

Foreign Policy & People's Republic of China 2024 (ISP/GIST & POLS 678)

Professor John James Kennedy
Classroom: CGSC 1103 and Zoom
Class Time: Wed 4:30-6:30 pm
Course: GIST and POLS 678

Office Hours: Appointment E-mail or Zoom
Office number: 864-9025
E-mail: kennedy1@ku.edu
Webpage: <https://www.johnjameskennedy.com/>

Scope and Purpose:

This hybrid course will survey and analyze the foreign relations of the PRC including the evolving relationships between China and other major global and regional actors such as the United States, Korea (North and South), Taiwan, Russia as well as African Nations. In general, the course is divided into four parts: Ideology and Practice, Cold War and post-Cold War Relations (US-China), China's Relations with its neighbors. Most of the course will focus on regional and bilateral relations including in-class debates from China and other country perspectives.

Readings:

No Textbook: All Readings will be posted on Canvas

All the listed readings for the lecture should be read before the class session.

Grading:

The course grade will be based on one mid-term, a paper and the final exam:

Debates: 30%	Midterm (2/7/24): 35%	Final Exam (3/6/24): 35%
--------------	-----------------------	--------------------------

**No Final Paper (debate write assignments)

Mid Term and Final Exams (35%)—Take Home Exam:

The mid-term and final exams are based on readings, debates, films and lecture material. It is your responsibility to know what has happened in class. A curve is *not* used in the grading, so you are not competing with each other. One week before each exam the instructor will hand out (and post on Canvas) a Study Guide. Although the study guide is comprehensive, nothing will be on the exam that is not on the study guide. The Mid-term and Final exam will consist of three parts: (1) identify a number of terms with a single sentence answer, (2) identify concepts and issues with a single paragraph answer and (3) essay questions. The total points possible is 100. Grading for each section is as follows part 1: 30 points, part 2: 30 points and part 3: 40 points. The final is not cumulative.

Debate Papers (30%):

We will use in-person debate groups or Zoom breakout sessions for on-line debate groups. Each paper is worth ten points. The reaction paper is due the following session. For example, if the debate occurs on Wednesday, January 24th, then the debate paper is due the following session on Wednesday, January 31st.

The debate papers are about 2-3 pages double spaced 12 point *not* including a reference page. The main point of the debate paper is to clearly articulate the position you supported during in-class as well as your own opinion.

Grading Criteria for Debate Papers [10 points possible total]:

(1) The structure of the debate paper starts with the stated issue such as “China and African Nations” or “China and US relations.” This is only a few sentences. [1 pt]

(2) Clearly state your debate group’s initial position and the opposing positions. Next write out the key debate question (or one of the key questions) from your handout. [1 pt]

(3) Then address the following *three* questions based on available evidence. Evidence includes data/statistics, reliable reports/information, policies, historical events or past actions. [3.1] Using evidence from the readings and other sources, how did your group support the position with evidence? This is for the first stage of the debate. [3.2] What was the *strongest evidence* that you think supported your argument? [3.3] What was the *weakest evidence*? This is the second stage of the debate (about a page). [3 pts]

(4) Then address the following two questions: [4.1] How did the final debate (larger group) play out in class? [4.2] In your opinion, which position had the *strongest argument*? Why? Remember support your opinion with evidence. This is the final stage of the debate (about half page). [3 pts]

(5) The conclusion should be *your opinion* on the outcome of the debate. Do you personally agree with the position of your group? Why or why not? In this part, you do not have to take the position of your debate group, but rather your own position. (This is about a half page) [2 pts]

E-Mail: I will communicate with you through e-mail to answer questions regarding class assignments and exams. However, all e-mail will receive a response within 24 hours. Regarding exams, I will *not* give exact answers for possible exam questions, but rather I will provide information to help you find the answers.

Canvas: This course will use Canvas (<https://canvas.ku.edu/>). I will post the lecture outlines, study guides and assignments on Canvas. If you are not familiar with this web site or need more information let me know.

Class and Debate Schedule: The official class time is 4:30-6:30 pm. I will split up each class into several sessions/recorded lectures/in-person debates. The general plan is as follows:

First two weeks:

Recorded Lecture (about 60-90 minutes: watch any time before official class time)

Open Discussion (about 90-120 minutes)

The other seven weeks (Debates):

Recorded Lecture (about 60-90 minutes: watch any time before official class time)

Debate (about 60-90 minutes)

Open Discussion (about 30 minutes)

The Structure of the Debates:

First students are divided into small county groups with one position (we will use Zoom breakout rooms). For example, in the China-Russia debate, we start with four groups of 5 or so students. These groups work together to collect the evidence to support their position while also keeping in mind the opposing (or other) position/countries. *Hint: This is where you discuss the evidence for your Group's position (see 3.1 in "Grading Debate Paper Criteria")*

Group 1: China View (A): cooperative relations with Russia

Group 2: China View (B): conflictive relation with Russia

Group 3: Russian View (A): cooperative relations with China

Group 4: Russian View (B): conflictive relation with China

Then after these groups meet to discuss and agree on key evidence to support their position, you will join (merge) with your assigned county group. For example, in the China-Russia debate Groups 1 and 2 merge and Groups 3 and 4 merge. At this stage the two opposing views for China (now Group 1) must come up with a single China position. The same with the Russia group (now Group 2). The two opposing positions must come up with a single Russia position. *Hint: this is where you determine your country group's strongest and weakest evidence for your debate essay (see 3.2 and 3.3 in "Grading Debate Paper Criteria")*.

Group 1: China View (A): cooperative relations with Russia

Group 1: China View (B): conflictive relation with Russia

Group 2: Russian View (A): cooperative relations with China

Group 2: Russian View (B): conflictive relation with China

Finally the large class debate is when the countries (in this case China-Russia) debate the county positions. *Hint: this is where you determine the strongest/weakest argument for the debate paper (see 4.1 and 4.2 in "Grading Debate Paper Criteria")*.

Group 1: China (A or B-one position)

Group 2: Russia (A or B-one position)

Week 1 (January 10) Introduction, History, Culture and Ideology in China's FP

Part 1: Introduction

Part 2: Major Traditions and Ideologies

Part 3: Historical Continuities and Territorial Integrity

Readings: Zhao, "The Power of the Past Over the Present" from *The Dragon Roars Back: Transformative Leaders and Dynamics of Chinese Foreign Policy* (Stanford University Press, 2022); Hunt, "The Pertinence of the Past" (pp. 3-28) from *The Genesis of Chinese Communist Foreign Policy* (N.Y., N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 1996) pp, 3-28

Soft Power: Nye, Joseph S. "Soft power: the evolution of a concept." *Journal of Political Power* 14, no. 1 (2021): 196-208.

Week 2 (January 17): No Class

"Inside China's Tech Boom" NOVA PBS

<https://www.pbs.org/video/inside-chinas-tech-boom-1tqyht/>

Week 3: (January 24) Ideology and Practice in the Making of Chinese Foreign Policy; Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), China's Soft and Hard Power

Part 4: Theory (Multi polar World), International Relations

Part 5: Structure and Process

Part 6: Belt and Road Initiative (BRI): Indicators of China's strength including domestic political and social control and legitimacy.

Readings: Fareed Zakaria, "The Self-Doubting Superpower: America Shouldn't Give Up on the World It Made" *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 2024; Kevin Rudd, "The World According to Xi Jinping" *Foreign Affairs* (Nov/Dec 2022); Jack Snyder, "One World, Rival Theories" *Foreign Policy* (Nov/Dec 2004) pp.53-62

BRI Readings: BRI Summary: Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) Backgrounder "China's Massive Belt and Road Initiative" February 2023

<https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/chinas-massive-belt-and-road-initiative>

Global and Domestic Challenges for China's BRI, Carnegie Endowment March 2023

<https://carnegieendowment.org/2023/03/03/belt-and-road-initiative-is-still-china-s-gala-but-without-as-much-luster-pub-89207>

Week 4: (January 31): Sino-Soviet (Russian) Relations: Alliance to Enemy and Friendship?

Part 7: Sino-Soviet

Part 8: Sino-Russian Relations

Readings: China-Russia Relations, Congressional Research Service, September 2023;
Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) Background: “China and Russia: Exploring Ties
Between Two Authoritarian Powers” June 14, 2022

<https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/china-russia-relationship-xi-putin-taiwan-ukraine>;
Xin, Zhang. "Chinese Perspectives on China-Russia Relations since 24 February 2022."
Russian Analytical Digest 296 (2023): 2-4.

Short Readings for Debate: “What Are the Key Strengths of the China-Russia
Relationship?” China Power (Center for Strategic and International Studies), August
2022: <https://chinapower.csis.org/china-russia-relationship-strengths-benefit/>
“What Are the Key Weaknesses of the China-Russia Relationship?” China Power (Center
for Strategic and International Studies), August 2022: <https://chinapower.csis.org/china-russia-relationship-weaknesses-mistrust/>

Sino-Russia Debate

Part 9: Debate (1): Is Russia more of a potential ally or a potential enemy? Does
Russia have more to fear from China’s intentions and foreign interests or is it the other
way around?

China View (A): cooperative relations with Russia

China View (B): conflictive relation with Russia

Russian View (A): cooperative relations with China

Russian View (B): conflictive relation with China

China (A/B) vs. Russia (A/B)

Week 5 (February 7): China and African Nations and Natural Resources

Part 10: China and African nations

Readings: McCauley, John F., Margaret M. Pearson, and Xiaonan Wang. “Does Chinese
FDI in Africa inspire support for a China model of development?” *World Development*
150 (2022): “China’s Emerging Africa Strategy Implications for the United States” NBR
September, 2022.

Data for the Debate: Deborah Brautigam (2022), “Twenty Years of Data on China’s
Africa Lending” China-Africa Research Initiative at the School of Advanced
International Studies, Johns Hopkins University (7 pages): See <http://www.sais-cari.org/>
for up-to-date data (as of January 2024); “China’s Slowing Economy Will Hit Sub-
Saharan Africa’s Growth” IMF, November 2023

<https://www.imf.org/en/News/Articles/2023/11/09/cf-chinas-slowng-economy-will-hit-sub-saharan-africas-growth>

Chinese Loans to Africa Database (Boston University)
<https://www.bu.edu/gdp/chinese-loans-to-africa-database/>

Part 11 Debate (2): Is China's diplomatic and economic involvement with many African countries based more on history and common international interests such as sovereignty and non-interference OR is based more on current and future energy needs? Is China's growing presence on the African continent a threat to US interests in Africa?

China View (A): Third World Solidarity and shared sovereignty interests
China View (B): Domestic concerns for energy demands

American View (A): China's growing presence on the African continent is a threat
American View (B): China's growing presence on the African continent is NOT a threat

African Union View (A): China's growing presence on the African continent is negative
African Union View (B): China's growing presence on the African continent is positive

China (A/B) vs. America (A/B) vs. AU (A/B)

Week 6 (February 14): PRC and Taiwan (ROC)

Part 12: Taiwan's Political System and Transition

Part 13: PRC Policy: Nationalism and Unity and Recent PRC/ROC Relations

Reading: Bonnie Glaser and Jessica Chen Weiss, "Taiwan and the True Sources of Deterrence: Why America Must Reassure, Not Just threaten, China" *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 2024; "Why China-Taiwan Relations Are So Tense" CFR August 2023: <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/china-taiwan-relations-tension-us-policy-biden#chapter-title-0-2>; Rigger, Shelley (2019), "The Taiwan Relations Act: Past, Present, Future" *Asia Policy* 26, no. 4: 11-17.

Debate Readings: "In Defense of Strategic Ambiguity in the Taiwan Strait" NBR October, 2021 at <https://www.nbr.org/publication/in-defense-of-strategic-ambiguity-in-the-taiwan-strait/>; Haass, Richard, and David Sacks. "American Support for Taiwan Must Be Unambiguous." *Foreign Affairs* 2 (2020).

Part 14: Debate (3): Should the USA abandon the strategic ambiguity policy and clearly state its commitment to defend Taiwan if attacked by the PRC? Should the U.S. maintain Strategic Ambiguity about the US commitment to defend Taiwan?

Should the PRC leadership be a more flexible and conciliatory towards Taiwan? Should the PRC leadership adopt a more hard-line stance towards Taiwan?

Should the ROC leadership adopt a more independent (and risky) stance towards the PRC?
Should the ROC leadership adopt less independence stance and closer relations with PRC?

PRC View (A): flexible and conciliatory towards Taiwan
PRC View (B): hard-line stance towards Taiwan

American View (A): abandon the strategic ambiguity policy
American View (B): maintain the strategic ambiguity policy

ROC View (A-Pan-Green): more independent (and risky) stance
ROC View (B-Pan-Blue): less independence stance

PRC (A/B) vs. America (A/B) vs. ROC (A/B)

Debate Readings: “PRC White Paper—The One China Principle and the Taiwan Issue”
February 2000 (12 pages); Official Document, US Congress Taiwan Relations Act, 1979;
Official Document, Anti-Secession Law, PR China 2005

****Midterm Exam Posted and Uploaded on Canvas (Material from January 10 to
February 7) Assigned Wednesday, February 14th at 9:00 pm due Friday, February
16th at 11:59 pm.**

Week 7 (February 21): Sino–American Relations

Part 15: China’s View of the Sino-US Relations

Part 16: America’s View of the US-China Relations

Readings (Chinese View): Zhao, Minghao. “Is a new Cold War inevitable? Chinese perspectives on US–China strategic competition.” *The Chinese Journal of International Politics* 12, no. 3 (2019): 371-394; “How China views “strategic competition” with the United States” *The Interpreter*, Lowy Institute, February 2022
<https://www.lowyinstitute.org/the-interpreter/how-china-views-strategic-competition-united-states>

Readings (American View): Graham Allison, “The Thucydides Trap: Are the U.S. and China Headed for War?” *The Atlantic*, 2015. Brands, Hal, and John Lewis Gaddis. “The New Cold War: America, China, and the Echoes of History.” *Foreign Affairs*. 100 (2021); Ross, Robert S. “It’s not a cold war: competition and cooperation in US–China relations.” *China International Strategy Review* 2, no. 1 (2020): 63-72; Hass, Ryan. “What America Wants from China: A Strategy to Keep Beijing Entangled in the World Order.” *Foreign Affairs*. 102 (2023).

Additional Reading (Data): “Americans Are Critical of China’s Global Role” Pew Research Report, April 12, 2023 [survey data on American public opinion towards China]
<https://www.pewresearch.org/global/2023/04/12/americans-are-critical-of-chinas-global-role-as-well-as-its-relationship-with-russia/>

“How Do the Chinese People View the “West”?” Stanford Center on China’s Economy and Institutions, June 1, 2023 [survey data on Chinese public opinion towards America] <https://sccci.fsi.stanford.edu/china-briefs/how-do-chinese-people-view-west-divergence-and-asymmetry-chinas-public-opinion-us-and>

Should the USA accept a more powerful/peaceful China and consider greater engagement with the PRC? Or should America take a more cautious stance and attempt to contain a more powerful and not necessarily peaceful China?

China View (A): interdependence and engagement with America

China View (B): autonomy and anti-US containment posture towards America

American View (A): engagement with China

American View (B): containing China

China (A/B) vs. America (A/B): Given the evidence and outcome from the debate, can China and the United States avoid the Thucydides Trap?

Discussion: Results of the debate and the implications for US-China relations on the African continent (African nations), China-Taiwan-USA and the South China Sea.

Week 8 (February 28) China and North Korea

Part 18: PRC and North Korea and Guest Speaker

Part 19 Debate (5): North Korean Nuclear Crisis (simulation)

North Korean View: Do not let US or China determine the development of defensive nuclear weapons: How do you use the nuclear develop as a bargaining tool for needed resources such as food aid, oil and consumer goods?

China View (A): Veto the use of force against the DPRK

China View (B): Support the use of force against the DPRK

American View (A): Support the use of force against the DPRK

American View (B): No support for the use of force against the DPRK

DPRK (A/B) vs. America (A/B) vs. China (A/B)

Readings: “The China-North Korea Relationship” *Council on Foreign Relations*, March 2020 (<https://www.cfr.org/background/china-north-korea-relationship>); “North Korea and China Aren’t the Allies You Think They Are.” Rand Corporation, September 2023 <https://www.rand.org/pubs/commentary/2023/09/north-korea-and-china-arent-the-allies-you-think-they.html>; “North Korea Is Joining China and Russia in Confronting the US” 38 North, March 2022, <https://www.38north.org/2022/03/north-korea-is-joining-china-and-russia-in-confronting-the-us/> “The China-North Korea Strategic Rift: Background and Implications for the United States,” U.S.-China Economic and Security Review

Commission Report, January 24, 2022; Debate Readings: Official Document, Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Assistance, 1967 (2 pages)

Week 9 (March 6): South China Sea and Maritime Disputes

Part 20: China Perspective on the South China Sea

Part 21: US and Regional Nations Perspective

Readings: "Territorial Disputes in the South China Sea" Council on Foreign Relations, December 19, 2023 <https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/territorial-disputes-south-china-sea>

US Department of State LIMITS IN THE SEAS No. 150 "People's Republic of China: Maritime Claims in the South China Sea" January 2022 (Pages 1-11)

PRC Ministry of Foreign Affairs Official Position Paper and response to US Department of State released a *Limits in the Seas No. 150* from the PRC Foreign Ministry Official Web site on the South China Sea in English <https://www.fmprc.gov.cn/nanhai/eng/>

Nguyễn Anh, Cường. "The South China Sea for China, the United States, and what choice for Vietnam." *Cogent Social Sciences* 9, no. 1 (2023):

PRC View (A): flexible and conciliatory towards US and Vietnam

PRC View (B): hard-line stance towards US and Vietnam

American View (A): maintain position in South China Sea, but flexible

American View (B): maintain position in South China Sea and hard containment

Vietnam View (A): work with China and even conciliatory to make concessions

Vietnam View (B): hard line stance towards China regarding the islands

Part 22: Debate (4): Should the China accept interdependence with the US and consider greater engagement with America? Can China backtrack on South China Sea advances given the nationalist claims and domestic support? Should China maintain greater autonomy from the US and take a more anti-US containment posture in the South China Sea?

Week 9 (March 6-8)

****Final Exam Posted and Uploaded on Canvas (Material from February 14th to March 6th) Assigned March 6th 9:00 pm and due March 8th at 11:59 pm.**