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Strategy is the pervasive element within a nation's decisions – it is the motivating factor from domestic to foreign policy. However, one nation that takes the notion of strategy to the extreme is China. For many scholars and laymen, China represents the ultimate enigma with regards to foreign policy and military doctrine – distilling some type of strategy remains elusive to many. However, with a globalized society comes more access to information. The world is beginning to notice China's increase in investment towards its military and many governments have started looking into possible reasons and outcomes for this seemingly sudden shift in Chinese military policy.

In 2005, Japan began pushing China to publish more accurate accounts of its military and weapon acquisitions. Along with Japan, the US questioned China’s increase in spending. Furthermore, then Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, accused China of spending more on military purchases then they acknowledged. In 2008, China purported that it would increase its military spending by 18 percent. However, this announcement came in March just when the US began criticizing the Chinese government for its high-end technological advances in space and information.

All of this rhetoric puts the US in an interesting position. Given the opaque nature of Chinese doctrine, the small amount of information coming from the Chinese government adds another element to the guessing game that nations play when deciding if China is friend or foe. However, what many nations fail to take into consideration when looking at the global calculus of the strategic landscape is Chinese views of warfare and their “strategic culture.”

The research that follows is one that presents the explicit links between technology, security, and prestige in China. It will attempt to explore China’s motivating factors and how
current events fit under China’s strategic culture and their political ramifications. It will also include recommendations for the US in terms of engagement and future policies.

The Importance of Strategic Culture

The definition of strategic culture used in this research comes from Dr. Andrew Scobell in his 2002 Strategic Studies Institute paper. He defines strategic culture as: “[…] the fundamental and enduring assumptions about the role of war (both interstate and intrastate) in human affairs and the efficacy of applying force held by political and military elites in a country.” This definition is of importance to this research because China’s strategic culture is distinct from many other nations. The impact of culture is essential to understanding China’s security affairs. This point is furthered by scholars and policymakers within the People’s Republic of China (PRC) who constantly cite traditional Chinese philosophy when espousing military or security doctrine. If a nation is going to look at China and attempt to parse out a discernable security doctrine the notion of strategic culture is essential.

One important aspect to note on Chinese strategic culture is their concept of defense and use of pre-emptive action. Chinese elites see their country’s doctrine as pacifist and they justify any use of force as defensive in nature. Despite what outsiders may assume or speculate, any type of military acquisition or build-up of their resources is seen as a defensive move to protect China.

Traditional Chinese views of other nations and their proclivities color how China might react and this manifests itself in terms of policy. It is important to note that strategic culture is never far from the PRC’s mind and pervades all assumed Chinese interests – especially this concept of defense. Thus, when looking into Chinese military advances, an awareness of strategic culture must also color how Chinese actions are assessed. Chinese actions must be
viewed and understood with a Chinese mindset of defense and policy recommendations should follow accordingly.

The Ties That Bind

During the Mao era of China, a concerted effort was made to improve China’s technological base. The goals of technological improvement were two-fold. Mao believed that technology is fundamental to national security and economic prosperity. The Korean War provided the ground work for early thinking about technology, science, and advanced industry.

The Korean War was different in that it was a “modern war” where typical weapons could not be used and the terrain made war-fighting difficult. The war drove China to depend on its Communist neighbor. This reliance on the Soviet Union created the transfer of “defense technology, loans for industrial investment, the construction of new industrial facilities, and assistance in the development of an indigenous military industrial base.” This partnership with the Soviet Union opened the door for the emergence of a military elite devoted to the acquisition of advanced technology. Because advanced technology was made a top priority, the elite were given room to maneuver within the Chinese bureaucracy. These privileged positions allowed for scientists to operate without government interference and insulated these workers from traditional Chinese politics. Due to the prestige of their work, there was much continuity in their research and this fostered an environment for sustained growth and advancements.

However, the Chinese scientists “were unable to make significant indigenous progress beyond the platforms and technologies provided by the Soviets.” This stalled progress allowed Chinese military scientists to lobby for more money – despite that the country’s resources were strapped due to several economic crises. This accounts for the shift in military doctrine; defense
technologies moved from national security to a fundamental part of national development strategy.

This influx of money and learned technology from the Soviet Union led to the launching of nuclear weapons programs in 1955, strategic missiles in 1956, nuclear-powered submarines and submarine-launched ballistic missiles in 1958\textsuperscript{10}. While China would not go on to explode its first nuclear device until October 1964, the quickness with which these programs began is a testament to where Chinese priorities lie. This also caused another shift in Chinese technology. It created an awareness not only of strategic weapons but strategic technologies with broader significance and scope. With this awareness, Chinese scientists became more interested in Western military hardware\textsuperscript{11}. Among scientists there was a call for more precision meters and instruments, precision alloys, rare gases, metallic elements, and artificial crystals\textsuperscript{12}.

With a significant portion of Chinese spending dedicated to military advancements and increased scrutiny of other nation’s technologies, an explicit link can be drawn between technological accomplishment and the position of the state in the global order. Given the importance that China bestowed upon its technological industry, an assumption can be made that China also notices this link. The PRC feels that economic dominance is not enough; the road to modernization and prestige in China is intrinsically linked to national security and advanced technology.

From a strategic culture aspect this analysis holds true as well. The progress made in technology provides a semblance of security for China. There is a Chinese predisposition for psychological and symbolic warfare over military-to-military battles\textsuperscript{13}. Weaponry and sophisticated technology aligns with this tendency. Advanced technology provides for more subversive and strategic means of warfare rather than ground soldiers. Information jammers,
anti-satellite technology, global positioning systems, and unmanned aerial vehicles, are all representative of current Chinese technical capabilities that could combat an enemy nation without the use of troops or traditional military weapons. Furthermore, these technologies are also possessed by many other industrialized nations and the PRC prides itself on having these capabilities as well.

Due to the evolution of the technological industry in China and the importance that the PRC places on technical advancement, the ties that bind are effectively technological ones.

Many policy makers in the US are concerned with current Chinese technological advancement. China is competing with the US in regards to space and anti-satellite technology, arms sales and transfers and finally in the acquisition of key defense technology suppliers. These high-end technological advancements and acquisitions have a decisive bearing on global security.

**The Competition**

As a result of strategic culture, China is competing with the US to garner a certain amount of political prestige, secure its borders, and substantiate itself as a technical elitist nation like Japan and the US. These industries are on the forefront of China’s technical boom and are representative of China’s current and future technological capabilities. The actions pursued by the PRC also have very broad security implications for the US and the Asia-Pacific region.

**Space Exploration and Anti-Satellite Technology**

Most notably, the PRC’s commitment to space exploration and its very public anti-satellite launch are indicative of their technical capabilities and priorities. On January 11, 2007, the PRC conducted a test that would demonstrate their anti-satellite capabilities. The PRC used a ground-based medium range missile to destroy a weather satellite\textsuperscript{14}. China faced international
outcry at the onset of this test. Nations such as Japan, the US, and Australia feared a Chinese test could augment a space arms race.

However, this test revealed much more than Chinese capability. It signaled China’s resolve to play a major role in military space activities. Only two other nations – Russia and the US – have previously destroyed spacecraft in anti-satellite tests. The last anti-satellite test – conducted by the US – was in the 1980s. This test ended a long period of restraint and seems to be an escalation of space weapons\textsuperscript{15}. At a time when China is modernizing nuclear weapons, expanding its navy, and sending astronauts into orbit, the test marks a new sphere of technical and military competition.

China also has the same marked determination in regards to its space exploration programs. Shenzhou V was one of China’s first manned flights into space. It cost about 19 billion yuan or 2 billion US dollars\textsuperscript{16}. In September 2008, Shenzhou VII launched and it included three astronauts and an intended space walk – a first for China\textsuperscript{17}. The amount of money the PRC has poured into its space program indicates how seriously China wishes to be taken with regards to space. China is also reported to be planning to build a space station by 2020 and eventually put a man on the moon\textsuperscript{18}.

This need for China to assert itself in a new way has very distinct political ramifications and highlights the strengths and weaknesses of other countries. Due to China’s outlook, any type of conflict in space will be seen as a defensive move that could seriously impair an opposing nation, the US in particular. This movement towards space creates a new war front and one that may have longer lasting effects than can be foreseen. However, space is assumed to be a relatively casualty-free battle ground and this could present nations with another option when it
comes to diplomatic pressure or coercion. The destruction of highly sensitive space technology would significantly compromise military and communication capabilities.

Many within the US Department of Defense feel that China is going to do what all other militarily inferior nations do; they are going to develop their military strengths based on their rivals’ weaknesses. As noted previously, China excels in psychological and non-combative wars, which constitutes a clear advantage for China. This advantage stems from an asymmetry present in space technology. While China is currently building up its satellites, the US is still far more reliant on space technology. This asymmetric advantage may diminish as China also grows more dependent on space and the US moves to address this vulnerability. Nonetheless, the US has far more to lose should China feel inclined that space warfare is an option.

China’s space program represents a critical challenge for policymakers within the PRC and those outside of it. With such new technology being developed at an incredibly quick pace, the PRC has failed to create a specific space doctrine. It is unclear whether China’s counter-space technology is being used for deterrence or as weapons of war. China only has one precedent: nuclear weapons. China’s nuclear policy is one of deterrence and has a decidedly “no first use policy.” While a small nuclear arsenal is present, it is not for waging war, but for deterrence purposes and to resist coercion. This, however, provides little elucidation. Space deterrence and nuclear deterrence are two very different concepts. The effects of space weapons are not as great physically which may leave the PRC inclined to use space weapons for war purposes.

Regardless of Chinese intent, the interest in space is one shared by many other nations. Russia and other nations such as India are taking another look at space initiatives to counter Chinese and US capability. This new space era is difficult to grasp and understand. Many
nations are approaching it with different levels of analyses thus making ascertaining true intentions nearly impossible. However, what is clearly demonstrated is China’s need and ability to expand its space program and this will alter how the US and other nations view space. China does not need to match the US or catch up with their sophisticated technology. China only needs to be able to deter in order to be effective. The implications of this new era are wide reaching and will shift the concept of space weaponization from passive to strategic. The attempt to buttress other nations’ space capabilities will be great and will be the underlying motivating factor in space weapons.

The Global Arms Trade

In the 1980s the PRC launched an aggressive campaign that placed a large majority of arms in Chinese hands. Since the PRC amassed such notoriety, the arms trade has resurfaced with a degree of urgency as China expands its weapons sales and transfers to a growing number of countries and investors: Iran, Iraq, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Syria, Thailand, Myanmar and Algeria. Furthermore, it is believed that China has no qualms about selling their nuclear related technology to many dubious regimes throughout the world. This period in the 1980s made clear China’s status as a weapons trader. With this history, the PRC is poised to expand its weapons trade and gain more international recognition.

Currently, China is under fire from its weapon sales to Sudan, which seems to perpetuate the violence occurring there. Reports note that China has sold fifty military helicopters to Sudan as well as a provision of technical repair services by Harbin Dongan Engine, a Chinese corporation. The small arms exported to Sudan come in the form of rifles, shotguns, and handguns. There are two major Chinese companies implicated with selling weapons to Sudan: Changhe Aircraft and Dongfeng Aeolus. The situation in Darfur highlights the problems and
implications to the global arms trade. Despite the global awareness of genocide in Sudan, China continues to sell arms to the Sudanese government. However, this situation also provides another paradox: these weapons do not travel through illicit channels, but through legal means and are reported to the UN Comtrade\(^2\).

Sudan is but one example of the damage Chinese arm sales have done for war-torn areas. The sale of military vehicles to Nepal and Myanmar have aggravated violence and abetted oppressive regimes in these nations as well\(^2\). China also signed a deal in 2001 for high-tech x-ray machines to be sold to the Israeli government to check cargo containers passing through the Gaza Strip\(^2\). This could only incense Israeli fear concerning Palestinians who may be transferring illicit material through Israel.

The implications of this arms trade is seemingly self-explanatory when looking at the current situations that Chinese arms have aggravated. However, the ramifications, unlike with new space technology, are intrinsically linked to motivating factors within the Chinese defense industries. Essentially, the arms trade regime is created by the Chinese defense establishment and the implications stem from this link.

History demonstrates that the PRC has an inability to translate the cooperation with other nations to the production of sophisticated weaponry at a technological level close to major arms producers in the world. Due to the lack of indigenously produced technology, the arms trade is an appealing way to make money and bolster prestige as an arms trader. Moreover, this highlights the defense establishment’s role in the lack of evolution in the technical sector. While scientists have full government backing, the fragmented nature of the current structure makes producing technologically superior arms difficult. Many nations rely on the PRC to ensure that the sale of sensitive arms (missiles and nuclear materials) will be restricted. The
compartmentalized nature of China’s political-military structure and the specialized roles of individual military sectors make these assurances hollow\textsuperscript{29}.

Decision-making on arms sales lies with defense corporations that exercise autonomous authority because of their insulation within the system and their personal connections. It is precisely because of their money and full government backing that they have such independence. These corporations are not designed to provide detailed instructions chronicling the constraints placed on a majority of weapons that pass through the PRC nor are these companies aware of regional stability or the criticism the PRC faces\textsuperscript{30}. Thus, with a defense establishment fraught with opaqueness and lack of communication, the global arms trade has more dire ramifications than on the surface. Moreover, the inability of the PRC to indigenously produce technological weapons that could compete with the US presents another facet to this problem.

Analyzing the PRC’s position as well the cultural and political motivations to the global arms trade makes the implications farther reaching than originally assumed. While it is possible that China could be forced to curtail its arms trading, it is highly unlikely. What is more probable is that China will work to expand its arms regime. With the US’ geopolitical dominance, China could present itself as an attractive alternative to weapon sales as the US and Russia become more cooperative with international export control regimes.

The inferiority that the PRC feels towards the US may spur the defense establishment to begin specializing in more aggressive weapons export policies. China may begin to develop a niche market in cheaper and less advanced weapons (such as small arms to Sudan). While the PRC may specialize in these small arms, that does not preclude the steady improvement of weapons China will pursue through “the diffusion of technologies and the receipt of upgrade and
retrofit packages for existing systems\textsuperscript{31}.” The direction the PRC will take has a profound effect on regional and global security along with the future of arms control regimes.

Ultimately, the PRC sees competition in the global arms trade. The arms trade allows the PRC to diffuse its own technology as well as serve as a conduit for other regimes that will forge partnerships and drive many closer to China and farther away from the West. This is beneficial to the PRC and detrimental to the world order. Policies must be adjusted with the understanding of the disjointed and separate nature of the military-industrial complex in mind.

**Defense Technology Suppliers**

China has pursued many questionable business deals; however, none of them have extended to the US until now. A key defense manufacturer in the US, Magnequench, is now in Chinese hands. This business deal represents the shrewd diplomacy that China employs and is a sign to the diplomatic and economic capabilities that guide their defense establishment.

Magnequench had a unique expertise in the manufacture of high-end neodymium magnets. However, Magnequench’s parent company, General Motors, put the subsidiary up for sale, despite their niche and the Department of Defense’s demand for magnets. Reportedly, Magnequench supplied 85 percent of neodymium magnets used in motors for guided missiles and bombs\textsuperscript{32}. However, the true power of these magnets lies not with their use in military weapons, but their ubiquitous nature. Neodymium magnets are the sole reason for the existence of high-speed, high-capacity computer data storage devices\textsuperscript{33}. They are found in every computer in the world. Furthermore, Magnequench and its merger partner, NEO Material Technologies, supply about 80 percent of the world market share of neodymium and rare earth oxide powders used in those magnets\textsuperscript{34}.
With clever diplomatic maneuvering and the exploitation of a loophole in the US Treasury’s interagency the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS), Magnequench is now controlled by China. It seems that China realized the necessity of these magnets and moved to acquire this corporation at the US’ ignorance and expense. By the first months of George W. Bush’s administration, Magnequench had moved its entire operation to China – unnoticed by the US – and left the US with no domestic supplier of neodymium. This becomes even more disconcerting when one recognizes that the US has no rare-earth oxide magnet production. No piece of advanced information technology can be created without these rare-earth materials and it is now outsourced to China.

Magnequench is not the only company that provides sensitive defense material to China. Reportedly, the McDonnell Douglas Corporation sold highly sensitive defense material to China. These materials included machines used to help build the B-1 bomber, the space shuttles, and the C-17 heavy-duty military transport plane. However, the deal was a little more sinister than originally assumed. China ordered $1 billion worth of aircraft material from the McDonnell Douglas Co. As part of that package deal, China offered a $5 million contract for the machines that produced the aircraft materials. The Clinton administration, Commerce and State departments favored the deal. Under this 1994 deal, the US government licensed the tools to China for use in their aircrafts. Despite the government licensing and the requirement that the McDonnell Douglas Co. must do an inventory of the machines every three months, PRC defense companies managed to use US technology to build up its military. This confirmed that PRC scientists ignored the stipulation that the machines should be for civilian use. The McDonnell Douglas Co. discovered that six of the nineteen machines used for commercial aircraft
construction in China had been diverted to factories in Nanchang that produce military aircraft and components of China’s Silkworm missiles\(^{37}\).

These two companies have supplied the PRC with highly marketable material to sell or to use in their own weapons systems. These two companies also reveal another part of Chinese investment: espionage. Some say that China’s commitment to two-way collaboration is a farce and is a way for Chinese scientists and investors to get closer to US technology. Furthermore, US officials cite that China has 3,000 “front” companies in the US that exist mainly to obtain technology and military secrets\(^ {38}\). It was reported that China learned of the capabilities and expertise of the McDonnell Douglas Co. by spies\(^ {39}\). Two other companies are also charged with selling secrets to the Chinese government after being infiltrated by Chinese spies: Loral Space and Communications and Hughes Electronics. They are charged with providing rocket technology and know-how to Beijing\(^ {40}\).

The acquisition of these key defense corporations and their technologies highlight US shortcomings and present distinct problems for the US and other technologically advanced societies. Acquiring technical means and know-how aligns with the Chinese stress of indigenous weaponization. Indigenous weaponization is praised and rewarded in the PRC. This accounts for Chinese spies and hackers stealing secrets and buying defense corporations and technologies in such deleterious means\(^ {41}\). Moreover, this also accounts for the Chinese government sending 600,000 students to foreign nations over a period of 25 years to develop technical expertise – as a part of a policy-initiative to develop more scientific and business skills\(^ {42}\).

The PRC relishes the opportunity for domestic production of a technical elite military and weapons that can rival other nations. The procurement of defense suppliers is one way to ensure that progress is being made rather than maintaining the status quo. The aggressive nature that
China pursues these defense corporations should be alarming to the US – especially since the four companies mentioned are American. The US should begin the process of re-evaluating its stance on defense technology and making a more concerted effort to keep defense corporations in the US. The holes present in US export law are great and if the PRC can so easily exploit them another country can just as easily duplicate these methods. These defense suppliers shape how and where technology is manufactured; however, their outsourcing puts the US at a serious disadvantage in producing better weapons and damages global security.

**Chinese Concept of Security**

The PRC has made some serious moves to catalyze their technological base and advance their weapons. With a burgeoning space program, an expanding arms trade, and in control of essential US defense technology – what is China going to do? This question brings forth an important aspect left out by many global policies addressing China: What is the Chinese concept of security?

Security will be defined as state security rather than individual or international security. In China, policymakers often use the phrase “comprehensive national strength.” There are many interpretations of this phrase and each one leads to its own specific set of conclusions. However, what can be derived from this phrase is that security for China is not simply a military aspect. China’s concept of security is multi-faceted and fueled by misconceptions of other nations that lead to a persistent attitude of skepticism and scrutiny. There is also a stress on ancient philosophy and lingering feelings from China’s modern history and dealings with the West.

China’s skepticism of the West also comes from an historical standpoint. In Chinese terms, China, the Middle Kingdom, was the world’s only civilization until 1840 during the first Opium War. The unequal treaties that subsequently followed forced China to be carved out by
imperialist powers and left a lasting impression on the nation. This period effectively created a “victim mentality” for China and this mentality persists today. The radical shift imposed on China by outside forces – from feelings of superiority to a vassal state – is essential to understand when looking at Chinese security doctrine. This historical perspective allows outside policymakers to see why China approaches the issues of national security and sovereignty with such sensitivity.

As mentioned with strategic culture, China sees itself as a defensive and peaceful culture. Often, many Chinese scholars cite the period of occupation during the Opium Wars until 1949 as a testament to their peaceful nature. Despite frequent invasions and threats to China’s territory, a constant pursuit of peace was maintained. In addition to this “pursuit of peace” there is an emphasis on morality and justice in warfare. Chinese military strategists stipulate that wars must have just cause and innocents should be protected. These points stem from Confucian ideals of benevolence and righteousness that permeates military strategy. Mao Zedong and Deng Xiaoping often cited Confucius and Sun Tzu when writing military policy. This culture of defense that Chinese elite purport is essential to understanding the concept of Chinese security.

Due to the influence of ancient Chinese philosophy and the pursuit of peace, China believes that it is exceptional. Many Chinese policymakers feel that China will be able to develop peacefully, as it does not seek hegemony or to challenge the current international system. Hence, if China engages in warfare it is to ensure order and assure its position in the global hierarchy. This is a bedrock principle when looking at Chinese security. China feels it must be allowed to develop and modernize uninhibited. If China feels that another nation is hindering their growth then it is detrimental to state security.
There is even a more pervasive aspect of Chinese security culture and that is economic policy. The concept of security cannot be constrained to simple military or political terms. Economics drives China and its military industrial complex. The arms trade and the defense companies acquired by China can be seen as a manifestation of economic policy interlinked with security doctrine. Science and technological development exist as part of economics since they constitute the tools for the Chinese to achieve rapid economic growth. It must also be noted that economic security is an important concern because this is largely not determined domestically. Chinese economics is often influenced and shaped by the dynamics of the Asia-Pacific region and the US.

Ultimately, the concept of Chinese security stems from ancient philosophy that states’ order must be maintained. For China, security is maintained if they are allowed to grow unchecked and without interference from other nations. This security culture is one that values sovereignty and a defensive outlook for its military policies. The concept of security in China is a part of its strategic culture. With its deep wounds after the Opium Wars and the “100 years of humiliation,” China is particularly reactive to policies that might work to curtail its development or be seen as a challenge to its sovereignty. This also has another important side-effect: competition. Due to China’s lasting resentment, the need to match or exceed technologically superior states is a core motivating factor. Chinese strategic culture and their concept of security pervade their military and foreign policy decisions. These concepts are important to note when evaluating the global security landscape.

**Military Doctrine and Strategic Culture**

The ultimate goal of China, much like any other state, is security and survival. Strategic culture has large effects on Chinese decision making. The three examples presented illustrate
how technology and lasting historical wounds affect military doctrine. However, the strategic preferences concluded by the three examples are contradictory. There is an overwhelming consensus among scholars that a broad Confucian-Mencian paradigm guides Chinese strategy. This paradigm is one that places non-violent, accommodationist grand strategies before violent defensive or offensive ones. Thus, a stress on benevolence, righteousness, and virtue is the basis of a security and military doctrine. Despite this consensus among the academic community, Chinese actions do not necessarily align with this paradigm. These current events, while motivated by historical and philosophical predilections, do not reveal a pacifist nation. They reveal a shrewd nation attempting to secure its position in the new global order.

The idea of benevolence and virtue as core motivating principles in military doctrine is counter-intuitive. Thus, there is a disparity in Chinese rhetoric and Chinese actions. This is what constitutes China’s enigmatic nature. Alastair Johnston, a leading Chinese strategic culture expert, states that there are two guiding principles in China with regards to strategic culture. One main principle is the Confucian-Mencian paradigm and the other is a *parabellum* paradigm. This *parabellum* paradigm is one that values offensive strategies before defensive strategies – a realpolitik view of security. These paradigms derive from ancient military texts and comprise the fundamental philosophical principles of Chinese military doctrine.

If these two strands of strategic culture do exist, as based on Johnston’s account and interpretation of classical Chinese literature, then these paradigms represent different aspects of Chinese strategic culture. The Confucian-Mencian principle must be an idealized version of security for China, in that there is little or no practical application of this doctrine. While these philosophical ideas are often cited in military doctrine, the lack of practicality in their recommendations should be disconcerting. These classics are texts and not operational or
strategic plans of a nation. Also, their historical context and authorship is often disputed creating more problems. Discovering the true essence of Chinese strategic culture is beyond the scope of this work and probably impossible for an outsider looking in. However, what must be noted is the dichotomy between classical Chinese tradition and modern Chinese application.

The bearing that strategic culture has on China’s foreign policy is great. Regardless of the exact culture that China’s derives its actions from, a historical and cultural perspective is necessary when evaluating its activities. Essentially, China’s increased funding for space technology, its increased arms trade, and newly acquired US defense technologies, are all actions carried about by the PRC due to some philosophical or historical reason.

Implications and Policies for the US

While China’s actions predominantly affect its neighboring countries, the US also has a large stake in the Asia-Pacific region. As China continues to grow its technical sector and attempts to garner international prestige, it will directly confront the US and its expansionist nature. Asia is increasingly important for US security interests, and China, more so than other nations in the region, is the most volatile power. Beijing's ignorance of the international discomfort regarding their military expansion only increases this volatility. However, the US is not oblivious to the Chinese military or its motivations.

Engagement with China from the US perspective must be a mixture between short-term and long-term policy goals. This creates much difficulty for the US because many policymakers do not craft policies and begin to engage other nations with long-term goals ahead. However, this type of engagement is required with China. Policymakers must write short-term engagement legislation with long-term goals and initiatives in mind.
The short-term implications for the US are specifically regarding Taiwan and Japan. Should China make a “defensive” move against Taiwan, the US would be forced to enter the Pacific theater. This would also occur should Japan feel threatened. Each dyad (US-Taiwan, US-Japan) has its own course of action that the US would be forced to follow. Policy recommendations are difficult to suggest given the complexity of the issue. However, it is the US’ intention to recognize one China and it seems that China will not make an attempt at reunification any time soon. In fact, much of their strategic culture seems to substantiate this point.

China, the nation that values continuity and succeeds in psychological warfare, is more inclined to let Taiwan make the first moves toward reunification. Taiwan and China are becoming more intensely linked due to trade ties and it is becoming easier for “mainlanders” and Taiwanese to travel back and forth between the two states. This signals a warming up in dialogue and China only needs to continue the status quo. Furthermore, the ramifications of the US openly supporting any separation effort of Taiwan from China would be great – the quiet method is, also, just as damaging. The US has been selling billions of dollars of military equipment to Taiwan; one can only assume this is for Taiwan to protect itself should the need arise\(^49\). The US should work to foster dialogue between the two nations rather than – as many policymakers see it – preparing Taiwan for the inevitable.

Despite the perpetuity the US must have towards Taiwan, there is a need for a redefinition in US-China policy. Currently, there is no strategic vision that guides US policy in Asia\(^50\). This lack of strategic vision may be a result of the US’ reluctance to specifically state that they have conflicting interests. However, in order to effectively engage China and work towards a mutual goal, the US must actively define its strategy for engagement with Asia.
This research accents the lack of understanding between the US and China. The US does not define or approach China with the notion of strategic culture in mind. China also approaches the US with suspicion and ambivalence. This mutual distrust makes effective dialogue and cooperation difficult to take place. However, policies must be created to adjust to the changing global security landscape. At the forefront of any type of substantive policy change should be an awareness of the shifting landscape within the PRC. Military analysts within the Pentagon and outside should be constantly vigilant of current Chinese political theory and public policies. While this might prove to be difficult for the Pentagon, they should also look to outside experts within academia to help clarify changing goals. Another policy initiative should simply be more communication between the Pentagon and the PLA. This military-to-military contact could prove to be invaluable as cultural walls begin to break down. Security cooperation will allow for the building of bonds and pave a way to augment growth of shared goals.

Ultimately, the US must consider Chinese strategic culture when developing policies. The lasting historical scars are difficult to overcome and are nearly impossible to empathize with. Nonetheless, there are certain guiding principles that push China ahead into the 21st century and these principles must be studied and understood. The power and influence that China garners will have a distinct impact on security in Asia. Not only that, but as China begins to expand and employ its influence, this will surely diminish US influence. Thus, policies that are currently in effect that work to contain China must be abandoned for more holistic and comprehensive approaches. The policies that echo “Cold-War containment” thought are counter-productive and increase suspicion on the Chinese side.

Policies addressing China must not only come in the form of bilateral agreements or cooperation, but multi-lateral and international agreements should be placed on the table. The US
was instrumental in bringing about Chinese membership to international treaties such as the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)\textsuperscript{51}. This has benefitted both sides, as it has brought China into the technically advanced fold and China’s membership has provided legitimacy to these treaties. This type of strategic engagement is essential to engagement policies towards China. The US should work to have China join many of the other multilateral security agreements. The avocation of multi-lateral security regimes allows China to join many other technical elite nations and work to curb some of the more pernicious aspects of China’s technical advances. This also demonstrates Beijing’s ability to work within established institutions and not challenge the global order.

A successful engagement policy of China is one that accounts for Chinese history and perceptions. If the US attempts to formally thwart China from development then serious problems will occur. However, if the US moves to more active and diplomatic engagement, both countries will achieve their goals and prestige among the echelons of the global hierarchy. The Chinese race into space, their expanding global arms trade, and the purchase of defense companies make China poised to directly affect US foreign policy. It is up to the US to decide what policies are created and how best to interact with a changing security landscape.
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