China and liberalism globalised

China and Liberalism's Globalisation

Christopher Hughes

It is hard to reconcile the thesis that the globalisation of liberalism is occurring with the rapid economic development of states in East Asia governed by regimes which are difficult to characterise as liberal. Confronted by the rise of East Asian power, analysts looking at the globalisation of liberalism have tended to start out by leaving caveats in their work.[1] Then, they develop their theories through *ad hoc* modifications which dilute the original thesis by bringing elements of cultural diversity back into the equation.[2] Alternatively, after an initial post-Cold War enthusiasm for the idea, albeit with minor qualifications when it comes to East Asian cases,[3] they have been forced by more recent events to revive the importance of culture to arrive at pessimistic conclusions which appear to nullify the initial thesis altogether.[4]

Instead of rejecting the globalisation thesis altogether, this article argues that events in East Asia call for a new understanding of what liberalism's globalisation really implies. This amounts to seeing the transmigration of liberalism not so much as a process of liberalism globalising the world, but rather as a process of liberalism itself being globalised by the world. What is meant by this shift of focus will be explained by focusing on the position of China in globalisation theories. By examining this from the perspective of Chinese attempts to enter the system of liberal states, it can be shown how the Chinese revolution has involved the articulation of liberal categories and imperatives in specific ways. An important consequence of this has been a tendency to exploit an ambiguity that arises when the language of liberalism when is applied to anthropomorphised states rather than to individual human beings. This results is an argument for the existence of highly illiberal domestic regimes, presented in terms of a society of free states. For political philosophy, this development is reflected in the much-debated crisis of the Englightenment project of constructing a universal civilisation. For International Relations, the transformation of liberalism points to the need to put more resources into understanding how ideas and institutions are adapted as they transmigrate across space and time through a process of what David Armstrong has called `socialisation' into international society.[5]

Globalisation as Socialisation

---

[1]See, for example, Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man*, (London: Penguin, 1992), p. 243.

[2]Francis Fukuyama, *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*, (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1995).

[3]Samuel P. Huntington, *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*, (London: University of Oklahoma, 1991), p. 304.

[4] Samuel P. Huntington, `The Clash of Civilizations?', *Foreign Affairs*, (Vol. 72. No. 3, Summer 1993), pp. 22-49.

[5]See especially Armstrong, *op. cit.,* in note 10.

For a number of reasons, the People's Republic of China (PRC) represents a particularly problematic case for the globalisation of liberalism thesis. It is a Leninist party-state presiding over one of the most rapidly growing of the world's economies, governing the world's largest population, it is a nuclear power that possesses growing conventional forces, it is expected to form the world's biggest market early in the new millennium, and it is a Permanent Member of the Security Council. One possible approach to understanding the role of the PRC in the globalisation of liberalism would be to ask how its socio-political system measures up to a standard of liberalism. This is the kind of method adopted by theorists such as Fukuyama and Huntington, who measure the growth of aspects of liberalism in societies against standards such as the American Bill of Rights,[6] or Schumpeter's definition of democracy.[7]

Although such an approach has certainly been valuable in provoking debate, it does raise methodological problems. First of all, can `liberalism' be measured by the sorts of standards used by Fukuyama and Huntington? The notion of liberalism is itself the subject of a dispute within Anglo-American political philosophy, and this raises issues that are highly relevant for coming to terms with a world of diverse cultures. Many of the communitarian critics of liberalism emphasise that contemporary (Rawlsian) liberalism is embedded in particular traditions of the Enlightenment.[8] This relativisation of liberalism allows us to question the assumption that the Enlightenment project is part of a universal civilisation founded on the rationality of individuals `unencumbered' by parochial values.

One of the most interesting things about this debate, however, is that much of the ammunition of the critics comes from a wider field which embraces the territory of International Relations. Recently, for example, John Gray has used the apparently successful illiberal models of development in East Asia, including the PRC, as part of his critique of the Enlightenment project, which goes beyond the attacks of the communitarians and calls for an `agonistic liberalism'.[9] This involves such a degree of tolerance that even

---

[6]Fukuyama, *The End of History*, p. 43.

[7]Huntington, *The Third Wave*, p. 7.

[8] John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972); Michael Sandel, *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982); and Alasdair Macintyre, *After Virtue* (London: Duckworth, 1985). For a good general survey, see Stephen Mulhall and Adam Swift, *Liberals and Communitarians* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992).

[9]The term `agonistic', Gray explains, comes from the Greek term *agon*, which has the meaning both of a contest, competition or rivalrous encounter, and of the conflict of characters in a tragic drama. John Gray, *Enlightenment's Wake* (New York, NY: Routledge, 1995), p. 68.

the search for the good conceived in terms of the ideal community must be discarded in favour of value-pluralism: `the theory that there is an irreducible diversity of human values (goods, excellences, options, reasons for action and so forth) and that when these values come into conflict or competition with one another there is no overarching standard or principle, no common currency or measure, whereby such conflicts can be arbitrated or resolved'.[10]

With the nature of liberalism itself thus under question, and with political philosophy increasingly drawing on the territory of International Relations on this issue, we need to ask how International Relations itself can both inform and accommodate this wider debate. Looking to the inventory of theory and evidence that has been accumulated from the study of existing relationships between communities, what will be proposed here is that one way of looking at liberalism's globalisation can be found in a development of the `English school' concept of an `international society'.[11] Why this approach is useful is primarily because it focuses analysis on how the *external* dimensions of liberal states have impacted on politics between communities under the expansion of the `Westphalian system of states'.[12] As various communities have transformed into states, there has gradually arisen the need to develop a better understanding of how this also entails the transformation of domestic politics through a process of `socialisation'.

By looking at China's entry into international society, this article will try to demonstrate how the notion of `socialisation' might be developed to arrive at an approach to globalisation somewhat different from the exercises in measurement found in Huntington and Fukuyama. Central to this will be an understanding of how the impact of liberalism has taken place through a process of adaptation determined largely by the need to build a political organisation that possesses the minimum characteristics necessary for entry into international society. This has entailed not so much the rejection of liberal notions of the individual, the economy and the state, but more their re-interpretation. Most prominent in this

---

[10] *Ibid.,* pp. 68-69.

[11] The seminal work in this school is, of course, Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics* (London: Macmillan, 1977). For a (critical) definition of the school, see Roy Jones, `The "English School" of International Relations: A Case for Closure', *Review of International Studies*, pp. 1-13. For more recent work on the school, see Sheila Grader; Peter Wilson; and Timothy Dunne.

[12]Valuable work which has developed this model to understand the expansion of international society includes Gerrit W. Gong, *The Standard of `Civilization' in International Society*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), David Armstrong, *Revolution and World Order: The Revolutionary State in International Society*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), and Hedley Bull and Adam Watson (eds.), *The Expansion of International Society*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985).

re-interpretation has been a master narrative of national salvation which enables liberalism to be presented not so much as an argument privileging the liberty of individual human beings, but to be converted into an argument for the freedom of the community in a system of world politics conceived as a `society' of states.

Learning Liberalism from the Outside

The problems that arise by trying to measure the spread of liberalism according to a given standard can be seen by looking at the transmigration across space and time of `possessive individualism': the principle that the individual human being ought to enjoy a sphere of private activity within which other individuals and the state have no right to interfere.[13] Although this principle has been central to Anglo-American liberal discourse from John Locke to John Rawls, the variety that arises when it is applied in different contexts is evident in all the creative developments of utilitarianism, socialism, and conservatism. Faced with such a range, it is not surprising that a historian of political thought like George Sabine prefers the woolly definition of liberalism as `the secular form of Western civilization'.[14] When we understand the transformation of this principle in the context of the emergence of the Chinese nation-state, it is hardly surprising that an even greater degree of divergence is to be found. However, we should not see this process either as a Chinese acceptance or rejection of the Enlightenment project. Instead, the emergence of the Chinese nation-state involved a redefinition of possessive individualism which was determined largely by the requirements of socialisation into the society of states.

Why the political dispensations that resulted from the impact of liberalism in Europe and North America on the one hand, and China on the other, are so different, can be understood as arising from the opposite ways in which liberalism has impacted on their respective cultures. In the European tradition, the indigenous questioning of the authority of the Church during the Reformation made possible the `law of Christian nations', the `public law of Europe', and the `law of "civilized" nations' after Westphalia. For the Qing dynasty, however, liberalism was first perceived through the medium of the exogenous impact of the European states system on the hierarchial world order of the sinocentric system.[15]

---

[13]For a classic introduction to this idea, see C.B. Macpherson, *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism: Hobbes to Locke* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962).

[14]George H. Sabine, *A History of Political Theory*, (London: Harrap, 1952), p. 620.

[15]For the Sinocentric world order see John K. Fairbank (ed.), *The Chinese World Order - Traditional China's Foreign Relations*, (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1968). For a more recent application and development of this model see Kim Key-Hiuk, *The Last Phase of the East Asian World Order: Korea, Japan and the Chinese Empire, 1860-1882*, (London and Los Angeles, CA 1980). Gerrit W. Gong illustrates the process of transformation involved through

When the messenger of liberalism is the imperial state, it is not surprising that the subject of liberal discourse in China has been not the nature of human beings, but more how to create the personality of the liberal state as characterised by its external qualities. From the perspective of the international advocated by the liberal states, these include, at a minimum, no superior authority beyond the state, the ability to exert supreme authority within a defined territory and the exercise of control over a certain number of people.[16]

The concern with creating the kind of political organisation that can maintain the life, liberty and property of the state as an actor in a metaphorical `society' of states has been one of the primary themes of China's long revolution. Rather than being a rejection of liberalism, this is in fact a development of the implications of liberalism for relations between communities which can be found in the European tradition itself. From the attempts by post-Reformation jurists to develop a conception of order between sovereign states by drawing analogies with municipal law,[17] to the conception of world politics as an international society as restated more recently in Hedley Bull's *The Anarchical Society*,[18] an anthropomorphisation of the state as actor has become embedded in the language of International Relations.[19]

What is significant about much of the language of International Relations is that it would make little sense without the kind of semantic shift that took place in the European tradition when states came to be conceived in terms of a macrocosm of the human being, possessing all the attributes of a soul, body and rights that this

---

an analysis of the entry of Japan, China and Siam into international society, in *The Standard of `Civilization' in International Society*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984). See also Hedley Bull and Adam Watson ed., *The Expansion of International Society*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989).

[16]Such are the minimum requirements as commonly understood by international lawyers, see George Schwarzenberger, *A Manual of International Law*, (London: Stevens and Sons, 1967), p. 55.

[17] Edwin D. Dickinson, `The Analogy between Natural Persons and International Persons in the Law of Nations', *Yale Law Journal* (Vol. 26, No. 7, 1916-17), pp. 564-91.

[18]Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society* (Basingstoke and London: Macmillan, 1993).

[19]This should not be confused with what Hidemi Suganami refers to as the `domestic analogy,' which involves the upgrading of the level of management from the domestic to the international. Examples of this given by Suganami are the arguments that because domestic society requires institutions such as a police force and an agency to coordinate economic policies, so should international society, a position which he rightly points out is rejected by Bull. See Hidemi Suganami, *The Domestic Analogy and World Order Proposals*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 28-29.

entails.[20] If that shift was a radical one in the context of Reformation Europe, it was equally revolutionary for the hierarchical order of the Qing dynasty. Yet it is acceptance of this anthropomorphisation of the state that allows the elite in Beijing to argue that the right of the state to its own sphere of private activity is the fundamental principle of world order. As a PRC spokesperson approvingly put it concerning human rights:

> Hedley Bull said: "The reluctance evident in the international community even to experiment with the conception of a right of humanitarian intervention reflects not only an unwillingness to jeopardize the rules of sovereignty and non-intervention by conceding such a right to individual states, but also the lack of any agreed doctrine as to what human rights are."[21]

This recipe for reconciling highly illiberal domestic politics with a liberal international order of states must be understood as a consequence of the order in which the expansion of international society has taken place for different communities. In Anglo-American liberalism, which arises from largely endogenous developments, the discourse over the distinction between a public and a private sphere, the democratic organisation of the political sphere, and the minimalisation of political intervention in the workings of the market is privileged. In China, on the other hand, the prior necessity has been for a programme of nation-building in which the value of individual liberties is assessed in terms of their compatibility with the task of achieving freedom for the state as an actor in international society. The resulting tension that arises from the unresolved ambiguities between individual and collective rights in liberal thinking lies behind what the Marxist historian, Li Zehou, calls China's `Enlightenment and National Salvation Variations'.[22]

What is meant by this can best be demonstrated by understanding how the freedom of the individual has been defined with reference to the freedom of the state through a process of learning from four different sources. The first three of these, namely the imperial-liberal states of nineteenth-century Europe, then Japan, followed by the Soviet Union, will be covered briefly below to show how the liberty of the individual has come to be subordinated to the needs of nation-building legitimised by a master narrative of national salvation. This will lead up to the question of where the

---

[20] See Jean Bodin, *Six Books of the Commonwealth*, trans, M.J. Tooley, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1967), Book One.

[21] Yi Ding, `Upholding the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence,' *Beijing Review*, (Vol. 33, No. 9, February 26 - March 4, 1990), p. 12. **There are quotation marks around Bull's words, but no reference given.**

[22] Li Zehou, `*Qimeng yu jiu guo de shuang zhong bian zou*' (Variations on National Salvation and Enlightenment), in *Zhongguo xiandai sixiang shi lun* (On the History of Chinese Contemporary Thought), (Taipei: Feng Yun Shidai Chuban Gongsi, 1991), pp. 1-54

source of learning about socialisation will lie in the post-Cold War era and the search among a range of models of development within which the liberal-democracies may not take a very high priority.

Learning and the Socialisation of Individualism

Looking, then, at early attempts to learn from the liberal states of Europe - the nineteenth-century exemplars of statehood - Qing reformers looked in particular to English liberalism, especially after the defeats of the Opium Wars. What can be seen from this early stage of learning, however, is that what such students wanted to know about liberalism was not how to realise the freedom of individuals. Rather, they were interested in what Benjamin Schwartz, looking at the life of Yen Fu (the first great translator of English political texts into Chinese), has called `the Faustian element of Western civilization':[23] the secret of how to unlock and harness wealth and power for the state. It is therefore not surprising that Yen Fu found Spencer's Social Darwinism more interesting than John Stuart Mill's concern with the threat to individual liberty posed by the tyranny of the majority. `Precisely because his [Yen Fu's] gaze is ultimately focused not on the individual per se, but on the presumed results of individualism, the sharp antitheses between the individual and society, individual initiative and social organization, and so on, do not penetrate to the heart of his perception'.[24] The resulting effect, as Schwartz sums it up, was that `what has *not* come through in Yen Fu's perception is precisely that which is often considered to be the ultimate spiritual core of liberalism - the concept of the worth of persons within society as an end in itself, joined to the determination to shape social and political institutions to promote this value'.[25]

This initial bias in favour of liberalism as instrumental to enhancing the strength of the state was reinforced when the search for wealth and power shifted towards the second source of learning about liberalism: the neighbouring community that had made the most successful transformation to statehood, namely Japan. After the defeat of the Qing forces in the Sino-Japanese War (1894-5), students flocked to Japan to learn the secrets of modernity. Yet, in Japan too, liberalism had come through the medium of envoys sent abroad to discover the secrets of nation-building from Europe and the United States, rather than through the European struggle by entrepreneurs to protect themselves against the adverse affects of mercantilism. In the process, the Japanese had learned that entrance into international society meant more than just meeting a standard of civilization, it also meant converting available resources into a force that could meet the liberal powers on their own terms.[26]

---

[23]Benjamin Schwartz, *In Search of Wealth and Power: Yen Fu and the West*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1964), p. 242.

[24]Schwartz, pp. 239-240.

[25]Benjamin Schwartz, *In Search of Wealth and Power: Yen Fu and the West*, (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University, 1964), p. 240.

[26]For an historical account of the rise of Japanese nationalism

However, despite the subjection of individual freedom to the search for freedom for the state in international society in Japan's encounter with the Enlightenment, many of the students from the Qing empire who had gone to Japan still tended to favour radical individualism (expressed in terms of democracy, rights, and feminism) over putting liberalism to the service of nation-building.[27] When the Qing dynasty collapsed in 1911, however, and these reformers tried to replace the *ancien régime* with a constitution embracing the ideas of Locke, Montesquieu, and Rousseau, a vacuum of authority resulted. This created the conditions for an attempt at imperial restoration and the disintegration of the new Republic of China into warlord fiefdoms. In this context of social and political disintegration the third source of learning about the Enlightenment emerged, in the shape of the Russian revolution.

The institution of Leninist Party dictatorship offered a new model with which to hold together what Sun Yat-sen described as the "plate of loose sand"[28] that was supposed to constitute the Chinese nation. Under Bolshevik influence, Sun Yat-sen explained the relationship between the new concepts of individual, state, and society by re-interpreting Lincoln's government `of the people, for the people and by the people' and the watchwords of the French Revolution, `Liberty, Equality, Fraternity', as the Three Principles of `Nationalism, People's Rights and People's Livelihood'.[29] This formula privileged the fate of the nation over the freedom of the individual, providing the ideological foundation for the first blueprint for party dictatorship in China, legitimised by the need for a period of nation-building (or `tutelage') by the Nationalist Party (*Kuomintang*). The linkage between Party dictatorship and national salvation was thus already established in the early 1920s, and was to be inherited as the master narrative of Chinese political discourse by the Communists when they came to power in 1949. This is why, shortly after consolidating his leadership position and crushing the outbreak of dissent in the `Peking Spring' of 1979, Deng Xiaoping reminded the people of China, that, before the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) enforced its rule and unified the nation, China used to be seen as `a heap of loose sand'.[30]

---

remains Delmer Brown, *Nationalism in Japan*, (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1955).

[27]A good recent account of the interaction with liberalism in this period is Lin Qiyan, *Buxiang minzhu: Zhongguo zhishi fenzi yu jindai minzhu sixiang* (Towards Democracy: Chinese Intellectuals and Modern Democratic Thought), (Hong Kong: Zhonghua Shu Ju, 1989).

[28]Sun Yat-sen, *Sanmin zhuyi*, (Three Principles of the People), (Taipei: Da zhongguo tu shu youxian gongsi, 1969), p. 1.

[29]Shao Chuan Leng and Norman D. Palmer, *Sun Yat-sen and Communism*, (London: Thames and Hudson, 1961), p. 26.

[30]Deng Xiaoping, `The Present Situation and the Tasks Before Us,' *Selected Works 1975-1982*, (Beijing: Foreign Languages Press, 1984), p. 252.

With the Soviet influence on Chinese politics only ever having played a supporting role to the earlier-established mission of national salvation, the CCP was in a good position to deal with the crisis of world communism of the 1980s: it progressively emphasised the imperatives of nationalist salvation over Marxist egalitarianism. This also allowed people in China to begin to search for a fourth model of nation-building. In the late 1980s, however, rather than looking to the Western liberal democracies, many Chinese turned their eyes to the examples of rapid economic growth displayed by neighbouring economies, particularly the Four Dragons (Singapore, Hong Kong, Taiwan, South Korea). These appeared to offer a solution to the old problem that was first raised by Confucian reformers in the nineteenth century:[31] to achieve `modernization' without `westernization'.[32] Such a trajectory becomes quite clear when we look at the nature of dissent during the period leading up to Tiananmen, when solutions to the problems of inflation and corruption were debated within a discourse on what has been called `neo-authoritarianism' (*xin quanwei zhuyi*). This looked to the examples of China's neighbours for an alternative path to economic development, and especially to strong, authoritative leaders like Chiang Kai-shek in Taiwan, and Park Chung-Hee in South Korea.

The Narrative of National Salvation in Contemporary China

The learning about liberalism that has been going on in China since the mid-nineteenth century, then, shows how liberalism has been interpreted according to China's particular requirements as a socialising community. Looking at recent debates on modernity and development in China, what becomes evident is that the theme of national salvation presents a real problem for the legitimisation of political dissent after Marxism. This can be seen by a brief look at the nature of recent debates on modernity and development in China.

Third Wave or Fourth Model?

Although the arguments on neo-authoritarianism have been complex and varied, what is interesting about the doctrine and its critics is that all continue the discourse on liberalism within the narrative of national salvation.[33] Advocates of neo-authoritarianism and their

[31]The formula of separating essence from function (*ti-yong*), taking Western technology to save the Chinese essence, was formulated by the Confucian reformer Zhang Zhidong (1837-1909). See Joseph Levenson, *Confucian China and Its Modern Fate*, (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California, 1965), pp. 59-79. It has remained a sub-theme in the development of Chinese politics down to the Special Economic Zones of today's PRC.

[32] Fareed Zakaria, `Culture is Destiny - A Conversation with Lee Kuan Yew,' *Foreign Affairs*, (Vol. 73, No. 2, March/April 1994), p. 116-118.

[33] For the debate on neo-authoritarianism see the four volumes of translations in *Chinese Sociology and Anthropology* (Winter

democratising opponents agree on the need to depart from Marxist doctrine. Both favour the assumption that the institution of private property and the building of markets will lead to political liberalisation through the formation of a middle class. They disagree, however, over how to get from a state-owned economy to a society in which there is a dualism between economics and politics, without bringing about national disintegration. As one of the main proponents of neo-authoritarianism, Wu Jiaxiang, puts it:

> We can observe, from the modern history of China, that the political pluralization that comes in advance of the building of markets often leads to fragmentation and chaos, to rule by gangs and cliques, or the partitioning of the government by warlords. If future practice belies this, I would be happy at any time to revise this viewpoint.[34]

With the narrative of national-salvation thus re-established, the argument of the neo-authoritarians is fundamentally the same as that of Sun Yat-sen's nationalist revolution: national disintegration needs to be avoided by a concentration of power while reform takes place.

The evidence for the success of this strategy is found in various places throughout the world, but most significantly in the economic success of the Four Dragons under authoritarian governments which appear to have created conditions for recent political liberalisation. Again, nation-building has taken precedence over individual liberty. It is highly significant that, in opposing this view, democrats do not take issue with the doctrine of neo-authoritarianism on the grounds that all authoritarianism is incompatible with individualism on principle. Instead, they argue that authoritarianism does not make sense as a solution to the political obstructions put in the way of Deng Xiaoping's economic reforms.[35] In this debate it becomes almost beside-the-point to advocate the value of political liberty as an end in itself—as the realisation of the nature of Aristotle's `political animal. The character of the argument is still much more that of Yen Fu's Faustian searchings for national wealth and power, in which democracy is seen as `the only plausible form through which we can reform and reestablish authority'.[36]

The sad fate of the proponents of democratisation in June 1989 is well known. What is not so clear is the influence of the doctrine

---

1990-91, Vol. 23, No. 2 - Fall 1991, Vol 24, No. 1).

[34] Wu Jiaxiang, `The New Authoritarianism: An Express Train Toward Democracy by Building Markets,' translated in *Chinese Sociology and Anthropology*, (Winter 1990-91, Vol. 23, No. 2), p. 45.

[35] Rong Jian, `Does China Need an Authoritarian Political System in the Course of Modernization?, translated in *Chinese Sociology and Anthropology*, (Winter 1990-91, Vol. 23, No. 2), p. 55.

[36] *Ibid.,* p. 64.

of `neo-authoritarianism' after Tiananmen. Although the doctrine has been suppressed by the state, it can be seen as not far removed from the general thrust of the Party's attempts to re-legitimate its dictatorship through economic growth presided over by an increasingly authoritarian state. Deng Xiaoping calls this policy `grabbing with two hands': `[o]ne hand opening and reforming, one hand suppressing all kinds of criminal activities'.[37] The nationalistic streak of the ideological offensive entailed here is made quite clear in key Party documents, such as the statement issued by the Third Plenum of the CCP's 14th Central Committee on November 14, 1993:

> The Party and government must widen with depth and vigour the development of patriotism, collectivism, socialist education; develop education in Chinese history, especially recent and contemporary history and the fine tradition of the Chinese nation, raising the self-respect of the nation, self-confidence and pride, developing the spirit of bitter and bold struggle, concentrating the great creative force of a billion people in the great task of building socialism with Chinese characteristics.[38]

Whether or not the CCP will succeed in this task of re-establishing its legitimacy is something of a moot point for the globalisation of liberalism, when seen in the broader discourse on national salvation within which the CCP must legitimate its activities. What is more significant for liberalism's globalisation is the Party's awareness that its leadership is more likely to be consolidated by looking not to the `third wave' of democracy, but to the `fourth model' for development offered by the booming economies of East Asia before their recent experiments with political liberalisation. It is not surprising that Beijing's officials are more attentive to the example set by Singapore, than to that set by Taiwan. In the former case, capitalism is lauded, but liberal-democracy is seen to be a block to economic development;[39] in the latter, divisions and conflict have become increasingly central to politics in the elections that have been held since 1991.[40] As Deng Xiaoping put it in January 1992, while

---

[37] Deng Xiaoping: "*Zai Wuchang, Shenzhen, Zhuhai, Shanghai deng di de tanhua yaodian*" (Essentials of Talks in Wuchang, Shenzhen, Zhuhai and Shanghai), *Renmin ribao* (People's Daily, overseas ed.), 6-11-93, p. 1.

[38] *Zhonggong zhongyang guanyu jianli shehui zhuyi shichang jingji tizhi ruogan wenti jueding* (Resolution of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party Concerning Various Problems in Building a Socialist Market Economy System), complete text in *Renmin ribao* (overseas ed.), 17-11-93, pp. 1 and 3.

[39] Kishore Mahbubani, `The Pacific Way,' *Foreign Affairs*, (January/February 1995,),p. 103-4.

[40] As the PRC's Xinhua news agency put it in a domestic service

the province of Guangdong is in the business of catching up with the Four Dragons, it should study Singapore's authoritarian methods for maintaining social order.[41] Again, then, liberal ideas can be seen to be taken up very selectively and only insofar as they work within the narrative of national salvation. Rather than the type of democracy that Huntington avers to being the outcome of this process, Party dictatorship continues to be legitimised in terms of maintaining integrity and strenght of the Chinese.

Democracy minus Civil Society

So far, we have seen how individual interests are subordinated to the destiny of the collective as a result of the interpretation of the Enlightenment in terms of national salvation. However, from the earliest years of this century, a faith in radical individualism and rationality did take root in Chinese thinking, and has flowered in a variety of forms over the decades. The student reformers and revolutionaries in Japan have already been mentioned, yet their failure after 1911 was not the end of attempts to reconcile individualism with national salvation. This continued in the attempt to establish constitutional democracy that rose and fell between 1911 and the establishment of the PRC in 1949. At another extreme, individualism can be seen as manifested in the passion for anarchism that was an important element of politics in the 1920s and 1930s.

It may seem that this was a straightforward appropriation of ideas from the Western Enlightenment. However, all these understandings of liberty were underpinned by the faith that `Mr Science and Mr Democracy' would `save the country'. This was the clarion call of the May Fourth Movement of 1919, when students demonstrated in Beijing to express their patriotic outrage over the transfer of the former German concessions in China to Japan at Versailles. It was this May Fourth Movement that the student demonstrators in Tiananmen Square in the spring of 1989 identified themselves with most strongly.[42] As the proclamation of the

---

announcement, `... the so-called Taiwan's "democratic politics" is nothing but a show of strange spectacle in which men and women in respectable suits and dresses are seen punching and kicking each other and letting out unprintable swearing words in the "Legislative Yuan" [parliament]. Money, power-abuse, out-of-control gangsters, vote-buyers' "gaining upper hand," and other scandals run rampant in all levels of elections...' Beijing Xinhua Domestic Service in Chinese, 6 August, 1995, (FBIS-CHI-95-151, 7 August, 1995).

[41] *Zai Wuhan, Shenzhen, Zhuhai, Shanghai deng di de tanhua yaodian*, (Essential Points of talks in Wuhan, Shenzhen, Zhuhai, Shanghai), *Deng Xiaoping Wenxuan* (vol. 3), (Beijing: Renmin chubanshe, 1993), pp. 378-9.

[42] On the parallels between 1919 and 1989 see Vera Schwarcz, "Memory and Commemoration: The Chinese Search for a Livable Past," and Craig C. Calhoun, "Science, Democracy and the Politics of Identity," in Jeffrey N. Wasserstrom and Elizabeth J. Perry ed., *Popular Protest and Political Culture in Modern China*, (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1994).

`Coalition of Students' Self-Governing Councils of Beijing Higher Educational Institutes' put it in a declaration of 4 May 1989:

> Fellow students and countrymen, what the spirit of democracy means is that people should pool their ideas and think together, and that every person's abilities should be fully developed and his or her interests protected. What the spirit of science means is that people should respect rationality and build the nation through science. Now more than ever, we need to sum up the experience and lessons of the many student movements since the May 4 Movement, to turn democracy and rationality into a kind of system and procedure. Only thus can the ideas first raised by the May 4 Movement become further institutionalised, the spirit of the movement develop, and the hope of a strong and prosperous Chinese nation become a reality.[43]

The domination of the discourse on democracy by the narrative of national salvation that is displayed in this statement is a reflection of the dilemma faced by dissidents, who must articulate their dissent with reference to the mission of national salvation monopolised by the Party. In times of political reform, such as the late 1980s, not being able to organise beyond the control of the Party-state becomes a secondary problem. The more pressing issue is how to present dissent as a legitimate activity, rather than as a traitorous movement to derail the process of nation-building.[44] This is why the demonstrators in Tiananmen Square had to go to such lengths to emphasise that theirs was a patriotic movement; it was not aimed at overthrowing the Party, but at making the Party more efficient in its nation-building activities through reform of the system of socialist democracy . It hardly needs to be stated that such a system pays little more than lip service to notions of possessive individualism. Perhaps the role of the national salvation narrative in this is best indicated by the definition of socialist democracy found in an internal document circulated by the Military Science Academy of the People's Liberation Army shortly after the crisis in world communism had erupted: `[i]t is precisely because the people have seized national political rights, are masters of the nation, that they use the spirit of being masters when building their own country. Because of this, socialist democracy greatly mobilises the people's enthusiasm and creativity'.[45]

---

[43] `Let Our Cries Awaken Our Young Republic!', translated in *Chinese Sociology and Anthropology*, (Vol. 23, No. 1, 1990), p. 16. NB this journal does not say who does the translations

[44] This point is made in more detail by David Kelly and He Baogang, `Emergent Civil Society and the Intellectuals in China', in Robert F. Miller (ed.), *The Developments of Civil Societies in Communist Systems*, (Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1992), pp. 33-34.

[45] Military Science Academy of the PLA, `*Renquan he minzhu wenti de bianxi*' (The Distinction Between Human Democracy and Human Rights), *Neibu wengao* (Internal Documents), 1990:10, p. 26.

With the theme of national-salvation dominating the discourse on democracy, the penetration of the authority of the state into the life of the individual can be legitimated to such a degree that outside observers are reduced to wondering whether it might be better to generate new categories for analysis, rather than look for a `civil society' that does not appear to be there.[46] Where, for example, is the dividing line in this story from the front page of a recent issue of the *People's Daily*?

> In Changqing Village, to facilitate a good social climate, good customs of domestic harmony, unity of in-laws, and respect for elders, on every twelfth moon there are held activities to appraise daughters in law. At the beginning of the first lunar month they announce a list of good daughters-in-law and give out certificates of merit. At the same time, the village branch of the Party gives the daughters-in-law a letter of merit to take home to their parents, thanking them for sending a good daughter-in-law to Changqing village. Last year, because Wei Dongmei did not treat her father-in-law well, she was dropped from the list. Unexpectedly, on returning to her parents, her mother opened the box of gifts and, seeing that there was no certificate of merit, asked why there was something missing and gave her daughter a good telling off. Wei Dongmei hung her head in shame. That day, Wei Dongmei hurried back to her matrimonial home and apologised to her father-in-law. After a few months she even specially bought a television for her father-in-law.
>
> This time, when Wei Dongmei returned to her parents' house, her mother smiled and her son quickly brought out the certificate of merit and shouted, `My mum has brought a certificate of merit'.
>
> Wei Dongmei went into the sitting room and took a look. The table was full of fruit and sweets . . . Dongmei's mother said, `Dongmei, you have given our family face and won glory, I will look after you well'.[47]

Of course, the *People's Daily*, as the organ of the CCP, would not be expected to trumpet the formation of organisations such as the independent workers and students unions that arose in the late 1980s. Nevertheless, the above quote does give some idea of how the Party tries to break down barriers between culture and state ideology to make them one and the same. When that ideology is intimately linked with the cause of nation-building, little space is left for social groups to develop opposition to the state, without this opposition being seen as either anti-social or destabilising. In this context, post-Marxist dissent needs to be presented more in terms of the rectification of economic problems caused by central planning and corruption, rather than as a movement towards placing

[46]Elizabeth Perry, *op. cit.* p. 2.

[47] *Renmin ribao*, (People's Daily, overseas edition), 8 February, 1995.

the kind of value on the liberty of the individual that is necessary for the development of liberal democracy. It is thus that the narrative of national salvation and the achievement of a position of equality in international society under the leadership of the nation-building Party threatens to make the promotion of the kind of democratic system envisaged by Huntington and Fukuyama something of an irrelevance in contemporary Chinese politics.

Liberalism - National or Global?

If the authoritarian paths to development followed by China's neighbours are seen by many inside China as offering a model for progress that is more suitable than liberal democracy, this poses the question of how the wider East Asian experience of socialisation is now feeding back into and transforming the nature of international society. Will the learning process about liberalism that is taking place between new members be so successful in its rejection of liberal democracy that it will change the nature of the members who originally constituted the international club? This is something that troubles even the most optimistic of the analysts of the globalisation of liberalism, such as Fukuyama, when he states:

> If Asians become convinced that their success was due more to their own faith than to borrowed cultures, if economic growth in America and Europe falters relative to that in the Far East, if Western societies continue to experience the progressive breakdown of basic social institutions like the family, and if they themselves treat Asia with distrust or hostility, then a systematic illiberal and non-democratic alternative combining technocratic economic rationalism with paternalistic authoritarianism may gain ground in the Far East.[48]

Faced by the phenomenon of East Asian-style reform, Huntington is also pessimistic about the development of democracy in East Asia and ponders the possibility of an authoritarian `third reverse wave'. He identifies a number of conditions that could pose a threat to the `third wave' of global democratisation, most of which appear to be present in East Asia today.[49] These include a perception of decline in the power and social integrity of the United States, a move towards authoritarianism in Russia (which many people in Europe forget is an East Asian state), and the emergence of the PRC as a powerful authoritarian state that is perceived as a threat to the security of many of its reforming neighbours. Although he sees no reason why there should not be a `fourth wave' of democratisation in the future,[50] in his recent article, *The Clash of Civilizations*, this optimism seems to have dissipated

[48]Fukuyama, *The End of History*, p. 243.

[49]Huntington, *The Third Wave*, pp. 292-294.

[50]Huntington, *The Third Wave*, pp. 315-316.

altogether.[51]

In his later work, Huntington has offered a vision of the world in which conflict will take place primarily along cultural lines. Echoes are thus present of the wider sense of foreboding that has been growing in North America and Europe since the rise of East Asian economic power in the late 1970s. Faced by growing trade deficits, there has been much fretting over whether the region's success is due to neo-mercantilist practices or to factors such as the high value attached to education and frugality, the resulting productivity of the work force, advanced management practices, and high rates of saving and investment.[52] Aside from noting the infusion of Japanese management practices into the US and Europe, some commentators have gone further and argue that Americans might do well to study Japanese educational and family ethics as well.[53]

This poses the perennial question of just how illiberal liberals are prepared to be if they perceive their own way of life to be at stake. As John Rawls recognises, `not all regimes can reasonably be required to be liberal, otherwise the law of peoples itself would not express liberalism's own principle of toleration for other reasonable ways of ordering society nor further its attempt to find a shared basis of agreement among reasonable peoples.'[54] Yet if this is understood within the context of the growing power of illiberal states, does this mean that the implications of globalisation must amount to the kind of toleration of diversity advocated by John Gray's `agonistic liberalism'? Washington's unilateral actions directed at altering the domestic societies of its trade partners through measures such as the US-Japanese Structural Impediments Initiative talks and unilateral trade sanctions, and pressures exerted on East Asian states over human rights issues by the United States and the European Union, indicate that the liberal democracies are in fact facing a dilemma when it comes to choosing between tolerance of other regimes and the promotion of liberal-democracy and free market economics.[55]

---

[51] Huntington, `The Clash of Civilizations,' *Foreign Affairs*, (Summer 1993, Vol. 72, No. 3), pp. 22-49.

[52]Perhaps the first shot fired in this broadside was Ezra Vogel's *Japan as Number One: Lessons for America* (New York: Harper Colophon, 1979), who followed up more recently with *The Four Little Dragons* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991). Chalmers Johnson also made a huge impact on this debate with *MITI and the Japanese Miracle* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1982). See also James Fallows, *Looking at the Sun: The Rise of the New East Asian Economic and Political System* (New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 1994); James E. Auer, `The Imperative US-Japanese Bond', *Orbis*, (Winter 1995).

[53] James E. Auer, `The Imperative US-Japanese Bond,' *Orbis*, (Winter 1995), p. 51.

[54]John Rawls, `The Law of Peoples,' in *On Human Rights*, Stephen Shute and Susan Hurley (eds.) (New York: Basic Books, 1993), pp. 42-3.

[55] That the PRC was prevented by the US from being a founding

Faced with the possibility of an `Asianisation of Asia',[56] the liberal-democracies have shown an increasing inability to present a clear scale of priorities between political and economic concerns in foreign policy. A potent symbol of this has been the de-linking of the renewal of China's MFN status from its human rights record in May 1994, by an administration that came to power on a platform of not doing business with Beijing. Following this de-linking, enthusiastic US `commercial diplomacy' in the PRC has only underlined the fact that, if there are priorities for Washington, they are increasingly presented in terms of promoting liberal economics rather than liberal politics.[57]

The recent preference of both the United States and the European Union for developing political and commercial links with China can perhaps be seen as a tacit acknowledgement that external pressure has shown poor results in bringing about political liberalisation. The rationale behind this is that integrating China into international society through a process of what has come to be referred to as `constructive engagement', will `promote a responsible and constructive Chinese role.'[58] To understand that

---

member of the WTO due to disputes over intellectual property copyrights, despite having the world's 11th largest volume of trade, was attributed by some commentators to the underlying problem of the US trade deficit with the PRC. See, for example, David Roche, `How China Can Secure Its Future,'*Financial Times*, (11-12 February, 1995). For a critique of US trade policy towards Japan see Jagdish Bhagwati, `Samurai's No More,' *Foreign Affairs*, (Vol. 73, No. 3, May/June 1994), pp. 7-12. The latest in a long-series of attempts to alter the structure of Japan's economy, going back to the Stuctural Impediments Initiative of the Bush adminstration, has been the Clinton administration's unilateral imposition of tariffs on Japanese luxury cars in June 1995, which was almost universally criticised (see for example, `Mr Clinton and Japan,' *Financial Times*, (9 May, 1995), and failed to achieve the main US demand for numerical quotas to be used to assess Japan's level of openness to US exports.

[56]Yoichi Funabashi, `The Asianization of Asia,' *Foreign Affairs*, (Vol. 72, No. 5, November/December 1993), pp. 75-85.

[57]A US trade mission to the PRC led by Commerce Secretary Ron Brown at the end of August 1994 opened a new era of `commercial diplomacy' with the signing of $5 bn. worth of agreements, while Brown announced the determination of the US to get its `fair share' of the $250 billion worth of infrastructure projects before the end of the century. For Brown, `China's importance—strategically and economically—demands that we construct a more comprehensive relationship.' His thinking was made clear when he told a meeting of the US-China Business Council that US exports to the PRC were growing at four times the rate of exports to the rest of the world, and that 150,000 Americans earned their living from these exports. *International Herald Tribune*, 30 August 1994.

[58] *A Long Term Policy for China-Europe Relations*, Commission of the European Communities, (COM(9)279, Brussels, 5-7-95), p. 3.

the outcome of interdepence will not necessarily be political and economic liberalisation, however, one need look no further than Singapore. It is hard to think of any other territory that is more integrated into the global economy (apart from the colony of Hong Kong perhaps).[59] As for the impact of the information revolution, the assumption that the spread of images and data will lead to liberal change hardly seems justified in the light of world history since the development of print capitalism,[60] and even less likely when states may possess the technology of control and manipulation thanks to the collaboration of media magnates.[61] In fact, as Samuel S.Kim has pointed out, the assumptions that opening to the world capitalist system will move China towards economic and political liberalization need to be balanced by an awareness of Beijing's ability to manage asymmetrical interdependence. The result `seems to have turned dependency theory on its head' through a policy of development based on `a neo-mercantilist, state-centred, and state-empowering model.'[62] That this can be seen from a broader perspective as a continuation of using science and technology to facilitate China's attainment of great-power status in a Darwinian world of competing nations,[63] brings us back to the central theme of this article, that the whole process of China's socialisation and interaction with liberalism continues to be dominated by the narrative of national salvation.

Conclusion

This article has argued that, rather than understanding the spread of liberalism as a process of the imposition of Anglo-American ideas on a supine world, it does more justice to the historical record to see globalisation as a process involving different communities adapting ideas and institutions to their respective needs. From

[59] With a population of only 3 million Singapore posted US$ 74 bn. in exports and US$ 85 bn. of imports of merchandise trade in 1993, and US$ 11.5 bn. of imports and US$ 20.7 bn. of exports of commercial services in 1993. The figures for Hong Kong, with a population of 6 million, are merchandise exports US$ 135.4 bn., merchandise imports US$ 141.3 bn., imports of commercial services US$ 12.4 bn. (1992), exports of commercial services US$ 28.9 bn. (1992). *1994 Trends and Statistics: International Trade*, (GATT).

[60] On the relationship between print capitalism and the rise of nationalism see Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (London: Verso, 1989).

[61] `Murdoch Cultivates his Asian Contacts', *Financial Times*, 13 February 1995.

[62] Samuel S. Kim, `China and the World in Theory and Practice,' in Samuel S. Kim (ed.), *China and the World: Chinese Foreign Relations in the Post-Cold War Era*, (Boulder, San Francisco, Oxford: Westview, 1994), p. 29.

[63] Kim, Ibid., p. 28.

this perspective, although the relationship between highly authoritarian regimes and liberalism might seem to be a distant one, links can be seen when we realise how the revolutionary ideas of the state, the private sphere, the market, democracy, and civil society have been recast in the furnace of nation-building, civil war, Western colonialism, Japanese imperialism, and the Cold War. Although the resulting understanding of liberalism within the narrative of national salvation may not have led to any cumulative increase in the liberty of individuals with regards to the state, the concept of liberty is still central to the legitimisation of dictatorship, insofar as dictatorship is held to achieve freedom for the collective in a system of states that is built on a metaphor of human society. The resulting dispensation might not be attractive to Western liberal democracies, but Beijing can always quote Hedley Bull to retort that the one drawback of liberalism is that one has to put up with the irritating habits of one's neighbours.

More significantly, as an indication of the multi-directional nature of socialisation, Beijing can also point to a growing swell of support for the transformation of liberalism in world politics in favour of the liberty of states. This can be seen in the promotion by East Asian spokespersons of the idea of `Asian values', and in more concrete form in events such as the Bangkok Declaration on Human Rights.[64] Issued to clarify a common position for Asian states (including Middle-Eastern and South Asian, as well as East Asian) at the Vienna Conference on Human Rights, this document can be seen as an example of liberalism's globalisation in that it does not reject the idea of human rights altogether; rather, it sets an agenda in which cultural diversity, economic, social, and cultural rights, and respect for national sovereignty are paramount. East Asian spokespersons thus increasingly argue that the rejection of norms derived from the Enlightenment tradition is not a rejection of liberalism altogether, but is a form of greater toleration than that shown by the liberal democracies themselves. Kishore Mahbubani, Singapore's Deputy Secretary of Foreign Affairs, for example, points out that, while authoritative voices such as *The Economist* insist that Islamic countries cannot progress unless they become more `Western', nobody in East Asia says that the world's most populous Islamic state (Indonesia), or its most economically successful Islamic state (Malaysia), should be reshaped in some other mould.[65] Such statements point to the possibility that the PRC may gain increasing support for its version of liberalism as non-intervention and a tolerance of diversity when relations between states are concerned.

The position increasingly advocated by East Asian elites may not in fact be far removed from the views of some of the main participants in the debate on the nature of liberalism itself. There are obvious parallels with the thinking of communitarians and, as noted above, Rawls himself has noted the paradox that arises when

---

[64] `Report of the Regional Meeting for Asia of the World Conference on Human Rights, Bangkok, 29 March - 2 April 1993,' (United Nations General Assembly, A/CONF.157/ASRM/8, 7 April 1993).

[65] Mahbubani, p. 105.

liberalism is extended to relationships between communities. Is it then consistent to go so far as John Gray and insist that the liberal democracies will have to adopt an `agonistic' liberal attitude towards non-liberal democratic societies which, `if they continue to perform well without converging on Western forms of life, may be regarded as the most radical empirical falsification of the Enlightenment project hitherto and so of traditional liberalism, since they are examples of the successful adoption of Western technologies by flourishing non-Occidental cultures that remain deeply resistant to Western values'.[66] That Rawls appears to run into trouble when he attempts to extend his theories to the international arena might seem to provide grounds for sympathy with Gray's position. Why, for example, should a dictatorial regime such as that in China be `outlawed'[67] when many in that country might see it as the best available option for stable development. To treat China as a community suffering from `unfavourable conditions,' on the other hand, which should be assisted to rise out of its `political traditions and the background institutions of law, property, and class structure, with their sustaining beliefs and culture,'[68] not only harks back to the nineteenth century `standard of civilization', it assumes that somebody has a better solution to China's problems than the Chinese themselves. It is hardly comforting to conclude on the issue of practicality that `the problem of giving economic and technological aid so that it makes a sustained contribution is highly complicated and varies from country to country.'[69]

That this inability to square the liberal project with developments in East Asia raises uncomfortable questions about the future of liberalism itself, becomes more salient when the debate is taken up in the mass media. Here there is a real danger that what is truly entailed in liberalism's globalisation may be lost in the tide of polemics that is resulting in the erection of straw men for the pursuit of political agendas. This is especially apparent when conservative journalists characterise the rise of East Asian power as proof of the redundancy of social democracy,[70] and go so far as to call for a response to East Asia through developing a `truly modern, elitist democracy of the future', and dismantling `the increasingly anachronistic egalitarian, populist, permissive and undeferential kind to which we have become dangerously addicted'.[71]

---

[66]John Gray, p. 83.

[67]Rawls, ibid. p. 78.

[68]Rawls, p. 75.

[69]Rawls, pp. 76-7.

[70]`A Warning to the West', *The Sunday Times*, 22 October 1995, editorial.

[71]Peregrine Worsthorne, `The Right-Wing Path to Oppression,' *Sunday Telegraph*, 21 May 1995. For an interesting critique of the use of the Asian stereotype of the minimalist state in the politics of the British Conservative Party see Will Hutton, `Tory Fantasy

Perhaps what International Relations can contribute to this kind of debate is to step back a bit from political philosophy and journalism and ask whether any of these commentators are basing their arguments on accurate information. Their arguments may indeed be valid, but there is no way to know this until the crude comparisons of stereotypes gives way to a better understanding of how the interaction between communities really takes place. When viewed from the perspective of China's socialisation into international society, for example, not only do Rawls's prescriptions appear to be rather irrelevant to the problems being faced, but Gray's approach to cultural relativism also fails to do justice to the fact that cultures are not hermetically sealed units but are composed of people who do engage in rational dialogue across communal boundaries, even if their conclusions are not always what liberals like.

It is here that the development of the notion of socialisation may be useful in providing a better understanding of the mechanics and implications that are involved when ideas and institutions transmigrate. There is, of course, a danger that understanding world politics in terms of the expansion of international society can take on something of a Eurocentric sheen. This is no doubt due to the fact that `it is not our perspective but the historical record itself that can be called Eurocentric'.[72] The resulting appearance of Eurocentricity tends to have been strengthened by the fact that much of the work carried out on the expansion of international society has focused on the earlier stages of the process, in which the spread of a European `standard of civilization' can appear to have taken place as a unidirectional flow.[73] That this standard amounted to the spread of norms such as the protection of basic rights, a certain kind of legal-political organisation, adherence to international law, the maintenance of permanent diplomatic relations, and the demand that other communities respect the various cultural and ethical mores considered necessary to uphold these institutions,[74] attests to its origins in the liberalism of the Enlightenment. What this means is that if the international society model is to continue to be useful for understanding how Enlightenment concepts are transformed when that project itself may have failed, the idea of socialisation must be developed adequately to accommodate what may be an increasing variety within the liberal discourse as ideas and institutions are adapted by communities.

While, within the international society school of thinking,

---

of Far Eastern Promise,' and Andrew Higgins, `Life and Death on the Landing,' *The Guardian* (*Outlook* section), October 28-29, 1995.

[72]Bull and Watson, p. 2.

[73] Gerrit W. Gong, *The Standard of `Civilization' in International Society*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), and `China's Entry into International Society', in Hedley Bull and Adam Watson (eds.), *The Expansion of International Society*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 198), pp. 171-184.

[74]Gong, pp. 14-21.

work has begun on developing an understanding of socialisation as a two-way process,[75] this project will require a great deal of further empirical and textual analysis if it is to do justice to the complexity of the processes of transmigration. Unfortunately, in International Relations there is still a tendency to confine to specialists the study of areas outside Europe and North America. Although much valuable work is carried out on the international relations of such areas, there is little effort put into understanding the wider implications of the results of this work for the normative assumptions upon which the notion of rational relationships between different communities rests. If International Relations is to avoid both the Manichean vision of history as the struggle between liberals and authoritarians as well as over-population by the `pale faced atheists' of anti-foundationalism,[76] this will require the ability to live dangerously. Not only by engaging in more collaboration between International Relations theorists and area studies specialists, but also through more willingness to draw on the sophisticated understanding of how transmigration takes place across cultures that has become central to fields such as literary theory and cultural studies.[77] If nothing else, it is to be hoped that what has been presented here is some idea of the nature of the tasks that this may involve.

Christopher Hughes lectures in international studies at the University of Durham

[75]David Armstrong, *Revolution and World Order: The Revolutionary State in International Society*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).

[76]This image of anti-foundationalists is raised by Chris Brown, who draws it from Nietzsche's idea of the `pale' atheist who, `while rejecting belief in God, thinks it possible to carry on living much as before.' Chris Brown, *International Relations Theory: New Normative Approaches*, New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Tokyo, Singapore: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992), p. 198.

[77]Since Edward Said's *Orientalism* a whole genre has arisen in these fields to approach the task of understanding the nature of perception across cultural-political barriers. A particularly interesting approach that may be of use to International Relations is the development of the concept of `hybridity', developed by Robert Young, *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*, (London: Routledge, 1995).