

their borders, especially in southeast Asia. I use that word "sway", and I would also use a word like "hegemony". I think it is impossible to define exactly the sort of influence they feel they rightly should have over their neighbours, especially their smaller neighbours to the south. I will only say I am as sure as I can be that it falls far short of outright expansion and occupation by Chinese communist troops. On the other hand, I think the sort of influence they want probably is somewhat stronger than the influence the United States has over us: it is somewhere between, although probably the American-Canadian parallel is much closer in my view than the alleged Chinese aggressive intention viewpoint.

In all these ways, the Chinese are clearly determined to reassert themselves as a great world power whose voice will be heard and heeded on all matters of world importance to an extent that is commensurate with what they regard as their due in terms of their population, their potential might and their resources and, above all, in terms of the continuity and excellence of their civilization. I am not going to delve into history, but I would like to stress briefly but very strongly that in order to understand Chinese foreign policy you have to understand what happened to them during the period from about 1840 to 1949. That century to them is one of profound humiliation. The western record in China is not good. Canada fortunately was not an imperialist power, but our allies were imperialist powers, and there is no other word to describe them. The record was bad, although not as bad as the Chinese propagandists paint it, but it was nothing to be proud of. The point I am trying to make is that regardless of the rights or wrongs of it, the Chinese feel very deeply that they were humiliated by the white man, including the white Russian man. Because of their tremendous chauvinism which borders on xenophobia very often and very easily, they feel very deeply that they have to reassert themselves. The encirclement of China today by the United States seems to them to be a direct parallel to the encroachments inside China by the foreign powers in the last century.

Now, this is a nationalistic viewpoint and the goals that I have described to you which I think are the important ones are nationalistic goals. There are specifically communist goals in Chinese foreign policy, most notably the rivalry with the Soviet Union for the leadership of the communist world and the support by China for what they call wars of national liberation throughout the developing world. These are goals that are couched in terms of communist ideology. They are sincerely held by men who are dedicated communists, but I would suggest to you that these goals are pursued mainly for nationalistic reasons. This is a way of reasserting Chinese prestige and power and about the only way the Chinese have, because they cannot match the Soviet Union or the United States in economic or military terms. They cannot even match either of them as a giver of aid to the developing world. These policies, I feel, are pursued mainly to embarrass the United States and the Soviet Union, and to undermine the American and the Soviet positions, especially in the Afro-Asian world.

I would add two qualifications immediately to my description of Chinese foreign policy goals. In pursuit of these goals, the Chinese have not been notably aggressive nor expansionist since the communist victory of 1949. When they have used force they have used it sparingly, within limits and only when they felt there was a clear threat to their national security or their territorial integrity. I will not do so now, but I am prepared to defend this thesis in terms of