Challenges for Sino-U.S. Relations: Issues and Problems

by Yang Jiemian

As the world enters a new century and the new millennium, so too does the configuration of world powers. The multipolarization of the world and the globalization of the economy are introducing new international factors. In the post-Cold War era, major powers are readjusting and realigning their relationships. The developed countries, especially the United States, are enjoying a relatively stable period of economic growth and making progress in science and technology. The information revolution has made the world a more integrated one. Along with these developments are changes in people's mindsets—mentalities as well as ideas. Another prominent development is the increase of the numbers of nonstate or superstate players, regional organizations, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and multinational corporations. Finally, the disintegration of the former Soviet Union is forcing the United States to redefine its strategic defense and China policy.

Nonetheless, states are still the most important actors in international affairs. In terms of state-to-state relations, the Sino-U.S. relationship is one of the most important bilateral relationships. In 1999, Sino-U.S. relations experienced dramatic and drastic events, ranging from the bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade1 to the conclusion of a trade agreement in Washington as a step toward China's accession into the World Trade Organization (WTO). The U.S. presidential election in 2000 makes the future of the Sino-U.S. relationship even more complicated and difficult to predict.

Sino-U.S. relations have a strong international context because of other regional and global factors. The direction that the relationship takes will directly affect peace and economic development around the world and in the Asia-Pacific region in particular. China and the United States, as two major powers, bear special responsibility. Given the commonality of some goals and differences between the two nations, there exist both positive and negative possibilities for their relationship in the years ahead.

The World, the Region, and China

World Environments

Since the end of the Cold War, the world has witnessed some fundamental changes. The bipolar environment has disappeared, but it is not yet clear what kind of system is developing. Some observers suggest a Pax Americana; others talk about a multipolar system. Still others advocate something in between. The question of how to define the new world system has caused some uncertainties and anxieties.

The transition from the Cold War international order to the post-Cold War environment does not resemble what has occurred in previous periods. The
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transition did not follow a major war and new treaties; instead, it has been undergoing a long process of evolution. The United Nations (UN), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Bank continue to be important parts of the current international order. But the WTO is definitely something new. All countries, especially some big and middle powers, want to obtain an advantageous position in the NIPEO—the new international political and economic order.

Both the content and extension of international affairs have expanded greatly. State-to-state relations exceed traditional spheres, now extending into economic affairs, education, culture, environmental protection, and others. Nonstate actors are coming to play more important and active roles than ever before. International and regional intergovernmental organizations act as part of a supranational government. Some multinational and transnational organizations have not only much more economic power but also more political power than do some medium and small countries. A state's physical boundaries have become less important for the flow of people, capital, and technology.

A dichotomy of trends is appearing to gather momentum. On the one hand, nations and peoples are inclined to determine their priorities by practical interests. Economic growth and the elevation of quality of life issues are more important than abstract concepts. On the other hand, the United States and some other Western powers are increasingly stressing such notions as democracy, freedom, and human rights. They emphasize the limitations of sovereignty, advocate humanitarian intervention, and call for preventive diplomacy.

The information revolution has rapidly and profoundly changed the world, not only in the ways people communicate but also in the ways they live, work, and think. The ease and swiftness of communications enable nations and people to think in a much broader sense. This is especially true in international affairs. The developed countries are attempting to take advantage of this to expand their political and economic interests in the world. The developing countries are obviously at a disadvantage.

The United States continues to gain advantages. It is enjoying the longest period of economic growth and rapid developments in science and technology. Through NATO expansion and the U.S.-Japan Security Guideline, the United States has succeeded in readjusting its relations with its major allies. With this boost to its comprehensive national strength and self-confidence, the United States is anxious to translate its will into actions in certain international affairs. At the same time, the United States has had to readjust its relations with other major powers. It faces difficulties in dealing with Russia, China, India and, to a certain extent, France. The United States also has troubles dealing with the developing countries.

Regional Environments

The perceptions and realities of the Asia-Pacific region have greatly changed over the past decade. Ten years ago, people were greatly optimistic about the region’s politics, economy, and security. The Asia-Pacific region did not suffer the European kind of political and economic turmoil at the end of the Cold War. People were thus encouraged to talk about the possibility of a peaceful and prosperous transition. The previous two decades of economic growth led them to entertain such ideas as an “Asia-Pacific century.” Some people even doubted if there would ever be a business cycle in the region. However, recent developments proved these predictions wrong.

First, the major power relationships in the region have seen frequent difficulties. Relations among the United States, Japan, and China have become difficult. Indeed, Sino-U.S. and Sino-Japan relations have soured. The strengthened U.S.-Japan military alliance is being watched carefully by China, while closer military-to-military ties between China and Russia are causing grave concerns in the United States and Japan.

Second, the Asian financial crisis that began several years ago ended a long period of high economic growth in the region. Many economies have actually regressed for many years. Asian countries realize now that their economies are vulnerable to outside impacts. As a result, the process of achieving regional economic cooperation and integration has been noticeably affected.

Third, in some countries political turbulence has gone hand in hand with economic difficulties. Indonesia finally discarded the Suharto regime. Tensions on the Korean Peninsula caused repeated concern. The U.S.-Japan Security Guideline and the proposed Theater Missile Defense (TMD) system are highly controversial. The nuclear arms race between India and Pakistan has been a severe setback to non-proliferation efforts.
Despite these adverse developments, the Asia-Pacific region is still moving ahead. On the whole, the Asian financial crisis is over. South Korea, Thailand, Malaysia, and others have regained their momentum of economic growth. Moreover, the Asia-Pacific countries have learned a good lesson that will benefit their development in the future. Indonesia has displayed a great capability to avert political disaster and adapt to the new situation. The ASEAN countries are closing their ranks and preparing for a new role in regional affairs.

**Implications for China**

After twenty years of reforming and opening up, China has substantially improved its national strength. Beijing hopes to transform backward China into a moderately developed country by the middle of the 21st century. To achieve its goals, China needs a peaceful environment externally and stability internally. Thus, China pursues an independent and peaceful foreign policy.

China set out a very clear global and regional strategy. At the global level, this strategy seeks to ensure a more just and reasonable international order. China, as an emerging power, does not demand an overhaul of the existing international order. Actually, China is already part of the existing one. For political and security matters, China is one of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council. For economic matters, it is a member of both the IMF and the World Bank. China is sparing no effort to join the WTO. As a matter of fact, China’s policy of reform and openness is a manifestation of how painstakingly China is working to integrate itself into the international community.

In the meantime, China also works hard at improving the existing order. China does not endorse a monopolar world, nor is it satisfied with Western dominance of world affairs. China calls for an increased role for developing nations. China hopes that, through negotiations and dialogue, the world community will finally be able to establish a more just and fair NIPEO.

At a regional level, China’s first priority is to improve relations with its neighbors, and thanks to past efforts, China enjoys good and stable relations with most of them. China has settled almost all of its border issues with Russia, the former Soviet republics, Vietnam, and some others. China’s proposal for common development while shelving disputes in the South China Sea has been widely appreciated by the parties concerned. During the Asian financial crisis, China kept its promise and did not devalue its currency, thus halting the “domino effect” and a new round of Asian devaluation. China’s high sense of responsibility has won great admiration from its Asian neighbors.

In fact, many Asian countries have come to realize that China is not a threat, but a helper. China also plays an important role in maintaining peace and stability in the Korean Peninsula and works hard on the issue of nonproliferation. China is a positive and active member of major regional organizations and mechanisms, such as the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), the 10+3 (10 ASEAN nations plus China, South Korea, and Japan), the 10+1 (10 ASEAN nations plus China), and the Asia-Europe dialogue.

**Trends in Sino-U.S. Relations**

**New Challenges**

There have been new challenges to the Sino-U.S. relationship:

*First*, mutual frustration has reached a dangerous point. In China’s view, the United States has created one trouble after another. These include allegations of Chinese political contributions to a U.S. presidential campaign, plans for theater missile defenses, the release of the congressionally commissioned Cox Report on suspected espionage, a last-minute rejection of the package deal with visiting Chinese Premier Zhu Rongji on China’s accession to the WTO, the embassy bombing, and the proposed Taiwan Security Enhancement Act (TSEA). The United States, on the other hand, has criticized China for its human rights record, its ties with such rogue nations as Iraq and Iran, its rejection of renouncing the use of force to solve the Taiwan issue, and its vehement reaction after the embassy bombing. The United States also complained that, among other things, China does not return America’s well-intentioned gestures.

*Second*, the strong mutual frustration has turned into deep mutual suspicion. The worst scenario has prevailed in some cases. Foreign policy depends substantially on perceptions. If people just think the worst of each other, sensible and reasonable policies will not be made and implemented. Some of the U.S. media have often depicted China in a very negative way. Some Americans both inside and outside the
government have suspected that China will become an adversary. Some believe that a conflict between the two sometime in the coming century is inevitable.

Third, domestic factors play an increasingly large role. Many complicated and difficult factors are affecting China policy in the United States. Political and partisan fights often derail the President’s agenda. The U.S. preference for unilateralism and the strange alliance of the left and right exert great pressure on any attempt to improve Sino-U.S. relations. The single-issue pressure groups, such as human rights and environmental protection groups, trade unions, and religious organizations, have all challenged the Clinton administration’s China policy. The 2000 presidential campaign has made the situation even more difficult to handle.

In China, increasing integration with the world and with the United States has blurred the distinction between foreign and domestic issues. The issues of Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) status with the United States and WTO accession are two cases in point. The Chinese people’s resentment and dissatisfaction over U.S. pressure have been on the quick rise. Patriotism and enhanced self-confidence have become important factors to be reckoned with in China’s foreign policy decisionmaking process. Of course, not all the domestic factors are negative. Years of interchanges in politics, economics, cultural affairs, professions, and academics have created a large group of people who want a normal and healthy relationship. The two business communities play an active and effective role in this bilateral relationship.

Fourth, the Sino-U.S. relationship is closely tied to cross-Strait relations. Since the Taiwan Strait crisis in 1995–1996 and the summit visits in 1997 and 1998, the United States has exercised some restraint and caution on the Taiwan issue. The U.S. executive and legislative branches and others in the mainstream have reached a sort of consensus behind the view that Taiwan should not take provocative moves. However, two opposing forces are pulling the United States: the desires to improve the Sino-U.S. relationship and to strengthen U.S. ties with Taiwan. The United States has increased arms sales to Taiwan, the U.S.-Japan defense Guideline virtually includes Taiwan, and the proposed TMD will give military, political, and psychological support to Taiwan’s separatist tendencies.

Some Positive Trends

The Sino-U.S. relationship is so important that neither side can afford total confrontation. Even during the troubling and eventful year of 1999, the two governments were able to control the damage and continue their relationship. There is some encouraging news.

1. Both governments are working to put their relationship back on a normal track.

Because the Sino-U.S. relationship is too important to let it get out of control, both countries are working to repair the damage. They reached an agreement on compensation for the embassy bombing. It is encouraging to see that the two presidents used their “hotlines” after both that bombing and Taiwan’s Lee Teng-hui’s “two-state” remarks. The Jiang-Clinton summit at the APEC meeting in September 1999 greatly facilitated the completion of the WTO deal. Finally, China and the United States have resumed political and military consultations, which had been suspended after the bombing incident.

2. The WTO trade package will exert a positive influence on the Sino-U.S. relationship.

Although President Clinton turned down the best possible offer from Chinese Premier Zhu Rongji during his April trip to the United States, the U.S. executive and legislative branches finally realize its importance. Only four months after the bombing incident, the two presidents met at the APEC meeting in Auckland, New Zealand, and agreed to reopen the WTO trade negotiations. Two months later, the two governments concluded the package agreement. As an important step in fulfilling the U.S. obligations, the U.S. Congress will vote on whether to offer PNTR to China some time in the middle of this year. In essence, this is a vote on whether the United States would like to continue its normal trading relations with China and realize the hard-won benefits from its trade negotiations with China. The conclusion of the WTO deal will help narrow differences and expand commonality in the relationship. Closer economic and trade relations will also have positive ripple effects in other fields.

3. China and the United States have reached a certain degree of understanding in order to stabilize the situation in the Taiwan Strait.

China and the United States realize that healthy and normal relations facilitate stable cross-Strait relations, which are in the interests of all the parties concerned. Shortly after Mr. Lee Teng-hui put forward
his “two-state” theory last July, the U.S. executive branch clarified its position on adhering to a “One China” policy and criticized Mr. Lee for his intention to “rock the boat” and “change the status quo.” Even some pro-Taiwan elements within the U.S. Congress showed their dissatisfaction. Some credit should be given to the Clinton administration for helping to defuse the tension.

4. The two sides have resumed political and security dialogues.

While the proposed constructive strategic partnership is controversial, both governments continue consultations on strategic and security matters. Starting from December 1999, China and the United States resumed political and military dialogues. It has been reported that more high-level visits will take place. The Chinese side has again agreed to allow U.S. ships to call at Hong Kong ports. The two sides will also hold joint maritime humanitarian exercises. Such mutual visits and military-to-military exchanges are obviously beneficial for increasing mutual understanding.

5. Realistic expectations reduce the chances of disillusion in future relations.

The two sides have become pragmatic and realistic in setting their goals this year, an election year in the United States. On the American side, the Clinton administration understands that the best course of action is to avoid controversy during the presidential campaign. It is focusing on winning support for PNTR. On the Chinese side, Beijing also realizes that under the current circumstances it is not likely to reach any significant breakthroughs in Sino-U.S. relations. Therefore, promoting the trade and economic relationship has become the major theme, and possibly the only feasible target. Perhaps this is what both sides have learned in the past few years: it is better to resist tempting catchwords and to adopt realistic attitudes.

**How Sino-U.S. Relations Impact the Region**

China and the United States are two important members of the world and the Asia-Pacific region. Their bilateral relationship has great significance for the foreign and domestic policies of the Asian-Pacific countries. For the past three decades, though with ups and downs, the general trend of the Sino-U.S. relationship has been positive and forward-looking. An improved relationship has greatly contributed to peace and development in the region.

In order to maintain this trend, we must understand some of the conceptual and actual differences between the two countries. In evaluating the global and regional situation, China does not see eye to eye with the United States. China believes that the world is heading for a multipolar arrangement. Since the end of the Cold War, the configuration of world powers is changing. The original bipolar confrontation has been replaced by the coexistence of one superpower and several major powers. Although this pattern basically remains stable, U.S. superiority is on the rise. Moreover, the United States is trying hard to translate its superiority into the advancement of its own interests in politics, diplomacy, security, and economy. China calls for the establishment of a more just and fairer NIPEO. It appeals for respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of all countries; it opposes interference in others’ internal affairs; and it rejects the use or threat of use of force.

The United States maintains that it should continue its leadership role in world affairs well into the 21st century. On the basis of its enhanced international standing and increased national strength, the United States tries hard to project its powers, promote its values, expand its economic interests, and spread its culture. U.S. superiority has been further strengthened vis-à-vis a weakened Russia, an economically injured Japan, and a Europe that is not yet a peer. In handling world affairs, the United States is often hegemonic, hotheaded, inclined to interfere with others’ internal affairs, and solve some regional conflicts by force. The United States has even gone so far as to bypass the UN to use military force. Just since August 1998, the United States has used force, either individually or multilaterally, against Afghanistan, Sudan, Iraq, and Yugoslavia.

The United States has not moved beyond the Cold War thinking in security matters. At the end of the Cold War, some Americans seriously thought of restricting NATO’s role, withdrawing some overseas troops, and calling for peace dividends. In the Asia-Pacific region, the Clinton administration once put forward the concept of a “New Pacific Community.” American academic circles explored possible collective models, ranging from the Northeast Asian Security Cooperation Conference to the ARF. However, in recent years, Cold War thinking is picking up in the United States. According to the U.S. Government strategy stated in 1997, the United States takes as
guiding principles molding a conducive international environment, maintaining the capacity to win two theater wars at the same time, and preparing for unforeseeable crises. It is stepping up a security system in the Asia-Pacific region by strengthening bilateral military alliances under its leadership.

The United States has clear-cut targets in these two strategic regions. First and foremost, the United States tries to maintain its global and regional leadership role. It wants to continue to weaken Russia so that there will be no way for Russian to challenge the United States once again in the future. In the Asia-Pacific region, the United States has a hedging policy to prevent China from becoming its peer sometime in the next century.

In order to realize its security strategy, the United States needs to cooperate and coordinate with its allies. The United States has worked out a security network in Europe by strengthening and enlarging NATO. In the Asia-Pacific region, the United States has made the U.S.-Japan alliance a cornerstone of its system of bilateral alliances with Japan, South Korea, Thailand, the Philippines, and Australia.

China has always advocated the casting away of Cold War thinking. It has called for common and cooperative security, and it opposes obtaining one nation’s security at the expense of others. China opposes the so-called NATO expansion, the U.S.-led NATO action in Kosovo, and U.S. military actions against some countries. China firmly opposes U.S. arms sales to Taiwan, the inclusion of Taiwan under the U.S.-Japan Security Guideline, the TMD covers for Taiwan, and the proposed TSEA. All these not only seriously violate three Sino-U.S. joint communiqués, but in China’s eyes, they gravely encroach upon China’s sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Small wonder that China and the United States differ on a number of international issues, such as China’s relationship with Iran and Iraq, post-nuclear test relations with India and Pakistan, the international trial of former Khmer Rouge leaders, and particularly the Kosovo crisis. Therefore, some Americans even claim that there is no basis of cooperation for the proposed strategic partnership between the two countries.

A Better Future

Working Toward a Better Sino-U.S. Relationship

As a ranking U.S. Pentagon official said, among the Sino-U.S. problems, the most important and imminent danger lies not with concerns over human rights, trade deficits, or the Falun Gong, but with the Taiwan issue. Indeed, the Taiwan issue has always been the most important and sensitive issue at the core of the relationship. Therefore, the United States should play a positive role in handling the Taiwan issue. Fundamentally speaking, the Taiwan issue is an internal affair between the Chinese across the Taiwan Strait, and the United States should not interfere with China’s internal affairs. However, the Chinese side can discuss the Taiwan issue with the Americans because the United States created the Taiwan issue half a century ago and still possesses great influence over Taiwan. The Taiwan issue remains the most important and sensitive issue at the core of the Sino relations. The U.S. executive branch and the U.S. Congress should not play a negative role in the process of China reunification. The United States should abide by the three joint communiqués and keep to its commitment to the “One China” principle; the U.S. Congress should encourage cross-strait dialogue instead of Taiwanese independence.

In the near term, both countries should strive to stabilize their relationship. Like it or not, the U.S. election culture has created a four-year cycle of first attacking and then dealing with China. Campaign rhetoric fuels fiery debates in both countries. Political and opinion leaders have a great responsibility to stabilize the bilateral relationship. The gradual resumption of political, strategic, and military exchanges is important for mutual communication. The so-called second tracks are indispensable in promoting mutual understanding. The economic interaction is a stabilizer in the relationship. Allowing each other to speak candidly and refraining from overreaction to words benefits efforts to maintain a stable relationship. Doing something of common interest and deferring something controversial facilitates a constructive relationship. The reverse will result not only in a competitive but also a confrontational relationship.

In the medium term, both countries should improve their mechanisms and work towards more confidence-building measures (CBMs). They should also create a favorable regional environment. Given the importance of the two countries, their bilateral
relationship has far exceeded their physical boundaries. It is in their common interest to create a politically friendly, strategically cooperative environment in the region. China and the United States should adopt a down-to-earth attitude to discuss important regional issues, such as the China-U.S.-Russia relationship, the China-U.S.-Japan relationship, the Korean Peninsula, economic and financial cooperation, and so forth.

In the long term, both countries should take a strategic and long-term view when they deal with each other. They should take concrete steps to enhance understanding, dispel misunderstandings, remove suspicions, reduce troubles, and increase cooperation. First and foremost, they should work out a strategy for making friendlier relations and not making enemies of each other. They must have more official and unofficial contacts, greater economic and trade interactions, better coordination on global and regional issues, closer consultation in international organizations, and joint efforts in building up a NIPEO.

**Working Toward a Better Asia-Pacific Region**

As the Sino-U.S. relationship directly affects regional stability and prosperity, the two countries have special responsibilities and hold the keys to building regional security and an economic framework. China and the United States should display more sincerity and trust in conducting dialogues on regional security matters. Together with other countries in the region, they should work out a formula to enhance mutual trust, reduce mutual suspicions, alleviate the danger of an arms race, and avoid unintentional accidents. Through these CBMs, they could contribute to a stable and secure regional environment.

On some existing and potential hot spots in the region, both China and the United States should expand cooperation where such cooperation exists, such as concerning the issues of the Korean Peninsula, Cambodia, and the matter of non-proliferation on the South Asia sub-continent. They should work hard to facilitate cooperation where such possibilities can be sought, such as in Southeast Asia. They should also do a better job of damage control where they have fundamental differences. Neither side should take unilateral actions that will aggravate the situation.

Security far exceeds traditional boundaries. Economic security has become an important component of national security considerations. China and the United States worked together at the APEC forum and cooperated to a certain extent on financial and monetary matters during the Asian financial crisis. However, further cooperation needs more frequent communication, understanding, and trust. China, the United States, and other concerned countries should work together toward this end. Here, region-wide cooperation must be a precondition for building up the regional mechanism to promote trade liberalization, cooperation in science and technology, and stability in finance and monetary matters.

**Working Toward a Better World**

China and the United States are major world powers. They are both permanent members of the UN Security Council, and both possess nuclear weapons. China is the largest developing country, whereas the United States is the strongest developed one. Moreover, China is emerging and the United States is not declining. To a large extent the two countries will be critical to the establishment of the NIPEO on a more just and fairer basis.

Both countries should work together with major countries and/or country groups to reach a consensus on the principles for establishing the new international order. They should determine the codes of conduct as well. While it is useful to explore such concepts as human rights and humanitarian concerns, no country has the right to monopolize their interpretation, let alone to enforce their views onto other nations. In the meantime, the two should fully implement China’s Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence as a prerequisite to establishing the NIPEO. Of course, they should also take into consideration other proper principles.

To realize these goals, China and the United States should work with other countries to reach agreements. China does call for an immediate realization of the NIPEO, but through negotiation and in a gradual way. It advocates strengthening rather than weakening the role of the UN. It firmly opposes unilateral alteration of existing arrangements, such as the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABM). It positively participates in new negotiations, such as the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). And China makes relentless efforts to join new organizations such as WTO.

Both countries should work hard, with a view to the era of the “earth village.” China and the United States are major nations that both have vast territories, big populations, and considerable powers. Therefore,
it is relatively easier for them to adopt the earth village concept, but still difficult to translate it into policies. They should stress the welfare of the entire human race rather than their own. They have the responsibilities and obligations to eliminate poverty both at home and abroad. Broad-mindedness is the basis for harmony, instead of conflict, between nations.

Both the United States and China should think far in advance for ways to promote the peace and prosperity of the world. At this time of invention, creativity, and advancement, new progress in science and technology takes place every day. China, the United States, and other countries are confronted with the issue of how to make these developments work for world peace and prosperity. All countries should concentrate their wisdom and resources on lifting up people’s living standards. All countries should use these new achievements to promote healthy state-to-state relations, instead of interfering with other countries internal affairs. No country should be allowed to start a new round of arms race by taking advantage of its strength.

The above-mentioned principles may seem to be too idealistic and moral-driven. However, for a better and more secure world in the new century and millennium, we need inspiration, principles, value, and truth. China is one of the birthplaces of great thoughts. The United States is typical in generating new thinking. Asia is proud of its unique value. The Asia-Pacific region has immensely contributed to development strategy and philosophy. There is no reason why China and the United States should hesitate to talk about ideas and ideals.

In the United States, especially in the military circle, it is generally believed that strong and sufficient military preparation can stop war. In Chinese characters, two parts make up the word “military”: meaning say NO to weapons. We have something in common despite of all our differences. Therefore, let us make joint efforts at the two ends of the world to say NO to wars and YES to peace and prosperity.

Notes

1 On May 8, 1999, NATO bombs hit the Chinese embassy, killing four. NATO said its planes were attacking a Yugoslav arms procurement office in Belgrade and fired on the wrong building.

2 The Cox Committee, formally titled the Select Committee on U.S. National Security and Military/Commercial concerns with the People’s Republic of China, issued its report in June 1999.

3 China conducted military exercises that included missile tests in the Taiwan Strait, to which the United States dispatched two carrier battle groups and other ships.

4 Lee made these remarks to a German radio station reporter on July 9, 1999.

5 The United States House of Representatives voted to approve PNTR on May 24, 2000; the Senate approved the measure on September 19, 2000.

6 In 1949, when Mao Zedong declared Beijing the capital of the new People’s Republic of China, millions of Kuomintang (KMT) supporters fled to Taiwan. The United States did not officially recognize the People’s Republic of China until December 15, 1978.

7 These principles for fostering friendly relations with other countries were formally presented by Premier Zhou Enlai in April 1955 at the first Asian-African conference (the Bandung Conference). In 1982, these principles were written into China’s Constitution.