

From the Discourse of “Sino-West” to “Globalization”: Chinese Perspectives on Globalization

GHC 04/1

March 2004

WORKING PAPER SERIES

Yu Keping
China Center for Comparative Politics



**Institute on Globalization
and the HUMAN CONDITION**

KTH 234, 1280 Main St W, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON L8S 4M4
(905) 525-9140 Ext. 27556 <http://www.humanities.mcmaster.ca/~global/>

**GLOBALIZATION AND AUTONOMY
MONDIALISATION ET AUTONOMIE**



Preface

Professor Yu Keping is the Director of the China Center for Comparative Politics and Economics (CCCPE) of Beijing University, a leading institution in the study of comparative political economy in the People's Republic of China. He graciously accepted my invitation to join the Globalization and Autonomy research project as an expert adviser shortly after the project began in 2002. In this working paper, Professor Yu Keping speaks about the emergence and growth of debates and discussions of globalization in China. He notes that these debates have grown in significance as the People's Republic has moved to open its economy and to 'reform' its internal economic structures. He discusses some of the different views of globalization found in the Chinese academy and adds that some scholars wish to confine the concept to economic developments. Others speak of the political and cultural globalizing processes and of their potential threat to Chinese political autonomy and cultural distinctiveness. In tracing the lines of these debates, Yu Keping moves then to examine the similarities and differences between them and intellectual discussions earlier in the 20th century focused on the relationship between Chinese cultural uniqueness and Westernization and between socialism and capitalism. He concludes that although there are some similarities between current debates on globalization and these earlier discussions, the globalization debates appear now to be superseding some of the binary oppositions in the earlier ones. Chinese scholars increasingly accept that China is *in globalization*, that this position offers the country some advantages, particularly in the economic realm, and that it poses some challenges. The challenges come both from the dominance of globalization by the developed countries and from devising policies that preserve these advantages, while defending and expanding Chinese economic, political and cultural autonomy.

William D. Coleman
Editor, Working Paper Series

From the Discourse of ‘Sino-West’ to ‘Globalization’: Chinese Perspectives on Globalization

Yu Keping, *China Center for Comparative Politics & Economics*

“Globalization” has become a fashionable term, and is itself as globalized as McDonald’s, the Internet and the film *Titanic*. So wherever in the West or the East, in developing or developed countries, or in capitalist or socialist countries, people are talking about “globalization,” so too are they doing in China. All popular theories in the West tend to have repercussions in China sooner or later, as the examples of modernization theory, post-modern theory and globalization theory demonstrate. Modernization theory, which prevailed in the West in the 1950s and 1960s, did not become popular in China until the 1980s, while globalization theory, which came to prominence in the West in the early 1990s, has been a hot topic in China since the mid-1990s. This fact itself is a good indicator that globalization has been an inevitable trend shaping the development process of the world, including China. Having introduced reforms that open the country’s economy to the world markets, and as an active member of the international community, China is necessarily facing the effects of globalization. As a result, Chinese politicians and scholars are posing questions about how to respond to the challenges and opportunities that globalization presents.

Perceptive Chinese scholars responded as soon as they noted the lively debates in the West about globalization at the beginning of 1990s. They introduced Western scholars’ views on globalization into Chinese intellectual circles and advocated studying them. In 1993, the Institute of Comparative Politics and Economics of Beijing University invited Professor Arif Dirlik of Duke University to come to Beijing for a series of lectures on globalization and capitalism, which were published in the initial issue of *Strategy and Management* in 1993 as “Capitalism under Globalization.” Dirlik’s article was regarded as the first to introduce Western globalization theories systematically and it had a great impact in Chinese intellectual circles. Professor Li Shenzhi, former Vice President of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, wrote a few papers where he advocated and encouraged studies on globalization in China. In this respect, he came to be recognized as one of the earliest Chinese advocates of studies of globalization.

Chinese awareness of the effects of globalization was heightened when Asia experienced a serious financial crisis in 1997. The wave of the crisis originated in Thailand and Indonesia and then spread to Malaysia, Singapore, South Korea and Japan. Although China has not yet been affected deeply by the Asian financial crisis, it did highlight for Chinese scholars the potential dangers of financial crises that might result from economic globalization. Mr. Jiang Zeming, President and General Secretary of the Communist Party of China (CPC), said on 9 March 1998, “we have to recognize and treat properly the issue of economic ‘globalization.’ Economic globalization is an objective trend of world economic development, from which none can escape and in which everyone has to participate. The key point is to see dialectically this trend of ‘globalization,’ i.e. see both its positive aspect and its negative aspect. It is particularly important for developing countries” (Zeming 1998). The interest in globalization expressed by the country’s top leader provided a great impetus to scholars and analysts engaging in studies of globalization, and made it a pressing issue for intellectuals. A number of essays on globalization have since been published and some important Western works on globalization such as *The Trap of Globalization* were translated into Chinese. The Institute of Comparative Politics and Economics has gone even further in editing a Globalization Series which includes seven books: *Antinomies of Glo-*

balization, Marxism and Globalization, Socialism and Globalization, Capitalism and Globalization, Globalization and China, Globalization and the World, and Globalization and Post-Colonial Criticism.

The debate on globalization among Chinese intellectuals focuses on the following main issues:

1. Conception of globalization. What is globalization and what essential features does globalization have?
2. Types of globalization. Besides economic globalization, are a nation-state's politics and culture subjected to globalization? If so, are there trends toward political and cultural globalization?
3. Implications of globalization for China. Is globalization above all a universalizing process or one which demands a reinforcement of national autonomy? What policies should China follow?
4. Globalization's advantages and disadvantages. Is globalization a blessing or a disaster for China's modernization and development? We examine each of these issues in the following sections of the paper.

Conceptions of Globalization

In order to study globalization, it is necessary to define and understand what is meant by it. In the attempt to define globalization, there are essentially three different opinions among Chinese scholars. Proponents of the first view argue that globalization is a process manifesting as a holistic propensity for integration of human life that reaches beyond regions and national boundaries. In other words, it stands for "an objective historic process and tendency of contemporary human development beyond nation-state boundaries, which is unfolding as global communication, global networks and global interactions" (Tuo 1998:20). Some go further to explain that the essential meaning of globalization lies in the global consensus beyond spatial, cultural and institutional barriers, in the global interdependence among nations and regions, and in the fact that as communication develops and international connections become tighter, human beings all over the world are facing common problems and therefore seeking to cooperate in order to resolve these problems (Junjiou 1998: 127).

The second view regards globalization simply as global capitalism at a new stage and new form of development. In the viewpoint of these authors, globalization is nothing but a logical result of contemporary capitalist development, a universalization of the capitalist mode of production. It is said that "fundamentally speaking, the present economic globalization is a globalization under the control of contemporary capitalism. So called issues of globalization are essentially issues of contemporary capitalism, especially of developed capitalism." Concretely, "in the perspective of the dynamic mechanism and its realistic foundation, the historic necessity of globalization should be found in the capitalist mode of production" (Caoren & Zhiwei 1998: 138). According to this logic of thinking, globalization is only a temporary form and even a synonym for capitalism. Thus, it is also called "late capitalism, developed capitalism, disorganized capitalism, transitional capitalism, globalized capitalism, post-Fordism and so on" (Fengzheng 1998: 91).

If globalization is the latest form of capitalism and the Western developed countries, especially the United States, are natural representatives of contemporary capitalism, it is plausible to conclude that globalization means Westernization. This is the third conception of globalization prevailing among a very few intellectuals in China. In this conception, globalization is characterized by the identification and universalization of human values, where the source of those values is perceived to be Western developed countries, specifically the United States. As one author pointed out, in the Chinese context, intellectuals with an orientation toward liberalism are inclined to define globalization as Westernization or Americanization by identifying or representing Western or American political, economic and cultural values and standards as "the world trend" and "universal values" (Yiwu 1998:82,86).

Above all, globalization encourages increasing homogeneity in human development on the basis of economic integration. Globalization involves homogenizing processes in politics, the economy and culture, among

nations fundamentally anchored on the intensification of financial and productive integration. Economic globalization is a necessary consequence of the development of a market economy that extends beyond national and regional boundaries in the form of a world market. Undoubtedly, Western developed countries have launched and dominate the globalization process, both making the rules of globalization and controlling rulemaking processes. They are trying to spread their political and cultural values to other countries, while casting them as universal ones for human beings the world over. Thus it might be reasonable to understand globalization as the process of homogenizing human experience, and thus as the latest development of capitalism, and as Westernization or Americanization.

Contradictory Aspects of Globalization

Nevertheless, each of the above definitions reflects only one of the essential aspects of globalization. The process of globalization by nature is intensively contradictory: it has tendencies both of homogenization/integration and fragmentation; it involves both unification and pluralization; both centralization and separation; it is simultaneously both internationalization and a reinforcement of national autonomy. First, globalization is a unity of universalization and particularization. On the one hand, globalization is a process of homogenization characterized by the convergence of life styles, modes of production and values among various nations' civilizations. For instance, the market economy is becoming a world abstracted from its European origins; democracy and human dignity are being sought all over the world as basic human values, while despotism is rapidly losing its supporters. On the other hand, universalization is always accompanied by particularization. Market economies in various countries are subtly different and these differences among market economies in various countries are not diminishing as the global market economy expands into every corner of the world. For example, the market economy in Germany is called the "Social Market Economy" and it is subtly different from the liberal market economy in the United States or the United Kingdom. The market economy in East Asia is different from others due to higher levels of governmental intervention. Democracy is similarly variable. People all over the world are longing for democracy which, however, has different versions in different countries. For instance, Japan and South Korea have created representative democracies, which are somewhat different from those in the USA or the UK.

Second, globalization involves both integration and fragmentation. Indeed, it involves integration and homogenization in terms of the rapid growth of international organizations such as the United Nations, World Bank, International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Trade Organization (WTO), whose roles now are much more important than before. Globalization also involves a higher degree of integration among nations, which leads to some weakening of traditional national sovereignty and of the use of national barriers. Moreover, the cosmopolitan ideal has come closer to realization because integration movements among nations are more intense and important, as illustrated by the examples of European integration, global capital markets, and the global sharing of increasing amounts of information. Nevertheless, there is a reverse tendency along with global integration that strengthens, in an unprecedented way, the particularity and independence of each nation and region. The movement of national independence and autonomy is a good example. It does not disappear but develops more deeply as global integration progresses. More and more small minorities demand independence one after another, such as the Albanians in Kosovo. The tide of regional, local and communal autonomy is rising, not disappearing, during this time of globalization. Community movements and communitarianism have been one of the more hotly debated political issues in developed countries. Scholars have coined the term "global localism" to specifically reflect these contradictions because local autonomy is developing rapidly under the condition of globalization.

Third, globalization is a combination of centralization and decentralization. One of the major aspects of globalization is the increasing centralization of capital, information, power, and wealth. The merger of large companies has been the fashion since the 1990s, which pushes the centralization of power and wealth further. A good example is the merger of McDonnell-Douglas and Boeing, two of the world's biggest companies in the aerospace industry. On the other hand, the decentralization of capital, information, power and wealth is also a marked trend. Small capital is still very active and developing very well, appearing not to have suffered as a result of the opposing tendency of the centralization of capital. It seems a contradiction, but in fact, the higher the degree of centralization of information, the more difficult it is to monopolize it. The best example in this regard is the Internet. To date, the Internet has been the largest medium for the exchange of information, making accessible information from all parts of the world, all fields of society, and all aspects of human life. No one can monopolize this information, and it is highly discursive in the sense that anyone with an Internet connection is able to access and share in this information.

Finally, globalization brings together internationalization and nationalization, or the reinforcement of all components of nation-states and their societies. As pointed out above, globalization transcends traditional national barriers. As a result, more and more international conventions, covenants, and agreements are officially accepted and observed by all nation-states across the world. Many international principles have an authentic international reality for the first time. On the other hand, each nation does not forget its own traditions and characteristics while accepting and implementing these international conventions, agreements and principles. Each nation tries to deal with international agreements in the light of its own specific national conditions, and to give a national rendering to the implementation of these international principles and norms. For example, many countries in the world accept international covenants on protection of human rights and the environment, while implementing these more specifically in a way consistent with their national characteristics.

In short, globalization is an antinomy, but a valid antinomy. Although defined through contradictory and apparently opposing forces, globalization as such is a fact and can be recognized as an objective trend. Furthermore, because it is impossible for any nation to shed its national characteristics, even for those most open to other countries, globalization as an antinomy is ultimately advantageous for human progress, since it is leading to the unification of a plurality of societies, and this is a worthy goal in human development.

Types of Globalization

Globalization is, above all, based upon the integration of capital, production, communication and technology and economic processes. Put in another way, Li Ling says, "the main sign of globalization is economic globalization as well as information globalization" (Ling 1998: 93). However, there is a necessary tendency, more or less, of political and cultural integration and homogenization as the global economy gradually becomes more integrated. Therefore, globalization has not only economic, but also political and cultural dimensions. It is "a cultural, a political, and an economic phenomenon" (Jinwen 1998: 102). Many Chinese scholars do not recognize these several dimensions. Most essays about globalization refer to economic globalization, and many scholars discuss globalization in exclusively economic terms. There are few scholars who identify globalization with economic integration. Most refuse to use a general conception of globalization, especially conceptions of political and cultural globalization. In their view, to claim political and cultural globalization is to abandon Chinese fundamental political values and its political system.

For most Chinese authors, the meaning of economic globalization is self-evident: "elements of economic growth, especially elements of capital, technology and human labour flow to the global level under dynamics of market rule, so that national and regional economies are increasingly integrated into a global economic system.

The interdependence, reciprocity and interlinkages of human economic development have increased and more varieties of commodities produced in different countries are shared by all people in the world” (Guangcong 1998: 19). Some researchers summarize the features of economic globalization as the following:

- 1) *globalization of production*, a new world-wide division of labour replacing the traditional international division;
- 2) formation of a *new international multilateral trade system* with agreement on common rules advancing the integration of national and regional economies into a single world market;
- 3) the rapidly expanding processes of *financial integration*;
- 4) a *global framework of investment* is in formation, with investment activity being able to reach almost everywhere in the world;
- 5) *transnational or supranational cooperation* has become the center of international economic life and is playing a more important role in the world economy, with greater challenges to the traditional sovereignty of the state;
- 6) skilled persons are themselves becoming globalized and developed into *global persons* with deep expertise in international trade and management (Rongjiou 1998: 46).

For most Chinese scholars, economic globalization has been an inevitable aspect of world economic development from which no country can escape. When a country opens to the world economic market, it is destined to be part of the process of economic globalization, and China is not an exception. These scholars believe that China should therefore actively participate in the process of economic globalization, they claim, rather than being forced into this process. Some people say that China’s participation in economic globalization is not only an inevitable fact but also necessary for achieving economic modernization. In their view, the most advantageous outcome of economic globalization is the optimal distribution of world resources. For no matter how effectively one country’s economy operates, it is always limited by the level of its own domestic resources and the particular features of its market. Moreover, the optimal development of the whole world economy can only be reached through the global integration of world resources and markets, with minimal limitations posed by domestic resources and markets. Furthermore, they argue, economic globalization provides developing countries with a good chance to catch up with developed countries economically (Lie 1991: 32).

Although it is generally clear that globalization is a holistic process of historic development and economic integration that impels nations to observe common rules and accept common institutional arrangements, globalization also has significant political and cultural effects. Some Chinese scholars have begun to reflect upon non-economic globalization such as political, legal and cultural globalization. For some Chinese authors, political globalization refers to increasingly similar political values and political institutions across nation-states. This is manifested above all in convergence upon democratic values based on political freedom and equality, and in the universalization of democratic institutions which assure such basic political values as freedom, equality and human rights. Some scholars go so far as to say that political globalization is a synonym for global democratization: “In terms of political implications, globalization and democratization are synonyms. The recent wave of political globalization was started by the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, the end of the Cold War and the disappearance of the Iron Curtain. The visible dynamic of globalization is economic integration while the invisible one is the integration of values, the integration of democratic and global values” (Junning 1998: 26).

Other political scientists discuss more specifically the kind of political trends emerging in the global age. As one of them argues, good governance in the global age will be democratic. Good governance means that

political processes are characterized by cooperation and synergy between governments and citizens to maximize public benefit. It is envisioned as a new, optimal relationship between state and civil society. Good governance consists of six elements:

- legitimacy – public order and authority should be identified by citizens as representing their interests;
- transparency – access by citizens to political information that pertains to their interests;
- accountability;
- rule of law;
- responsiveness; and
- effectiveness.

Such an ideal political form is defined as “the political model of the global age” (Keping 1998: 38).

International practices and conventions that all nations are meant to observe have more importance now than before the global age. In response, a few Chinese jurist have recommended that globalization of law, as a new stage of legal development, be put on the official agenda for lawmakers. “From the legal perspective, the adoption of a conception of globalization raises a number of problems over which people have to think seriously, like the problem of conflict between the world economy and national interests, the problem of tension between traditional culture and modernization, the relation between globalization and the sovereignty of the state, the problems posed by legal pluralism, and the status of state legislatures and so on” (Ling 1998: 94). As a new stage of legal development, some scholars state that the new legislation required in the context of globalization should be based upon global consensus, possible resolutions to global problems, changing notions of traditional sovereignty of the state, and a weakening of nationalist ideologies (Jinwen 1998: 111-119).

The issue of cultural globalization is more debatable in China. In the history of modern China, there have been two dominant views: a “Westernization View” (Xihua Lun) and a “Chinese Cultural Quintessence” (Guo Cui Lun) view. The Chinese Cultural Quintessence view has gradually lost its defensibility as Western popular music, fashion, books, magazines, and lifestyles entered China one after the other, following China’s economic reforms that opened it to more external influences. Cultural globalization has been a reality in a sense that a cultural identity or value identity has emerged, beyond a native or national cultural identity. Some Chinese scholars refer to it as “global culture”. For the Chinese advocates of global culture, global identity or global values draw their necessity and reality from global processes of socialization. In their view, human socialization is always completed in particular cultural environments, which now extend beyond the national boundaries. A global culture and global socialization now exists, which fosters the “global person” who is surrounded by global cultural information. Such a person is, above all, a global person rather than a Chinese, an American, a French, or a Russian person. Similarly, each national culture is in reality a fusion of several cultures, in spite of the fact that each national culture retains an independence from the others. Global culture has been formed by a merging of national cultures. The existence of global culture means universal values have emerged which transcend national borders, social systems and political ideologies (Junjiou 1998: 131-132).

The Impact of Globalization on China

Chinese scholars are highly interested in what impacts globalization will have on China. Globalization has both positive and negative aspects for the international community. From a positive perspective, globalization is advantageous for distributing resources more effectively throughout the world, for raising the level of international cooperation, for sharing scientific and technological information globally, and for resolving global prob-

lems like air pollution, illegal immigration and drug smuggling.

From a negative perspective, globalization strengthens the hegemony of developed countries in international economic and political life, increases the risks of an international financial crisis, widens the gap between the South and the North, and helps international capital to increase its control of the economies of less developed countries.

Chinese society experiences both the positive and the negative aspects. On one hand, globalization provides a lot of opportunities for China's development. It is beneficial for China to absorb foreign capital, to acquire advanced scientific knowledge and technologies, theories of management, and knowledge of foreign institution-building methods, to export national products, and to participate in international cooperative arrangements. On the other hand, it is obviously unfavourable for China's economic development at the same time, as Chinese politicians and scholars have emphasized since the East Asian financial crisis.

Generally speaking, negative evaluations of globalization for China are focused on the following two aspects. First, there are threats to China's economic security. Foreign control of capital and high technology in large domestic enterprises threatens both the structure and progress of China's industry. As the domestic financial market opens up to the world on a large scale and accumulates a huge number of foreign debts, it becomes more subject to serious financial crises resulting from the fluctuations of the world economy. Second, there is a possibility of weakening the sovereignty of the Chinese state. One of the primary conditions for participating in the process of globalization is to observe established international practices and conventions. Most of these have been made according to, and reflect, the standards and values of developed countries. Developing countries have no alternative but to follow these Western-valued practices and conventions. As a consequence, their sovereignty tends to decline to varying degrees (Caocai & Jianping 1998: 180-200).

Globalization, Modernization and Development

As many Chinese researchers have clearly seen, the Chinese government has taken very active approaches to participating in the progress of globalization by implementing policies that open its economy to the world, by striving to become a member of WTO, and by signing the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Most Chinese scholars agree that it is advisable to participate actively in globalization. The problem for China as a developing country is not whether to join in to globalizing processes, but how to do so. As an author notes,

the Chinese people must recognize fully the dual impact of globalization dominated by developed countries: opportunity coincides with challenge. It is a fortunate opportunity in the sense that globalization provides avenues for developing countries to absorb international capital and modern technology, to increase exports, to improve their market economies and to join into the world market. China provides a good example by carrying out its policies of reform, including opening its economy, and by constructing socialist market economy. Meanwhile, it is a source of mental agony and pain for developing countries as well in the sense that the progress of globalization will undermine the foundation of state sovereignty and their economic independence will suffer due to the hegemony of the developed countries. The financial crisis in East Asia is a good example in this regard (Weiping 1998: 50-51).

This crisis has exerted a great influence on Chinese intellectuals who are interested in globalization. Now they are more carefully and cautiously putting their emphasis on timing, and on the ways in which China participates in globalization.

First, many people argue that China cannot try to match developed countries in participating in the processes of globalization because China's socio-economic condition remains behind theirs, and globalization is actually controlled by a few advanced countries. Trying to match the advanced countries in the progress of globalization will certainly lead to a situation where China's economy is integrated into the global market too quickly to develop itself. In this scenario, the economy will be subject to manipulation by the economically advanced countries. An economist summarizes the "view of 'keeping up' with globalization" in this way: "China has entered through the gate of globalization and will not be able to improve its economy without keeping up with advanced countries in the progress of globalization" (Li Kemu 1998:44). Then he criticizes this view as "too simplistic and far from the Chinese situation, and therefore is one-sided and improper."

Second, some think that China should take part in the progress of globalization with some reservations. Relative to politics and culture, the priority should be given to economic globalization, although politics, culture and the economy are difficult to separate from one another, as is well known. In the view of certain Chinese scholars, as we have seen, globalization is equivalent to economic globalization. For some of them, China can never follow and keep up with Western countries even when it comes to economic integration. Instead China should open up to global markets at a moderate pace. They warn that Chinese economists should not cultivate a dream of economic globalization that hides the huge risks involved, urging them instead to recognize the inequalities of the existing global economic order through which Western developed countries can manipulate developing countries like China. These scholars emphasize that China must insist on an independent strategy of economic development, watching out for Western economic and political hegemony, and defending control of its national economy and the sovereignty of the Chinese state.

Lastly, some intellectuals put their emphasis on national economic autonomy upon which, in their opinion, economic globalization should be based. As pointed out at the beginning of the paper, globalization combines nationalization (in the sense of protecting and building national autonomy), and internationalization. These two trends or impulses apply to the economy. On one hand, economic globalization is dissolving traditional national barriers and speeding the progress of world economic integration. On the other hand, the trend of defending national economic autonomy has become more apparent than before. As examples, regional economies have been developing very rapidly in recent years; protectionism, even in developed countries, remains as strong as before as illustrated by the example of agricultural subsidies; and trade wars continue to take place among nations now and then.

In such a situation, how should China deal with the relationship between economic globalization and national economic autonomy? In other words, which should be given priority, joining into the global economy or developing the national economy? A few scholars frankly express the need for giving priority to the national economy over economic globalization. The fundamental reason for participating in the global economy, for them, is to develop the national economy more quickly and to increase national economic power. The more global the world economy becomes, the more apparent the national interest is. They conclude "it is absolutely mistaken to stress opening to the global market rather than protecting the national economy. It is a basic principle to develop our national economy" (Gao 1997: 44).

Conclusion

Globalization has been one of the most important discourses in Chinese academic circles in recent years, drawing scholars from political science, economics, philosophy, sociology and other disciplines. We have been able to discern some new features and special meanings from this discussion, although it has only recently begun and it will be a long time before it ends. There are at least two attractive developments in this discourse,

in our view, when compared to other discourses in modern Chinese intellectual history: the discourse is gradually going beyond both the dichotomies of the traditional paradigm of “Sino-West” and the ideological paradigm of “Socialism *versus* Capitalism.”

The “Sino-West” discourse might be the longest standing intellectual debate in modern China, and has focused on the merits of “Sinification” or “Westernization” in terms of China’s relations with the world. Chinese intellectuals have been disputing aspects of this discourse since the period of the Westernization Movement under the Qing Dynasty, through the Republic of China under the Kuomintang regime, and then under the People’s Republic of China and the CPC. The dominant doctrine throughout the debates has always been the “Chinese body with Western functions” (*zhong ti xi yong*). The essence of this doctrine is that China and Western countries are opposed to each other in fundamental interests, and therefore China must only introduce and use Western sciences and techniques as tools, while strictly maintaining the Chinese political system and Chinese traditional values. This doctrine strongly resists accepting or accommodating Western political, social, economic and cultural systems and values, and has had essentially the same meaning all along, despite various forms of expression in different periods and under different regimes.

This doctrine, however, has been affected by the discussions of globalization that began in the 1990s. Participants in the discussion of globalization, for the most part, no longer regard it simply as Westernization in spite of the fact that almost all of them recognize the dominant role of Western developed countries in globalization. Chinese intellectuals argue that the subjects of globalization must be nations on an equal basis, no matter whether the nations are large or small, and even though the manipulators of globalization, in effect, are Western advanced countries. It follows that China should participate actively and intuitively in globalization processes while never becoming Westernized. This is clear evidence that Chinese intellectuals are beginning to move away from the dichotomy of “Sino-West”, but are still deeply concerned with nationalistic issues.

After the Second World War, much of the international community divided into two blocs: communist countries and capitalism countries. As of 1949, China belonged to the communist bloc while Western developed countries were capitalist. Because of this division, Western countries became almost synonymous with capitalism. In this particular context, the traditional discourse of “Sino-West” took the form of “Socialism *versus* Capitalism”. The ideological discourse on “Socialism *versus* Capitalism” was repeated many times throughout the period that China was implementing policies that opened it to the Western world. More recently, however, we are able to find in the discussion of globalization that Chinese intellectuals, for the most part, no longer regard globalization as a synonym for capitalism, although they know clearly that the developed capitalistic countries control the progress of globalization. They do not advocate capitalism publicly in China but they do welcome globalization. In this respect, we can say that the discourse of globalization is dissolving the ideological dichotomy of “Socialism *versus* Capitalism” which has dominated Chinese intellectual discussions for so long.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Cai Tuo, (1998). "Globalization and Contemporary International Relation", *Marxism and Reality*, (3), p20.
- Gao Debu, (1997). "Globalization or Nationalization?" *Chinese Cadres' Forum* (5), p.44.
- Jiang Zeming, (1998). *People's Daily*, March 9.
- Li Ling, (1998). "Chinese Legal Development under the Background of Globalization," *Studies and Inquiries* (1) p. 93 - 94.
- Liu Jianping, "Economic Globalization and Our Strategy of Economic Safety," in Hu Yuanzhi, ed. *Globalization and China*, Beijing: Central Compilation and Translation Press, pp.180-200.
- Liu Junning, (1998). "Globalization and Democracy," *Contemporary World and Socialism* (Quarterly) (3), p.26.
- Li Kemu, (1998) 'Remarks on the Process of Economic Globalization' in Hu Yuanzhi, ed. *Globalization and China*, Beijing: Central Compilation and Translation Press.
- Liu Lie, (1997). "Economic Globalization: An Necessary Way by which Developing Countries Catch Up With Developed Countries," *International Economic Review* (11-12), p.32.
- Mu Guangcong, (1998). "Economic Globalization and Chinese Population," *Contemporary World and Socialism* (Quarterly), (3), p.19.
- Tan Junjiou, (1998). "Thinking and Arguing on Globalization," in Yu Keping, ed. *Globalization and Antimonies*, Beijing: Central Compilation and Translation Press, p.127 - 132.
- Wang Caocai, (1998). "World Economic Globalization and China's Economic Safety," in Hu Yuanzhi, ed. *Globalization and China*, Beijing: Central Compilation and Translation Press, pp.180-200.
- Wang Fengzheng, (1998). "Globalization, Cultural Identity and Nationalism," in Wang Ning, ed. *Globalization and Post-Colonial Criticism*, Beijing: Central Compilation and Translation Press, p. 91.
- Wang Weiping, (1998). "Globalization and China's Political Reform," in Yu Keping, ed. *Globalization and Antimonies*, Beijing: Central Compilation and Translation Press, pp. 50-51.
- Xue Rongjiou, (1998). "The Impact and Challenge of Economic Globalization," *World Economy* (4), p. 46.
- Yang Caoren and He Zhiwei, (1998). "Globalization, Institutional Opening and National Rejuvenation," in Yu Keping, ed. *Globalization and Antimonies*, Beijing: Central Compilation and Translation Press, p. 138.

Yu Keping, (1998). "From Good Government to Good Governance," *Way* (1), p. 38.

Zhang Yiwu, (1998). "Globalization: Rethinking in view of Asian Financial Crisis," in Wang Ning, ed. *Globalization and Post-Colonial Criticism*, Beijing: Central Compilation and Translation Press, pp.82, 86.

Zhu Jinwen, (1998). "Some Issues on Globalization," in Hu Yuanzhi, ed. *Globalization and China*, Beijing: Central Compilation and Translation Press, p.102 - 119.

Institute on Globalization and the HUMAN CONDITION

The Institute on Globalization and the Human Condition was created in January 1998 following the designation of globalization and the human condition as a strategic area of research by the Senate of McMaster University. Subsequently, it was approved as an official research center by the University Planning Committee. The Institute brings together a group of approximately 30 scholars from both the social sciences and humanities. Its mandate includes the following responsibilities:

- a facilitator of research and interdisciplinary discussion with the view to building an intellectual community focused on globalization issues.
- a centre for dialogue between the university and the community on globalization issues
- a promoter and administrator of new graduate programming

In January 2002, the Institute also became the host for a Major Collaborative Research Initiatives Project funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada where a group of over 40 researchers from across Canada and abroad are examining the relationships between globalization and autonomy.

<http://www.humanities.mcmaster.ca/~global/>

The WORKING PAPER SERIES...

circulates papers by members of the Institute as well as other faculty members and invited graduate students at McMaster University working on the theme of globalization. Scholars invited by the Institute to present lectures at McMaster will also be invited to contribute to the series.

Objectives:

To foster dialogue and awareness of research among scholars at McMaster and elsewhere whose work focuses upon globalization, its impact on economic, social, political and cultural relations, and the response of individuals, groups and societies to these impacts. Given the complexity of the globalization phenomenon and the diverse reactions to it, it is helpful to focus upon these issues from a variety of disciplinary perspectives.

To assist scholars at McMaster and elsewhere to clarify and refine their research on globalization in preparation for eventual publication.

“From the Discourse of ‘Sino-West’ to ‘Globalization’: Chinese Perspectives on Globalization”

Yu Keping, Director

yukp@pku.edu.cn

China Centre for Comparative
Politics & Economics (CCCPE)

36 Xixiejie, Xicheng District,
Beijing, 100032 CHINA

