

**Beyond Bilateralism: Rethinking the
Study of China's International Relations**

Shaun Breslin

Reader in Politics and International Studies
University of Warwick

National Europe Centre Paper No. 36

**Paper prepared for the Workshop on
*Asia-Pacific Studies in Australia and Europe:
A Research Agenda for the Future,*
Australian National University, 5-6 July 2002**

Abstract

This paper attempts to provide a new framework of analysis for understanding China's international relations. It argues that "traditional" conceptions of international relations, based on "statist" and "realist" methodology, do not capture the dynamics of China's international relations in an era of globalisation. Rather, we need to consider the analytical tools of international political economy as a means of breaking down the barriers between the domestic and the international, and between politics and economics. At the same time as enriching the study of China, such an approach can also enrich the discipline of international political economy, by breaking away from the OECD-centric nature of much research in the field.

Keywords: China, International Relations, International Political Economy, Area Studies.

Introduction

This paper is in some ways a paper of frustration – a frustration that emerges from the pitfalls that emerge in many of the dominant approaches to considering China’s international relations (IR) in an era of globalisation. Immediately, we face a large analytical problem as my basic premise runs the risk of caricaturing a vast canon of literature. Nevertheless, and accepting this risk, I suggest that much of what is written on Chinese IR – particularly from inside China – is methodologically overly-statist and realist. In particular, I suggest that it fails to address the analytical problems of separating the domestic from the international, and separating economics from politics.

This basic failing can be addressed by deploying the analytical tools of International Political Economy (IPE). Nevertheless, much of the wider work on IPE and globalisation also contains methodological problems. On one level, there is a tendency, particularly within China, to equate IPE with rational choice theory which has become “hegemonic” in much of the US academe. As such, IPE as a framework of analysis for Chinese scholars is frequently (and rightly in my view) rejected. On another level, much of the “critical IPE”, as I will call it, that has considerable purchase outside the US also has methodological flaws. It is too often informed by theories developed by examining advanced industrialised economies, or tries to find a once and for all overarching explanation of the relationship between states and markets, or takes the nation state as the basic unit of analysis (or in some cases, all three). While critical IPE studies of the implication of globalisation and the state have become more “pluralistic” in case studies¹, and more nuanced in approach, many modes of analysis still do not transfer efficaciously to the study of developing states.

Building on Payne’s analysis of the political economy of area studies², the objective of this paper, then, is both quite straightforward and rather grand at the same time. In terms of studying China’s IR as policy and Chinese IR as academic discourse, I argue that we need to move beyond the study of bilateral relations and statist/realist approaches to take into account different processes of, and actors in, IR in the contemporary world. By modifying the work of those in a Coxian tradition, particularly the New Political Economy (NPE) approach associated with Payne and Gamble among others, we can provide a framework for analysing the increasing complexity of policy making – a framework which respects the inherent power of states, but also considers the power of sub-state and non-state actors in the global political economy. In the process, I suggest that the divisions between “politics” and “IR” become ever more blurred as the global becomes embedded within the domestic. In this respect, it is perhaps Chinese political science, more than IR, that faces the biggest challenges of coming to terms with the contemporary order. And in particular, I suggest that the study of Chinese IR as a discipline needs to become less dependent on US IR approaches and discourses, even if the US remains the dominant policy issue in the study of IR.

In terms of studying IPE, I argue that the discipline needs to become more sensitive to case studies from the developing world, with a recognition of the different characters of “the state” outside the advanced industrialised world. This can be achieved by enriching the theory with more case studies

built on a detailed knowledge of the specifics of individual examples to provide a truly comparative basis for the development of theory.

As such, the debates, conflicts, and separation (largely in the US) of area studies and “scientific” discipline obstruct the emergence of pluralistic understandings of Chinese IR under conditions of globalisation. If we accept that markets and capitalist forms are culturally, politically, historically and culturally embedded, then it is not a matter of area versus discipline, but one of combining the two. By marrying “area studies” and IPE, both can become more enhanced as analytical frameworks and provide a set of research questions and/or hypotheses to illuminate future studies of China’s political economy. And by way of a preliminary offering, I propose the following hypotheses to guide our study of the impact of globalisation on the study of Chinese IR.

First, globalisation further blurs the divisions between the domestic and the international, and between politics and economics. Second, globalisation leads to a renegotiation of relationships between state actors within the national sphere. Third, globalisation increases the number of actors in IR. Finally, globalisation at the very least leads to perforated sovereignty, and increases the power of external actors over domestic policy³.

International Relations Studies of China

One of the main argument in this paper is that dominant approaches to studying Chinese IR place too great an emphasis on the national state as the level of analysis, and is built on statist and realist notions of international relations. Before going any further, it is important to reiterate my comment in the introduction that I am not making a Kenichi Ohmaesque⁴ argument that the state is irrelevant to the functioning of the international system – that the state is “dead”. It would be meaningless to consider China’s IR without recognising the importance of formal diplomatic and government to government relations. It is also meaningless to deny the importance of the state as the key actor in China’s IR, and even China’s international economic relations. I will argue later that a key dynamic in China’s IR is the relationship between local state actors, and international non-state actors. But that is not to deny that “high” politics at the national state level creates the conditions within which this localised relationship takes place. Taiwanese businessmen may play an important role in shaping the evolution of places like Dongguan⁵, but the national state organs still retain overall control of the relationship between Taiwan and the PRC. It is not one or the other, but how the two interact.

Nevertheless, I do suggest that on their own, statist and intergovernmental levels of analysis do not tell the full story. In particular, I argue that the focus on bilateral relations at the national level misses key determinants of China’s IR, and the way in which external forces partially shape the evolution of China’s political economy – particularly, but not only, in light of China’s WTO entry. First, I simply argue that the mainstream IR literature misses the salience of economic actors – particularly non-state economic actors. Second, I suggest that national levels of perception miss the uneven geographical and sectoral pattern of China’s international economic relations and the political implications of this

process⁶. It is true that many in China and outside have long recognised the importance of local authorities in forging China's international economic relations, and there is a considerable literature in this area. But haven't taken these analyses down to the local, I argue that they need to go beyond the bilateral, and be taken back to the global (or at least the regional) – to consider how these local manifestations of globalisation are linked to transnational global capitalist processes. In short, the task is to consider the linkages between domestic politics, domestic economics, international relations, and international economics. Processes of globalisation generate both localised and internationalised networks of relationships that need to be considered alongside the bilateral to gain a full understanding of how best to theorise contemporary Chinese international relations.

There is now a **relatively** developed literature on the development of IR as a discipline within China, and the development of a Chinese IR theory. Outside China, the most well known are not surprisingly those written in English by scholars (many of whom have spent considerable time outside China) such as Gerald Chan⁷, Wang Feiling and Yong Deng⁸, Zhang Yongjin⁹, Jia Qingguo¹⁰, Wang Jisi¹¹ and so on. And while IR in China is still a relatively new discipline, there is a good body of work assessing the discipline in China by people such as, Su Changhe, Wang Liping, Peng Zhaochang, Yuan Ming, Song Xinning and so on.

It would be wrong to say that *all* Chinese IR utilises blunt realist methodologies¹². Zhang Yongjin has correctly also identified an increasing interest in the English School as a methodological tool within Chinese IR, whilst accepting that US informed realist approaches continue to dominate¹³. In establishing the new IR programme at Yanshan University, Wu Yong has developed a programme which owes much to his doctoral studies in Durham under David Armstrong.

Constructivist ideas, particularly those associated with Thomas Risse, are beginning to influence the work of some Chinese scholars such as Su Changhe¹⁴, while Chen Zhimin is also exploring how international structures influence China's international policy options¹⁵. It is perhaps worth noting here that for classical realists (if not neorealists) the journey from realism to constructivism is not a particularly long one¹⁶. The domestic-international linkage has also been explored by those scholars considering the impact of globalisation on China. Perhaps the best known, and one of the earliest scholars to engage in debates over globalisation (and from my reading the most cited), is Wang Yizhou¹⁷.

There is also an increasing awareness of IPE as academic discourse, with courses now available at Renmin and Fudan Universities at least. Song Xinning¹⁸ and Fan Yongming¹⁹ from Renda and Fuda respectively, have both produced volumes on IPE which cover a wide range of thinkers and approaches. However, I would contend that both of these volumes are *about* IPE rather than IPE texts in themselves, in that they describe western approaches to the (sub)discipline, rather than deploying these approaches to analyse Chinese politics and IR. The same is also true of Wang Yizhou's volume on "Western International Political Study"²⁰. As with early studies of IR in China in the late 1970s and

early 1980s, these works at the moment acknowledge and consider these approaches, without (broadly speaking) using them.

So it is important to accept that the IR discipline in China is not static, and that new ideas and approaches are being discussed. Nevertheless, I think that it is still fair to say that there are three main problems that obstruct the emergence of a Chinese IR that can deal effectively and in a nuanced manner with IR under conditions of globalisation.

An American-Centred Discipline?

The first is an over concentration on relations with the United States, and the “conditioning” element that this places on Chinese IR. It is clearly the case that the US is objectively more important for China than, for example, the European Union, or individual European states for Chinese policy makers and researchers. That being said, it is instructive that in Wang and Yong’s “In the Eyes of the Dragon”²¹ there is no chapter at all on Europe (including Russia) – and not only are Europe and European states absent from the contents list, but also absent from the index. The single reference to any European state is three lines on the UK handover of Hong Kong.

While this Americancentricism is understandable through a policy lens, there is another dimension to be considered here. Through the provision of scholarships and grants, a period of study in the United States is still the most probable and attractive option for Chinese IR scholars wishing to study in the west – through which the dominance of US perspectives in international relations²² is partially transmitted to the emerging IR community in China.

This brings me to a second point. Much of the IR literature in China remains concerned with issues of sovereignty and statehood and is built on realist and statist methods. For Song Xinling:

“The overarching constraint [on IR theory in China] is a structural one, being the social setting in which the study of IR in China takes place.”²³

He goes on to argue that the main domestic constraints are the dominance of policy related research, the residual ideology, and the importance of the state itself in Chinese discourses.

I would suggest a further constraint, in that much of the work in China on IR strikes me as still being informed by a Cold War framework. The strategic triangle approach to considering China’s place between Moscow and Washington served well as an approach during the Cold War. Much of what has been written about China’s place in the world appears to be seeking for new third poles to replace the now absent Soviet Union – to find something that might act as a counterbalance to US hegemony in a post-Cold War unipolar system. While this is understandable given the importance of the US for China, moving from a cold war geo-strategic framework to a post-Cold War framework of globalisation remains an incomplete task.

For Song, making such a transition is problematic as “the divides which separate disciplines and institutions are still very deep in China”²⁴. This separation, has obstructed the emergence of an IPE which considers the importance of non-state actors and economics in general in the study of IR. Whilst there is an IPE discipline in China, it has emerged in the shadow to the type of IPE which again is heavily influenced by US academia. On one level, Zhu Wenli’s paper in *Contemporary China* on IPE in China reveals a focus on an IPE which is heavily statist, and largely defined in response to US IPE theories as analytical tools – particularly hegemonic stability theory²⁵. As she argues:

“The emergence of global issues is portrayed as the expansion of the diplomatic arena.”²⁶

The issues that now face governments may be increasingly transnational in character, but the solution is still seen as being found in intergovernmental dialogue and processes. Under this approach, economic affairs often ignored as being “economics” or more often subsumed as a subject that can be dealt with by state-to-state relations.

On another level, Song and Chan argue that there is a strong concept in China that equates IPE with:

“The approaches used by Western scholars in IPE studies, such as rational choice, game theory, mathematical and statistical methods”²⁷

Again, this reflects the over-dependence on the US as a source of ideas – even if those ideas are being rejected - in the Chinese IR and IPE discipline(s). As we shall see in the debate over areas studies below, many within the US are also concerned about the dominance of rational choice approaches as a methodological “science” for studying international relations. And a conception of IPE as a framework of analysis that moves beyond the dominance of US approaches can help provide methodological tools that really can take us a step further in theory building.

At the very least, it is fair to say that non-statist critical IPE has yet to make a significant impact on Chinese international relations studies. Little focus is placed on whose interests within individual countries are being served by these economic initiatives. Nor is much attention placed on the role of non-state actors – for example, the role of those that Strange terms the “international business civilisation”²⁸ or Cox would describe as the “transnational managerial class”²⁹ that “play an major role in almost all levels of the regional policy-making process”³⁰.

The above is not intended to “rubbish” Chinese academia – far from it. Very similar comments could be made about the majority of western observations of IR in general, and Chinese IR in particular. Wæver has shown, for example, how publications in the mainstream IR journals in general are dominated by rational choice and realist approaches (and also by authors based in the US)³¹. Nor is China the only country where the link between academia and policy making can create methodological myopia. Indeed, I would suggest that much writing on China in the US “suffers” from the problem of being too closely related to policy issues. As times it is difficult to know whether some scholars are writing about US policy towards China, or trying to write that policy itself. It is also the case that much of the US literature on China’s IR also ignores, for example, the position of Europe. In a rather neat comparison with Wang and Deng, neither does Johnston and Ross’s edited collection on “Engaging

China” have a single chapter on Europe³². Finally, divisions between disciplines are also strong outside China³³. There is, for example, a considerable literature that discusses China’s international economic relations – but the division between economics, IR, and political and economic geography remain largely entrenched.

I suggest, then, that IR specialists in China and without need to look further than just the US for the theoretical models used to analyse Chinese IR. And if this is the case for IR theorists, it also holds true in different ways for those who would consider themselves to be in the “area studies” camp as well.

Area Studies versus Economics and Rational Choice Theories

The debate over the relationship between area studies and discipline has been raging in the US for over half a decade now. A key impulse for this debate was the decision to fill the chair in Japanese politics vacated by the retiring Chalmers Johnson with a specialist in rational choice theory, largely considered by insiders in the Asian studies community to have little to no background in Japanese studies. Broadly speaking, the complaints from the area studies disciplines revolve around the notion that economics, and its bastard offspring, rational choice theory, have become hegemonic in academic discourses. According to Johnson³⁴, rational choice theorists are attempting to promote their agenda by discriminating against “unscientific” area studies.

The dominance of rational choice theory in much of US political science does create significant problems for the study of politics and international relations. So too do interpretations of policy based on pure economic theory. Take, as just one example, this section from a World Bank report on the potential impact of the WTO on Chinese agriculture:

“Over the longer term, increased liberalization in China will accelerate the shift of agriculture away from areas of comparative disadvantage towards its comparative advantage. There is likely to be a more pronounced decline in the production of land-intensive sectors, such as livestock, fruit, flowers and vegetables. Liberalization of global agricultural barriers should augment this trend as it provides China with increased access to other countries’ markets in return for its one-sided concessions”³⁵

The economic theory might be sound. But let’s assume for a moment that people all do act as rational actors based on full knowledge. Even then, it is difficult to imagine the peasant trying to scratch a living out of the barren earth in Shaanxi having the knowledge, the wherewithal and investment, and indeed even the right type of land and climate to make such a change. Geography, topology, and nature can be frustrating obstacles to the transference of economic theory into practice.

It is not my intention here to embark on a detailed account of the relationship between politics and economics in IPE – that has been done by others³⁶. Suffice to say that within the IFIs, economic approaches have come to dominate much research, and also to have a disproportionate influence on policy making methodology. But while it is right to be sceptical of the efficacy of economic theory, and

its bastard offspring of rational choice as explanatory tools and methods, it is important not to fall back into a defence of area studies that denies the relevance and utility of all theoretical approaches.

Area studies as an academic programme in the United States in the post War era owed much to the conditions of the Cold War. In perhaps the classic interpretation of the evolution of Area Studies in Cold War USA, Bruce Cumings notes:

“For a generation after World War II the bipolar conflict between Moscow and Washington and the hegemonic position of the United States in the world economy drew academic boundaries that had the virtue of clarity: ‘area studies’ and ‘international studies’, backed with enormous public and private resources, had clear reference to places or to issues and processes that became important to study. The places were usually countries, but not just any countries: Japan got favored placement as a success story of development, and China got obsessive attention as a pathological example of abortive development. The key processes were things like modernization, or what was for many years called ‘political development’ toward the explicit or implicit goal of liberal democracy.”³⁷

At the very least, the need to understand what was going on in the “closed” environments of communist party states inspired many of the university degrees and scholarships to study language and culture. Building on McGeorge Bundy³⁸, Cumings notes the close relationship between many US academics and the US Office of Strategic Studies, and how the US area studies community found much of its funding³⁹. In Europe, too, Cold War politics played a part in shaping academic interest, courses and programmes. For example, the special foreign office funding for the School of Oriental and African Studies at the University of London, whilst initially inspired by the needs of serving the British Empire, was at least invigorated by the needs of the foreign policy community to train specialists to understand places like China.

In some respects, then, the area studies discipline, like Chinese IR, needs to come to terms with the changing geo-strategic environment within which it functions. The Cold War context that Cumings argued drew the lines of demarcation between area studies and international relations has gone. To use a Maoist concept (incorrectly), the primary contradiction is no longer a geo-strategic one based on security, but a geo-economic one based on increased economic interdependence (albeit an asymmetric interdependence) through greater trade and investment flows. And this means that the boundaries between the domestic and the international become ever more blurred, requiring an analysis of how the two interact:

“The separation between the global and the local no longer holds, as the new hierarchies of the global economy cut across regional and national boundaries”⁴⁰

This in turn requires an understanding of the dynamics of the external environment, actors and processes.

In the case of “Chinese studies”, the end of the geo-strategic context of study has coincided with the end of a period of relative autarky. Until perhaps as late as Deng Xiaoping’s *nan xun* in 1992, Chinese politics could be studied almost entirely in terms of domestic dynamics. And while I would contend that such “domesticism” was no longer efficacious for much of the 1990s, China’s post-WTO political economy clearly cannot be considered without a recognition of the role of external factors.

The debate over the validity and future of area studies versus discipline should not just be conducted within the narrow confines of US academia, and in the specific context of a revolt against hegemonic approaches in the shape of economics and rational choice theory. As Kasaba argues⁴¹, area studies requires a “revitalizing” impact by combining the study of individual cultures and areas with wider disciplinary understanding – not rational choice “science”, but other disciplines that help us best understand the local-global context of the contemporary world. Kasaba’s main interest is in postmodernist approaches – and while this is not my own interest here, I share his basic tenet that the aim is not to replace old disciplinary barriers between “area studies” and “international relations” with new barriers:

“In order not to use this as yet another way of creating divisions, we should start from the premise that the modern era is generative its own comprehensive world view that encompasses all places and groups who are in interaction with each other”⁴²

So if we move away from an internecine battle within US academia, we can find ways in which area and discipline come together to enhance each other. This is done by recognising that there are a set of internationalised factors that face most, if not all states – factors that can fall under the broad heading of “globalisation”. But also by recognising that these globalising factors will play out in different ways in different states because of the embedded domestic contexts of each individual state⁴³. We need the discipline to understand the former, and the area studies to understand the latter.

As noted above, there is more than one understanding of what political economy actually is as a field of inquiry. From the above, it should also be clear that like many from the area studies discipline(s), I am not promoting economic interpretations, or those of rational choice theory. The approach I emphasise here is what might be called “critical IPE”. And I suggest that in this IPE can provide the methodological and ontological tools that fit best with the specific knowledge of “national conditions” of area studies specialists to provide the best chance of studying IR under conditions of globalisation.

At its most basic level, such IPE starts from two assumptions – that analytical divisions between the international and the domestic, and between economics and politics, should be broken down. Critical IPE is thus more holistic in its approach than “traditional” IR. Perhaps even more fundamentally, it has at its heart a concern with the relationship between structure and agency (though not insisting on an ontological separation of the two⁴⁴ For Gamble⁴⁵, it is an approach which also attempts to recapture the spirit of classical political economy.

But in its broadest possible definition to capture a wide as possible set of scholarship, this critical IPE is perhaps best understood in what it rejects – in what it stands against more than what it stands for. Thus, I suggest that this IPE can be defined as standing against pure economic interpretations, against rational choice theory, and against statist and realist international relations. For all that divides the numerous critical IPE scholars, this rejectionism is more or less shared by all. And in at least two of these areas of rejection, it has much in common with Johnson’s suspicion and rejection of hegemonic and arrogant disciplinary approaches.

The Pitfalls of Universalist IPE

But in emphasising the benefits of utilising critical IPE approaches for studying Chinese IR, I am not suggesting that IPE has all the answers. On the contrary, a starting point for this paper is that IPE itself can become enhanced by taking on a more comparative nature that is aware of the contexts of individual states – and in particular, states from non-core areas of the global political economy. Just as there are methodological pitfalls in using dominant approaches to understand China’s IR in an era of globalisation, so too there are potential methodological pitfalls in the IPE literature. At the risk of oversimplification, these can be described as universalism, the OECD-centric nature of much IPE research, the emphasis on the nation state as the unit of analysis, and teleological pitfalls.

Universalism

The first pitfall is one that emerges from trying to make definitive statements that contain universal truths. Trying to find a once and for all answer to, for example, which has power, states or markets, is essentially misguided. The real quest should be twofold. The first is to discover differential levels of power in the international political economy – an approach which fits well with conceptions in the Chinese literature regarding the uneven nature of power in a unipolar globalised world. Quite simply, there are clear divergence in different state’s ability to dictate, respond or react to globalising forces. This study, then, shares an understanding with those scholars who perceive globalisation as an uneven process⁴⁶. For proponents of this view, rather than globalisation leading to harmonisation and convergence:

“Existing inequalities make it more likely that globalization will lead to an increasingly sharp division between 'core' states, who share in the values and benefits of a global world economy and polity, and 'marginalised' states”⁴⁷

The second is to embrace divergence and, deploying the insights of area studies, consider how the relationship between states and power, between structure and agency, is determined within individual settings. IPE should not only allow diversity, but indeed emphasize the fact that there is no single answer; no single set of relationships; no single simple understanding. The researcher should consider, particularly through comparative approaches, how different sets of relationships emerge with different balances of power between actors in different and specific historical, geographical, social and political contexts. As Tim Shaw has argued:

“any local to global social relationship inevitably includes a trio of heterogeneous actors ... To be sure the balance among this trio varies between regions and issue-areas & over time but none of them can be excluded or overlooked in any ongoing relationship”⁴⁸

This is an approach that does not lead to simplicity. Nor does it lend itself to snappy book titles or defining characteristics that ensure good results on citation indexes. But as Hettne and Söderbaum⁴⁹ argue, the world is complex, and saying this is much better than truncating reality to the fit methodological or ideological predilection.

IPE as a study of developed states

The search for universal truths is helped when the universe is contracted. Tony Payne has argued that the theories of hegemony were largely constructed around observations of the US experience, moderated by some comparisons with Europe. What we end up with is a concept constructed from a narrow set of cases. More to the point, a concept that because it is so case (or a few cases) specific might not have relevance outside that setting. The same argument can be made for many of the approaches within IPE⁵⁰. Once we move outside the setting of the case studies (either explicit or more inferential) that have been used to construct theory, then the applicability of theory becomes more questionable.

One of the major research questions for IPE scholars is to consider the relationship between the state and the market. Indeed, there are around 100 published books in English alone where the main focus is to discuss the relationship in one way or another⁵¹. But much of this literature is based on understandings that are predicated on an understanding of the role of the state in the contemporary world that is based on the experience of advanced industrialised democracies. Such a separation of state and market that underpins much IPE analysis in the West does not always hold true outside the context of the west itself.

Van Woferen⁵², for example, has long argued that analysts from the “west” fail to understand Japan because they start with false assumptions. The concept of a separation between “public” and “private” that lies at the heart of some investigations of political economy is, according to van Woferen, absent in Japan. For Deans, this is a consequence both of “both the traditional understanding of ‘economy’ in East Asia and the way in which market economies were established there”⁵³. Indeed, in some respects, following Polanyi⁵⁴ it is not so much Japanese capitalism that is “different” as European capitalism, and of course, the USA. It was the “great transformation” of industrialisation in Europe in the nineteenth century that marks the “singular departure” from the dominant norm by creating the institutional separation of society into an economic and political sphere.

In essence, the argument here is that the nature of the Japanese state and Japanese capitalism is different. It might have an industrial structure that looks a bit like a western one, but the nature of the state and the nature of Japanese capitalism is not the same as the nature of the US state and US capitalism, or European states and European capitalisms. Capitalism in Japan developed in a different

way from in the west due to “pre-industrial legacies, patterns of industrialization, and twentieth-century state structures and policies”⁵⁵. Indeed, even within the west, there is no single model of capitalism, and no single model of “the state”. A study of comparative capitalisms, then, is an essential component of recognising divergence.

There are effectively two problems here. The first is the aforementioned dominance of studies of advanced industrialised economies. Even in some of the best works on comparative capitalisms, the emphasis remains on advanced industrialised economies. Coates⁵⁶, for example, concentrates on a comparison between the US, Sweden, Germany and the UK, while Crouch and Streeck⁵⁷ similarly consider Italy, Sweden, the UK, France, the US and Japan. A similar tripartite analysis of Europe-the US-Japan is also evident in Berger and Dore⁵⁸. While these works serve a very useful purpose in exposing the varieties of capitalism within advanced industrialised societies, the lack of analyses of less developed economies is marked.

Similarly, with a brief exception for analyses of the Asian financial crises, discussions of developing states are in a minority in the major IPE journals. Here, though, we should note a difference between US journals and those in Europe – particularly the UK, and particularly in *New Political Economy*⁵⁹. It is notable that among the editors of *New Political Economy* there is a strong “developing area” expertise. It is also the case that in inception, *New Political Economy* emphasises not a single theoretical approach, but a framework or “toolkit”⁶⁰ which embraces non-exclusionary pluralistic approaches:

“The methodology of the new political economy rejects the old dichotomy between agency and structure, and states and markets, which fragmented classical political economy into separate disciplines. It seeks instead to build on those approaches in social sciences which have tried to develop an integrated analysis.”⁶¹

There may be good reasons for this relative under-representation, particularly in the US. One explanation could simply be that there are not enough people writing on developing areas using IPE perspectives. Another explanation is found in the good work on IPE that appears in development oriented journals and in “area studies” journals. Indeed, the logic of career enhancement often leads towards publishing in a relatively narrow set of journals conceived as the appropriate outlet by the peer community.

The second problem emerges from the potential of concept stretching. If Van Wolferen is right, and western paradigms are used to try and understand things that look similar in Japan, then problem becomes magnified when we move on to look at states like China. When China was “different” – when it was a state planned economy – then it was relatively easy to analyse. We knew that it was different and treated it as such (though sometimes falsely putting it in a box with other “different” states – assuming that socialist economies were all the same for example). As China has reformed and moved

away from socialism, we have perhaps found it increasingly difficult to box. Dealing with the bits that are still different remains relatively easy. The problem is the problem of the familiar.

As just one example here, there is a widespread understanding of how stock markets work and why they exist in the west. And as china now has stock markets, it is tempting to assume that they serve the same functions in China and work in the same way as they do in London, Frankfurt or New York. But as China “area study” specialists know, not only do Chinese stock markets serve different purposes and interests, but the stock exchanges in Shanghai and Shenzhen each have different characteristics. The embedded power of the state in the emerging Chinese market economy means that we have to be very careful in deploying modes of analysis devised from case studies in very different parts of the world.

The nation state as the unit of analysis

As with much of the economics and IR literature, there is still a tendency in IPE to consider the nation state as the unit of analysis. Even studies of globalisation normally consider how this impacts on states, rather than disaggregating the state as a unit of analysis. On a very simple level, we need to remember perhaps the first question of politics – who gets what ? So we should not ask if, for example, will China benefit from joining the WTO? But instead ask who will benefit and who will not. As China specialists know, reform has had a highly differential impact on Chinese society. The gap between the urban and the rural is just one example, to which we could add the benefits accruing to the existing elites versus the benefits accruing to the workers⁶², and many others.

And of course, the Chinese case also reveals massive regional differentials – while some parts of China have become embedded within internationalised networks of production and are highly integrated into the global economy, other parts of the country are at best, only marginally participating. This is not to say that they are unaffected by globalisation, but to suggest that they are not internationally “integrated”. This is often explained by making a bipolar division between coastal and interior China. This approach is helpful in establishing the differential nature of the internationalisation of China – but only partially so. There are, for example, many TVEs in the interior which have benefited greatly from internationalisation, and have significantly contributed to the growth of Chinese exports. As such, while geographically based concepts of divergence are clearly important, they do not tell the whole story of the differential impact of globalisation on China.

This recognition of the differential impact within nation states is manifest in only a few theoretical pieces considering the political economy of regional integration relatively small body of IR literature dealing with globalisation and integration⁶³. There are a number of good case studies discussing the significance of sub-national and cross-national regional integration in various parts of the world. Nevertheless, work on microregionalism, and the way that globalisation can lead to a disjuncture between the national political and emerging transnational economic spaces remains an understudied phenomenon⁶⁴. In this respect, the work of area studies specialists (and political geographers) on and in China who emphasise the uneven spatial impact of jingji kaifang, particularly in terms of international

economic relations, are ahead of the game, and have much to offer comparative political economists and IPE theorists in general.

Teleology and Politics: What Drives Globalisation?

At this stage, this paper should really try and provide some definition of what is meant by globalisation. But after five years of the existence of the Centre for the Study of Globalisation at Warwick, perhaps the clearest collective finding is how contested the G-word is, and in many respects, how useless as an analytical term. From Kenichi Ohmae⁶⁵ at one extreme to Hirst and Thompson⁶⁶ at the other, there is a vast literature attempting to understand what globalisation really means (or in the case of Hirst and Thompson, to ask if it is even happening at all). As of March 2002, a grand total of 1,500 books listed on the Amazon web page with globalisation or globalization in the title. As Taylor puts it:

“To say that “globalisation” is the new mantra of our contemporary era is to be at once both banal and profound. Few other words has been so used and abused in recent times, or have generated so much printed word and comment. Yet, for all the rhetoric surrounding globalisation, its meaning remains both vague and elusive and symbolises a host of different things to different people.”⁶⁷

In a similar vein, Hurrell notes that:

“Although rarely tied to any very clearly articulated *theory*, it has become a very powerful *metaphor* for the sense that a number of universal processes are at work generating increased interconnection and interdependence between states and between societies.”⁶⁸ [original emphasis]

As such, I am trying here to duck the issue of providing a clear definition, and instead consider some of the methodological pitfalls that exist in studying IR through globalisation lenses.

One of the key potential pitfalls here is the danger of falling into teleological understandings of globalisation. To be fair, teleological explanations do not have much salience in IPE discourses in the west any more. However, in discussing globalisation in China, I have often come across the view that globalisation is an economic phenomena, and not a political one. This view is based on a separation of economics and politics that is also evident in wider interpretations of globalisation. In its extreme form this can lead to understandings that take globalisation as a given factor, or something that is divorced from politics.

Critics will complain that this is a caricature of Chinese work on globalisation. They will point to the fact that Chinese scholarship on globalisation does consider how states can respond and live with globalisation, and also deals with the political implications of participating in a globalised economy. A good example comes from Wang Yizhou:

“globalisation also naturally represents a process of politics, which is used here in its widest sense. That is to say, in addition to the operation of government, the competition among upper-level leaders, and speeches given by various politicians, it includes decision-making, such as making development strategy, handling social conflict, assessing opportunity as well

as challenge, working out the timetable for opening up and participation. Economic globalisation has become a growing tendency, causing social instability in many countries. It urges national states in the age of globalisation to adjust or change their set agenda”⁶⁹

On one level, Wang’s piece is instructive in its recognition that globalisation impacts on state sovereignty and permeates into societal issues. It also recognises that globalisation doesn’t just happen, but is dependent on government decisions and policies. But on another level it is problematic as it considers the political dimensions of economic globalisation, without accepting that economic globalisation in itself is inherently political.

In proposing an IPE framework for considering China’s IR in an era of globalisation, it is essential to start from an understanding that globalisation does not just happen. It is a phenomenon which is driven by a combination of technological advances, and changing patterns of production, which places a significant element of “power” in the decisions of non-state economic actors. It is also driven by the policy preferences and dominant ideas within the major international financial institutions. But as the above quote from Wang acknowledges, it is also the result of the actions and policies of governments. Crucially, and this is absent from Wang’s analysis, these decisions are predicated on an acceptance that participation in the global economy is beneficial to perceived interests, and based on an acceptance that neoliberal economic policies are the best way of generating growth. In this respect, globalization also entails an ideological dimension, and is not just economic process. In combination, as Bernard and Ravenhill argue in relation to the political economy of East Asia:

“We have argued that the emerging political economy of East Asia should be understood in terms of the relationship between changes in the global political economy, changes in the political economy of individual states, and changes in the organization of production.”⁷⁰

So a key impulse in the evolution of globalisation has been ideological change, and resultant governmental policies. Another key driving force has been technological changes which have facilitated changing modes of production. For Oman, a:

“principle macroeconomic force shaping those dynamics and driving ‘globalization’ is the ongoing development, formidable competitive strength, and spread of post-Taylorist “flexible” approaches to the organization of production within and between firms’.⁷¹

While there has always been world trade, the structure of that trade has changed. Rather than raw materials flowing to production sites, and finished goods flowing to markets, the production of a single commodity can now take place at a number of different stages in a number of different states.

“capitalism today...entails the detailed disaggregation of stages of production and consumption across national boundaries, under the organizational structure of densely networked firms or enterprises’.⁷²

As such the investment-trade nexus has become increasingly significant, as investments move to the most profitable location for specific parts of the production cycle.

So building on the work of Cox⁷³, “new political economy” approach associated with Andrew Gamble, Tony Payne and others⁷⁴ argues that the international economy of the Bretton Woods era characterised by exchange relations between national economies has been replaced by a global economy grounded in production and finance:

“the formative aspect of the new global political economy is seen to be the structural power of internationally mobile capital. States now have to recognise the power not only of other states and international organisations but also of international capital, the banks, and foreign exchange markets.”⁷⁵

It is a system where non-state actors play a significant role in shaping financial and commodity flows, but one in which states and state actors do much to facilitate the globalisation.

In some respects, we have to take one step back and consider the political dimensions that lie behind the growing power of non-state actors in the global political economy. As the German Bundestag report on globalization forcefully argued:

“The growing worldwide integration of economies came not by any law of nature – it has been the result of active and deliberate policies.”⁷⁶

First, we need to consider how non-state actors came to have such power in the first place. For example, while Susan Strange asserts that transnational corporations (TNCs) are key actors in the promotion of globalised production:

“this has not happened entirely by accident. The shift from state authority to market authority has been in large part the result of state policies. It was not that the TNCs stole or purloined power from the government of states. It was handed to them on a plate - and, moreover, for 'reasons of state'.”⁷⁷

Strange goes on to argue that even the US government could not contain the forces that it unleashed, and that even the world’s most powerful government finds its actions constrained by the actions of TNCs. But nevertheless, this should not obscure the fact that the original liberalization of the economic structure was based on political choice and decisions.

It might help here to distinguish between globalism as a statist project, and globalisation as a process. Globalism is a project which has been pursued with vigor by the successive US administrations, supported by the neo-liberal agendas of other governments in the advanced capitalist world. It sought to spread specific political, economic, security and social forms of interaction and understanding on a global spatial scale. It is symbolized in particular by Reaganite-Thatcherite efforts to spread the market economy, and promote neo-liberal economic strategies through both its own actions, and via the policies of the major international financial institutions. Globalization, in contrast, is a process of growing interconnectedness in these different dimensions driven where non-state actors utilise the economic and legal structures that have been established by political elites - for example, by business enterprises which develop a global strategy in order to maintain international competitiveness and ensure continued profitability. In short, globalism as a political project creates the environment in which globalization can proceed.

This analysis effectively concentrates on what we might call the initiators of globalization. But we also need to consider the political dynamic of globalization in developing states. In the 1960s and 1970s, much of the literature on developing states concentrated on the attempts to ensure that developing states did not become locked in a system of dependency on the core states. There is also a considerable literature on the way in which international financial institutions forced neoliberal agendas on developing countries through conditionalities on aid packages. But in the current era, the dynamic is very different. As Bowles argues:

“By 1991 the purpose was no longer premised on the need to be more independent of the global economy but rather seen as a measure to ensure continued participation in it. The fear of developing countries was no longer one of dependence on the global economy but rather was seen as a measure to ensure continued participation in it.”⁷⁸

If globalization is the new dependency theory, then it is in large parts a domestically self-imposed dependency – dependency as the best way of achieving growth.

There are two key issues to consider here. The first is the “ideological” or “ideational” change. In short, key elites in much of the developing world have altered their policy preferences and accepted the neo-liberal project as the best method of achieving growth. Perhaps more than anything else, this is what I mean when I argue that economic globalization in itself is inherently political.

The second issue relates to specific policy changes designed to facilitate globalization. While the internet and telecommunications facilities increase the speed of communication, goods still have to be transported around the world on ships, trucks and trains. And in order to do this, you need the necessary “hard” infrastructure, more often provided through state investment rather than through private sector funding:

“Transport and communications are “massively state-subsidised, and the overhead costs of transport and communication (e.g. policing, rules and regulations) are met not by the users but by the general public”⁷⁹

Furthermore, policies conducive to the international economy do not just occur on their own. The Special Economic Zones are not “natural economic territories”, as Scalapino⁸⁰ has defined emerging cross border micro-regions – they were established through political fiat, and supported by other state policies on taxation, distribution and so on. And perhaps most importantly of all for the future, the decision to join the WTO, and to accept all the disciplining elements of neo-liberalism that will follow, was a political choice.

In summary, this internal process of change has been promoted by what Leslie Sklair terms “globalising state bureaucrats”⁸¹, who might also be considered as constituting a party-state comprador class. This group, epitomised by the policies of Zhu Rongji, is engaged in a process of making the investment regime within China more and more liberalised and “attractive” to international capital, and

reforming the domestic economic structure to reduce domestic protectionism, and institute a more neoliberal economic paradigm. In combination, these processes can best be understood by using a framework of analysis established by Robert Cox:

“There is something that could be called a nascent historic bloc consisting of the most powerful corporate economic forces, their allies in government, and the variety of networks that evolve policy guidelines and propagate the ideology of globalisation. States now by and large play the role of agencies of the global political economy, with the task of adjusting national economic policies and practices to the perceived exigencies of global economic liberalism. This structure of power is sustained from outside the state through a global policy consensus and the influence of global finance over state policy, and from inside the state from those social forces that benefit from globalisation (the segment of society that is integrated into the world economy)...Neo-liberalism is hegemonic ideologically and in terms of policy.”⁸²

Towards a Framework of Analysis

Studying Chinese IR

In terms of the study of China’s international relations, this framework suggests moving away from bilateral and statist interpretations of IR. In particular, it suggests an increased attention on the interaction between Chinese state elites at various levels, and external non-state actors. There is a lot of good research being undertaken on the way in which parts of China are integrating with the global economy, with a particular and entirely proper emphasis on China’s coastal provinces. This work which emphasises the partial national nature of integration into the global economy, and points to issues related to the integration of the national economy as a whole makes an important contribution to theoretical understandings regarding the impact of globalisation on nation states. However, there are two areas in which this work needs strengthening.

The first is in the way that these analyses fit into overall analyses of China’s IR. While some may reject this on the grounds that the relationships under investigation are purely economic, this denies the linkages between politics and economics outlined above. The role and importance of local governments is also important on the side of the external partners as well. Gilbert Rozman⁸³ and Glenn Hook⁸⁴, for example, have written extensively on the role of local governments in Japan in forging economic links with Japan’s neighbours. Indeed, the local-local nexus is already an important component in Sino-Japanese economic relations. Witness, for example, the links between the sister cities of Kita Kyushu and Dalian. These links are not just built on local government dialogue. The local state is the key facilitator, but contacts are also dependent on local bureaux of MITI, local governments, Japanese representative offices in China, individual companies, the relationship between different companies in the supply chain⁸⁵, providers of transportation, and even the role of Chinese students who have returned to China after being educated in Japan⁸⁶. In this case, the role of the local state acting to further the interests of non-state economic actors (primarily on the Japanese side) is particularly notable.

Second, it is important not to focus too closely on specific localised manifestations such as relationships. There is, for example, now a considerable literature on the emergence of this thing called “Greater China”. Some of this literature (good examples include Naughton⁸⁷ and Hamilton⁸⁸) has, at its heart, an understanding of the complexities of the relationship. Going beyond a simple bilateral level of analysis, they consider the wider regional and global processes involved. But many others do not. They are instead over-concerned with, for example, showing how China is trying to ensnare Taiwan through economic relations.

Even some of those analyses that recognise that the political borders of China are not the parameters of economic activity, they then often replace a politically defined boundary of economic activity with another one – even if this new one is the conflation of a number of different political boundaries. An understanding of a “Greater China” economic space is constructed which does as much to underplay the significance of Japan and the United States in the construction of capitalist processes within which localised forms of relationships exist. A concept designed to illuminate the transnational nature of economic relations can, without care, obscure more than it reveals.

We need to move beyond this national basis of analysis, even when the national basis of analysis itself moves beyond bilateralism. We should think of how the particular and the localised fit with wider regional/international modes of analysis. It is entirely correct to focus on the way in which localised relationships between local Chinese officials and Hong Kong and/or Taiwanese businessmen is helping shape China’s re-engagement with the global economy. But these local sets of relationships do not exist in isolation. Regional and global modes of production are **primarily** transmitted or linked into China through more localised relationships. Indeed, overseas Chinese networks often deliberately exploit cultural links in locating themselves in China. But these localised relationships are themselves predicated on the wider structure of a regional and global economy. The overall structure may be a regional one, or indeed even a global one. But the mechanism through which China is integrated can be a local one, or indeed, through a number of different local processes. Thus, I follow Smart’s understanding that:

“many capitalist practices are embedded in local structures, and that certain contexts can generate new and vibrant variations upon the theme of capitalism. If nothing else, globalization produces a considerably diverse set of local outcomes.”⁸⁹

Simply focusing on bilateral relationships, even if we disaggregate the states, do not provide a full explanation of “what is going on”. The most obvious example of this pitfall of bilateralism in trying to understand the dynamics of international economic relations lies in an assessment of trade relationships with Hong Kong. If we just focussed on the bilateral, then we would assume that Hong Kong is awash with Chinese imports, to the extent that it would be impossible to walk through the streets because they would be stocked with containers. But as we all know, this is not the case, as much of what is exported from China to Hong Kong is re-exported on to third destinations.

We can take a trilateral approach and try and work out where these goods are re-exported to from Hong Kong⁹⁰. At least this gives us a more nuanced understanding of direction of trade statistics and their implications than simply using raw China or importer country customs data⁹¹. But while this helps us go beyond the bilateral on the export side, we also need to consider the import and investment side. Again, the example of Hong Kong is the most obvious, as it still acts as a financial and also physical conduit between China and the world, notwithstanding the opening of China.

But it is a feature of China's international economic relations that also extends beyond relations with Hong Kong. The classic example used by the Chinese authorities is that of Barbie Dolls. This rather low tech commodity is produced in China and carries the "made in China" stamp. But it is produced by a US company through a contract with a Taiwanese company, which imports raw materials from Japan and the Middle East, before re-exporting the dolls to markets in the developed world⁹².

If anything, the internationalised nature of these commodity driven production networks is more evident in the production of more higher tech goods. For example, Sasuga has show that computers bearing the "made in China" stamp produced through Taiwanese investments in Southern China (now primarily Dongguan) contain virtually no Chinese content other than occasional inputs to peripherals (ie: plastic casing for keyboards etc). The high tech components are all produced in Taiwan, Japan or the US, with most of the Taiwanese companies operating under OEM licenses with original companies in Japan or the US⁹³.

The structure of regional capitalism, then, goes much deeper than bilateral levels of analysis can hope to explain. One of Sasuga's key concerns is how Taiwanese investment in southern China is leading to new structures of governance – how the localised relationship plays out. But crucially, he acknowledges that this is merely the local manifestation of a wider process of industrial agglomeration, changes in production processes, and internationalised production chains driven by the spread of global capitalism.

Nor can the implications of such processes be explained by the type of statist and intergovernmentalist approaches to understanding East Asian regionalism that dominates in Chinese IR (and indeed in non-Chinese IR). Rather, we need to deploy modes of analysis that think in terms of production networks and/or class alliances that cut across politically drawn boundaries⁹⁴.

In particular, for those of us from a politics tradition, we should not forget basic and fundamental questions. Who gets what? Whose interests are served? If these questions are asked, then we can start to see more clearly how, alongside bilateral processes, Sino-Japanese relations or Sino-Taiwanese relationships are embedded in a wider network of relationships – even if these relationships are manifest in localised networks of overseas Chinese businessmen and mainland party-state-entrepreneurs. This understanding, then, does not posit the local against the regional or the regional

against the global as loci of analysis. Rather, it suggests that assessing the relationship between the local the regional (and multiple forms of region) and the global remains a fruitful avenue for research in the future.

Studying Chinese Politics

One of the basic tenets of the NPE approach is that the distinction between the domestic and the international needs to be broken down. As such, deploying IPE approaches not only has efficacy for studying IR, but also for the study of domestic Chinese politics. Even before China's entry into the WTO, this assertion held true. But in the coming years as, for example, China's legal structure continues the ongoing process of becoming WTO compliant, the significance of the global for the domestic in China will become increasingly apparent. It will remain entirely correct to consider the actions of Chinese elites from an understanding of the specific social, economic, historical and cultural context of China. But any such analyses will also have to consider the context of globalization, and the way that the market or neoliberalism has a disciplining impact on domestic politics.

Following from this, we need to internationalise the study of factional formation and political alliances in China. I content that the decision to join the WTO in 1999 cannot be considered without a recognition of an alliance between reformers in Beijing, and those in the US and elsewhere that wanted to promote a type of reform in China that conforms with international norms and the interests of the "international community". This idea is perhaps best summed up by an official White House statement of March 2000

"China's accession agreement will deepen and help to lock in market reforms -- and empower those in China's leadership who want their country to move further and faster toward economic freedom. In opening China's telecommunications market, including to Internet and satellite services, the agreement will expose the Chinese people to information, ideas, and debate from around the world. And China's accession to the WTO will help strengthen the rule of law in China and increase the likelihood that it will play by global rules"⁹⁵

Nor is it just an American approach, as the EUs trade commissioner, Pascal Lamy's speech in Beijing in October 2000 illustrates:

"It can only lock in and deepen market reforms, empowering those in the leadership who support further and faster moves towards economic freedom".⁹⁶

The boundaries between economics and politics as academic disciplines also need to be broken down. I suggest that the chief constraint on economic restructuring – particularly within the financial system – is political will, and the biggest challenge to political stability lies in how the leadership handles economic restructuring⁹⁷. Add this to the national-international linkages noted above, and we arrive at a situation that is almost the basic defining characteristic of IPE as a field of enquiry. Returning again to the WTO issue, the delays in reaching a final agreement after the November 1999 agreement between China and the USTRO can largely be explained by considering how domestic political demands in each negotiating partner were played out in an international forum.

It is perhaps worth reiterating that I am not denying that the state is still important. What I am suggesting is that an understanding of the dynamics of power within China needs to be modified. This modification should accept that sovereignty, in the economic sphere at least, is “perforated”⁹⁸ and that external actors now do have an influence over the functioning of the Chinese political economy. As suggested in the introduction, globalization has increased the number of actors in policy making, and, I suggest, increased the power of external actors.

It should also recognise that, in Sassen’s words, the global becomes embedded within the national. She argues that the effects of economic globalization often “materialize in national territories”⁹⁹ and that:

“the strategic spaces where global processes are embedded are often national; the mechanisms through which new legal forms, necessary for globalization, are implemented are often part of national state institutions”¹⁰⁰

Following Sassen, then, we need to investigate the impact of globalization on the institutional balance of power within China’s governmental structures – as suggested in the introduction, to argue that globalization leads to a renegotiation of relationships between state actors. Sassen’s main emphasis was on the shifting balance of power between different ministries and agencies within government – the financial agencies may gain power and influence while others may lose. In the specific case of the WTO, we can suggest that the state organs in charge of reforming the legal structure in WTO conforming manners within the National People’s Congress will play an increasingly important role in shaping the bases of China’s domestic political economy. While separating the state from the party is still an inherently difficult task in China, WTO membership should further strengthen the role of state organs, particularly legal institutions of the NPC, vis-à-vis those of the party. In this respect, fundamental political reform in China is inspired, or perhaps more correctly, facilitated, by an international economic agreement.

What this suggests, then, is that the search for political change in China should not be constrained by views that equate political change with democratisation, or those that conceive that economic reform inevitably leads to democratisation¹⁰¹. Ironically, while such approaches were designed to explain the link between economic and political change, equating political change with political liberalisation can actually contribute to the depoliticisation of analyses of economic change – no liberalisation is equated with no political reform. Abandoning state planning and ownership in favour of market forces and private modes of ownership are clearly not apolitical. But searching for democratisation and liberalisation (at this stage of China’s transition from socialism at least) does not allow us to understand the nature of this political change. Rather, we should be assessing the reformulation of political alliances and strategies – alliances within China’s political elites, between political elites and new economic elites, between elites and societal groups, and between domestic and transnational actors.

Class is important. I noted above the efficacy of using notions of trans-national class alliances to understand the political implications of economic change. But there is also a domestic dynamic to this

change. A recent report from the department of sociology at CASS has outlined how the Chinese social structure can now be divided into ten broad groups, each of which can be subdivided into smaller sub groups¹⁰². Notably, the report uses the definition of *jieceng* or social level, rather than class (*jiejì*), but the basic understanding that economic reform has led to a reformulation of the bases of Chinese society would not be out of place in a class based analysis.

This changes has been occurring long before China's WTO entry. There has, for example, been a relatively large body of work considering the rise of new business elites in China¹⁰³. There is also a smaller body of work that considers the exploitation of Chinese workers (often by party-state managerial classes in collaboration with external capitalists)¹⁰⁴ and the creation of an "underclass" through what Solinger terms the "informalisation" of the Chinese urban economy¹⁰⁵.

But one of the implications of WTO entry could be to accelerate those changes. For example, even under rosy assumptions like those produced by the Beijing Bureau of the World Bank, those industries and sectors that stand to lose most, even under rosy assumptions, are those where the hand of the state – or the hand of the old style of state control – still dominates¹⁰⁶. Those that stand to gain most – in particularly clothing and textiles – are sectors where the new quasi-private sector and foreign ownership dominate. For example, attempts to calculate the impact of WTO entry on China's share of world markets suggest that Chinese exports of clothing will rise from 19.5 per cent of world exports in 1995 to 42.2 per cent in 2005¹⁰⁷. The new opportunities in the service industry will likewise favour those who are not under old-style state control. To call it a quasi-privatisation of the Chinese economy is perhaps pushing it too far – not least because current party-state officials (the party-state bourgeoisie) are key actors in the new non-state economy. But WTO membership will further facilitate the ownership basis of the Chinese economy and the class basis of CCP rule that has been ongoing since 1994.

So while IPE as a discipline is largely concerned with the relationship between state and non-state actors, in the Chinese case, the emphasis should be on how these relationships are emerging. In particular, although the way in which a new bourgeois class (or classes) emerge from within the existing party state elites – and the way that they utilise their political position to enhance their economic position – has been the subject of some good studies¹⁰⁸, it is an issue that warrants further attention.

Finally, we need to consider ideology and ideational change. If "neo-liberalism is hegemonic ideologically and in terms of policy"¹⁰⁹ as Cox suggests, then we need to consider the mechanisms by which it becomes hegemonic. This is partly a result of the use of blunt instruments of power by the core states to enforce change on developing countries. For example, in developing his concept of "disciplinary neoliberalism", Stephen Gill argued that:

"the US government is using access to its vast market as a lever of power, linked to a reshaping of the international business climate, by subjecting other nations to the disciplines

of the new constitutionalism, whilst largely refusing to submit to them itself.”¹¹⁰

Although published almost seven years before China joined the WTO, this understanding could have all but been designed to understand the process.

But there are also many much less blunt ways in which ideas are transferred from one setting to another. Through educational exchanges, the provision of training programmes to allow Chinese officials to become “WTO compliant”, the rise of the internet, and increased access to the outside world, and so on, Chinese academics, government researchers and policy makers. Business people too are developing new concepts and practices through processes of “social learning” and “industrial learning”. Chinese government policy is increasingly being shaped by the actions of pro-market “policy entrepreneurs”, and also by epistemic communities that are often transnational in nature¹¹¹. And just as the Japanese authorities deliberately cultivated people who thought would become the next generation of Chinese leaders in the declining years of the Qing dynasty, so we should consider the various “aid” and “training” packages offered to Chinese officials in the light of WTO entry to have a clear, if not always explicit, political context.

Conclusions

In a special edition of *New Political Economy* in November 2000, Higgott and I called for:

“the need for regional-based groups/communities of scholars to talk more within a disciplinary framework in order to provide a basis for dialogue and comparison”¹¹²

This desire to imbue area studies with more discipline, whilst accepting that more analyses of non-core states can enhance the discipline itself, was also at the core of Payne’s important paper on the political economy of area studies and IPE¹¹³. The aim of this paper, then, is to make a contribution to an understanding of how the area specialists and the disciplinary specialists can come together to improve the study of each.

It starts from an understanding that the way that China “receives” or “responds” to globalization is very much embedded in the specific historical, political and cultural contexts that have influenced the emergence of the contemporary Chinese political economy. But it is no longer possible to simply consider this Chinese political economy by only considering the internal dynamics of change. Through conscious political decision, elements of the Chinese leadership have chosen to integrate China – or at least, parts of China – into the global political economy. In the process, they have allowed Chinese sovereignty, in the economic sphere at least, to become “perforated”, and increased the number of actors in the policy sphere. As Stange so forcefully put it in response to Krasner in the *Review of Political Economy*, “Wake up The world *has* changed”¹¹⁴. We need the country knowledge **and** the disciplinary knowledge to truly understand the dynamics at work.

Good political economy should, almost in conception, be comparative political economy. In developing an IPE framework for the study of contemporary China, we can also contribute to the evolution of a discipline that looks away from the core heartlands of both the global political economy and the

heartlands of IPE academia. As such, the future of both area studies and IPE can perhaps best be enriched by each acknowledging the merits of each other, and facilitating a more comprehensive literature on the political economy of developing states.

References

- 1 For a good recent account of the literature on globalisation and the state, see John Hobson and
M Ramesh (2002) 'Globalisation Makes of States What States Make of It: Between Agency
2 and Structure in the State/Globalisation Debate' *New Political Economy* 7 (1) 2002 pp: 5-22.
3 Anthony Payne (1998) 'The New Political Economy of Area Studies' *Millennium*, 27 (2):
253-273.
- 4 These last three hypotheses are adapted from the unpublished first draft of the introduction to
Jean Grugel and Wil Hout (eds) (1998) *Regionalism Across the North South Divide* (London:
Routledge).
- 5 Kenichi Ohmae (1995) *The End of the Nation State*, (London, Harper Collins).
- 6 For details see Katsuhira Sasuga (2002) "Microregionalization Across Southern China, Hong
Kong And Taiwan" in Shaun Breslin and Glenn Hook (eds) *Microregionalism and World
Order* (Basingstoke: Palgrave).
- 7 I have explored this in more detail in Shaun Breslin (2000) 'Decentralisation, Globalisation
and China's Partial Re-engagement with the Global Economy' *New Political Economy* 5 (2)
pp: 205-226.
- 8 Gerald Chan (1999) *Chinese Perspectives on International Relations* (Basingstoke:
Macmillan).
- 9 Wang Feiling and Yong Deng (eds) (1999) *In The Eyes of the Dragon: China Views the
World* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield).
- 10 Zhang Yongjin (1998) *China In International Society Since 1949: Alienation And Beyond*
(Basingstoke: Macmillan).
- 11 Jia Qingguo, (1996) 'Reflections on the Recent Tension in the Taiwan Strait' *China Journal*
(36) pp: 93-97.
- 12 For example, Morton I. Abramowitz, Yoichi Funabashi, and Wang Jisi (1998) *China-Japan-
U.S. Managing the Trilateral Relationship* (Washington D.C. Brookings).
- 13 I think the classic example of this ultra realism, though a little dated now, is Huang Shuofeng
(1992) *Zonghe Guoli Lun (On comprehensive national power)*, (Beijing: Zhongguo shehui
kexue chubanshe).
- 14 Zhang Yongjin (2000) *The 'English School' in China: A Research Note* (Department of
International Relations RSPAS, ANU) July 2000.
- 15 See, for example, Su Changhe (2002) "Guoji Jiegou yu Guonei Zhengzhi: Guoji Jizhi dui
Zhongguo de Guonei Yingxiang, 1979-1999 (International Structure and Domestic Politics:
International Institutions Impact on China, 1979-1999)" paper presented at *Quanqiuhua yu
Zhongguo de Gaige (Globalisation and China's Reforms)* Fudan University, Shanghai, May.
- 16 Chen Zhimin (2002) "Guoji Jiegou yu Zhongguo Duiwai Zhengce de Xuanze (International
Structures and China's Foreign Policy Options)" paper presented at *Quanqiuhua yu Zhongguo
de Gaige (Globalisation and China's Reforms)* Fudan University, Shanghai, May.
- 17 Knudsen argues that both Ruggie and Wendt "accept more or less implicitly the main tenets of
realism", and that The gap between a social constructivist reading of international politics and
mainstream traditionalism seems smaller than the argumentative rhetoric would lead us to
expect.... I have very little problem with anything set forth by either Ruggie or Wendt in these
two solid books, except that the specifications they advocate seem to add little of consequence
to the theories they want to improve." Olav Knudsen (2001) "Transcending a Fruitless
Debate: Towards a Delimitation of Competing Paradigms" p.10.
<http://www.sh.se/statsvetenskap/files/knudsen.doc>
- 18 Wang Yizhou (1995) *Dangdai Guoji Zhengzhi Xilun (Analysis of Contemporary International
Politics* (Shanghai: Shanghai Renmin Chubanshe). Chapter one covers understandings of
globalisation. As far as I am aware, his latest book on China's Foreign Policy in An Era of
Globalisation has yet to be completed.
- 19 Song Xinning (1999) *Guoji Zhengzhi Jingji Xue Gailun (Introduction to International
Political Economy)* (Beijing: Renmin University Press).
- 20 Wang Yizhou (1998) *Xifang Guoji Zhengzhi Xue: Lishi yu Lilun (Western International
Political Study: History and Theory* (Shanghai: Shanghai Renmin Chubanshe).
- 21 Wang Feiling and Yong Deng (1999) op cit.
- 22 See Steve Smith's various papers on this theme.

23 Song Xinning (2001) 'Building International Relations Theory with Chinese Characteristics' *Journal of Contemporary China* 10 (26), p:71.

24 Ibid p:72.

25 Zhu Wenli (2001) 'International Political Economy from a Chinese Angle' *Journal of Contemporary China* 10 (26), 45–54.

26 Ibid p:48.

27 Song Xinning and Gerald Chan 'International Relations Theory In China' in Weixing Hu, Gerald Chan and Daojiong Zha (2000) *China's International Relations in the 21st Century: Dynamics of Paradigm Shift* (Lanham: University Press of America) p:29.

28 Susan Strange (1990) 'The Name of the Game' in Nicholas Rizopoulos (ed.) *Sea-Changes: American Foreign Policy in a World Transformed* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations).

29 Robert Cox (1990) *Power, Production and World Order* (New York: Columbia University Press).

30 Richard Higgott (1997) *De Facto and De Jure Regionalism: The Double Discourse of Regionalism in the Asia Pacific* in *Global Society* 11 (2) p:173.

31 Ole Wæver (1998) 'A Not So International Discipline: American and European Developments in International Relations' *International Organization* 52 (4) pp: 687-727.

32 Alastair Johnston and Robert Ross (eds) (1999) *Engaging China* (London: Routledge).

33 The requirement to publish within disciplinary journals for career enhancement provides an important part of the explanation here.

34 Chalmers Johnson (1997) 'Preconception vs. Observation, or the Contribution of Rational Choice Theory and Area Studies to Contemporary Political Science' in *PS: Political Science and Politics*, pp: 170-174.

35 Masahiro Kawai and Deepak Bhattasali (2001) 'The Implications of China's Accession to the World Trade Organisation' paper presented at Japan and China: Economic Relations in Transition Jan 2001 Tokyo, p:5.

36 See Richard Higgott (2001), 'Taming Hegemony and Economics, Emboldening International Relations: The Theory and Practice of International Political Economy in an Era of Globalisation', in Stephanie Lawson (ed.) *International Relations Ten Years After the Fall of the Wall*, Cambridge: Polity Press, pp.91-108; and Colin Hay and David Marsh (eds) (1999) *Putting the 'P' Back into IPE a Special Edition of New Political Economy* 4 (1).

37 Bruce Cumings (1997), 'Boundary Displacement: Area Studies and International Studies during and after the Cold War' *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars* 29 (1).

38 Bundy's 1964 speech at John Hopkins, quoted in Sigmund Diamond, *Compromised Campus: The Collaboration of Universities with the Intelligence Community* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), p: 10. This citation taken from Cumings (1997) op cit.

39 Cumings (1997) op cit.

40 Andrew Gamble, Anthony Payne, Ankie Hoogvelt, Michael Dietrich and Michael Kenny (1996) 'Editorial: New Political Economy' *New Political Economy* 1 (1) p: 10.

41 Resat Kasaba (1998) 'Towards a New International Studies' jsis.artsci.washington.edu/programs/is/toanewis.html

42 Ibid.

43 See, for example, the special issue of *The Third World Quarterly* Vol 17 (4) 1996, which assessed how different embedded historical, political, social and 'cultural' contexts led to different developmental outcomes in East Asian states notwithstanding similar internationalising contexts.

44 Ellen Wood (1981) 'The Separation of the Economic and the Political in Capitalism' *New Left Review* (127).

45 Andrew Gamble (1995) 'The New Political Economy', *Political Studies* 43(3), pp.516-30.

46 For example, See Hans-Henrik Holm and Georg Sorensen (eds) (1995) *Whose World Order? Uneven Globalization and the End of the Cold War* (Boulder: Westview Press); Andrew Hurrell and Ngaire Woods (eds) (1999) *Inequality, Globalization, and World Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press); Mitchell Seligson and John Passe-Smith (eds) (1998) *Development and Underdevelopment: the Political Economy of Global Inequality* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner); and Frank Ackerman, Neva Goodwin, Laurie Dougherty and Kevin Gallagher (eds) (2000) *The Political Economy of Inequality* (Washington DC: Island).

47 Andrew Hurrell and Ngaire Woods (1995) 'Globalisation and Inequality' *Millenium* 24 (3) p: 469.

48 Tim Shaw (2000) 'New Regionalisms in Africa in the New Millennium: comparative
 perspectives on renaissance, realisms and/or regressions' in *New Political Economy* 5 (3) p:
 400.

49 Björn Hettne and Frederik Söderbaum (2000) 'Theorising the Rise of Regionness' *New*
Political Economy, 5 (3): 457-473.

50 For Payne, while area studies clearly benefit from being embedded in theory and comparison,
 the theory itself might benefit from being exposed to case studies other than just Europe and
 North America. Payne (1998) op cit.

51 The classic remains Susan Strange (1994) *States and Markets* (London: Pinter).

52 Karel Van Wolferen, (1990) *The Enigma of Japanese Power* (New York: Vintage).

53 Phil Deans (1997) *Japan-Taiwan Relations, 1972-1992: Virtual Diplomacy And The*
Separation Of Politics And Economics (University of Newcastle upon Tyne PhD) pp: 17-43.

54 Karl Polanyi (1944) *The Great Transformation* (Rinehart & Company) p:71.

55 Richard Whitley (1999) *Divergent Capitalisms - The Social Structuring and Change of*
Business Systems (Oxford: Oxford University Press) p: 16.

56 David Coates (2000) *Models of Capitalism: Growth and Stagnation in the Modern Era*
 (Oxford: Blackwell).

57 Colin Crouch and Wolfgang Streeck (eds) (1997) *Political Economy of Modern Capitalism :*
Mapping Convergence and Diversity (London: Sage).

58 Suzanne Berger and Ronald Dore (eds) (1996) *National Diversity and Global Capitalism*
 (Cornell University Press).

59 For a wider discussion of the differences between US and UK IPE, see Craig Murphy and
 Douglas Nelson (2001) 'International political economy: a tale of two heterodoxies' *British*
Journal of Politics and International Relations, 2001, 3 (3) , pp:393-412.

60 Gamble *et al* (1996) op cit p:6.

61 Ibid pp: 5-6.

62 Perhaps the best account of the process by which the perty state elites have 'captured' many of
 the benefits of reform is He Qinglian (1998) *xiandaihue de weixian – dangdai zhongguo de*
jingji shehui wenti (Pitfall's of Modernisation – Contemporary China's Economic and Social
Problems) (Beijing: Jinri Zhongguo Chubanshe).

63 For example, James Mittleman (1999) 'Rethinking the 'New Regionalism' in the Context of
 Globalisation' in Björn Hettne, András Inotai and Osvaldo Sunkel (eds.), *Globalism and the*
New Regionalism (London: Macmillan) p:28; Bjorn Hettne (1999), 'Globalisation and the new
 Regionalism', in Hettne Björn, András Inotai, and Osvaldo Sunkel (eds.), *Globalism and the*
New Regionalism (London: Macmillan) pp:1-24; Hettne and Söderbaum (2000) op cit pp:
 457-473; Shaun Breslin and Richard Higgott (2000) 'Studying Regions: Learning from the
 Old, Constructing the New', *New Political Economy*, 5 (3): 333-352; and Michael Schultz, ,
 Frederik Söderbaum, and Joakim Öjendal (2001) 'Introduction: A Framework for
 Understanding Regionalization' in Michael Schultz, Frederik Söderbaum, and Joakim Öjendal
 (eds) *Regionalization in a Globalizing World: A Comparative Perspective on Forms, Actors*
and Processes, (London: Zed) p:16.

64 Something we tried to redress in Breslin and Hook (2002) op cit.

65 Kenichi Ohmae (1995) *The End of the Nation State*, (London, Harper Collins).

66 Paul Hirst and Grahame Thompson (1999) *Globalization in Question* (Polity).

67 Ian Taylor 'Globalisation' in Nicola Phillips (ed) *Globalising IPE* (Palgrave forthcoming).

68 Andrew Hurrell (1995) 'Explaining the Resurgence of Regionalism In World Politics' *Review*
of International Studies 21, p: 345.

69 Wang Yizhou (2000) 'Political Stability and International Relations in the Process of
 Economic Globalisation'.

70 Mitchell Bernard and John Ravenhill (1995) 'Beyond Product Cycles and Flying Geese:
 Regionalization, Hierarchy, and the Industrialization of East Asia' *World Politics* No 47,
 pp:171-209.

71 Charles Oman (1999) 'Globalization, Regionalization, and Inequality' in Andrew Hurrell and
 Ngaire Woods (eds) *Inequality, Globalisation and World Politics*, (Oxford: Oxford University
 Press): 36-65.

72 Gary Gereffi, Miguel Korzeniewicz, and R.P Korzeniewicz (1984) 'Introduction: Global
 Commodity Chains', in Gary Gereffi and Miguel Korzeniewicz, (eds.) *Commodity Chains and*
Global Capitalism (London: Praeger) 1-14.

73 Specifically, Robert Cox (1981) 'Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond
International relations Theory' in *Millennium* (10); Robert Cox (1983) 'Gramsci, Hegemony
74 and International Relations: An Essay in Method' in *Millennium* (12) and Cox (1990) op cit.
75 Gamble *et al* (1996) op cit pp: 5-12.
76 Anthony Payne and Andrew Gamble, A. (1996) 'Introduction: The Political Economy of
Regionalism and World Order' in Andrew Gamble and Anthony Payne (eds) *Regionalism and
World Order* (Basingstoke: Macmillan) p:15.
77 German Bundestag Study Commission (Select Committee) (2001) *Globalisation of the World
Economy – Challenges and Responses*
http://www.bundestag.de/gremien/welt/welt_zwischenbericht/zwb003_vorw_einl_engl.pdf
78 Susan Strange (1996) *The Retreat of the State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
pp:44-5.
79 Paul Bowles (1997) 'ASEAN, AFTA and the "New Regionalism"' *Pacific Affairs* 70 (2) pp:
219-233. Though in light of the financial crises of 1997, a feature of the new "new
regionalism" is an attempt to moderate to excesses of unrestrained capitalism. See Shaun
Breslin, Chris Hughes, Nicola Phillips and Ben Rosamond (eds) (2002) *New Regionalisms in
the Global Political Economy: Theories and Cases* (London: Routledge)
80 German Bundestag Study Commission (Select Committee) (2001) *Globalisation of the World
Economy – Challenges and Responses* op cit.
81 Robert Scalapino, (1991-2) 'The United States and Asia: Future Prospects' *Foreign Affairs*,
Winter: 19-40.
82 Sklair outlines four groups that constitute the new transnational elite class in the South. In
addition to globalising state bureaucrats, these are Capitalist-inspired politicians,
Transnational corporation executives and their local affiliates, and Consumerist elites. Leslie
Sklair (1995) *Sociology of the Global System* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press) pp:
135-136.
83 Robert Cox (1999) 'Civil Society at the Turn of the Millennium: Prospects for an Alternative',
Review of International Studies, vol. 25, no. 1, January 1999, p: 12.
84 Gilbert Rozman (1998) 'Flawed Regionalism: Reconceptualizing Northeast Asia in the 1990s'
The Pacific Review, 11 (1).
85 Glenn Hook (1998) *Japan's Role in Microregionalism: The Yellow Sea Economic Zone*.
Unpublished manuscript. Glenn Hook (1999) 'Japan and microregionalism: Constructing the
Japan Sea Rim Zone', in Yoshinobu Yamamoto (ed.) *Globalism, Regionalism and
Nationalism. Asia in Search of its Role in the 21st Century* (Oxford: Blackwells), pp: 126-41.
86 ie: components producers moving to China to follow their key partners.
Who act as negotiators. See Glenn Hook (2000) 'Building Yellow Sea Bridges: Kyushu's role
in Sino-Japanese relations' Conference Paper cited with author's permission.
87 Barry Naughton (ed) (1997) *The China Circle : Economics and Electronics in the PRC,
Taiwan, and Hong Kong* (Washington: Brookings).
88 Gary Hamilton (ed) (2000) *Cosmopolitan Capitalists* (Seattle: University of Washington
Press).
89 Alan Smart (2000) 'The emergence of Local Capitalisms in China: Overseas Chinese
Investment and Pattern of Development' in Si-Ming Li and Wing-Shing Tang (eds) *China's
Regions, Polity, & Economy: A Study of Spatial Transformation in the Post-Reform Era*
(Hong Kong: UHKP) p: 74
90 As I tried to do using Hong Kong customs data in Shaun Breslin (1999) "The Politics of
Chinese Trade and the Asian Financial Crises: Questioning the Wisdom of Export Led
Growth" in *Third World Quarterly* 20 (6): pp1179-1199.
91 An even more nuanced approach was taken by Feng and Liu, who recalculated Sino-American
trade taking into account the difference between FOB and CIF prices, re-exports through
Hong Kong, and also smuggling. They concluded that the Sino-US trade imbalance was
almost (but not quite) half-way between the Chinese and American figures. Feng Guozhao
and Liu Zunyi, "A New Estimation on the Trade Imbalance Between America and China",
International Economic Review (Guoji Jingji Pinglun), 1999, (5-6).
92 The Chinese authorities used this example to show that despite China's trade surplus with the
US, the actual benefit to China was much less than the cost of the doll as it entered the US
market, and in fact, most of the financial benefits were accrued by companies outside China.
State Council, *On Sino-US Trade Balance*, Beijing: Information Office of the State Council

Of the People's Republic of China, March 1997. See also "Barbie and the World Economy", *Los Angeles Times*, 22 September 1996.

93 Only one Taiwanese computer firm is actually producing integrated boards within China. Katsuhira Sasuga (2002) *The Dynamics of Cross-Border Micro-Regionalisation Between Guangdong, Taiwan and Japan: Sub-national Governments, Multinational Corporations and the emergence of Multi-Level Governance* (University of Warwick PhD).

94 See, for example, David Zweig (1995) "Developmental Communities" on China's Coast: The Impact of Trade, Investment, and Transnational Alliances', *Comparative Politics*, 27 (3), pp. 253-274.

95 'The U.S.-China WTO Agreement Will Help Promote Reform, Accountability, and Openness in China' The White House Office of the Press Secretary March 8, 2000
<http://usinfo.state.gov/regional/ea/uschina/wtofact2.htm>
<http://www.ecd.org.cn/WTO/1023.htm>

96 Shaun Breslin (2002) '(Still) Learning to Live Without the Plan: The Politics of Financial Reform in the People's Republic of China' in Geoffrey Underhill and Zhang Xiaoke (eds) *International Financial Governance under Stress: Global Structures versus National Imperatives* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) forthcoming.

97 See Ivo Duchacek (1990) 'Perforated Sovereignties: Towards a Typology of New Actors in International Relations' In Hans Michelmann and Panayotis Soldatos (eds) *Federalism and International Relations: The Role of Subnational Units* (New York: Oxford University Press). Zheng Yongnian has applied this concept to the study of provincial trade policies in China in Zheng Yongnian (1994) 'Perforated sovereignty: Provincial dynamism of China's foreign trade' *Pacific Review*, 7 (3): pp: 309-321.

98 Saskia Sassen (1999) 'Embedding the Global in the National: Implications for the Role of the State' in David Smith, Dorothy Solinger and Steven Topik (eds) *States and Sovereignty in the Global Economy* (London: Routledge) p: 159.

99 Ibid p: 167.

100 For example, see David Potter, David Goldblatt, Margaret Kiloh, and Paul Lewis (eds) (1997) *Democratization* (Oxford: Polity Press).

101 The ten broad headings are (1)state and social management (guojia yu shehui huanli); (2) economic management (jingli); (3) private enterprise owners (siying quanyezhu); (4) specialised technological personnel (zhuanye jishu renyuan) (5) administrative personnel (banshi renyuan); (6) individual industrial and business households (geti gongshanghu); (7) business service personnel (shangye fuwu renyuan); (8) (business) workers (shangye gingren) (9) agricultural workers (nongye laodongzhe) (10) urban unemployed (literally urban without work to include laid off workers), unemployed and "semi" unemployed personnel (chengshi wuye, shiye he ban shiye renyuan).Lu Xuyi (chief ed.) (2002) *Research Report on Contemporary China's Social Levels (dangdai zhongguo shehui jieceng jianjiu baogu)* (Beijing: Social Science Publishers for the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences).

102 Examples of this pre-WTO literature include Margaret Pearson (1999) *China's New Business Elite: The Political Consequences of Economic Reform* (Berkeley: University of California Press); David Goodman, D (1995) "New Economic Elites" in Robert Benewick and Paul Wingrove (eds) *China in the 1990s* (Basingstoke: Macmillan); and Susan Young (1995) *Private Business and Economic Reform in China* (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe).

103 For example, see Anita Chan (1996) 'Boot Camp at the Show Factory: Regimented Workers in China's Free Labour Market' *The Washington Post* 3 Nov, and Anita Chan (2001) *China's Workers under Assault: The Exploitation of Labor in a Globalizing Economy* (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe). Deng Liqun has also warned of the dangers of the emergence of a "new capitalist class" which exploits workers and farmers, and called for the party to be "prepared for a new class struggle". See China News Digest 7 May 2000.

104 Dorothy Solinger (2001) *The New Crowd of the Dispossessed: Factory Layoffs and the Informalization of the Urban Economy* (University of Warwick Centre for the Study of Globalisation and Regionalisation Working Paper 81/01).

105 Kawai and Bhattasali (2001) op cit.

106 Martin Ianchovichina and Emiko Fukase 2000 'Comparative Study of Trade Liberalization Regimes: The Case of China's Accession to the WTO' Third Annual Conference on Global Economic Analysis, Monash, Melbourne, June 2000.

107 See Barbara Krug, (1997) *Privatisation In China: Something to Learn From* (Rotterdam: Erasmus University Management Report No 2); Chan (1996) op cit; Chan (2001) op cit;

108

-
- David Wank (1999) *Commodifying Communism: Business, Trust and Politics in a Chinese City* (New York: Cambridge University Press); He Qinglian (1998) op cit; Jean-François Huchet and Xavier Richet (2000) *Between Bureacracy and Market* (CEFC Working Paper No 2).
- ¹⁰⁹ Robert Cox (1999) op cit p: 12.
- ¹¹⁰ Stephen Gill (1995) 'Globalisation, Market Civilisation, and Disciplinary Neoliberalism' in *Millennium* 24 (3) p:415.
- ¹¹¹ Even if the role of non-state actors is less in China than Haas envisaged in discussing the growing complexity of policy making in Peter Haas (1992) 'Introduction: epistemic communities and international policy coordination' *International Organization* 46(1): pp: 1-36.
- ¹¹² Breslin and Higgott (2000) op cit p: 343.
- ¹¹³ Payne (1998) op cit pp: 253-273.
- ¹¹⁴ Susan Strange (1994) 'Wake up Krasner! The world *has* changed' in *RIPE* 1 (2) pp: 209-219.