China, particularly the perceived injustice of the privatization process and corruption it engendered. The most famous proponent of this view is a Hong Kong-based economist, Larry Lang, a vehement opponent of SOE reform and, according to public polls, the most popular economist in China. The "New Left" intellectuals have also criticized financial liberalization—particularly the sale of banks to foreigners—warning of "economic colonization" and loss of economic sovereignty, which dovetails with the rise in popular economic nationalism—or "economic patriotism," as the *China Daily* termed

it. This discourse has not been confined to the pages of economic journals but has had a real impact: Government technocrats faced increased questioning and opposition in discussions not only of SOE reform and foreign participation in China's financial system but also in preventing passage of a law to formalize private property ownership.<sup>21</sup>

Moreover, foreign companies have also felt the heat of the "economic security" debate, with the Carlyle Group and Goldman Sachs, among others, mired in protracted negotiations over the purchase of Chinese companies. In a sign that the leadership was clearly listening to the debate and anxious to deflect criticism, in September 2006, regulations were issued that strengthened the government's supervisory role over mergers and acquisitions and added two more state agencies—and considerably more red tape—to the approval process. The international business community was further alarmed when China's Anti-Monopoly Law, 13 years in the making, was finally adopted in August 2007—with stipulations that require foreign purchasers of Chinese companies to go through special checks in order to ensure that the deal will have no adverse impact on China's "national security."

But the "reformist" or "liberal" camp has not sat silently in the face of these critiques. In February 2006—just prior to the 4th Plenary Session of the 10th National People's Congress (NPC) in March and approval of the 11th Five-Year Program to set the broad economic development strategy for 2006–10—commentator "Huangfu Ping," a pseudonym for Zhou Ruijin, who provided the intellectual foundation for Deng's political comeback in 1992, published his first article in 15 years. He argued that it is wrong to blame market reforms for current social problems and wrong-headed to rehash the old ideological debates over whether the Chinese system should be called "capitalist" or "socialist." Instead, he blamed societal problems on the lack of progress in administrative and management reform. Given that the "Huangfu Ping" commentaries of the early 1990s were reportedly commissioned by Deng's daughter, Deng Nan, and tacitly approved by then-mayor of Shanghai, Zhu Rongji,<sup>22</sup> there was considerable speculation that retired and current leaders were involved in the publication of these most recent commentaries.

While the Hu Jintao–Wen Jiabao vision for the future direction of China's economic development initially appeared to encourage the "New Left"—by acknowledging concerns about equity, corruption, and a fraying social safety net and by casting their policies in terms of building a "new socialist countryside" and realizing a "harmonious society"<sup>23</sup>—the Party's overarching Scientific Development Concept, which guides these policies, pays at least equal attention to continuing market economic reforms. The 11th Five-Year Program laid out at the NPC, while signaling a shift in emphasis from GDP-oriented growth to social welfare, was, therefore, aimed at balancing different interests and consolidating a consensus on China's future direction at a time of unprecedented social transforma-

tion and intellectual debate. Wen Jiabao displayed the delicate balancing act at his news conference during the March 2006 NPC. He frankly admitted that reform was going through a “very difficult period,” but, in a clear swipe at “New Left” critics, stated that “backpedaling offers no way out” in solving China’s problems and that reform would “unswervingly push forward.”<sup>24</sup> Earlier, President Hu Jintao made similar remarks at a meeting of deputies from Shanghai, a city that has been at the forefront of China’s modernization. Hu’s remarks made headlines in all major Chinese newspapers, with some analysts concluding that this put an official end to the ideological debate.<sup>25</sup>

However, such optimism proved premature. On March 20, conservative economist Liu Guoguang reignited the discussion, publishing an article in *Zhongguo Qingnian Bao* (*China Youth Times*) on the need for more central planning.<sup>26</sup> Party authorities took other steps apparently to moderate the “Old” and “New Left”: An outspoken left-of-center publication, *Bingdian* (*Freezing Point*) was closed in January 2006, Larry Lang’s popular Shanghai TV show was canceled in March 2006, and the editors of the left-leaning *Dushu* (*Reading*), including Wang Hui, were removed in July 2007. In the midst of these intellectual battles, in April 2006, the minutes of an internal meeting among policy analysts and government officials held by the China Society for Economic Reform, a think tank affiliated with the State Council, were leaked onto the internet, revealing “unprecedented controversy and dissent” among China’s leading policy intellectuals.<sup>27</sup> Even on the eve of the 17th CCP Congress in late 2007, some 170 left-wing Party members published an open letter to Hu Jintao calling on the Party to defend its traditional ideals in the face of the new “capitalist class.”<sup>28</sup>

## Policy Response

The importance of these intellectual policy debates is reflected in the effort by Hu and Wen to steer a consensus course. It is difficult to judge whether Hu and Wen genuinely share “New Left” convictions or whether it was politically expedient to do so. It appears that they at times supported the “New Left” position in part because it played into their effort to reduce the continuing influence of former President Jiang Zemin and his so-called Shanghai clique of close political and intellectual associates. By coopting “New Left” tenets and allowing public criticism of Jiang’s reform legacy, Hu and Wen articulated an alternative policy prescription to address China’s pressing issues—an approach popular among the Chinese masses if not among some of their Political Bureau colleagues. Building particularly on public anger over corruption, Hu and Wen moved against “Shanghai clique” stalwart and Jiang protégé Chen Liangyu, the mayor of Shanghai, who had openly opposed their policies, firing him for corruption in September 2006. Ironically, Hu and Wen were following a Party

tradition: Jiang Zemin had used the same gambit to remove his rival, Beijing Mayor Chen Xitong in 1995. Indeed, during their tenures both Deng Xiaoping and Jiang Zemin tacked to the “Left” when necessary, before pulling back to a middle course—which is apparently what Hu and Wen were attempting to do before the 17th CCP Congress in October 2007.

In a highly unusual move, on the eve of the 5th Plenary Session of the 10th NPC in March 2007, Premier Wen Jiabao published an article in the *People’s Daily*, in which he countered Leftist charges that China’s reform had strayed too far from socialist ideals and was the cause of the nation’s socioeconomic problems. On the contrary, Wen held that social injustice and corruption are part and parcel of China’s “immature” socialist system, reviving Deng Xiaoping’s dictum that China will be at the “primary stage of socialism” for 100 years.<sup>29</sup> The premier reminded critics that, at this stage, economic development is the Party’s “central task” and warned that “big policy mistakes,” particularly the “disastrous ten-year long Cultural Revolution,” led to major missed opportunities in China’s development. Pushing the point further, two highly contested pieces of legislation, the Property Law and Corporate Income Tax Law, were passed during the NPC session in March 2007.

On June 25, 2007, during a speech to Central Party School (CPS) cadres,<sup>30</sup> President Hu Jintao effectively laid out the leadership’s policy platform before the 17th Party Congress and put intellectuals of all persuasions on notice about where the economic line would fall. Hu said that pursuing the “socialist road with Chinese characteristics” was “correct” and that, while “changing the mode of economic development” and “putting people first,” the “central task” remained seizing “economic construction”—Deng Xiaoping’s “basic line” adopted at the 13th CCP Congress in 1987 and re-asserted and accelerated in 1992.<sup>31</sup> In August 2007, Xing Bensi, an adviser to Jiang Zemin and former vice president of the CPS, argued that solving China’s problems “can only be alleviated and resolved through sustained economic development and continued deepening of reform, and we should never go back to the old path before reform and opening up.”<sup>32</sup>

Hu Jintao’s work report at the 17th CCP Congress in October 2007 further reaffirmed the mainstream view that Deng Xiaoping’s vision of reform and opening up, “being a new great revolution,” is the “only way to realize the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation.”<sup>33</sup> While acknowledging the difficulties of implementing these reforms, Hu responded to Leftist critics by stating bluntly that “standing still or turning back would lead us nowhere.” Reaffirming that the CCP’s “central task” remains economic construction, while striving for more equitable and sustainable development, the Party will clearly continue market reforms, strengthen protections for property rights, and pursue further SOE reform, with greater regulatory oversight.<sup>34</sup>

Of particular interest to the international community is the emphasis in the work report on the importance of enhancing “independent innova-

tion” and supporting indigenous research and development. The Political Bureau study meeting held on the eve of the 17th CCP Congress was also significant. At the session, Professor Wang Xinkui of the Shanghai Institute of Foreign Trade and Research Fellow Long Guoqiang of the State Council Development Research Center discussed the hotly debated topics of opening up wider to the outside world and assuring China’s economic security. Hu Jintao gave a speech at the session, which served as a preview to his work report, in which he strongly endorsed opening up and further integration into the global economy while at the same time emphasizing the need to “improve laws and regulations for safeguarding national economic security.”<sup>35</sup>

Following the Party Congress, Vice Premier Zeng Peiyan was reported to have called for the restriction of foreign capital in key areas and “sensitive industries” in order to defend China’s economic security, suggesting that multinational companies could face further roadblocks in their attempts to invest in China’s domestic companies and industrial sectors.<sup>36</sup> The intellectual debate is likely to focus on this issue going forward. In September 2007, the influential business magazine *Caijing* (*Finance and Economics*) carried an article by Qinghua University law professor Wang Baoshu critical of the Anti-Monopoly Law, particularly the inclusion of a “national security review” for foreign investors.<sup>37</sup> At the same time, the book *Currency Wars*, which takes a negative look at the global investment industry and warns against the opening up of China’s financial sector, was a publishing success in China at the end of 2007.<sup>38</sup> In spite of some of the conclusions drawn at the 17th CCP Congress, the debates over China’s economic future will continue, especially as the downsides of economic growth persist.

Indeed, as China prepares to celebrate the 30th anniversary of reform in 2008, a new round of debate has been launched not only evaluating the past three decades but also looking ahead to decide the future path China should traverse. At the 17th CCP Congress, Hu Jintao laid out both the opportunities and challenges facing China at this new stage of development and called for an “emancipation of the mind” in order to correctly handle the focal issue confronting the CCP of coordinating economic growth and social development moving forward. While a seemingly esoteric concept to a foreign audience, these “emancipation” campaigns cannot be underestimated, and they have been launched at critical junctures in the course of China’s modernization (see box 2.1).<sup>39</sup> This “third emancipation of the mind” campaign calls on cadres to “break the old rules” and “practices and systems that are out of keeping with the scientific development concept,” in particular, admonishing them to not neglect education, public health, the environment, and other social development indicators of “most concern to the people” in pursuit of rapid GDP growth.<sup>40</sup>

This debate in turn will affect—and has already affected—how Beijing chooses to respond to outside pressures on such economic issues as renminbi revaluation, promoting domestic consumption, energy policy, and

### **Box 2.1 “Emancipation of the mind” campaigns**

The Chinese Communist Party’s “emancipation of the mind” (*sixiang jiefang*) campaigns are aimed at forging ideological consensus and support for the central leadership’s overarching policies. They have historically been launched by the Party leadership at critical junctures in the course of China’s modernization: in 1978, as former paramount leader Deng Xiaoping battled Maoist opponents of the initial reform and opening up policy, and in 1992, as Deng once again battled opposition from Party conservatives trying to roll back market economic reforms.

The third emancipation of the mind campaign, which is being launched in 2008, the 30th anniversary of China’s reform and opening up, was first mentioned in President Hu Jintao’s work report to the 17th National Party Congress in October 2007 and again in Premier Wen Jiabao’s report to the National People’s Congress in March 2008. It appears aimed not only at containing and steering the ongoing intellectual debate about the next phase of China’s economic and political reform but also at breaking through ongoing entrenched bureaucratic and local-government resistance to implementing the central leadership’s Scientific Development Concept, in particular, to addressing the continued neglect of education, public health, the environment, and other social development indicators in pursuit of rapid GDP growth.

The campaigns involve intensive study sessions and meetings for officials as well as local-level investigations into the implementation of central directives. In addition to getting cadres to toe the official line, however, the campaigns also provide officials and intellectuals with the space to experiment with economic and now political reform—although within parameters still set by the Party.

Experiments with political-administrative reform under the rubric of the emancipation of the mind campaign are being spearheaded by a close associate of Hu Jintao, Wang Yang, who is the party secretary of Guangdong Province, which has been the location of many of China’s pioneering economic reforms and where the second emancipation of the mind campaign was launched. Given the historical precedent, much hinges on the success of the third campaign not only for the Hu-Wen administration’s policy platform but also for China’s future development trajectory.

further opening of the domestic market to foreign investment and influence. These and other key challenges to the Chinese development agenda and their implications for US-China relations are discussed in this book.

## **Democracy Debated**

In recent years, the intellectual discourse in China has also significantly expanded beyond economics to include discussion of political reform and

foreign policy, with nationalism a common underlying theme linking the cross-cutting debates. Given the enduring images and perceptions of the 1989 Tiananmen Square protests, it might come as a surprise that many proponents of political change in China today eschew the “May Fourth Movement”<sup>41</sup> ethos, which first looked to Western science and democracy to “save China” at the beginning of the 20th century and which was revived by liberals in the 1980s. At the same time, many of today’s intellectuals are not adherents of orthodox Marxism-Leninism either. Rather, some of the most vigorous debates among Chinese policy intellectuals concern the notion of a “democratic deficit,” pointing to the political and economic difficulties that followed from the rapid introduction of Western-style democracy in places such as Russia and other former Soviet republics, as well as Iraq, Indonesia, and Taiwan. “New Left” critics also charge that only China’s nouveau riche will benefit from Western “capitalist-style” democracy. Debate now often centers on whether Western-style democracy is right for China or whether a “third way” for political reform can be found.

The democracy debate has coincided with—and indeed allowed to proceed because of—a growing recognition by the Party that in order to stay in power it needs to implement more serious political reform to accompany economic reform, a strategic calculation first proposed by Deng Xiaoping in 1980 but then postponed because of the divisions within the leadership that were laid bare in the post-Tiananmen Square crackdown in 1989.<sup>42</sup> For the Party, political reform traditionally focused on administrative improvement, Party- and institution-building, and limited grass-roots democracy—all aimed at keeping the Party in control.<sup>43</sup> That intellectuals have been allowed to widely discuss “democratization” for the first time since 1989 is significant. Du Daozheng, editor of the liberal journal *Yanhuang Chunqiu* (*Chinese Spring and Autumn*), told reporters that for the first time “such a complicated and important theoretical issue was discussed fairly . . . there was no abuse, name-calling, threats, punishment, bans or dismissals.”<sup>44</sup>

As the 17th CCP Congress approached, the democracy debate intensified, filling online chat rooms and animating discussions in China’s official and nonofficial media outlets. In December 2006, Yu Keping, deputy director of the Party’s Central Translation Bureau and reportedly a close advisor to Hu Jintao, published an article in *Xueshi Shibao* (*Study Times*) entitled “Democracy is a Good Thing,” offering a vision of gradual, incremental democratization with Chinese characteristics. In the article he highlighted the words of Hu Jintao, who said at Yale University in April 2006, “without democracy, there will be no modernization.” Emboldened by the debate, the 86-year-old former vice president of Renmin University, Xie Tao, published an article in the liberal journal *Yanhuang Chunqiu*, urging China to follow the road of social democracy socialism found in Northern Europe. The article set off a firestorm of controversy, with supporters

and opponents holding a series of competing symposiums to discuss Xie's article. The debate also reanimated the Old Leftists, who, having found limited outlet for their articles in the mainstream media, posted them on Maoflag.net and other sympathetic websites. In July 2006, after 17 former top officials and Marxist scholars posted a letter accusing China's leaders of betraying the revolution and steering the country in the wrong direction, Maoflag.net was shut down temporarily.

## Official Line Weighs In

Beginning in the early part of 2007 and extending through the summer, the Party stepped up its efforts to rein in and forge consensus on the political reform debate. The first official reaction to the democracy debate came in the form of Premier Wen Jiabao's aforementioned *People's Daily* article published in February 2007. To contain the discussion, Wen revived Deng Xiaoping's dictum that China is at the "primary stage of socialism" during which economic development must precede political reform. Implicitly rejecting Western models, Wen stated that China should "take its own path in enhancing democracy."<sup>45</sup> Perhaps most authoritatively, a *People's Daily* commentator's article, which has the imprimatur of the Political Bureau, declared that President Hu Jintao's June 25, 2007 CPS speech had established the "political, ideological, and theoretical foundation" for the upcoming 17th CCP Congress.<sup>46</sup> Indicating caution on political reform, Hu reiterated the Party's basic line set at the 13th Party Congress of "one central task" (economic construction) and "two basic points" (upholding reform and opening up and upholding the Four Cardinal Principles of the socialist path, people's democratic dictatorship, CCP leadership, and Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought). But Hu's additional comments on the need to move forward "commensurate with the continuous rise of our people's enthusiasm for political participation," to "enrich the form of democracy" and "broaden the democratic channel," reflected comparatively progressive notions that policy intellectuals had voiced over the previous one to two years.<sup>47</sup> The CCP's vision for China's political reform is discussed in detail in chapter 3.

These debates and their outcomes will affect developments in 2008 and beyond on some of the most fundamental questions and challenges confronting China's domestic political future, including such problems as leadership accountability, improved governance, endemic official corruption, center-local relations, and the future role of the Party. The outcomes of these debates will likewise affect the tenor and tone of US-China relations and China's relations with the West more broadly, especially on issues of human rights, civil liberties, media censorship, rule of law, and development of a more responsive, just, and democratic political system in China.

## Foreign Policy: Rise of Nationalism or Peaceful Rise?

As with economic and domestic political questions, foreign policy issues, no longer considered within the sole purview of state and Party organs, are increasingly the subject of intensifying debate in China. The debate on foreign policy evolves from many of the same sources and echoes many of the same themes as the debates on economic and political development. In examining China's growing role in the world, intellectuals question whether modernization necessarily involves emulating the West or following Western-built norms and institutions within the international system. Others have been influenced by international critiques of neoliberalism and postcolonialism—the Washington Consensus versus Beijing Consensus debate, which played out as differences among the leadership over China's entry into the WTO and the impact of globalization became apparent.<sup>48</sup> Coming out of this discourse are the hotly debated issues now finding concrete expression in official government policy—including laws and regulations aimed at ensuring economic security and building indigenous innovation capacity, which have a direct impact on international business interests. Still other intellectuals have been preoccupied with traditional “hard power” issues such as China's military modernization and how to respond to the superpower status and “hegemony” of the United States in the post-Cold War period.

### Nationalism Debated

The sides in the current Chinese foreign policy debate can be roughly divided into those who argue the need for China to pursue its interests more assertively and unilaterally and those who argue a rising China's interests are best served through further steady and peaceful integration within the international system. Those who advocate a more assertive, “nationalist” approach believe China must more consciously marshal its growing resources to realize the country's interests, which for too long have been suppressed by foreign forces intent on keeping China down. This viewpoint has a deep history in Chinese thinking—drawing strength from the view that from the mid-19th to mid-20th century, China was devastatingly humiliated at the hands of foreign powers—but in recent years has seen resurgence as China's development and popular confidence levels have steeply risen. While openly displayed in reaction to specific international events—such as visits by the Japanese prime minister to the Yasukuni Shrine, the accidental bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade by US warplanes in May 1999, or more recently the Beijing Olympics torch relay—nationalist sentiments at both elite and popular levels are frequently expressed on issues ranging from economic security, to indigenous innovation capacity, to traditional foreign policy issues such as relations with the United States, Japan, Russia, and Taiwan.<sup>49</sup>

Today, a good portion of nationalist concern is pointed at the US government, which, in contrast to the past, is increasingly seen as unfriendly toward China. Changes in Chinese popular thinking toward the United States are starkly illustrated: Tiananmen protestors erected the “Goddess of Democracy” statue in homage to the United States in 1989, but 10 years later, following the accidental bombing by US warplanes of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade, furious protestors pelted the US embassy in Beijing with eggs and bricks and set some US consulate buildings in Chengdu on fire. Such attitudes slowly built up over the course of the 1990s: 87.1 percent of Chinese in a 1995 poll identified the United States as the country “least friendly” toward China.<sup>50</sup> More recently, according to a BBC poll conducted in 2006, 62 percent of Chinese polled had a negative view of the United States, up from 42 percent in 2005 (these trends reflect a broader deterioration in positive views of the United States across much of the globe in recent years).

It is all too tempting—but ultimately misleading—to dismiss these developments as merely the cynical manipulation of public opinion by government and Party organs to stoke nationalist sentiments, distract attention away from China’s pressing socioeconomic problems, and position the CCP as the one and only legitimate defender of the country’s interests. There is some evidence the leadership has turned to this ploy (and not always successfully), but looking to this explanation alone obscures serious discussions, debates, and changes within the collective Chinese consciousness regarding the outside world, and particularly the United States. Suisheng Zhao has termed this process the “demythification” of the West in China. This trend can be clearly traced in intellectual debates, which have at various times intersected with leadership politics, both influencing and being influenced by the formulation of Chinese foreign policy.

Intellectuals disagree over the particular causes of nationalism in the current period and hence the ability and the interest of Chinese authorities to control its expression. But most believe rising nationalism is inevitable, and debate whether the government should seek to guide it in constructive ways. Most mainstream scholars agree that Chinese nationalism is largely reactive—it emerges most openly and vociferously in response to specific international events deemed insulting to the Chinese people, such as the US bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade in 1999, the Japanese prime minister’s visits to the Yasukuni shrine, and the former Taiwan leader Lee Teng-hui’s visit to the United States in 1995. However, unhappy with this “reactionary” aspect of nationalist sentiment, Wang Xiaodong, whose views are representative of the “New Left,” argues that expressions of nationalist sentiment should be more systematic, confident, and militant in order to provide stronger ideological support for strengthening the Chinese nation.<sup>51</sup> On the other hand, critics of nationalism, including Xu Jilin, Ren Bingqiang, and Wang Dingding believe its reactionary nature indicates that Chinese nationalism is empty, offensive, and unconstructive.<sup>52</sup>

Still other intellectuals believe that the current nationalism is rational and essentially a form of patriotism, while others are less optimistic.<sup>53</sup> In practice, Chinese authorities appear to tread a thin line, which restrains extreme nationalism but encourages patriotic displays. For example, official media such as *Zhongguo Qingnian Bao* (*China Youth Times*), *Huanqiu Shibao* (*Global Times*), and *Xuexi Shibao* (*Study Times*) have highlighted Japan-bashing campaigns on the internet while also running editorials denouncing narrow-minded nationalism.<sup>54</sup>

The publication of the 1996 best-seller *China Can Say No* and journals such as *Zhanlue yu Guanli* (*Strategy and Management*) provided a platform for the articulation of ideas with a nationalist slant from many of the “New Left” intellectuals already writing on economic and political issues. Intellectuals such as Wang Xiaodong, He Xin, Gan Yang, and Fang Ning grabbed the headlines with their polemics, often highly critical of the United States. In response, “mainstream” intellectuals such as Xiao Gongqin and Shen Jinru—who wrote the rejoinder, “China Will Not Be ‘Mr. No’”—mobilized in order to counter the “New Left” and to support rapprochement with the United States and China’s integration within the international community. At the time, the Chinese leadership was deeply divided over the specific question of entry into the WTO as well as the larger question of relations with the United States, and they tolerated the intellectual debate as far as it supported their respective positions.<sup>55</sup>

## Integrating China

For the most part, however, the Chinese leadership has remained wary of “New Left” ideas in the foreign policy arena because their brand of “populist nationalism” also has an antigovernment slant to it, which can quickly get out of hand—as it did during anti-Japanese demonstrations in the spring of 2005. As a result, the leadership has to increasingly take into account emergent and popular intellectual ideas that resonate widely with the public, particularly those related to historically sensitive topics such as relations with Japan, the Taiwan issue, and “economic security.” Nonetheless, establishment intellectuals and foreign ministry professionals have largely managed to maintain control over the foreign policymaking process and put forward a goal of steadily and peacefully integrating a more powerful China with the international system.

In their 2007 *China Quarterly* article, Bonnie Glaser and Evan Medeiros trace the evolution of China’s foreign policy and the influence of establishment intellectuals who work outside the formal government bureaucracy in formulating it, as China grappled with establishing a theoretical foundation for its “new diplomacy” and global activism in the 21st century.<sup>56</sup> In particular, they examine how the concept of “peaceful rise”—first articulated by Zheng Bijian, former chairman of the China Reform

Forum and reportedly a Hu Jintao confidant—became one of the new concepts the Hu administration introduced into China’s foreign policy.<sup>57</sup>

By 2004, however, the term began to be dropped from the official lexicon as debate arose within the leadership and among intellectuals and the general public about its usage. These debates critically evaluated many aspects of the term, including that it would constrain China’s policy options in dealing with Taiwan, that the goal of a “peaceful rise” is unattainable, that the term “rise” would actually engender more concern, that the term contradicts Deng Xiaoping’s basic guidance on foreign affairs, that it could set back much needed military modernization, and that it could incite populist nationalism. Most interesting was the fact that the debate took place at all and in such a public way, calling into question a senior-level policy pronouncement. As a result of the debates and criticism, the more acceptable term “peaceful development” found its way into official usage.

The formulation of China’s foreign policy and its theoretical foundation further crystallized in April 2005, as President Hu Jintao introduced the concept of building a “harmonious world” at the Asia-Africa summit in Jakarta and expounded on it at the United Nations summit in September. The concept, which complemented Hu’s domestic policy of establishing a “harmonious society,” represents an effort to respond to the challenges of globalization and calls for the establishment of a new international political and economic order based on “multilateralism, mutually beneficial co-operation and the spirit of inclusiveness.”<sup>58</sup> While a new term, “harmonious world” in practice differs very little from mainstream concepts espoused by Chinese leaders since the beginning of the reform era: that China’s interests are best served through a foreign policy that seeks a peaceful external environment so that the country can devote its energies principally to domestic economic development, reassure neighbors and key partners about China’s benign intentions, and avoid confrontation with other major powers, especially the United States.

In another reflection of ongoing debate about China’s foreign policy and the need for the Party and government to put its authoritative stamp on such discussions, a rare and critically important work conference on foreign affairs was held in August 2006, bringing together all leading foreign ministry officials and diplomats from overseas. According to Chinese press accounts, the meeting set out the “important principles that must be followed in order to build a harmonious world.” The “central authorities” reportedly “expounded in all-round and systematic fashion on the idea of building a harmonious world, and established this as a guideline and policy principle for Chinese diplomacy.”<sup>59</sup> The need for the leadership to clarify its foreign policy direction and the debate that surrounded it suggests differences of opinion not only among intellectuals but within the officialdom as well.

Since the foreign affairs work conference, much of the open debate on Chinese foreign policy has subsided and cohered around the general con-

cept of seeking a “harmonious world.” Discussion within mainstream think tanks and other intellectual circles have for the time being concluded that the “framework” of a harmonious world was in place, that it now needs to be “put it into concrete practice,” and that this approach “projected a new image for China as a responsible power.”<sup>60</sup> At the 17th CCP Congress in October 2007, Hu Jintao in his formal work report made frequent reference to following the path of “peaceful development” and the need to build a “harmonious world,” thereby further solidifying these ideas in the lexicon of official Chinese foreign policy.<sup>61</sup>

Nevertheless, while this broad framework appears solidly in place, it remains open to critiques and adaptation on a number of specific issues. Chinese leaders will not pursue a “harmonious world” at all costs and will remain highly sensitive to slights to the country’s growing national pride. Over the past year, China’s tougher stance on foreign economic policy and on Taiwan and the Chinese antisatellite test, for example, are just a few indicators of the greater assertiveness that lies not far beneath the surface within circles of government, military, and intellectual elites. While Chinese leaders will want to lead with a more constructive and “harmonious” approach to their dealings with the outside world, they will need to remain ever mindful of and at times accommodate the growing sense of confident nationalism that has come with China’s growth and success of recent years.

## Looking Ahead

While the past several years have seen an unprecedented degree of open and at times highly public debate in China over critical economic, political, and foreign policy issues, the run-up to the 17th CCP Congress and the Congress itself served in part to forge agreement and assert leadership consensus to guide both ideological and policy thinking over the next five years. Nevertheless, in following what was arguably the liveliest and most open intellectual debate China has witnessed since reform and opening up began in 1978, it is important to ask whether the confluence of social, political, economic, and cultural developments that helped nurture the discourse were a temporary phenomenon or a sign of deeper and more meaningful change.

For the near term, these developments will have pluses and minuses for the United States and US-China relations, with both encouraging signs and continuing and new difficulties on issues that matter to Americans and American interests. At a broad level, it is encouraging to see an unprecedented level of more open and public debate in Chinese intellectual circles, traditional media, the internet, and amongst government analysts. At the same time, however, calls for a return to traditional Communist Party tenets and for more forceful assertion of narrowly defined Chinese

national interests are more worrisome. More specifically, regarding economic questions, current results of these policy debates mean continued opportunity for the United States and others to benefit from increased trade and investment with China, but growing protectionist impulses in the country, especially concerning foreign investment, will need to be watched. On the political front, Americans can be encouraged by the leadership's incremental and potential steps toward a more open and just society in China but dismayed by the overarching atmosphere of CCP power and the lack of accountability and abuses that go with it. As for foreign relations, China is expected to continue to make some encouraging and constructive contributions consistent with global norms, regional expectations, and US interests, but these will remain tempered by growing New Left and nationalist sentiments within the broader population.

## Notes

1. *Zhongguo Gaige Bao (China Reform Times)*, "Pro-Reform Paper Considers Emancipation of Mind," May 21, 2008, in Open Source Center (OSC): CPP20080530615001.
2. The following information on China's intellectual debates draws from a more detailed discussion in Melissa Murphy, *Decoding Chinese Politics: Intellectual Debates and Why They Matter* (Washington: Center for Strategic and International Studies, January 2008).
3. "Marxism-Leninism reveals the universal laws governing the development of the history of human society. It analyzes the contradictions inherent in the capitalist system that it is incapable of resolving internally and shows that socialist society will inevitably replace capitalist society and ultimately develop into communist society. The Chinese Communists have untiringly striven to integrate Marxism with the concrete practice in China and adapted it to Chinese conditions. Combining Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution, the first generation of the CCP's central collective leadership, with Mao Zedong as its core, settled such basic questions as the nature, motive, and object of the new democratic revolution and the road to socialism in China. And Mao Zedong Thought was thus established, which is Marxism-Leninism applied and developed in China" ("Ideological and Theoretical Basis of the Communist Party of China," *China Daily*, July 10, 2007, [www.chinadaily.com](http://www.chinadaily.com)).
4. For further discussion of this period, see Joseph Fewsmith, *China Since Tiananmen: The Politics of Transition* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
5. A number of intellectual advisers have subsequently moved into powerful Party and government positions, including Wang Huning, former professor at Fudan University and adviser to Jiang Zemin, appointed to the Secretariat of the 17th CCP Central Committee in October 2007. Also, in the 1980s, China Investment Corporation (CIC) Chairman and former Vice Finance Minister Lou Jiwei worked at the Research Center of Economic Development, a State Council think tank, before coming to the attention of former Premier Zhu Rongji.

6. *Nanfeng Chuang* [Southern Wind Window], "Wang Shaoguang: Lishi de luojia yu zhishifenzi mingyun de bianqian" ["Wang Shaoguang: The Logic of History and the Changing Fate of Intellectuals"], January 24, 2007, [www.tecn.cn](http://www.tecn.cn). Wang Shaoguang along with Hu Angang pioneered work on the problems of decentralization, tax reform, and China's regional disparities in the 1980s, issues that subsequently became front and center for the CCP. See Fewsmith, *China Since Tiananmen*, 132.

7. Under Hu Jintao, a regular mechanism for discussion between Party leaders and intellectuals has been established, reviving a practice first begun by former CCP General Secretary Hu Yaobang in 1985. Since 2002, the Political Bureau has held more than 40 "study sessions"—currently about once a month—during which leading intellectuals from think tanks and universities are invited to discuss topics of concern with the leadership, ranging from rule of law to rural issues to financial and political reform.

8. Xinhua News Agency, "Hu Jintao zai zhongyang dangxiao fabiao zhongyao jianghua" ["Hu Jintao Makes an Important Speech at the Central Party School"], June 25, 2007, <http://news.xinhuanet.com>.

9. "Beijing Spring" refers to brief periods of political liberalization beginning in 1978, which have usually been followed by clampdowns. The name is derived from "Prague Spring," an analogous event that occurred in Czechoslovakia in 1968.

10. Former General Secretary Zhao Ziyang employed think tankers to help formulate his economic policies in the 1980s, in part to circumvent the official bureaucracy, then a conservative bastion. See Barry Naughton "China's Economic Think Tanks: Their Changing Role in the 1990s," *China Quarterly*, no. 171 (September 2002): 625.

11. One example is the best-seller by Wang Shan, *Luo Yi Ning Ge'er, Disanzhi Yanjing Kan Zhongguo* [Looking at China Through a Third Eye] (Taiyuan: Shanxi People's Publishing House, 1994), a highly critical look at China's reform with a nationalistic slant, by a then-young writer.

12. *Nanfeng Chuang*, January 24, 2007.

13. Official Chinese statistics put the number of "public order disturbances" at 87,000 in 2005, up from 8,700 in 1993 and 74,000 in 2004. According to official Chinese sources, the number of more narrowly defined "mass incidents" fell by 22 percent in the first 10 months of 2006 to 17,900. In 2008, it was reported that "figures of mass incidents and participants decreased by 2.7 percent and 17.1 percent, respectively" in 2007, without further elaboration. See Xinhua News Agency, "China's Public Security Organs Promote Safety," April 20, 2008, [www.chinapeace.org.cn](http://www.chinapeace.org.cn).

14. The "reformers" or "liberals" comprised a group of Party elders and intellectuals including Wan Li, Liu Ji, Li Shenzhi, Shen Jiru, Ma Licheng, Liu Junning, Xu Youyu, and Zhou Ruijin aka Huangfu Ping. Today, some of the mainstream intellectuals are Gao Shangquan, Shen Baoxiang, Lu Zhongyuan, Zhou Qiren, Lin Yifu, Mao Yushi, Jiang Ping, Xu Xiaonian, Wu Jinglian, Xing Bensi, Fan Gang, Li Yining, Zhang Weiyang, Sheng Hong, and Zhang Shugang.

15. The "New Left" is a loose and heterogenous group that would not necessarily identify itself as such and includes intellectuals operating outside the establish-

ment, including Wang Hui, Chen Xin, Larry Lang, Zhang Qingde, Yang Fan, Cui Zhiyuan, Han Shaogong, Li Tuo, Zhang Chengzhi, Li Shaojun, Yang Bin, Zuo Dapei, Zhang Xudong, Han Deqiang, Gan Yang, Zhang Kuan, Gong Xiantian, Wang Xiaodong, Wang Shaoguang, and Hu Angang.

16. A slogan introduced by Mao Zedong in 1940, noted again by Liu Shaoqi in 1958, and used more frequently in connection with leftist attacks on the “cultural front” in late 1965 and early 1966. The expression was used to denote the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, a political campaign officially inaugurated in August 1966 to rekindle revolutionary fervor of the masses outside formal party organizations. The Cultural Revolution decade (1966–76) can be divided into three periods: 1966–69, from the militant Red Guard (the young “soldiers” of the Cultural Revolution) phase to the 9th National Party Congress; 1969–71, the period of the zenith and demise of Lin Biao; and 1971–76, the period of Mao’s declining health and the ascendancy of the Gang of Four (term used by the post-Mao leadership to denote the four leading radical figures—Jiang Qing [Mao’s fourth wife], Zhang Chunqiao, Yao Wenyuan, and Wang Hongwen—who played a dominant political role during the Cultural Revolution). At the August 1977 11th National Party Congress, the Cultural Revolution was declared officially to have ended with the arrest in October 1976 of the Gang of Four (Library of Congress, Federal Research Division, Country Studies/Area Handbook Series—China, [www.loc.gov/rr/frd](http://www.loc.gov/rr/frd) [accessed June 20, 2008]).

17. The “Old Left” or “conservatives” are typically associated with Party elders and intellectuals such as Chen Yun, Wang Zhen, Hu Qiaomu, Li Peng, Deng Liqun, Yu Quanyu, Gao Di, and Liu Guogang. Some members of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS), particularly its Marxism Institute established in 2005, are also considered “conservative/leftist,” including Chen Kuiyan, Li Shenming, Liu Fengyan, Zhang Shuhua, and Zhang Quanjing. They were recently involved in the compilation of a DVD that blamed the fall of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on the “ideological errors” of Nikita Khrushchev and Mikhail Gorbachev, seen as a veiled criticism of both Jiang Zemin and Hu Jintao. See “OSC Analysis—China: Lessons From CPSU Demise Reflect CPC Policy Debate,” June 15, 2007, in OSC: CPF20070615534001.

18. The Washington Consensus is a 10-point strategy for economic and political development that has formed the cornerstone of US-led multilateral institutions since the end of World War II.

19. For a discussion of the influence of works by Edward Said, Michel Foucault, Fredrick Jameson, et al., see Fewsmith, *China Since Tiananmen*, 114. A number of Western academics have begun to look to China for lively discussions in “critical theory”; see Steven Venturino, “Inquiring After Theory in China,” *Boundary*, no. 33 (February 2006): 91–113.

20. See Joshua Cooper Ramo, *The Beijing Consensus* (London: Foreign Policy Centre, May 2004). Ramo notes that whether China’s reform project ends in success or failure, “the Beijing Consensus is already drawing a wake of new ideas that are very different from those coming from Washington,” and are “marking a path for other nations around the world” to follow. It should be noted that much controversy surrounds the validity of the “Beijing model,” though the discussion is beyond the scope of this chapter.

21. An interesting anecdote underscores the link between intellectuals, the Party, and policymaking in China: Gong Xiantian is an outspoken “New Left” critic of the property law, who charged that private property rights were unconstitutional. In 2005, he received a call from NPC Chairman Wu Bangguo to discuss his views. In the final version of the law, among other amendments, a clause was inserted that the law must not contradict the Constitution. See Lesley Hook, “The Rise of China’s New Left,” *Far Eastern Economic Review*, April, 2007.
22. Fewsmith, *China Since Tiananmen*, 45.
23. Creating a “harmonious society” (*héxié shèhuì*) is the end goal of the Scientific Development Concept, a policy program that seeks to balance China’s pursuit of economic growth with paying equal attention to solving social welfare issues and putting the “people first.” The concept, which aims to ultimately create overall societal balance and harmony, is identified with the Hu-Wen administration and was first proposed during the 4th Plenum of the 16th Central Committee of the Communist Party of China (CPC) in 2004.
24. CCTV, “Wen Jiabao Zongli jizhe zhaodaihui” [“Premier Wen Jiabao News Conference”], March 14, 2006, [www.cctv.com](http://www.cctv.com).
25. Xinhua News Agency, “Top Leaders Join Lawmakers, Advisors in Group Discussions,” March 7, 2006, [www.npc.gov.cn](http://www.npc.gov.cn). See also Su Xin, “Deepen Reform at a New Starting Point in History,” People’s Forum column, *People’s Daily*, March 9, 2006, translated by National Technical Information Service, US Department of Commerce; and Joseph Kahn, “A Sharp Debate Erupts in China Over Ideologies,” *New York Times*, March 12, 2006, [www.nytimes.com](http://www.nytimes.com).
26. Liu Guoguang, “Shehui Zhuyi Shichang Jingji ye Xuyao Jihua” [“The Socialist Market Economy Also Needs Planning”], *Zhongguo Qingnian Bao* [*China Youth Times*], March 20, 2006.
27. Joseph Kahn, “At a Secret Meeting, Chinese Analysts Clashed Over Reforms,” *New York Times*, April 7, 2006.
28. *Boxun News*, “Excerpts from PRC Leftists’ 17 September Open Letter to Hu Jintao,” September 21, 2007.
29. Xinhua News Agency, “Wen Jiabao: Guanyu shehuizhuyi chuji jieduan de lishi renwu he wo guo dui wai zhengce de ji ge wenti” [“Wen Jiabao: Several Questions Concerning the Historical Duty of the Primary Stages of Socialism and Our Nation’s Foreign Policy”], February 26, 2007, <http://news.xinhuanet.com>. The “primary stage” idea was first developed by Zhao Ziyang and incorporated into the 13th CCP Congress as ideological justification for further liberalization and reform. The term fell out of use after 1989.
30. Cadres are persons who hold responsible administrative positions in either the Party or the governmental apparatus throughout China.
31. Xinhua News Agency, “Hu Jintao zai zhongyang dangxiao fabiao zhongyao jianghua” [“Hu Jintao Makes an Important Speech at the Central Party School”], June 25, 2007, <http://news.xinhuanet.com>.
32. *Beijing Ribao*, “CPC Theorist Says Development Key to Solving Contradictions Among People,” August 6, 2007.

33. CCTV, "Dang de shiqi da kaimu: Hu Jintao zuo baogao" ["The Opening Ceremony of the 17th Party Congress: The Report of Hu Jintao"], October 15, 2007, <http://news.cctv.com>.
34. Ibid.
35. Xinhua News Agency, "Hu Jintao Speaks at CPC Political Bureau Study on Opening Up, Economic Security," September 29, 2007.
36. *South China Morning Post*, "Restrictions Urged on Foreign Capital in 'Key Areas,'" October 31, 2007.
37. *Caijing*, "Qinghua Law Professor Wang Baoshu Criticizes Anti-Monopoly Law," September 2, 2007.
38. *South China Morning Post*, "Book About 'Dark Side' of Global Bankers Top Draw for Mainland Chinese," November 5, 2007.
39. *Nanfang Dushi Bao*, "Xin yi lun sixiang jiefang cong nail qibu?" ["What Should Be the Starting Point for a New Round of Discussion of Mind Emancipation?"], March 3, 2008, [www.eeo.com.cn](http://www.eeo.com.cn).
40. Zhonggong Shandong Shengwei Dangxiao [Chinese Communist Party School of Shandong Province], "Wo xiao juxing di san ci jiefang sixiang da taolun zhuanti yantaohui" ["Convening of the Third Specialized Symposium on 'Emancipation of the Mind' "], May 12, 2008, [www.sddx.gov.cn](http://www.sddx.gov.cn).
41. The May Fourth Movement was a Chinese intellectual movement (1917–21) that advocated strengthening and reforming China through the application of Western science and democracy. Following the end of World War 1, on May 4, 1919, pressure for reform culminated in a protest by Beijing university students against the Versailles Peace Conference's decision to transfer former German concessions in China to Japan. The movement inspired future generations of student activists and intellectuals, especially after the launch of reform and opening up in 1978.
42. Deng Xiaoping, "On the Reform of the System of Party and State Leadership," August 18, 1980, in *Selected Works of Deng Xiaoping 1975–1982* (Beijing: Foreign Languages Press, 1983).
43. A summary and analysis of these measures in recent years is provided in C. Fred Bergsten, Bates Gill, Nicholas Lardy, and Derek Mitchell, *China: The Balance Sheet: What the World Needs to Know Now about the Emerging Superpower* (New York: PublicAffairs Books, 2006), chapter 3.
44. Richard McGregor, "China Struggles to Define Democracy," *Financial Times*, June 12, 2007.
45. Xinhua News Agency, February 26, 2007.
46. "OSC Analysis: Hu Speech Sets Agenda for 17th Party Congress," July 1, 2007, in OSC: CPF2007072539001.
47. Xinhua News Agency, "Hu Jintao zai zhongyang dangxiao fabiao zhongyao jianghua" ["Hu Jintao Makes an Important Speech at the Central Party School"], June 25, 2007, <http://news.xinhuanet.com>.
48. Cooper Ramo, *The Beijing Consensus*, 33.

49. For a good summary of Chinese scholars' debate over the origins of nationalism in Chinese thinking, see Chen Xueming, "Dangdai Zhongguo Minzu Zhuyi Sichao Yanjiu Zongshu" ["Summary of Trends and Research in Contemporary Chinese Nationalism"], *Guangdong Sheng Shehui Zhuyi Xueyuan Xuebao* [*Journal of the Guangdong Institute of Socialism*], no. 22.1 (January 2006): 104–108.
50. Xinhua News Agency, "Jiang Zemin zhuan: Jiang Zemin de jingli" ["Biography of Jiang Zemin: Jiang Zemin's Experience"], March 23, 2005, <http://news.xinhuanet.com>.
51. Wang Xiaodong, *Zhongguo de Minzu Zhuyi Bixu Xiang Xifang Xuexi* [*Chinese Nationalism Should Learn from the West*] (Chinese Democracy and Justice Party, February 5, 2003), [www.cdjp.org](http://www.cdjp.org).
52. Ren Bingqiang, "Zhongguo Minzu Zhuyi de Chongxin Xingqi: Yuanyin, Tezheng ji Yingxiang" ["The Reemergence of Chinese Nationalism: Reasons, Characteristics, and Influence"], *Xuehai* [*Sea of Learning*] (January 2004): 78–82.
53. Zhang Yonghong, "Dangdai Zhongguo Minzu Zhuyi Toushi" ["Perspectives on Contemporary Chinese Democracy"], *Xinjiang Daxue Xuebao* [*Xinjiang University Journal*], no. 32.1 (March 2004): 39; Lin Zhibo, "Dangdai Zhongguo Shifou Xuyao Minzu Zhuyi?" ["Does Today's China Need Democracy?"], *Shidai Chao* [*Trends of the Era*], no. 24 (December 2004): 46–47.
54. See "Xuni Shijie de 'Kangri'" ["Japanese Resistance in a Hypothetical World"], *Zhongguo Qingnian Bao* [*China Youth Times*], April 13, 2005; and Ma Licheng, "Weihe Buyao Xiaai de Minzu Zhuyi" ["Reasons For Not Wanting A Narrow Democracy"], *Xuexi Shibao* [*Study Times*], November 18, 2002. See also Zhang Wenmu, "Yong Guojia Zhuyi Daiti Minzu Zhuyi" ["Replacing 'Nationalism' With 'Statism'"], November 12, 2003, [www.cngdsz.net](http://www.cngdsz.net); Wang Yiwei, "Yong Aiguo Zhuyi Chaoyue Minzu Zhuyi" ["Patriotism Trumps Nationalism"], *Huanqiu Shibao* [*Global Times*], January 31, 2005.
55. The magazine *Zhuanlue yu Guanli* [*Strategy and Management*] was reportedly closed down in September 2004 after publishing an article critical of China's policy toward North Korea.
56. Bonnie S. Glaser and Evan S. Medeiros, "The Changing Ecology of Foreign Policymaking in China: The Ascension and Demise of the Theory of 'Peaceful Rise,'" *China Quarterly*, no. 190 (2007): 291–310.
57. See Zheng Bijian, "China's 'Peaceful Rise' to Great-Power Status," *Foreign Affairs* 84, no. 5 (September/October 2005): 18–24. See also "Full Text: China's Peaceful Development Road," White Paper, State Council Information Office, December 22, 2005, <http://english.people.com.cn>.
58. *China Daily*, "Hu Calls for a Harmonious World at Summit," September 16, 2005.
59. *Guoji Wenti Yanjiu*, "China Reform Forum Member Yue Xiaoyong Discusses Harmonious World Theory," July 13, 2007, translated in OSC: CPP20070724455003.
60. *Shijie Jingji Yu Zhengzhi*, "PRC Scholar Summarizes Academic Conference on PRC Foreign Strategy," May 14, 2007, translated in OSC: CPP20070525455002.
61. CCTV, "The Report of Hu Jintao."