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As the current epoch becomes ever more complicated, a variety of political science and world-view concepts appears in the field of social sciences. Under the assault of new, “fashionable” views, the fundamental laws of social development, discovered by our predecessors, sometimes are put to oblivion or crossed out arbitrarily. These laws include, among others, the eternally valuable conclusion that the foreign policy of any state is determined first and foremost by its domestic policy, is a follow-up of domestic policy, and basically proceeds from the social system of the given state. Also, foreign policy cannot but be influenced by major events occurring in the given state — especially economic crises, social and ethnic conflicts, and power struggles. Even some catastrophic natural calamities, which have very little if anything to do with domestic policy as such, by their social and economic consequences, can affect foreign policy.

Considering the ultimate significance of these cornerstone provisions, one cannot but pay due tribute and express appreciation to our Japanese
colleagues who have put a most acute and important issue on the agenda of this international academic forum.

**Chinese Specifics**

Being universal, the postulate on the primacy of domestic policy over the foreign one manifests itself quite specifically in the case of China. This is evident for several reasons. The main reason is the incredibly dramatic metamorphosis, undergone by China one and a half centuries ago, when the great and strong power, which identified itself as the Celestial Empire (i.e., the possessor and ruler of everything covered by the heaven, and which really dominated over all thereto known countries and nations — the power, which had no rivals) became a humiliated, devastated, powerless, and rightless victim of foreign invaders who threw it to the backyard of the international community. As a result, the Han nation, which, according to its most ardent apologists, had created the greatest civilization when Europeans were still “living on trees,” was doomed to live not only in poverty and backwardness, but also in the position of meager and primitive tribes.

In those circumstances, the Chinese people quite naturally strove to restore the power and prosperity of their motherland. Having passed the difficult road of maturation and formation, the most important stages of which included the Xinhai Revolution and People’s Revolution, crowned by establishment of the PRC, this effort has become the central idea and the main engine for China’s development.

The condition of extreme weakness experienced by China at that time totally ruled out any possibility to realize its revival by means of foreign policy, whatever sophisticated diplomacy was applied. And, the use of military force was out of the question; as the Chinese army had cardboard swords, like the severe personages of Peking opera.

In the difficult search for an exit from the unbearably painful situation, the fighters for China’s revival realized that only by overcoming the detrimental backwardness, which corroded all spheres of the life and activities in the country, would they be able to transform China from the colossus on clay legs into a really strong power. The kernel of this idea,
planted thoroughly by Sun Yat-sen, grew to the full understanding that the first-priority task was to build up the inner forces of the country, i.e., priority of the domestic over foreign policy.

National independence, gained by the Han people with the establishment of the PRC in 1949, provided the necessary prerequisite for the revival of China. However, this resolved only a part of the great historical task. Then the economic backwardness of the country became even more evident. Even twenty years after 1949, production of energy in the PRC was 1.7 times less than in Italy, 1.9 times less than in France, 3.7 times less than in Britain, 4.4 times less than in Japan and 25.3 times less than in the United States. The volume of energy production was more or less comparable to that in the German Democratic Republic, where the population was 1/40 of the population in China.1 The PRC’s lag behind other countries in other sectors of industrial production was no less amply evident. In terms of per capita production, the gap between China and developed countries was even more impressive.

In these circumstances, economic growth became the most important core task to revive China; both because “policy is concentration of economy”2 and “the deepest roots of domestic and foreign policy are determined by the economic interests.”3 Despite all the contradictions and even zigzags in the history of the PRC, the essence reflects the search for ways, means, and methods for acceleration of national economic growth. This priority has become most solid in the last two decades of the 20th century, and exactly this factor should serve the starting point for analysis of Beijing’s domestic and foreign policy.

The stronger primacy of domestic over foreign policy in the PRC than in other countries also can be explained largely by the fact that the PRC is a socialist country. Therefore, there is the coincidence between the objective (the need to overcome China’s backwardness) and the subjective (purpose-

oriented policy by the ruling party, the CCP) factors of domestic and foreign policy-making in the PRC. The CCP leadership is not simply led by the trend for revival of China, but considers realization of this trend as its main task, organizes and directs the process of such realization, and successfully eliminates everything that hampers this process. The priority of the PRC domestic development tasks, expressed in the “self-reliance” formula, is fixed in the PRC Constitution and CCP policy documents. With all its importance, the “open-doors” course does not serve as the main but rather a supplementary instrument to reach economic growth and to attain the objectives of China’s revival. A meaningful point is that the economic growth is being stimulated mainly by domestic savings rather than foreign investments, which in the last 10 years provided only 5 percent of the GDP growth in the PRC.

The security problem, too, appears quite specifically in the PRC. This is connected with the fact that the PRC is a socialist country. Therefore, the ruling communist party in the PRC is faced with the task not only of providing for national security, but also for preserving and consolidating the existing social system. In the 1950s the second task was being resolved on the basis of socialist transformation in urban and rural areas, as well as through suppression of anti-socialist forces. Today the major precondition for resolution of this task as well as for protection of national security is seen in the economic growth and improvement of living standards of the people. So, in this sphere, too, domestic policy with its main economic axis assumes to priority.

At the same time, the methods to solve the second task are marked by some important peculiarities. Today, the sphere of ideology has become the main battlefield, and information warfare the main form of struggle. Information warfare proved quite efficient in the case of the Soviet Union, where it played the central role in the destruction of the socialist system.

Certainly, the foreign policy of the PRC, like that of any other state, is relatively autonomous, has a number of its own laws and logic, and is affected not only by the process of domestic development, but also by the outer circumstances, (e.g., general international situation and relations vis-à-vis China by other states). Moreover, all these factors render influence on domestic policy — sometimes so strongly that they deform it
and lead it away from the mainstream direction. This happened several times, and an ample case in point is the consequences of the Sino-Soviet split. At that time, the task to protect national security came to the forefront of PRC domestic policy. This component can even become a dominating one — as a result of not only objective factors (appearance of a real threat) but also subjective factors (unintentional or intentional overstatement of a threat by leaders of the country). Both cases occurred in the course of the Sino-Soviet quarrel.

The Taiwan issue strongly affects Beijing’s security policy. This issue adds more specifics to the question of correlation and mutual influence of China’s domestic and foreign policy. Many political scientists tend to consider the Taiwan issue as a purely foreign policy affair, and consider Beijing statements to the effect that it is China’s domestic affair as nothing else but a mere formality and demagogic rhetoric. However, the reality is much more complicated. The significance of Taiwan’s reunification with the mainland extends beyond the national task of restoring China’s territorial integrity. Reunification would have very profound consequences for the domestic situation in the PRC and the future of its social system. It is not at all clear how this system would stand in co-existence with the capitalist system of Taiwan, which by all dimensions is superior to the capitalist enclave of Hong Kong. From this perspective, the Beijing-style resolution of the Taiwan issue can, however paradoxically this might seem, frustrate rather than consolidate security of the PRC. At least, the tasks facing the CCP would become tangibly more difficult.

**Security Issues in PRC Domestic Policy at the Current Stage**

Since December 1978, when the 3rd Plenum of the CCP CC put the task of China’s modernization in the focus of all efforts by the party, state, and people, the shaping of Beijing’s position with regard to national security has undergone three major changes. Each time, this was accompanied by fierce discussions within the leadership of the CCP, and each time the question was raised by the initiative of Deng Xiaoping.
The need to proceed to a new foreign policy strategy was revealed most amply for the first time in the early 1980s, when it became absolutely evident that the guidelines of the CCP 11th Congress (1977), confirmed in June 1979 at the session of People’s Assembly (i.e. after the 3rd Plenum), did not correspond to the interests of China’s modernization. These guidelines included the conclusions on the growth of international tensions threatening to grow into a new world war, the use of rivalry between the Soviet Union and United States, China’s active role in the struggle against imperialism, and continuation of the struggle against “Soviet social-imperialism.” Before that time, such guidelines had been justified in overcoming of then appearing difficulties and in collision with major circumstances. For example, the external threat and sustenance of the besieged fortress situation in the PRC had fueled the mechanism of mobilization economy, while anti-Sovietism has been used as a means to develop relations with imperialist countries.

Later on, however, when the objectives of economic growth were regarded as independently important, different — longer-term and more sustainable — conditions were required for attainment of those objectives. In January 1980, Deng Xiaoping announced three major deeds which China was to realize in the 1980s: “on the international scene, to act against hegemony”; “to return Taiwan to Motherland”; and, “to accelerate the course of modernization.” As far as the order of priorities was concerned, Deng said that modernization “is the most fundamental basis … Therefore, beginning from the first year of the 1980s, without losing a single day, we must concentrate all our attention and all our efforts on modernization of the country.”4 Since that moment, the task to create the maximally favorable conditions for realization of the set objective was the main focus of domestic and foreign policy. Within the country, the main prerequisite for success was seen in sustained political stability. The latter task required repudiating the line of class struggle, and that became possible owing to the end of the Cultural Revolution. On the outer scene, the task was to attain a peaceful international situation that would not distract resources of the PRC from modernization and would allow using cooperation with other countries in the interests of modernization.

The first and the main need of China’s modernization was not to allow a new world war, which had been seen by Mao Zedong almost as a benefit. A worldwide military catastrophe would totally frustrate all plans for the restoration of a powerful and prosperous China. Even a local large-scale conflict, which inevitably would divide all countries by blocs and camps, could involve the PRC into its orbit and thus impede its economic growth. Hence, there was the need to revise the theoretical clause on the inevitability of a new world war and to repudiate all practical actions that would undermine international stability.

Hostility against the Soviet Union no longer had a practical value as a means to improve relations with capitalist countries, which reached the point where they could grow independently, without being fueled by anti-Sovietism. Other, mainly economic factors entered the game.

As for Sino-American relations, Beijing had chances to understand that their development was tightly restricted and strategically the United States continued to be an adversary of the PRC. Having initiated the course to rapprochement with the United States, Chinese leaders hoped that it would facilitate resolution of the Taiwan issue. The communiqué of the 3rd Plenum stated: “With normalization of relations between China and the USA the even broader prospects opened for us to return the sacred Chinese territory of Taiwan to Motherland and to realize the great cause of reunification.” However, exactly this issue brought grave disappointment for Beijing. Three months after establishment of diplomatic relations between the PRC and United States, Washington passed the Taiwan Relations Act, designed to prevent reunification of the island with the mainland part of the PRC. Not incidentally, the fiercest disputes among the Chinese leaders at that time centered on no other issue but relations with the United States, and many stood for the continuation of a hard-line American policy.

Even with the persistence of Deng Xiaoping, formulation of the new foreign policy took a number of years, and finally was articulated in the platform of the CCP 12th Congress held in September 1982.

---

The importance of modernization was regarded as absolute and the main factor to protect the PRC’s security. Deng Xiaoping pointed out the following: “Like the struggle against hegemony on the international scene return of Taiwan to the Motherland and realization of national reunification implied successful economic construction.”\(^6\) This view served as the basis for the concept of comprehensive power, the build-up of which was essential to guarantee the security of the PRC. At that time, the role of defense capacity and armed forces of the country was regarded as secondary in the realization of this task.

In the early 1990s, for the second time, the security problems of the PRC became a subject for fierce discussion in the CCP leadership. The reason was the disintegration of the USSR and the collapse of the socialist system in East European countries. In Beijing, those events were perceived as the prologue to an attack by anti-socialist forces against the positions of socialism in China. Such an attack was regarded as an attack on China’s national interests because from the very beginning socialism was understood by the CCP leadership as a form and means of national revival rather than as an abstract ideological doctrine. Such a perception was aggravated by the anti-government rallies with anti-socialist slogans that started to take place in the PRC from early 1989. In May-June of the same year they resulted in the renowned demonstrations in the Tiananmen Square.

The events of 1989 drove the CCP leaders to the conclusion that successful economic construction per se would not guarantee national security because security could be undermined by special means, which now are defined as media and information warfare. Deng Xiaoping repeatedly pointed to the reasons that generated the anti-government demonstrations of summer 1989 in Beijing. In particular, he said: “The Western world, especially the United States, launched into operation its propaganda machine in full power, and, using the mechanism of instigation, by all possible means inspired and supported the so-called ‘democrats’ and ‘opposition figures’ within China, who in fact were renegades of the

---

Chinese nation. This resulted in the situation that has led to disorders.”

Deng also made it clear that “in the United States and some other Western countries, they nourish the hope for a peaceful evolution in socialist countries”; in the past, he said, capitalism tried to win a victory over socialism “with the help of weapons as well as atomic and hydrogen bombs, and this generated rebuff on the part of all peoples of the world. Today, it has resorted to peaceful evolution.”

Discussion of the ways to protect security in the given situation was underway within the CCP leadership. Some leaders spoke in favor of a hard-line policy towards the United States as a response to U.S. economic sanctions, and to this effect they proposed further construction of armed forces. However, the interests of modernization prevailed again. Deng Xiaoping drew the conclusion that the United States would not dare to exert far-reaching pressure on the PRC. A weighty argument to support this conclusion was found in the normalization of Sino-Soviet relations, which occurred at the peak of the Tiananmen events and caused tensions between Beijing and Washington. At the same time, however, it would be unwise to act against the United States or the principle of “spearhead against spearhead.” So, the only option for the PRC was to use business ties with the West, including the United States, in the interests of modernization. To this end, it was necessary to continue the open-door policy for which any confrontation was counter-productive. Given such considerations, Deng Xiaoping proceeded step by step to settle Sino-American disagreements. As soon as October 31, 1989, during his talks with former President Nixon, Deng called for “drawing the line under the past months and opening doors to the future.”

At the same time, China decided to take measures that would neutralize the pressure from the West through the activation of China’s relations with its nearest neighbors and devoting increased attention to Russia, Vietnam, and India. China interpreted comprehensive power in

---
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much broader terms that included not only the economy, but also such factors as the moral and political unity of the people. The improvement of living standards of the population, activation of measures to counter the information warfare by more profound ideological work with the population, as well as the broader propaganda of patriotism, national values, and ideals of socialism. The task was set to draw the lesson from the fact that neglect of these components of comprehensive power resulted in the collapse of such economically developed powers as the Soviet Union, while a much smaller country, Serbia, owing to the unshakable morale of her people, was able to withstand the attack of the military monster of NATO!

In view of all these considerations China found it appropriate to continue working with the United States and the West without putting emphasis on defense construction. There were serious hopes that the Western countries again would be attracted by the benefits of economic cooperation with the PRC. Deng Xiaoping said to Richard Nixon: “The Sino-American relations have a good basis. Whatever you say, the Chinese market is not explored sufficiently so far, and in order to use it, there is much to be done by the United States.”

The PRC security problem was not, according to Deng Xiaoping, the threat of military aggression, but rather with a violation of national sovereignty in the form of interference in China’s domestic affairs, which could take place without military action. Hence Deng’s formula: “Sovereignty and security of the state must be put always to the first place.” This, too, is connected with the main task (i.e., modernization of China), as the interests of modernization would be damaged in case interference in PRC domestic affairs generates disorders that would undermine domestic stability. According to Deng Xiaoping, the events of the summer 1989 made Chinese leaders understand even more profoundly that the “protection of stability is the decisive factor for China in the elimination of poverty and the realization of modernization in the four spheres.” So, security of the PRC was
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interpreted as making a situation in which nothing would threaten the modernization of the country. A meaningful point is that the Law on Defence, passed in the PRC in 1997, says that the PLA, apart from the tasks of defense, shall provide assistance to restoration of public order in necessary cases.

However, Deng Xiaoping also stated that if China is brought into chaos, “it will be a calamity of the global dimensions” because hundreds of millions of Chinese refugees would flood other countries.”  

After the collapse of the USSR, the prospect opened for China to replace the Soviet Union as one of the world’s leaders. However, Deng Xiaoping repudiated the chance, as it would interfere with concentration on the task of China’s modernization. In December 1990, Deng stated: “To be in charge of something is an unrewarding business, which also is connected with the considerable loss of initiative,” and recommended “without assaulting anybody, to act on the basis of five principles of peaceful co-existence.”

The 14th Congress of the CCP, which took place three years after the Tiananmen events, decided to consolidate the PRC armed forces in the following way: “To build up defense power in order to provide for success of reforms, expansion of foreign ties and economic construction.” By the time the Congress was convened, the size of the PLA had been reduced by one million personnel. The Congress stated that “the current period has become one of the best periods of China’s friendly good-neighbor relations with the neighbor countries since establishment of the PRC,” and that China’s relations with all states in the world, including developed countries of the West, were improving and becoming more perfect.

Five years later, this assessment of the foreign-policy situation was confirmed by the 15th Congress of the CCP (1997), which stated, “in a whole, it continues to develop towards détente,” and that “the strive for peace and cooperation as well as contribution to development has become the mainstream
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of the epoch.” Again, the Congress emphasized that “for realization of the socialist modernization we need the long-term peaceful international situation and the most favorable environment.” However, this time the Congress devoted more attention to military construction, and even proclaimed the thesis: “Consolidation of the national defense and army construction is the basic guarantee of our national security.” However, this thesis was immediately subordinated to the cause of “successful modernization.” This did not at all mean any revision of the role of the modernization and open-door policy as the main factors to protect national security. The task of the army construction emphasized construction of a compact and well-selected army operating with modern and high-technology equipment. On this basis, China planned to reduce the size of armed forces by another half million personnel within three years.

That Deng’s opinion was decisive in those years is not the only reason for the above frequent quotations from his instructions. What is more important, Deng’s ideas, embodied in the theories of socialist construction with Chinese characteristics and encompassing all facets of life and activities in the PRC (including its security), are taken by the CCP as the guideline for action in the long-term perspective. At the 15th Congress Jiang Zemin, having noted that the CCP “is the party, attaching an exceptional importance to the directing role of theory,” stated that the theory of Deng Xiaoping “is the correct theory, leading the Chinese people to the victorious realization of socialist modernization by means of reforms and openness.”

According to published data, the PRC has elaborated a long-term program for military construction to be accomplished in three stages. By the end of the first stage in 2000, the armed forces must be capable of defending the state interests of the PRC by successfully conducting local warfare at a low and medium intensity along the entire border, as well as solving the tasks of efficient “containment” and “deterrence” of potential adversaries. At the second stage around 2010 the PLA must be transformed into a force that would guarantee expansion of “strategic borders and living space” for China. In the course of the third stage by 2050 the
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armed forces must be able to win victory in a war of any scale and duration through the use of all means and methods of armed struggle.¹⁹ Widely circulating in the military-political circles of the PRC has been the concept by which the “living space” should “provide for security and life activities of population as well as its economic and science-tech development.” Strategic borders are understood as “territorial and space frontiers, marking the limits within which the state can efficiently protect its interests with the help of real force.” In the case of armed conflicts involving China, it is considered admissible to relocate armed hostilities from the areas within China’s state borders to the zones of “strategic borders” and even beyond. It is assumed that a conflict might be caused by difficulties in the “protection of legitimate rights and interests of the PRC in Asia-Pacific.”²⁰ As for the currently effective doctrine of Beijing, it is of a defensive nature and proceeds from the understanding that in the near-term future the probability of a large-scale war or a direct aggression against the PRC is rather low.

The third turning point in the formulation of Beijing’s position with regard to security issues took place in 1999. This turn was made because of NATO aggression against Yugoslavia. The concept articulated at that time, continues to be valid until now. While the former basic guidelines are preserved in the present concept, a new element is seen in the higher significance of the military component in the complex of measures designed to protect the security of the PRC. The NATO aggression against Yugoslavia has led Beijing to the conclusion that the United States has not abandoned the use of force to reach its objectives. Moreover, Beijing fears that verbal reprimands from Washington to other states, including the PRC, for some misbehavior (e.g. human rights violations) could be followed by hard-line practical actions, including armed hostilities. The U.S. missile attack on the PRC Embassy in Belgrade was interpreted in Beijing as a warning. I happened to be in Beijing at that time, and I did

¹⁹ Information collection Po zarubezhnym stranam i armiyam [By Foreign Countries and Armies], No. 5 (116). General Staff of the RF Armed Forces. Moscoe, 1996.
²⁰ Ibid.
not meet a single Chinese person — whether an official, a scholar, or a common man in the street — who believed that the attack was not intentional. While talking with the PRC Foreign Minister Tang Jiaxuan at the APEC summit of 1999 in Oakland, the U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright rejected the assumption that the United States might treat the PRC in the same way as it treated Yugoslavia as “total nonsense,” but this statement did not comfort leaders in Beijing. There was no reason for benevolence, as President Clinton’s message to the U.S. Congress, entitled “A National Security Strategy for a New Century” (October 1998) stated that the U.S. strategic approach is based on the understanding that the United States must be the leader in the world, and must be prepared to use all necessary instruments of national power in order to influence some or other actions of other governments and non-government actors of international relations.21

The CCP leadership is gravely concerned by U.S. plans to build a missile defense system. As stated in the Joint Statement by the Presidents of the PRC and RF of July 18, 2000, realization of this plan would bring most serious consequences for the security of China and Russia.22 A direct threat to the security of the PRC is seen in the U.S. intention to deploy the TMD system in the Asia-Pacific and to have Taiwan involved in it.

However, Beijing has not chosen to build up military construction excessively, as it is aware that competition with the United States in this sphere would not bring a victory to the PRC but would frustrate the program of China’s modernization. All the detrimental consequences caused to the Soviet economy by the involvement of Moscow in an arms race with the United States, have been thoroughly analyzed in Beijing.

By all evidence, Beijing’s main response to U.S. missile defenses is asymmetrical and concentrated on political measures. For example, a major aspect is seen in the consolidation of relations with neighboring countries — Russia and other Asian countries of the CIS that together with China form the Shanghai Five, as well as with India. At the same time,

efforts are being taken in order to improve, based on the concept of a multi-polar world, relations with such poles or centers of power as Japan, ASEAN, and the European Union. Such a strategy would introduce difficulties in Washington’s actions vis-à-vis China.

**What Is There for the PRC in the New Century?**

Quite unfortunately, the foreseeable future does not promise to be easy and cloudless for the PRC. Suffice it to say that many difficult problems of today will remain for tomorrow.

The number one of these is the unresolved Taiwan issue. In early 2000 Beijing stated that it would resort “to all possible resolute measures, including the use of force,” should Taiwan refuse “for an uncertain time” to conduct negotiations on reunification. At the same time, a draft law on the consolidation of Taiwan’s security, providing for restoration of a U.S. alliance role for the island, was introduced for consideration by the U.S. Congress. It is not so difficult to see what detrimental consequences for PRC security would be caused by the practical realization of the amply expressed contradictory approaches to the Taiwan issue on the part of Beijing and Washington.

There is an objective need for PRC and India mutual rapprochement that would help to counter hegemonic intentions to establish a uni-polar world. However, an agreement, signed by the two countries in November 1996 is not sufficient for this need to be realized. Beijing and New Delhi will have to make relentless efforts in order to clear their bilateral relations from the burden of territorial claims. India is catching up rapidly with China by the size of population and becoming a power with a huge economic and military potential. According to Chinese forecasts, by 2010 India will join the ranks of “global military powers of the first class.” In this context, one should not exclude a danger of rivalry, detrimental for both, between the two Asian giants in the 21st century.

---

The PRC could hardly manage to evade serious domestic difficulties, too. However paradoxical this might seem, the main sources of these are the same factors that provided for the successful development of the country in the last 20 years; i.e., the economic reforms that contain such dangerous shortcomings as the deepening stratification of Chinese society. The latter might generate social conflicts that would undermine domestic stability which is vitally needed for China’s modernization.

More recently, separatist trends in Xinjiang, actively encouraged from abroad, have become a more disturbing phenomenon. There, in Xinjiang, Islamic fundamentalists, too, are trying to root themselves. These developments threaten to spread beyond the borders of the PRC and aggravate its relations with the Muslim world.

Chinese leaders are quite concerned by the current developments in Russia. Repeated statements by the PRC leaders saying that they want to see Russia as a strong and stable country are not a mere rhetoric, dictated by diplomatic politeness. Russia certainly is the main and most efficient foothold for China in the struggle against hegemony. Today, Russia is not just the main, but also the only source of advanced types of weapons for the PRC. According to the Associated Press information of July 19, 2000, financial volume of Russian-Chinese relations in the military sphere exceeds 2 billion USD per year. This takes place in spite of the fact that the roads of social development of the two countries have drifted apart. In this connection, we cannot help recalling the words of Mao Zedong in the worst days of the Sino-Soviet conflict: “In case of a war we shall stand together.” Leaders in Beijing certainly understand that a weak Russia, should she happen to depend on other powers, would become their tool of struggle against China. In view of the fact that the PRC-Russia border is one of the lengthiest in the world it is not difficult to foresee how Beijing would react in case, for example, NATO appears at this border.

Relations of equal and trustful partnership and strategic co-operation between Russia and China meet the security interests of both countries. At the summit of July 18, 2000, Presidents Vladimir Putin and Jiang Zemin

said that they were satisfied by the course of the RF-PRC cooperation “in preservation of the global strategic balance and stability.” Moscow and Beijing announced their intention to sign the treaty of good-neighborliness, friendship, and cooperation.

Turning to the prospects for the 21st century, there are many reasons to say that the PRC has a sufficient reserve of solidity to cope with the forthcoming difficulties and trials. In August 2000, during his visit to Moscow, Dai Bingguo, head of the CCP CC International Department, said: “Today the Communist Party of China develops its strategy, which is relevant to the challenges of the 21st century. We solve the tasks of construction of the stronger and more powerful party that is capable of ruling the state efficiently and preparing the country for the fierce world competition in the spheres of economy, science, equipment, and technologies.” Beijing has all the bases, built in the course of the two decade-long modernization processes, to be confident of success.

---
