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WELCOME FROM THE ALFRED DEAKIN INSTITUTE FOR CITIZENSHIP AND GLOBALISATION

Professor Shahram Akbarzadeh, Alfred Deakin Institute for Citizenship and Globalisation

Professor Shahram Akbarzadeh (PhD) is ARC Future Fellow at the Alfred Deakin Institute for Citizenship and Globalisation, Deakin University. He has an active research interest in the politics of the Middle East, and Islam in Australia. He has led two ARC projects on questions of Muslim integration. This research has resulted in a body of publications, including two research reports for DIAC, a number of refereed papers and two books: Muslim Active Citizenship in the West (Routledge: 2014 with M Peucker) and the Routledge Handbook on Political Islam (Routledge 2011). Professor Akbarzadeh is the Foundation Editor of Islamic Studies Series with Melbourne University Press.
WELCOME FROM THE CONVENORS

Does China matter for the knowledge production and theory-building in International Relations (IR)? A growing number of scholars have been concerned with the China challenge in economic, military, political, and/or cultural terms, but thus far few have pondered whether and how China may pose theoretical challenges to the way we make sense of China and the world, and whether its rise to global prominence warrants new analytical lenses for explaining and understanding complex global dynamics.

This workshop aims to explore these hitherto little-examined questions. It brings together leading scholars on IR and China from the UK, the US, China, Singapore, Taiwan as well as Australia to discuss a wide range of fascinating topics under the broad workshop theme. We would like to extend our warmest welcome to all our participants in the workshop and look forward to the fruitful and insightful conversations in the two-day event. We hope you will enjoy the discussion as well as your stay in Melbourne and Australia.

This workshop is a truly collaborative effort. We would like to take this opportunity to thank our sponsor the Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation for International Scholarly Exchange, and our respective home institutions, Alfred Deakin Institute and the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Deakin University and Institute for Social Justice, Australian Catholic University. We owe our gratitude to Professor Shaun Breslin at the University of Warwick for his enthusiasm and support for this project since its conception. Our thanks also go to Professor Gary Smith (Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Global Engagement, Deakin University), Professor Brenda Cherednichenko (Executive Dean, Faculty of Arts and Education, Deakin University), Professor Matthew Clarke (Head, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Deakin University), Professor Fethi Mansouri (Director, Alfred Deakin Institute, Deakin University), Professor Shahram Akbarzadeh (Deputy Director, Alfred Deakin Institute), Cayla Edwards, Sandra Kingston, Jo Collins (Alfred Deakin Institute), and Lisa Tarantino (Institute for Social Justice, ACU) for their confidence in and support for this project.

Dr Chengxin Pan
Deakin University

Associate Professor Emilian Kavalski
Australian Catholic University
DAY ONE | THURSDAY 31 MARCH

8:45 am  Registration

9:15 am  Welcome
Professor Shahram Akbarzadeh, Deputy Director (International), Alfred Deakin Institute for Citizenship and Globalisation, Deakin University
Associate Professor Emilian Kavalski, Associate Professor of Global Studies, Institute for Social Justice, Australian Catholic University
Dr Chengxin Pan, Senior Lecturer in International Relations, Deakin University

9:30 am  Session One: China in the World

*China’s Rise in English School Perspective*
Emeritus Professor Barry Buzan, London School of Economics

*China’s Normative Theory of International Relations: The Theoretical Case of Civilizational Equality*
Professor Baogang He, Deakin University

*China and International Order*
Professor Wang Jisi, Peking University

12:45 pm  Lunch

2:00 pm  Session Two: Rethinking Power and Interdependence

*Power, Interdependence, and China’s ‘Connectivity’ Agenda in Greater Asia*
Professor Evelyn Goh, Australian National University

*Dancing with the Dragon: How Has Singapore Viewed and Engaged with China?*
Professor See Seng Tan, Nanyang Technological University

*Discourses of Power: An Interpretive Approach to China’s Rise*
Dr Chengxin Pan, Deakin University
**DAY TWO | FRIDAY 1 APRIL**

9:15 am  **Session Three: Theorising Differences and Relations**

*After Binaries: Multiplicity and Difference in IR Theorizing*
Professor L.H.M. Ling, The New School

*What Can We Guanxi about in World Affairs?*
Associate Professor Emilian Kavalski, Australian Catholic University

*Towards an Ontology of Relations: Reintroducing Friendship from China to the West*
Dr Astrid Nordin, Lancaster University (Co-authored with Graham M. Smith, University of Leeds)

12:30 pm  **Lunch**

2:00 pm  **Session Four: Knowledge Production and Theory Travel**

*Putting China in the World: The Geography of IR Knowledge*
Professor John Agnew, University of California Los Angeles

*Ideas Chinese and Western: The ‘Theory Migrant’ in the Age of China Rising*
Professor Chih-yu Shih, National Taiwan University (Co-authored with Jay Hwang, Leiden University)

*IRT and China: Between Theory and Reality*
Professor Bin Yu, Wittenberg University

5:00 pm  **Concluding Discussion**
**ABSTRACTS & BIOGRAPHIES**

**Session One: China in the World**

Chair: Dr Chengxin Pan

---

**China’s Rise in English School Perspective**

One of the things that makes this project interesting is that the English School (ES) has become quite popular in China, and is therefore part of how the Chinese see themselves. This paper starts by reviewing the ES literature on China which covers the ‘warring states’ period, the classical ‘tribute system’, the ‘encounter’ with expanding Western international society, and Communist China’s evolving relationship with Western-global international society. ES concepts have been applied to China’s history to give a perspective that differs from other mainstream IR theory approaches. And China’s classical history has provided alternative, hierarchical models for thinking about international society.

The next section uses ES lenses to look at contemporary China and its unfolding relationship with Western-global international society. To a considerable extent, this relationship can be understood using conventional ES tools and concepts. China sometimes claims to be a status quo power but it is not. At the very least it is an orthodox revisionist, seeking to increase its status within the existing rules. Probably it is a radical revisionist, also wanting some changes in the rules, but prepared to negotiate those changes. Under Mao it was a revolutionary revisionist, wanting to change international society in major ways and prepared to use any means to do so. Probably this is no longer the case, but it could re-emerge as China grows stronger, and if that rising strength continues to be accompanied by increasingly nationalist, Sino-centric, thinking. China’s relationship with Western-global international society contains a core tension between China’s embrace of capitalism on the one hand, but its firm commitment to authoritarianism on the other. China’s relationship with international society can be quite substantially captured by looking at primary institutions (sovereignty, nationalism, human equality, the market, international law and suchlike), and there is a pretty clear pattern of which such institutions China accepts and which it does not.

The third section focuses on those aspects of rising China that either challenge, or fall outside, the ES framing. One example of this is the role of ‘face’ in China’s foreign policy, and its link to the guanxi, relational way of doing things. This is not new, but has not been taken into account in ES theories, and could become more important as China’s global power rises. Another example is the continued strong role of hierarchy in Chinese thinking, and its deep link to the rhetoric of ‘harmonious relations’ that infuses China’s foreign policy talk. Deep ‘Chinese characteristics’ are re-emerging in China’s behaviour, and again, as China grows stronger, these will matter more and more, especially to the region (if China seeks primacy there), but also globally (because China cannot de-link Asia from the concerns of other great powers). There is allowance for hierarchy in ES theory, but a rising China may well require further development of what is a rather marginal area in the ES.
Professor Barry Buzan, London School of Economics

Barry Buzan is a Senior Fellow at LSE IDEAS, Emeritus Professor in the LSE Department of International Relations, Honorary Professor at Jilin and Copenhagen Universities, and a Fellow of the British Academy. Among his books are *From International to World Society?* (2004); co-edited with Rosemary Foot, *Does China Matter?* (2004); with Lene Hansen, *The Evolution of International Security Studies* (2009); co-edited with Amitav Acharya, *Non-Western International Relations Theory* (2010); *An Introduction to the English School of International Relations* (2014); co-edited with Yongjin Zhang *Contesting International Society in East Asia*, (2014); with George Lawson, *The Global Transformation: History, Modernity and the Making of International Relations*. He is working, with Evelyn Goh, on a book with the working title *Confronting the History Problem in Northeast Asia: A Perspective from Outside*; and with Yongjin Zhang on a book with the working title *China and the Transformation of International Society: Power, Institutions and Order.*
ABSTRACTS & BIOGRAPHIES

Session One: China in the World
Chair: Dr Chengxin Pan

China’s Normative Theory of International Relations: The Theoretical Case of Civilizational Equality

Cultural or civilizational equality is a critical component of, and a testing ground for global justice; this is because the notion of global justice is based on the fundamental principle of equality which includes cultural and/or civilizational equality. Historically Western civilization like modern Western law and divisions of powers was deemed as the new global standard by the Meiji government. However, civilizational and cultural equality has assumed increasing importance in the normative discourse of multiculturalism and international relations since the end of World War II. Since then, the international community has repudiated decisively the older tradition of a racial or ethnic hierarchy, and come to endorse the idea of human and ethnic equality. Indeed, with the rise of East Asian economic power in the 1980s, policy-makers and academia placed particular emphasis on the notion of cultural equality.

China, in particular, has pursued the principle of civilizational or cultural equality. President Xi Jinping, for example, gave an official speech at the UNESCO Headquarters on 27 March 2014 exploring ‘a correct approach with some important principles’. He also outlined three fundamental principles - civilizational diversity, equality and inclusiveness. The first principle is that ‘civilizations come in different colors, and such diversity has made exchanges and mutual learning among civilizations relevant and valuable’ (Xi Jinping 2014:283). The second principle is that ‘civilizations are equal, and such equality has made exchanges and mutual learning among civilizations possible. All human civilizations are equal in value, and they all have their respective strengths and weaknesses’ (Xi Jinping 2014:284). The third principle is that ‘civilizations are inclusive, and such inclusiveness has given exchanges and mutual learning among civilizations the impetus to move forward. The ocean is a vase because it refuses no revisers.’ (Xi Jinping 2014:284).

Xi Jinping’s thesis of civilizational equality may reflect many Asian counterparts’ desires to defend their esteem and civilizational traditions against the ‘invasion’ of Western cultural globalization. It also reflects an Asian opinion that Asian cultures and civilizations should be treated equally and the same as their counterparts in the West. For example, both global rankings of higher education and the Google global citation system need to take cultural equality seriously and pay attention to non-Western cultural practices.

This paper takes Xi Jinping’s thesis of civilizational equality as a theoretical case of global justice. It will problematize the key notion of civilizational equality and address a number of unsettled questions such as: what are the exact meanings of civilizational equality? Which meaning of civilizational equality can or cannot be held true? Does the idea of civilizational equality mean that each civilization has its own normative value system so that other civilizations cannot interfere? Is there a universal criterion above civilization? And, how far can the idea of civilizational equality be institutionalized and enforced? However, a number of contradictions or paradoxes occur if we take institutional arrangements into account. Is the notion of civilizational equality still defensible in the face of these paradoxes?
Professor Baogang He, Deakin University

Baogang He is the head of Public Policy and Global Affairs program at Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, and tenured Professor and Chair of International Studies program since 2005, at Deakin University, Australia. Graduated with PhD in Political Science from Australian National University in 1994, Professor He has become widely known for his work in Chinese democratization and politics, in particular the deliberative politics in China. Professor He has published 5 single-authored books, 63 international refereed journal articles resulting in total Google citation count of 5964 (as of 11 Feb 2016) and Hirsch index of 28. His publications are found in top journals including *British Journal of Political Science, Journal of Peace Research, Political Theory, and Perspectives on Politics*. In addition, he published 3 books, 15 book chapters and 63 journal papers in Chinese. Professor He has also held several honorary appointments and research fellowships at renowned universities including Stanford University, University of Cambridge, Columbia University, Leiden and Sussex University.
China’s attitude toward the current international order has undergone subtle but significant changes. A few years ago, Beijing’s official statements quietly dropped the goal of establishing a “new international economic and political order,” which China insisted on for almost three decades. Now the Chinese leadership pronounces that China is a beneficiary, a contributor, and a protector of the existing international order.

However, to some observers, China’s external behavior in recent years, reflected particularly in its actions in the East and South China Seas, seems to belie its pronouncement. In addition to the “assertiveness” in foreign relations, China’s domestic policies also appear to be more “restrictive” than before. These changes provide reasons to suspect that the ascendance of China in global affairs may drive the country to “set up another kitchen” in the international order, thus challenging the leading role of the United States and forcing others in the Asia-Pacific region to “choose side” between these two giants.

“International order” basically means the structure of power and the “rules of the game” among major international players. I will first observe the power structure and China’s position in it, and then analyze China’s attitude toward the norms and institutions that govern the international system.

Taking a closer look at China’s relationship with the Western-led world order, one may find that China is more ready to join the economic part of the order but has stronger reservations about the political and security order. In particular, Beijing is concerned about political infiltration from the Western world and guards again the danger of “color revolution.” Also, US-led security alliances in the Asia-Pacific region are regarded in China as a long-term threat. Serious efforts should be made to narrow the perception gaps and integrate China more fully into the international system. Among other things, China and the United States need mutual accommodation and mutual adaptation.
WANG Jisi is a professor in the School of International Studies and president of the Institute of the International and Strategic Studies, Peking University. He is honorary president of the Chinese Association for American Studies, and has been a member of the Foreign Policy Advisory Committee of China’s Foreign Ministry since 2008. After working as a laborer in the Chinese countryside in 1968-78, Wang Jisi entered Peking University and obtained an MA degree there in 1983. He was a visiting fellow or visiting professor at Oxford University (1982-83), University of California at Berkeley (1984-85), University of Michigan at Ann Arbor (1990-91), and Claremont McKenna College in California (2001). He was invited as a Global Scholar by Princeton University in 2011-15 and spent 9 months in total there with the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs. Wang Jisi taught in Peking University’s Department of International Politics (1983-91), and then served as director of the Institute of American Studies at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences until 2005. From 2005 to 2013, Wang Jisi served as dean of the School of International Studies at Peking University. He was concurrently director of the Institute of International Strategic Studies of the Central Party School of the Communist Party of China from 2001 to 2009. Professor Wang’s scholarly interests cover U.S. foreign policy, China-U.S. relations, and Asian security. He has published numerous works in these fields.
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Session Two: Rethinking Power and Interdependence
Chair: Professor Baogang He

*Power, Interdependence, and China’s ‘Connectivity’ Agenda in Greater Asia*

This paper is derived from a bigger project trying to understand China’s infrastructure-building drive across mainland Southeast Asia, South Asia, and Central Asia since the late 1990s. This aspect of China’s periphery strategy has garnered increasing international attention over recent years because of the highly-publicised ‘One Belt, One Road’ (OBOR) initiative under President Xi Jinping, an ambitious plan to construct new ‘silk roads’ linking China with the Middle East and Europe using continental and maritime routes. However, OBOR is but one element of a wider strategy to deal with China’s periphery and the outside world, which contains renewed and revitalised geographical and geopolitical elements.

This conceptual paper argues that China is reviving an older tradition of ‘geo-strategy’ associated with its primary identity as Asia’s continental hegemon. Geo-strategy is about facilitating the creation of new spatial assemblages and new spatial transcendence, in pursuit of particular ends, and within a longer timeframe.

The paper focuses on the key concept of ‘connectivity’ within China’s renewed geo-strategy. Connectivity is usually understood in the context of infrastructure building as linking up otherwise disparate locations, populations and resources. In our context, the connectivity agenda serves to revive China’s position as the ‘middle’ state, adding modern (physical and institutional) infrastructure to its traditional forms of centripetal power. It also allows Beijing to leverage the shared imperative of ‘national security through economic development’ in increasingly wider arcs of regional and international connectivity. Economic interdependence and mutual gains is a very clear theme, but interdependence is not developed at the expense of power: indeed, connectivity interdependence is an expression of power and a key mode of influence.

By investigating how Chinese policy-makers, scholars, analysts and industrial actors articulate the notion and agenda of ‘connectivity’ in the domestic, periphery and regional contexts, this paper sheds light on the connections between power and interdependence in Chinese strategic thought and action using these abundant and important empirical developments. It shows that given China’s geo-strategic circumstances, Chinese notions of ‘connectivity’ differ in significant ways from how mainstream (US) IR literature has tended to think about power and interdependence.
Professor Evelyn Goh, Australian National University

Evelyn Goh (MA, MPhil, DPhil) is the Shedden Professor of Strategic Policy Studies at the Australian National University, where she is also Research Director at the Strategic & Defence Studies Centre. She has published widely on U.S.-China relations and diplomatic history, regional security order in East Asia, Southeast Asian strategies towards great powers, and environmental security. These include *The Struggle for Order: Hegemony, Hierarchy and Transition in Post-Cold War East Asia* (Oxford University Press, 2013, 2015); *Great Powers and Hierarchical Order in Southeast Asia: Analyzing Regional Security Strategies*, *International Security* 32:3 (Winter 2007/8): 113-57; and *Constructing the US Rapprochement with China, 1961-1974* (Cambridge University Press, 2004). Most recently, she edited the volume *Rising China’s Influence in Developing Asia*, forthcoming with Oxford University Press in March 2016. Among her current projects are a study of emerging U.S. security partnerships with pivotal Southeast Asian countries, and a co-authored book on re-thinking the Northeast Asian history problem. Evelyn is co-editor of the *Cambridge Studies in International Relations* book series; and founder and Convenor of the Graduate Research and Development Network on Asian Security (GRADNAS). She has held previous faculty positions at the Universities of Oxford and London, and the Rajaratnam School of International Studies in Singapore.
**Dancing with the Dragon: How Has Singapore Viewed and Engaged with China?**

This paper will examine the ways in which ASEAN-based academic and policy discourses on China’s rise in the contemporary Asia-Pacific have sought to not only make sense of China’s growing power and influence and its ramifications for the region. Those discourses have also been deployed to create and consolidate strategic space for ASEAN and its member states in a post-Cold War regional environment where China’s rise and the region’s responses to it have the potential to constrict the foreign policy freedoms and choices of smaller or weaker states in the region. In the 1990s and 2000s, ASEAN-based academic and policy discourses on China on the whole differed qualitatively from their US-based counterparts. While the bulk of US discourses emphasised the prospect of an existential threat posed by growing Chinese power and influence – there were exceptions that offered a more balanced perspective, to be sure – ASEAN discourses, which for the most part avoided reference to China’s rise as a ‘threat’, favoured more ambiguous terms such as ‘challenge’, ‘concern’ and even ‘opportunity’ when analysing the implications for their region. At the same time, ASEAN discourses have also sought to rationalise the role and raison d’être of the United States as a counterweight to China in the region. However, that discursive ambivalence and even openness has been tested in recent times by rising Chinese assertiveness in the South China Sea, tempering ASEAN states’ perspectives on Chinese initiatives such as the Maritime Silk Road, the ‘one belt, one road’ plan and the AIIB. Going forward, the discursive-cum-policy challenge for ASEAN and its member states will remain the quest for strategic space in a time of growing strategic rivalry between and among great and regional powers and the pressures that is likely to exert on ASEAN’s fragile unity.
See Seng Tan is Professor of International Relations at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS), Nanyang Technological University, and Deputy Director and Head of Research at the Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies at RSIS. He was formerly the founding Head of the Centre for Multilateralism Studies and Deputy Head of Graduate Studies at RSIS. A student of Asian security, he is the author of 3 books and editor or co-editor of 14 edited volumes and special journal issues, and has published over 50 refereed scholarly papers. His recent books include *Multilateral Asian Security Architecture: Non-ASEAN Stakeholders* (Routledge, 2015) and *The Making of the Asia Pacific: Knowledge Brokers and the Politics of Representation* (Amsterdam University Press, 2013). He sits on a number of advisory and editorial boards and is an elected member of his University’s Senate. He has consulted for a number of international and regional organisations as well as national governments (including Singapore’s), and has held visiting appointments at a number of universities and research institutes. Before joining academia, he worked at a faith-based non-profit organisation.
Much attention has been paid to an apparent power transition from the United States to China. Scholars of China’s international relations have debated over the nature, extent and implications of this transition. Fruitful though the debate may be, it continues to be dominated by a positivist-cum-empiricist approach to (Chinese) power, an approach which assumes that the phenomenon of power as well as the policy implications of its transition, however complex and contested, are ultimately subject to scientific observation. This paper seeks to problematise this approach and its underlying epistemological assumptions. Differing from the usual focus on power transition and its implications for great power relations, the paper draws attention to power interpretations. This interpretive research agenda on power is predicated on both an ontological assumption about power’s inherent existence in interpretation and a methodological necessity to understand power perception through interpretation. In the latter aspect, the paper shares neoclassical realism’s interest in power perceptions. At the same time, however, it also moves beyond neoclassical realism whose concern with power perception is limited largely to perceptions of relative power, whereas discourses of power should include how the purpose, attractiveness, connectedness, effectiveness, and reflexivity of power are understood. Proposing a new interpretive framework and applying it to the case of China, the paper illustrates why we should not only study Chinese power in terms of how much power China has and what it has done with it, but also how the Chinese have thought about it. This approach to Chinese power discourses may help us gain a more nuanced understanding of China’s rise and its international implications.
Dr Chengxin Pan, Deakin University

Chengxin Pan is a Senior Lecturer in International Relations at Deakin University and a member of the Alfred Deakin Institute for Citizenship and Globalisation. He has held visiting positions at the University of Melbourne, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, and Peking University, and is on the editorial board of the Series of International Relations Classics (World Affairs Press, Beijing). He was recently awarded a 2016 Endeavour Research Fellowship by the Department of Education and Training, the Australian Government. His publications have appeared in many peer-reviewed journals and edited books (both in Chinese and English). His latest article, ‘Neoconservatism as Discourse: Virtue, Power and US Foreign Policy’ (with Oliver Turner), was published in *European Journal of International Relations* (OnlineFirst). He is a co-editor (with David Walker) of *Australia and China: Challenges and Ideas in Cross-cultural Engagement* (Beijing: China Social Sciences Press 2015). His sole-authored book *Knowledge, Desire and Power in Global Politics: Western Representations of China’s Rise* (Edward Elgar, 2012, paperback edition 2015) has been translated into Chinese and will be published by Social Sciences Academic Press in 2016.
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Session Three: Theorising Differences and Relations
Chair: Dr Hitomi Koyama

After Binaries: Multiplicity and Difference in IR Theorizing

Westphalian International Relations (IR) entrenches us in binary deadlocks like “China” vs the “West.” To break out, we need to emancipate IR spiritually, not just analytically or politically. This paper draws on two ancient traditions for help: Advaita monism and Daoist dialectics. A vision of post-Westphalian IR emerges: “raindrops in a barrel.” It offers insight from ayurveda to Buddhist enlightenment. Both reinforce the heart as the new centripetal force for world politics beyond Westphalia.

Professor L.H.M Ling, The New School

ABSTRACTS & BIOGRAPHIES

Session Three: Theorising Differences and Relations
Chair: Dr Hitomi Koyama

What Can We Guanxi about in World Affairs?

The contention of this paper is that one of crucial features of the incipient patterns of world affairs is a shift from international relations to international relationality. Drawing on the intellectual history of the Chinese term guanxi, the suggestion is that relationality is one of the defining features of post-Western IR thinking and practices. Hence, unlike the conventional (Western) framing of world affairs as a constant struggle for power in which the actors are positioned in opposition to one another, the emphasis on relationality in post-Western thinking offers opportunities for the redefinition of the ‘international’ as a co-dependent space where two or more actors (despite their divergences) can form a dialogical community. The implications of the proposed inquiry are that the shift to international relationality offers an important insight into the a nascent patterns of world affairs as a result of the so-called ‘shift to the East’ – namely, power in post-Western global life is not about the relative capabilities of actors, but about the kind of relationships they engender in their international interactions.

Associate Professor Emilian Kavalski, Australian Catholic University

Emilian Kavalski is Associate Professor in Global Studies at the Institute for Social Justice, Australian Catholic University (Sydney). He has held research positions at Aalborg University (Denmark), Academia Sinica (Taiwan), Ruhr University-Bochum (Germany), Osaka University (Japan), National Chung-Hsing University (Taiwan), the Rachel Carson Center (Germany), the Killam Postdoctoral Fellowship at the University of Alberta (Canada), and the Andrew Mellon Fellowship at the American Center for Indian Studies (India). Emilian is the author of three books, most recently: Central Asia and the Rise of Normative Powers: Contextualizing the Security Governance of the European Union, China, and India (Bloomsbury, 2012) and he is the editor of nine volumes, including World Politics at the Edge of Chaos: Reflections on Complexity and Global Life (State University of New York Press, 2016). Emilian is the Book Series Editor for the ‘Rethinking Asia and International Relations’ series published by Routledge.
Towards an ontology of relations: reintroducing friendship from China to the West

Chinese scholars and pundits have attempted to ameliorate fears about China's rise by portraying China as a new and friendlier kind of great power. It is claimed that this represents a new way of relating, a way of relating which transcends problematic Western understandings of self-other relations, and their tendency to slip into domination and enmity. This article takes such claims seriously, and analyses them with focus on the explicit discussions of friendship in politics that this has involved. It explores the possibility that thinking about friendship as central to international relations can re-emphasise the relations of international relations. Whereas much contemporary international relations scholarship has relied on an ontology of things, this Chinese view shifts the register to an ontology of relations. However, this Chinese view should not be exoticised and considered culturally unique. On the contrary, the Chinese focus on an ontology of relations is not so much something entirely new, as a reminder to scholars of the particularity of understanding politics through an ontology of things in global and historical terms. Thus, it is not that Chinese scholars are introducing friendship to Western thought, they are reintroducing it. The reintroduction of friendship enables the theorisation of what binds a polity together; where polity is understood not as a static entity, but a set of dynamic relations characterised by becoming. In this way, friendship complements much existing focus on enmity, disjuncture and war, and makes it possible to theorise relations to others in a shared world of human encounter.
Astrid Nordin is Lecturer in the Department of Politics, Philosophy and Religion at Lancaster University, Associate Director of the Institute of Social Futures, and a research fellow at the Swedish Institute of International Affairs. Her research engages critical theories of global politics, with a special focus on Chinese political thought and cultural governance. She has recently published articles on these topics in journals such as *Review of International Studies*, *Millennium*, *Alternatives* and *China Information*. Her monograph *China's International Relations and Harmonious World: Time, space and multiplicity in World Politics* is in press with Routledge.
Putting China in the World: The Geography of IR Knowledge

Recent rethinking about where knowledge is produced and how it circulates can helpfully inform our understanding about geographies of knowledge of IR. Such geographies, of course, are not simply ends in themselves. The point is to understand the ontological bases of knowing from perspectives that do not either privilege a singular history of knowledge associated with a specific world region such as Europe versus China (a typical relativism), or presume conceptions of knowledge that implicitly or explicitly assume their own self-evident universality (a typical positivism). The specific sites or venues within which geographical knowledge is produced and across which it circulates must be situated within the framework of these larger concerns. There is no “view from nowhere.” This is not to imply that there is no such thing as “true” knowledge. Rather it is to insist that we need to know how knowledge is made in order to judge how well it “travels.” Knowledge is always made somewhere by particular persons reflecting on their place’s historical experience. “Universals” often arise by projecting these experiences onto the world at large.

What is needed are ways of understanding how this happens and drawing attention to the need to negotiate across perspectives so that knowledge can be less the outcome of hegemonic impositions (and a dialogue of the deaf) and more the result of the recognition and understanding of differences, both cultural and theoretical. I examine recent discussions about “Chinese” versus “Western” understandings of world politics in terms of the geography of knowledge, surveying the major theoretical issues at stake and outlining the ways in which either/or thinking about China’s rising significance—it is a repetition of previous transitions versus it is something completely different—can be interrogated and used to establish an alternative conception of “China in the world.”
John Agnew is Distinguished Professor of Geography at UCLA where he has taught since 1995. Previously he taught at Syracuse University for over twenty years. He specializes in political geography, particularly state sovereignty and territory, international political economy, particularly currencies and financial regulation, and geopolitics of China. His work in critical geopolitics focuses on the geography of knowledge about world politics as well as its impact on the practice of foreign policy. His recent publications include *Globalization and Sovereignty* (2009), *Hegemony: The New Shape of Global Power* (2005), (with M. Shin) *Berlusconi’s Italy: Mapping Contemporary Italian Politics* (2008) and (with D. Livingstone) *Sage Handbook of Geographical Knowledge* (2011).
Ideas Chinese and Western: The “Theory Migrant” in the Age of China Rising

The paper will investigate how the Chinese political theory can travel to Anglo-American IR discipline. We will use the case of Sun Tzu’s Art of War specifically, in the field of Strategic Studies, political, military as well as business. We will identify four plausible routes of theoretical traveling in response to the study of theoretical innovation associated with Chinese international relations theory and practice. Specifically, we propose that Sun Tzu thinking in the West may mean cultural specific, useful resource, universal value, and outdated convention. The paper will critically contextualize the receptions and interpretations of Sun Tzu’s art of war in the West, and examine how these different alternative thinking routes may allude to the evolution of international relations in the age of China rising.
Professor Chih-yu Shih, National Taiwan University
with Jay Hwang

Chih-yu Shih, who coached inter-mural basketball for 18 years, with 10 national titles and 10 runner-ups under his belt, is himself an evergreen leaguer in the inter-mural basketball in Taiwan. Saturday Gathering on Chinese Affairs held weekly in his apartment enters the 24th year in 2016. Professionally, he is currently teaching anthropology of Knowledge, international relations, and China studies in the Department of Political Science at National Taiwan University. He is additionally the author and the editor of many books, including Understanding 21st Century China in Buddhist Asia: History, Modernity and International Relations (2016); Post-Western International Relations Reconsidered: The Premodern Politics of Gongsun Long (2015); Harmonious Intervention: China’s Quest for Relational Security (2014); Sinicizing International Relations: Self, Civilization and Intellectual Politics in Subaltern East Asia (2013); Civilization, Nation and Modernity in East Asia (2012); Editor of the journal Asian Ethnicity, and an editorial board member of a few international and domestic political science as well as China studies journals. He is MPP of Harvard University and Ph.D of University of Denver.
IRT and China: Between Theory and Reality

In the Western studies of international relations theories (IRT), there has been a curious “China eclipse” with China being either a friend or foe of the West. During the Cold War, IRT was known for its “Soviet-heavy”-“China-lite” propensity. In the 21st century, the China passing in IRT continues with little attention to the world’s largest economy and most populous nation-state as a normal and legitimate player at the international systemic level. This is the case despite the fact that China has largely immersed itself into the existing international system and become an active participant for global governance. IR, therefore, remains a space of, by, and for itself (the West).

In the policy world, however, China has never been off the hook. Aside from the ubiquitous China “collapse” or “threat” polarizations, Washington is actively pursuing a dual track strategy: geostrategic “rebalancing” and geo-economic exclusion (TPP). Why is such a disparity of the China-passing IR and China-passion in the policy world?

The paper examines evolution of IRT from the Cold War to the post-Cold War, and compares China studies and Soviet/Russian studies in the West. A preliminary argument is that in addition to highly ideological connotation in the China studies, race seemed to be a veiled, but discernible, element in the West’s treatment of China. Meanwhile, the Western IRT field clearly “normalized” the former Soviet Union as a legitimate player in the world system, a status China is yet to obtain even today. Finally, the paper examines several “blind spots” in the West’s IRT paradigm, particularly its transition from the Cold War to the post-Cold War era, its radical switch from culture-free to culture-obsession, and the implications for its search for pure and ultimate generalizations of human behavior.
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