

Emotions, international hierarchy, and the problem of solipsism in Sino-US South China Sea politics

Wirth, Christian

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:
GIGA German Institute of Global and Area Studies

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Wirth, C. (2020). Emotions, international hierarchy, and the problem of solipsism in Sino-US South China Sea politics. *International Relations*, 34(1), 25-45. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047117819875995>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY Lizenz (Namensnennung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY Licence (Attribution). For more Information see:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>



Emotions, international hierarchy, and the problem of solipsism in Sino-US South China Sea politics

International Relations
2020, Vol. 34(1) 25–45
© The Author(s) 2019



Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/0047117819875995
journals.sagepub.com/home/ire



Christian Wirth 

GIGA German Institute of Global and Area Studies; Griffith University

Abstract

This study offers an explanation for Beijing's seemingly self-defeating approach to the South China Sea that distances China ever more from the regional and international communities which it wants to lead and join while drawing in the foreign military presence that it seeks to keep at a distance. Combining recent research on the role of emotions and on hierarchy in international politics, this article shows how the powerful narrative of national 'humiliation' and 'rejuvenation' has informed Chinese maritime politics. As the South China Sea became incorporated in the linear timeline of China's 5000 year civilizational history, the US' and its allies' push-back against Beijing's territorial claims deepened China's ideational isolation. The ensuing state of solipsism increases the risk of violent confrontations.

Keywords

China, emotions, international hierarchy, South China Sea, trauma, United States

Introduction

In November 2012, Xi Jinping, the newly elected General-Secretary of the Communist Party of China (CPC) and Chairman of the Central Military Commission led the other six members of the Politburo Standing Committee through the National Museum at Tiananmen Square. The highly symbolic visit by the party-state's inner circle provided the setting for the most powerful leader since Mao Zedong to renew the Party's pledge to fulfil its historical mission and make China great again. Walking through the Road of Rejuvenation permanent exhibition, Xi reportedly paid special attention to exhibits on the First Opium War (1840–2) and to charts illustrating the humiliating history of 'how

Corresponding author:

Christian Wirth, GIGA German Institute of Global and Area Studies, Rothenbaumchaussee 32, 20148 Hamburg, Germany.

Email: christian.wirth@giga-hamburg.de

the West had occupied China's territories, established concessions and carved-out spheres of influence'.¹ Media reports also emphasized him looking at photos of the Central Committee session at which Deng Xiaoping launched the 'epoch-making reform and opening up drive'. In the subsequent speech *The Road Towards Renewal*, touted as 'a retrospective on the Chinese nation, a celebration of its present and a declaration on its future', Xi reminded his countrymen and women that 'the Chinese nation had suffered unusual hardship and sacrifice in the world's history' and pointed out that 'the Chinese people have never given in, have struggled ceaselessly, and have finally taken hold of their own destiny and started the great process of building the nation'.²

This speech and media coverage not only located China but also every Chinese citizen on the linear timeline of development such as it continues to constitute international hierarchy. Referring 'to the country's hard-earned finding of a correct road towards rejuvenation and its remarkable achievements', that is China climbing upwards in the hierarchy, Xi also cited from a poem: 'I will mount a long wind some day and break the heavy waves'. The state-guided media clarified that 'after more than 170 years of hard struggle since the Opium War, the Chinese nation has bright prospects, is closer than ever to reaching its goal of great renewal'.³

The emphasis on the trauma of 'national humiliation' and the hope for and path towards 'rejuvenation', including the allusion to the seas, proved to be highly consequential. In early 2015, media reports revealed that China had been engaged in large-scale land reclamation and reinforced several of the disputed reefs and rocks in the Spratly area of the South China Sea.⁴ Predictably, the clandestine manner and unprecedented scale – fleets of dredging ships had been constructing a 'great wall of sand'⁵ through the enlargement of no less than seven features including major runways and harbours – elicited widespread condemnation. Not only the rival claimants of Vietnam and the Philippines but also US, Japanese, and Australian policy-makers decried the Chinese move as provocative, violating international laws and norms, and thereby undermining the 'rules-based international order'.⁶ Highly publicized and in line with its long-standing practice,⁷ the US Navy intensified so-called Freedom of Navigation Operations (FONOPS) in the South China Sea,⁸ and the Japanese government dispatched submarines and large helicopter carriers to Southeast Asia with the intention of 'sending strong messages'.⁹ Much to the Chinese government's dismay, the G-7 leaders repeatedly criticized Beijing's behaviour too.¹⁰ Thus, the Xi administration managed in a few years to bring about the opposite of Beijing's principal strategic objectives: To be recognized as a peacefully developing, responsible member of the international community, and to safeguard China's sovereignty by keeping foreign, especially US forces, at a distance.

How is this seemingly self-defeating course of action by a leadership that is deemed exceptionally apt in strategic thinking and policy-making explainable? Why did the Chinese government deliberately follow a policy line that would arouse widespread concerns, condemnation, and in turn rekindle Chinese leaders' and people's feelings of national humiliation? Answers to these questions not only address the empirical question how far the Chinese leadership may be ready to go in defending its claims. The examination of Sino-US South China Sea politics also provides a case for the study of collective memory and of emotions through the linking of trauma with a specific instance of international hierarchy.

The present study suggests that international hierarchy centred on 'Western' international community of developed and democratic states made it difficult for the non-Western, underdeveloped and communist-party-ruled China collectively, and people in China individually, to communicate grief that stems from past violence and thus obstructed the re-construction of new identities. The national trauma, manifest in the discourse of 'national humiliation', persists despite rapidly increasing material power and deepens China's ideational insulation. Thus, international hierarchy spurs the Communist Party's continuing quest for national 'rejuvenation' by making China the Maritime Power (*Haiyang daguo*) that, through its assertiveness, partially reproduces the very memories and feelings of national humiliation that it is supposed to overcome.

The line of argument proceeds in five steps. In the next section, I link recent advancements in the study of emotions in world politics to the constitutional effects of international hierarchy and its effects on Sino-US geopolitics in the South China Sea. Thereafter, I introduce the concept of trauma time as a means to operationalize the role of emotions in hierarchical international politics.¹¹ Subsequently, I revisit the revival of China's 'national humiliation' narrative as an indication for China's unresolved collective traumata. Then, I show how the South China Sea has become an integral part of China's imagined historical trajectory from humiliation to rejuvenation. This insight suggests that the Sino-US geopolitical contest, as discussed in the subsequent section, has been nurturing the national victimization narrative. Last, I point to the problematic dynamic that this emerging ideational isolation or solipsism on the part of China entails.

Emotions, international hierarchy and the South China Sea

Although the emotion of fear is central to the inquiry into, it is rarely operationalized in studies of contemporary politics.¹² Even though recent scholarship refuted earlier concerns with scientific quality,¹³ the predominant view continues to treat actions based on fear, anger, shame, grief, hatred and hope as mere aberrations from the otherwise rational behaviour of the modern subject.¹⁴ Emotions that lead to so-called misperceptions tend to be attributed to the unreasonable 'other' and are seen as the very traits of human behaviour that need to be rooted out; usually through sufficiently strong and well-crafted postures of deterrence. Moreover, few studies have systematically analysed the important role of emotions in (international) politics beyond the Euro-Atlantic.¹⁵ This shortcoming may be pronounced in analyses of Asia-Pacific affairs.¹⁶ Therefore, the dimension of international hierarchy is often underappreciated. Likewise, few discussions of international hierarchy make emotions their focus of analysis.¹⁷ This is intriguing given that the defining vocabulary of 'shifting' and 'rising' powers display an emotional 'expression of our vulnerability to events that we don't control'.¹⁸

International hierarchy engenders a rather contradictory conception China's place in the world. While most outside observers are anxious about an assertively 'rising China' remaking world order according to its own preferences, Chinese policy-makers fear the consequences of being weak; of a China that fails to advance fast enough, remains an outsider to the international community, and consequently faces the prospects of societal disorder, foreign encroachment, and even dismemberment.¹⁹ In Callahan's words, China is a 'pessoptimist' nation.²⁰ Fear of the future co-exists with hope for a better future, such

as President Xi expounded it in his formulation of the Chinese Dream.²¹ It is the CPC's long-standing aspiration to, first, realize a 'moderately well-off society' and second, to become a respected member of the international community.²² The leadership even set itself and every Chinese person deadlines for achieving them: The former by the centenary of the CPC's founding in 2021 and the latter by the centenary of the founding of the People's Republic in 2049.²³ Hence, the Party sees the first two decades of the twenty-first century as a 'period of strategic opportunity' not to be missed.²⁴

Hierarchy conceals these emotions: Those showing emotions are seen as behaving unreasonably and their concerns and claims are, therefore, invalid or insignificant.²⁵ The dismissal of Chinese emotional reactions as purely instrumental, as the Party's tactical use of nationalism, is a direct outflow of this view.²⁶ Because deliberately exaggerated and distorted 'facts' will elicit reactions from target audiences and may eventually become commonly held beliefs, also among the very manipulators, it is largely irrelevant whether emotional outbursts are part or results of a propaganda offensive or not. To the contrary, in their desire to portray themselves as strong leaders in control of every situation and contingency, officials will likely tone down the full extent of their individual disapproval and conceal their personal fears through the use of diplomatic jargon. Since escalating maritime conflicts are seen as epitome for how the power shift towards China destabilizes the established 'rule-based order', the South China Sea provides an insightful case for showing 'how exactly [...] hierarchies create the trade-offs that (later) shape behavior'.²⁷

While clashes between Beijing and Washington are well documented, studies that apply conventional methodologies display great difficulties with explaining the repetition of escalatory 'mistakes' and 'miscalculations', including officials' refusal to use communication hotlines and their clear tendencies to believe in conspiracy theories amid the continuous build-up of antagonistic military postures.²⁸ Methodologically more critical studies made the strong case for the relevance of deeply entrenched historical narratives, the so-called century of national humiliation in particular, in framing Beijing's interpretations of the international environment and determining foreign and security political responses. Gries, for instance, points to the lasting humiliation that the Chinese leaders and public felt after the US in May 1999 bombed the Chinese embassy in Belgrade.²⁹ Wang's study shows in detail how these feelings led Chinese decision-makers to interpret the Belgrade bombing as US-led ploy to create chaos and topple the CPC. The same case also strongly supports the argument that China's transformation to a capitalist economy led to a rekindling of national humiliation narratives and pushed leaders such as President Jiang Zemin – known for his personal emotional outbursts upon what he perceived as lack of respect for his country – to put utmost premium at increasing China's status through boosting 'comprehensive national power', that is the twenty-first century version of the 'rich nation strong army' paradigm originally propagated by twentieth century nationalists.³⁰

In the same vein as the Belgrade embassy bombing, the collision of a Chinese fighter jet with a US EP-3 reconnaissance plane over the South China Sea that caused the Chinese pilot's death and led to a controversy over the arrest of the US crew after their emergency landing deepened Chinese indignation. The foreign ministry repeatedly asserted that China's national sovereignty and *dignity* should not be violated and insisted

that the American government apologize and take responsibility for the troubles caused to China.³¹ Shepperd, explicitly theorizing these emotions, found that while the US sought to bolster their position through references to international law, Chinese leaders and the public alike felt bullied and lamented the US' hegemonic attitude.³² Noting the use of strongly emotional language and seemingly excessive insistence on a US apology, and recognizing that the 'betrayal' of hitherto practised rules of interaction led the situation deteriorate at 'alarming' speed, she points to the long-standing Chinese fears of encirclement fueled by the narrative of national humiliation. Hutchison goes one analytical step further. Examining the memory politics described by Wang and others, she finds that people in China have been unable to 'act out' their trauma.³³ Yet, while pointing to the crucial role of community in this process, her conclusion stops with a reference to the need for critical reflection. Here, an explicit theorizing of international hierarchy and a discussion of evidence beyond instances of diplomatic crisis management promises deeper insights.³⁴

Warped trauma time and the linear time of the state

Experiences are traumatic when they are 'too horrible to be remembered' and to be 'integrated into our symbolic universe'.³⁵ This is true especially for violence directed at individuals. Victims feel a deep sense of betrayal and loss of trust in their immediate social worlds and, hence, also in their own ability to act as independent agents.³⁶ As Edkins elaborates, traumatic events reveal the radical contingency of social order. Thrown out of the world that we all take for granted, and unable to make sense of what happened, the victim must not only fear the possible return of violent encounter at any moment, he or she is also unable to communicate the meaning of the painful – unimaginable and unspeakable – experience to others.³⁷ As a result, it is very difficult for the victim of violence³⁸ to regain a new understanding and purpose of his or her place in a given social world:

the boundaries of meaning are circumscribed by a frozen picture of the past, which continues to structure interaction with others. Held captive by this picture, the self engages with the world as if past and present were inseparable, and as if the world were her world of trauma'.³⁹ Being caught in this emotional warp is what Edkins calls 'trauma time'.⁴⁰

The only way to regain a sense of control – or ontological security – leads through the gradual sharing of grief and reflection about the traumatic experiences with others. Others who acknowledge the victim's pain and assist him or her to regain confidence in the self and in their world through the reattribution of meaning to the past, while also directing attention towards reconstructing a new future. In other words, it is necessary to 'encircle' the traumatic experience in order to gradually restore a linear timeline of existence compatible with the social structures of contemporary society.⁴¹

In a modern society such as the CPC forcefully propagates it, belonging to certain national communities inevitably defines social worlds. Yet, imaginations of linear and therefore reassuringly transcendent accounts of national histories are always precarious. Collective memory is incompatible with the individual memories that it absorbs into

national narratives of common suffering, heroic sacrifice, and redemption or salvation. This tension is especially pronounced when the national community refuses to recognize the victim's grief. Worse, when the community and its representatives are the very perpetrators of violence. Instances of large-scale violence, then, impose a particular strong demand for the assimilation of individual narratives into national narratives. For the national community to remain united, authorities must provide an instant and credible story about the causes for past suffering and embed it into the community's journey to the prosperous future: the linear time of the state.⁴²

In this way, the aforementioned Road to Rejuvenation exhibition creates the depoliticizing time of the state.⁴³ In China's case, it is the time of the (Han-)civilizational state.⁴⁴ Chinese history is narrated as a linear path that starts with the Qin dynasty. According to official historiography, a peaceful order had been established and laid the foundation for China's prosperity when the first emperor forcibly unified a great number of disparate and incessantly warring kingdoms in 221 BC. The 5000 year march through history culminates with the display of modern China's proud achievements. The steady if not exponential increase of industrial output, the electrification of Chinese households, the People's Liberation Army (PLA) wielding advanced weaponry and participating in United Nations peacekeeping operations, and the successful pushing of civilizational boundaries through the Xuelong ice-breaker's explorations of the polar ice caps, the Jiaolong manned submersible's charting of the deep oceans, and the Long March rockets' supplying the Tiangong space station.⁴⁵

Yet, as the strong insistence on national unity and expedient progress from the 'century of national humiliation' to 'national rejuvenation' amid a successful rekindling of the national victimization narrative suggests, the traumata of past violence have proven hard to overcome. The onslaught of European empires, culminating in the Middle Kingdom's subjugation to previously peripheral Japan from 1931 onwards, features most prominently. While the so-called semi-colonization and the ensuing civil wars shattered the Chinese people's worlds, interstate wars destroyed China's world.⁴⁶

Defeat means a loss of control, or profound ontological insecurity, by the loser over his or her future. It is compounded by the fact that the history of the conflict is written by the victor; the defeated also loses control over the own past.⁴⁷ Thus, the victimized or defeated, individually and as a community, respectively, struggle to find the words that can convey their grief and find empathic listeners for their stories about what happened. Consequently, trauma gives rise to a 'hardening of boundaries between self and others, in an attempt to reduce vulnerability'.⁴⁸ This can lead to ideational isolation or solipsism. Solipsism denotes the emotional state when an individual, due to a traumatic experience, retreats or flights from a shared reality to an inner world which is only open to comprehension by that individual, who inhabits it all alone: '*the world and my world*' becomes to be experienced as '*one and the same thing*'.⁴⁹

In such situations, anger and the drive for revenge are often the only available means for restoring the minimum of self-respect and dignity that are required for keeping someone going and avoid him or her falling into self-destructive behaviour.⁵⁰ This is because, as Fierke explains, the most important emotion that lies behind anger (and fear) is shame; shame that is often denied because we are 'ashamed of being ashamed'.⁵¹ While shame is directed at oneself, anger is directed at the other: 'the self, unable to acknowledge

painful emotions inside, articulates the problem outward, as betrayal or *humiliation* by another', and 'an Other may reinforce the boundaries separating the isolated self through further denial'.⁵² That is, traumatic experiences cause two seemingly contradictory emotional reactions: Shame for being unable to resist someone taking away all that we hold dear, including our own agency and self-respect, and anger at the perpetrated injustice. The former haunts the victim in the form of constant fear of being deprived of agency again, and thus being humiliated once more. The latter spurs the victim into action to prove, especially to the perpetrator and to the self, that the violent acts were wrong and that the self is not to blame. This can only be done if the victim succeeds in restoring agency by finding empathic listeners for his or her story about what happened. Hence, international hierarchy manifests itself not only in an actor's power to take away another's self-respect but also in the capacity to suppress *or* acknowledge another's story.

As we have seen, the CPC under Xi Jinping redoubled its efforts to rectify past injustice and overwrite China's humiliating history – such as it is officially narrated – through achieving a moderately well-off society and regaining recognition as a (responsible) great power until 2021 and 2049, respectively. The present analytical framework is capable of shedding more light on the reasons behind the extraordinary strength and persistence of this motivational structure as it propels China's maritime policies.

China's recurrent traumata

Mao Zedong's famous declaration in 1949 that 'the Chinese (people) have stood up'⁵³ did not mean the fulfilment of the CPC's or his personal mission.⁵⁴ Despite the downfall of the Japanese Empire and defeat of the rivalling Nationalists, siege mentality, an indication of ideational isolation, continued to hold sway over the Communist leadership. Increasingly paranoid, Mao personally and the party-state leadership collectively, remained caught in their own worlds and suffered great anxiety.⁵⁵ Hence, Mao continuously adhered to an aggressive revolutionary stance in both domestic and international politics. Not only did his CPC fail to restore China's linear trajectory towards prosperity and peace beyond national independence, Mao's policies also meant the breaking of countless individual and communal timelines that had persisted or been restored after the civil war had ended in 1949. As China remained isolated even in the communist camp, Mao's zealous modernization drive engendered further traumata.

Disconnected from the reality of ordinary people, the state turned on its citizens: aimed at fast catching-up with Western industrialization, the massive collectivization programmes of the Great Leap Forward led to the premature death of more than 40 million people between 1958 and 1962.⁵⁶ This extremely traumatic event in Chinese history engendered a further series of equally disruptive atrocities.⁵⁷ When Mao's faction started the Cultural Revolution (1966–76) to purge potential challengers and thereby dismantled the very party-state the CPC had been building, people also turned against one another: students denounced teachers, neighbours accused each other, and even family members allowed the mob to publicly humiliate, expropriate and kill their closest on the grounds of alleged anti-revolutionary mindsets.⁵⁸ Thus, people in China suffered the greatest possible – unimaginable and therefore unspeakable – loss of trust in their immediate social worlds.⁵⁹

These traumatic events allowed Deng Xiaoping to embark on the radically different reform and opening-up policy. The subsequent advances in agricultural and industrial development led to incipient prosperity and enabled a great many individuals to rebuild their worlds as they envisioned new, linear trajectories into promising futures. At the same time, Deng's developmental success allowed the Communist Party to reconstruct the linear time of China's path to rejuvenation, including its re-joining of the international community. Yet, forceful economic restructuring combined with the displacement of rural communities for the sake of development stirred public unrest. Deng's fear that protests would lead to a recurrence of chaos and derail China from its developmental track misled him to partially recreate the very traumatic experiences that he sought to avoid when ordering troops to Tiananmen Square in June 1989.⁶⁰ The People's Liberation Army's attack on the people could not be integrated in the narrative of China's path to rejuvenation and became taboo. Moreover, the crackdown meant that China was going against the tide of the time. Since it threatened the coherence of the equally linear narrative of the world's inevitable 'Westernizing' and the 'ending of history',⁶¹ the Communist Party leadership became isolated and retreated into siege mentality once more.⁶²

Instead of being 'situated within a social world where the painful experience has meaning within a [national as well as international] community such that the bereaved receives the necessary support over time to redefine [their] place in everyday life', much of peoples' grief became 'accompanied by betrayal and isolation' and lead to the continuation of trauma.⁶³ Thus, China's 'rise' coincided with the resurgence of status anxiety and rekindled feelings of victimhood and *national* humiliation.⁶⁴ As we have seen, emotions of shame result from memories and corresponding fears of renewed loss of control over the self, and the exposure of that loss in ways that suggest to others and, crucially, also to the victim him or herself, that he or she lacks agency, and potentially deprives him or her of being respected as a human.⁶⁵ Therefore, contrary to giving up and turning upon oneself, 'living well is the best revenge'.⁶⁶ This approach to overcoming humiliation is not without caveats, though. Because living well depends on industrial development along the ideal of US-led modernization, a repudiation of China's success in following that model may dash the hope of becoming part of the prosperous 'West' and raises the spectre of further humiliation.⁶⁷ This is why foreign criticisms pointing at socio-economic problems, which are also seen as likely impediments within China, exacerbate feelings of national humiliation. They confirm pre-existing anxieties and suggest that Chinese leaders could lose control over their country's fate and might be unable to steer it along the linear path of development and national rejuvenation.

These circumstances give rise to a contradictory emotional pattern. The straightening of China's civilizational timeline for overcoming the national trauma requires both successful socio-economic development and foreign recognition. Yet, since the negative appraisal of *rising* China as a threat, especially from the US, brings some recognition as an independent actor in international relations too, development may take precedence over the maintenance of good relations. Hence, China's foreign policy-induced national trauma persists and helps the Party to continue demanding greater sacrifice from the people for the sake of development and national security.⁶⁸ From the mid-1990s onwards, this developmental drive came to propel China's pushing of the maritime frontier further into the deep seas.

The national rejuvenation dream and the South China Sea

The discovery of marine development as a new 'growth engine', in conjunction with the post-Tiananmen patriotic education campaign's emphasis on national victimhood,⁶⁹ led to the incorporation of the South China Sea into the 5000 year timeline of the Chinese state. The National Museum's panels pertaining to each of the phases of China's Road to Rejuvenation depict the South China Sea as part of the country ever since 221 BC. Yet, political maps not only create the impression that the nation has always been there, immutably frozen in time and space and therefore reassuringly persistent into the distant future. As Callahan demonstrated, these cartographic representations of China are also highly emotional. They mourn the loss of national territory and are aspirational in that they stake out the territories to be recovered.⁷⁰ The Communist Party not only appropriated the infamous nine-dash line drawn by a middle-ranking officer of the rivalling Nationalist Party in the 1930s; they also elevated its safeguarding to a matter of national survival.⁷¹ Increasingly tied to China's (territorial) integrity, this projection of 'newly written borders *backward* in time'⁷² morphed into a de facto 'core interests' in a manner that had 'never applied to its land border disputes'.⁷³

The strengthening developmental imperative entrenched Chinese leaders' urge to control the seas to the extent that the successful assertion of maritime claims came to be perceived as a precondition for the nation's development, and for achieving the China Dream.⁷⁴ In 1998 already, the first White Paper on Marine Development had asserted that ocean development was nothing less than a condition for the success of China's modernization project: 'As a major developing country with a long coastline, China must take exploitation and protection of the ocean as a long-term strategic task before it can achieve the sustainable development of its national economy'.⁷⁵ The inclusion of ocean development in the 11th Five-Year Plan of 2006 accelerated efforts to develop the seas, for the stimulation of growth, and for the assertion of international status. This drive experienced another push after the 2008 Global Financial Crisis put millions of migrant workers out of their jobs and prompted the leadership to dispense an enormous \$586 billion stimulus package while introducing new special economic zones.⁷⁶ The 12th Five-Year Plan increased emphasis on the marine economy even further and the State Oceanic Administration (SOA) started publishing annual reports on China's Ocean Development.⁷⁷ In line with the overall objective to boost comprehensive national power,⁷⁸ the blueprint for national development from 2011 to 2015 proclaimed 'the importance of integrated maritime indicators is growing' as a means to avoid being 'left behind' and to 'catch up with worldwide trends'.⁷⁹ The state-guided media hailed the marine economy a new 'growth engine',⁸⁰ and officials elevated it to a 'strategic level' for China's development.⁸¹ At the same time, during the 18th Party Congress of 2012, the incoming leaders Xi Jinping and Li Keqiang pledged to enhance China's capacity for marine resource exploitation, to safeguard its maritime rights, and to make it a maritime power. The head of the SOA elaborated that a country requires the comprehensive strength to develop, use, protect, control and manage maritime areas.⁸² Given the 'complicated' situations, both domestic and international, this strategy appeared to be the only way forward for developing China into a World Power.⁸³ Subsequent government work reports and policy papers consistently reiterated this emphasis on coordinated ocean development.⁸⁴

China's turn to the seas, the quest to becoming a maritime power, represents the desire to become an industrially advanced country and a respected member of the (Western) international community. Thereby, ocean development restores the linear timeline of the Chinese civilizational state. This is even more important given the persistence of the strongly self-denying view that 'land civilizations', such as China's, have historically been inferior to the 'maritime civilizations' of the 'West' and Japan.⁸⁵ As Xie points out, the documentary 'Toward the Sea' aired by the country's main broadcaster in December 2011 reveals this driving force behind (ocean) development. It is reminiscent of the now disgraced 1988 television series *He Shang* [River Elegy]. Particularly the title of its first segment 'Searching for a Dream' had stirred great controversies due to its modernist portrayal of traditional Chinese culture – land-based as opposed to western ocean-based culture – as being backward and the cause for China's underdevelopment. In a display of deep-rooted feelings of shame, it conveyed the message that China must throw its culture overboard, that is negate the self and Westernize to become prosperous and respected (by the 'West' and by itself).

Consequently, the projection of the desire for national development into the maritime sphere means that to renounce maritime territorial claims would be tantamount to give up hope for achieving national modernization and rejuvenation project itself. China's imagined 5000 year trajectory through time would be broken again, or come to an end altogether. This is the context in which specific policies such as new laws aimed at 'protecting' islands through development,⁸⁶ including land reclamation in the South China Sea, must be understood.

Solipsism and China's future past?

From Beijing's perspective, China is once again being 'bullied' and must redouble its efforts to overcome 'national humiliation'. Foreign pressure in the East and South China seas all but confirms this rationale.⁸⁷ Until recently, it was only a minority of outspoken 'naval nationalists' who voiced this kind of concern.⁸⁸ Yet, since around 2008, this view on maritime issues has been spreading. Wang identified three common messages in mass media coverage: 'the alleged theft of resources by foreign countries, a presumed conspiracy of the United States, and a call for stronger positions to confront foreign challenges'.⁸⁹ Indicating solipsistic tendencies, China is always portrayed as the victim, not the aggressor. Because these messages have been falling on open ears, positively at home and negatively abroad, it is problematic to distinguish them from the 'real' and ostensibly more rational views of the elites.

Nurtured by a continuous string of seemingly minor but no less publicized incidents emerging from surveillance activities at sea, the national humiliation discourse lost none of its salience, and led to a deepening of China's ideational isolation. In March 2001 already, a Chinese frigate, according to US courses, 'aggressively confronted' an oceanographic survey ship of the US Navy and ordered it to leave the exclusive economic zone (EEZ).⁹⁰ In March 2009, a US vessel with a similar task was harassed by five Chinese vessels that 'shadowed and aggressively maneuvered in dangerously close proximity'.⁹¹ In March and May of the same year, this kind of encounters recurred.⁹² Each time, the Chinese Foreign Ministry protested vehemently against US protests.⁹³

As the action-reaction cycle of negative emotions deepened, wartime history remained ever present and seemingly prone to repeat itself.

As tensions between Beijing and Washington increased, the disconnect between China and its neighbours widened. During the 2010 Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) foreign ministers' meeting in Hanoi, successive representatives raised the issue of Chinese assertiveness in the South China Sea. Yet, after Secretary of State Hillary Clinton – on the background of large-scale US military manoeuvres against North Korea in the Yellow Sea – declared the so-called freedom of navigation in East Asian waters a US national interest, Foreign Minister Yang Jiechi reacted furiously. The apparent ganging-up against China prompted him to leave the meeting and return with a passionate speech in which he declared that 'China is a big country and other countries are small countries, and that's just a fact'.⁹⁴ For Chinese representatives, criticisms from its neighbours were incomprehensible. Unable to communicate painful historical experiences to the international community, they seemed caught in their own world.

At the same time, Japanese leaders acting in line with the US fueled Chinese feelings of humiliation and fears of containment. Under the impression of a major controversy over maritime territorial delimitation in 2010, Japan's nationalization of some of the disputed Diaoyu/Senkaku islets in 2012 drew particularly harsh reactions from Beijing. A senior official went as far as warning Japan that 'the indignation of the Chinese people will erupt like a volcano', and the "purchase" would do no less damage to China-Japan relations than an atomic bomb'.⁹⁵ Beijing subsequently enhanced patrols at sea and in the air, and declared an Air Defense Identification Zone (ADIZ) to match the existing US-Japanese ADIZ and counter Japan's perceived 'hyping of the China threat'. However, instead of leading to the acknowledgement of China's past suffering and assistance in resisting what Beijing sees as Japan's 'outright denial of the outcomes of victory in the war against fascism' and 'grave challenge to the post-war international order',⁹⁶ these moves nurtured the view of China as aggressively expansionist.⁹⁷ Consequently, US officials came under heightened pressure to commit to allied defence of the Senkakus.⁹⁸

In Beijing's eyes, foreign attempts to 'shape'⁹⁹ or curb China's rise intensified, and mandated robust response. In December 2013, a PLA warship stopped a US guided-missile destroyer from shadowing the Chinese aircraft carrier in the South China Sea¹⁰⁰ and in August 2014, a Chinese fighter jet intercepted a US Navy anti-submarine warfare plane in a move that Pentagon officials called 'unprofessional', 'very dangerous', and 'inconsistent with customary international law'.¹⁰¹ The prospect of China pushing back by establishing another ADIZ in the South China Sea loomed large, too.¹⁰² Yet, when US Secretary of Defense Hagel accused Beijing of 'destabilising' the South China Sea, and threatening the region's long-term progress,¹⁰³ the Chinese representative condemned his as 'a speech which tastes of hegemony, a speech with expressions of coercion and intimidation, a speech with flaring rhetoric that usher destabilizing factors into the Asia-Pacific to stir up trouble, and a speech with unconstructive attitude'.¹⁰⁴

The confrontation deepened once it became clear that China had been reclaiming large areas in the Spratly group of the South China Sea and was constructing berths and runways capable of hosting major troop contingents. This move invited widespread condemnation. Prime Minister Abe of Japan seemed to be particularly eager for the G-7 leaders to include strong wording in their joint statement.¹⁰⁵ Consequently, Beijing

became more isolated. Despite that the Chinese representative at the 2016 Shangri La symposium, Admiral Sun Jianguo, objected US Secretary of Defense Carter's suggestion that China risked isolating itself, such isolation had already become reality. Sun unintentionally confirmed this when he stated: 'Actually I am worried that some people and countries are still looking at China with the Cold War mentality and prejudice. They may build a wall in their minds and end up isolating themselves', and when he emphasized that 'China will not be bullied, including over a pending international court ruling over its claims in the vital trade route', and asserted that 'we do not make trouble, but we have no fear of trouble'.¹⁰⁶ More trouble came. Washington started highly publicized so-called freedom of navigation operations (FONOPS) against the Chinese expansion. Beijing deemed them violations of international law ignoring others' sovereign security and maritime interests, and labelled them as a conduct of maritime hegemony in the name of 'freedom of navigation',¹⁰⁷ that is, an outflow of American exceptionalism.¹⁰⁸ Subsequently, even Chinese scholars known for their liberal stance argued that 'the so called FONOPS [. . .] not only misinterpreted international law, but also intentionally violated China's domestic law and *deliberately humiliated China*'.¹⁰⁹ In other words, underlying the rhetoric of security imperatives, feelings of national humiliation drove Beijing's assertion of maritime territorial control.

Whether intended or not, the Obama administration's strategic response to China's (perceived) assertive rise and US allies' increasing demands for reassurance, the so-called 'pivot' towards the Asia-Pacific greatly reinforced this emotional downwards spiral. Authoritative figures designated the shifting of 60% of US naval and overseas air force assets to the Pacific, and the US countering of China's alleged¹¹⁰ Anti-Area Access Denial strategy (A2/AD) with the Air-Sea Battle Doctrine, as the work of 'the invisible hand behind the rising tension in the South China Sea'.¹¹¹ They also saw the policy papers on twenty-first century Seapower, the National Security Strategy, the National Military Strategy, and the Asia-Pacific Maritime Security Strategy, all released in 2015, as further proof that US wants to 'make China pay the price', and warned against a future Sino-US conflict. The disputes in the South China Sea, they emphasized in a display of solipsism, emerged because China 'as the biggest victims of the Japanese militarism and one of the four major victors in WWII' had not been invited to the 1951 San Francisco Conference by the US. Although 'China is growing into a strong country', they went on,

the painful memory of history is not long gone. The Chinese people have not forgotten that [. . .] why the Chinese people and government are very sensitive about anything that is related to territorial integrity and would never allow such recurrence even if it's just an inch of land.¹¹²

The July 2016 award of an arbitral tribunal further deepened China's isolation. Although the judges' legal clarification of 'historical waters', 'island' and the coastal states' responsibilities to protect the marine environment are of general relevance, the Philippines' filing of the case against China meant that Beijing was singled out as the main culprit flouting international standards of behaviour. The Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs immediately declared that the award 'is null and void and has no binding force'¹¹³ and that it had resulted from political manoeuvring.¹¹⁴ The state-guided press expressed indignation and outrage.¹¹⁵ Scholars and decision-makers in Beijing

were convinced that, between 2009 and 2013, the US had been manipulating the issue 'behind the scenes'¹¹⁶ and thereby led the Philippine government turn to arbitration to shame China.

In short, the emotional action-reaction cycle around maritime territorial disputes ensures that China remains caught in the 'trauma time' warp: Referring to late 19th and early twentieth century international politics, the editors of the authoritative *China Daily* reassured 'Westerners' that 'they have underestimated China's determination to safeguard its sovereignty and territorial integrity', that 'the days have long passed when the country was seen as the *"sick man of East Asia"*, whose fate was at the mercy of a few Western powers', and that 'It is naive to expect China to *swallow the bitter pill of humiliation* from this orchestrated attempt to run roughshod over it'.¹¹⁷ Put differently, the Chinese inability to communicate the meaning of the twentieth century's painful experiences, both domestically and internationally, makes many of its leaders see twenty-first century maritime politics through the solipsistic lenses of China's incessant and solitary struggle against the 'Western' world.

Conclusion

International hierarchy centred on the Euro-Atlantic 'West' and its allies mandates and nurtures China's drive to 'catch-up' through rapid economic development and military modernization until the present day.¹¹⁸ Paradoxically, China's developmental success and attempts at escaping the warped 'trauma time' have been accompanied by an increasing emphasis on China's national humiliation, both, in the past and in the present. Against this emotionally laden background, China's expanding interests in East Asian seas and US-led responses, prompted increasingly insecure Chinese decision-makers to secure the South China Sea and embark on land-reclamations of unprecedented scale. Incapable of connecting their expansive maritime claims with the reactions of weaker neighbours, Chinese leaders strengthened their assertions of China's enduring 'peace-loving' character, of a China that, during its 5000 year history 'never engaged in colonialism or aggression'.¹¹⁹ Instead of seeking compromise in territorial disputes, a deep sense of being misunderstood prevails in Beijing. The 2011 white paper on China's Peaceful Development, for instance, states in an almost pleading tone 'we sincerely hope that the international community will [. . .] support rather than obstruct China's pursuit of peaceful development'.¹²⁰ President Xi Jinping too, in unusually clear wording, noted that Chinese leaders faced 'prejudices and misunderstanding' from those who 'view China through coloured glasses and believe that China will inevitably become a threat', and 'even portray China as being the terrifying Mephisto who would someday suck the soul of the world'. Such 'absurdity', he pointed out, 'couldn't be more ridiculous'.¹²¹

Hence, the action-reaction cycle of expanding maritime claims and international condemnation and isolation has established an emotional structure which perpetuates the Chinese people's need to make sacrifices for achieving a particular kind of a better future, and to do so under the strong leadership of the Communist Party. In line with Fierke's elaboration, the experience of social traumata created the conditions for Chinese leaders to mobilize the solipsism of the group.¹²² Thus, international hierarchy, as it props-up domestic hierarchy, has not helped people in China to gradually address, or 'encircle' as Edkins calls

it, the traumatic memories of past violence.¹²³ This is problematic because when individual isolation and fear is 'given meaning in the transcendent state which would avenge past humiliation', the potential for the nation to embark on a 'messianic mission' increases.¹²⁴

For now, continuing economic development and especially 'Western' recognition of China as a new force, as a competitor, rival or even as a threat, ensures the linearity of China's 'rise' and rejuvenation. Beijing's enthusiasm for a New Type of Great Power Relations and its engaging in a 'gentlemen's competition'¹²⁵ with Washington is as much testimony for this, as President Xi's Belt and Road Initiative (BRI).¹²⁶ Because the BRI safeguards jobs through the export of excess capacities and places China above less developed Asian and African countries while linking it to the European 'West' – also in the geopolitical cartographic imagination – is suitable for reducing China's ideational isolation and alleviates the lingering danger of solipsism. Since overcoming 'national humiliation' remains a task as arduous as creating a 'moderately well-off society', however, the dictum that 'history if not forgotten can serve as a guide for the future'¹²⁷ should be taken seriously. The question is of course what histories shall be forgotten, and whose histories shall be remembered so as to avoid violent pasts repeating themselves.


Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank the two anonymous reviewers, Karl Gustafsson, Kei Koga, and especially Zhihai Xie for their helpful comments on earlier drafts.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

ORCID iD

Christian Wirth  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8150-9276>

Notes

1. *Xinhua*, 'Xi Pledges "Great Renewal of Chinese Nation"', *Xinhua*, 29 November 2012, available at: <http://en.chinamuseum.cn/Default.aspx?TabId=521&InfoID=86595&fritid=500&AspxAutoDetectCookieSupport=1> (accessed 4 September 2019).
2. *Xinhua*, 'Xi Pledges "Great Renewal of Chinese Nation"'.
3. *Xinhua*, 'Xi Pledges "Great Renewal of Chinese Nation"'.
4. The BBC had reported in 2014 already: R. Wingfield-Hayes, 'China's Island Factory', *BBC News*, 9 September 2014, available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/resources/idx-1446c419-fc55-4a07-9527-a6199f5dc0e2> (accessed 27 December 2018).
5. H.B. Harris, 'Speech at the Australian Strategic Policy Institute', Sydney, 31 March 2015, available at: <http://www.cpf.navy.mil/leaders/harry-harris/speeches/> (accessed 27 December 2018).
6. C. Campbell, 'Naming and Shaming: U.S. Surveillance over China's Land Reclamation Projects and Regional Reactions', U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission Issue Brief, 10 June 2015, available at: http://origin.www.uscc.gov/sites/default/files/Research/Naming%20and%20Shaming_Issue%20Brief_6.10.15_0.pdf (accessed 27 December 2018).

7. Department of Defense, 'DoD Annual Freedom of Navigation (FON) Reports', available at: <http://policy.defense.gov/OSDP-Offices/FON/> (accessed 27 December 2018).
8. J. Sciutto, 'Exclusive: China warns U.S. surveillance plane', *CNN News*, 15 September 2015, available at: <http://edition.cnn.com/2015/05/20/politics/south-china-sea-navy-flight/index.html> (accessed 27 December 2018).
9. *Asahi Shimbun*, 'MSDF Convoy to Make 'Friendly' Call at Subic Bay with Real Attention Focused on China', 3 March 2016, available at: <http://www.asahi.com/ajw/articles/AJ201603030056.html>; Cabinet Office, Kokka Anzen Hosho Senryaku [National Security Strategy], 17 December 2013, available at: <http://www.cas.go.jp/jp/siryoku/131217anzenhoshou/nss-j.pdf> (accessed 27 December 2018).
10. G-7 Summit 7–8 June 2015, 'Leaders' Declaration', available at: <https://www.bundesregierung.de/breg-de/service/datenschutzhinweis/g7-abschlusserklaerung-und-weitere-dokumente-387344>; G-7 Summit 26–27 May 2016, 'Leaders' Declaration', available at: <http://www.mofa.go.jp/files/000160266.pdf> (accessed 4 September 2019).
11. This concept has been proposed by Jenny Edkins: Jenny Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory of Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
12. N.C. Crawford, 'The Passion of World Politics: Propositions on Emotions and Emotional Relationships', *International Security*, 24(4), 2000, pp. 116–36; Barry Buzan, *People, States, and Fear: The National Security Problem in International Relations* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1983). See also the discussion of John Herz and Herbert Butterfield's work in Ken Booth and Nicholas J. Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma: Fear, Cooperation and Trust in World Politics* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).
13. See Bleiker and Hutchison, Fierke, and Edkins below; Also: B.E. Sasley, 'Theorizing States' Emotions', *International Studies Review*, 13, 2011, pp. 452–76.
14. R. Bleiker and E. Hutchison, 'Fear No More: Emotions and World Politics', *Review of International Studies*, 34, 2008, pp. 115–35.
15. Emma Hutchison, *Affective Communities: Collective Emotions after Trauma* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016); Duncan Bell, ed., *Memory, Trauma and World Politics: Reflections on the Relationship between Past and Present* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010). For a notable exception see: K. Fattah and K.M. Fierke, 'A Clash of Emotions: The Politics of Humiliation and Political Violence in the Middle East', *European Journal of International Relations*, 15(1), 2009, pp. 67–93.
16. N. Hamilton-Hart, 'War and Other Insecurities in East Asia: What the Security Studies Field Does and Does Not Tell Us', *The Pacific Review*, 22(1), 2009, pp. 49–71.
17. A. Zarakol, 'Ontological (In)security and State Denial of Historical Crimes: Turkey and Japan', *International Relations*, 24(1), 2010, pp. 3–23.
18. K.M. Fierke, 'Whereof We Can Speak, Thereof We Must Not Be Silent: Trauma, Political Solipsism and War', *Review of International Studies*, 33(4), 2004, pp. 471–91.
19. See prominent scholars: Jin Canrong, *China's Future* (Beijing, China: Renmin University Press, 2011), and Hu Angang, *Economic and Social Transformation in China: Challenges and Opportunities* (New York: Routledge, 2007).
20. William A. Callahan, *China: The Pessimist Nation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).
21. *Xinhua*, 'Xi Jinping zai shier jie quanguo renda yici huiyi bimu hui shang fabiao zhongyao jianghua [Xi Jinping's Important Speech at the 1st Plenary Session of the 12th National People's Congress]', 17 March 2013, available at: http://news.xinhuanet.com/2013lh/2013-03/17/c_115052635.htm (accessed 27 December 2018).

22. See for instance: State Council, 'China's Peaceful Development', 6 September 2011, available at: http://english1.english.gov.cn/official/2011-09/06/content_1941354.htm (accessed 27 December 2018).
23. Jiang Zemin, *Jiang Zemin Wenxuan* [Selected Works of Jiang Zemin], Vol. 2 (Beijing, China: People's Publishing House, 2006), p. 4; *Xinhua*, 'Full Text of Constitution of Communist Party of China', 29 March 2013, available at: <http://english.cpc.people.com.cn/206972/206981/8188065.html> (accessed 27 December 2018).
24. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 'The Central Conference on Work Relating to Foreign Affairs Was Held in Beijing', 29 November 2014, <www.fmprc.gov.cn/mfa_eng/zxxx_662805/t1215680.shtml> (accessed 27 December 2018).
25. This has prominently been noted, for example, by Edward Said and Cynthia Enloe. For recent contributions see: A.A.G. Ross, 'Why They Don't Hate Us: Emotion, Agency and the Politics of 'Anti-Americanism'', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 39(1), 2010, pp. 109–25; W.A. Callahan, 'Trauma and Community: The Visual Politics of Chinese Identity in Sino-Japanese Relations', *Theory & Event*, 10(4), 2007, 4.
26. E.g. B. Hayton, 'Charmless, Offensive: Beijing's Bogus South China Sea PR Campaign', *The National Interest*, 16 May 2016, available at: <http://nationalinterest.org/feature/charmless-offensive-beijings-bogus-south-china-sea-pr-16220> (accessed 27 December 2018).
27. J. Bially Mattern and A. Zarakol, 'Hierarchies in World Politics', *International Organization*, 70, 2016, pp. 623–54.
28. T.H. Hall, 'We Will Not Swallow This Bitter Fruit: Theorizing a Diplomacy of Anger', *Security Studies*, 20(4), 2011, pp. 521–55; K. He, 'Power and Risk in Foreign Policy: Understanding China's Crisis Behavior', *Political Science Quarterly*, 130(4), 2015–16, pp. 701–33; Jessica Chen Weiss, *Powerful Patriots: Nationalist Protest in China's Foreign Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014); X. Wu, 'Understanding Chinese and U.S. Crisis Behavior', *The Washington Quarterly*, 31(1), 2008, pp. 61–76.
29. P.H. Gries, 'Tears of Rage: Chinese Nationalist Reactions to the Belgrade Bombing', *The China Journal*, 46 (2001), pp. 25–43.
30. Zheng Wang, *Never Forget National Humiliation: Historical Memory in Chinese Politics and Foreign Relations* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), p. 171.
31. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 'Foreign Minister Tang Jiaxuan Convenes US Ambassador to China on the Aircraft Collision', emphasis added, available at: http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/web/ziliao_674904/zl_674979/ywzt_675099/2355_676073/2379_676137/t11178.shtml (accessed 27 December 2018).
32. Taryn Shepperd, *Sino-US Relations and the Role of Emotion in State Action: Understanding Post-Cold War Crisis Interactions* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).
33. Hutchison, *Affective Communities*, p. 228.
34. A.M. Agathangelou, 'A Conversation with Emma Hutchison and Frantz Fanon on Questions of Reading and Global Raciality', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 47, 2019, pp. 249–62, available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0305829818808387> (accessed 3 December 2018); L.H.M. Ling, 'Decolonizing the International: Towards Multiple Emotional Worlds', *International Theory*, 6(3), 2014, pp. 579–83.
35. Slavoj Žižek cited in Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory of Politics*, p. 1.
36. Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory of Politics*.
37. Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory of Politics*.
38. Note that the witness, unable to protect others, and the perpetrator, shocked by the horrible act he or she committed, may also experience trauma.
39. Fierke, 'Whereof We Can Speak, Thereof We Must Not Be Silent', p. 482.

40. J. Edkins, 'Remembering Relationality: Trauma Time and Politics', in Duncan Bell, ed., *Memory, Trauma and World Politics: Reflections on the Relationship between Past and Present* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), pp. 99–115.
41. Edkins, Trauma and the Memory of Politics.
42. Edkins, Trauma and the Memory of Politics.
43. Edkins, Trauma and the Memory of Politics, p. 16.
44. See Callahan, China: The Pessoptimist Nation.
45. National Museum of China, recorded by the author in September 2013.
46. Shogo Suzuki, *Civilization and Empire: China and Japan's Encounter with the European International Society* (London: Routledge, 2009).
47. Fierke, 'Whereof We Can Speak, Thereof We Must Not Be Silent'.
48. Fierke, 'Whereof We Can Speak, Thereof We Must Not Be Silent', p. 473.
49. Fierke, 'Whereof We Can Speak, Thereof We Must Not Be Silent', p. 478.
50. On China: Gries, 'Tears of Rage', pp. 25–43; P.H. Gries, 'Social Psychology and the Identity Conflict Debate: Is a "China Threat" Inevitable?' *European Journal of International Relations*, 11(2), 2005, pp. 235–65. General: Jack M. Barbalet, *Emotion, Social Theory, and Social Structure: A Macrosociological Approach* (New York: Cambridge University Press).
51. Thomas J. Scheff and Suzanne M. Retzinger, *Emotions and Violence: Shame and Rage in Destructive Conflicts* (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1991), p. 30.
52. Fierke, 'Whereof We Can Speak, Thereof We Must Not Be Silent', p. 483, emphasis added.
53. *South China Morning Post*, 'The Famous Mao Slogan, That He Never Even Used', 25 September 2009, available at: <http://www.scmp.com/article/693526/famous-mao-slogan-he-never-even-used> (accessed 27 December 2018).
54. L. Wu, 'Jian lun Mao Zedong de "shijie geming" zhanlüe [On Mao Zedong's 'World Revolution' strategy]', *Zhongguo Gongchangdang Xinwenwang* [Chinese Communist Party News Net], 18 August 2010, available at: <http://dangshi.people.com.cn/GB/138903/138911/12473028.html> (accessed 27 December 2018).
55. For instance, in March 1969, the leadership thought that a Soviet nuclear attack was imminent: John W. Lewis and Xue Litai, *Imagined Enemies: China Prepares for Uncertain War* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006).
56. Frank Dikötter, *Mao's Great Famine: The History of China's Most Devastating Catastrophe, 1958–62* (London: Bloomsbury, 2010).
57. W. Tu, 'Destructive Will and Ideological Holocaust: Maoism as a Source of Social Suffering in China', *Daedalus*, 125(1), 1996, pp. 149–79.
58. Joseph W. Esherick, ed., *The Chinese Cultural Revolution as History* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006); *The Economist*, 'The Cultural Revolution, 50 Years On: It Was the Worst of Times', 14 May 2016, available at: <http://www.economist.com/news/china/21698701-china-still-denial-about-its-spiritual-holocaust-it-was-worst-times> (accessed 27 December 2018).
59. V. Schwarcz, 'The Pane of Sorrow: Public Uses of Personal Grief in Modern China', *Daedalus*, 125(1), 1996, pp 119–48.
60. Bao Pu, Renee Chiang, and Adi Ignatius, trans. and ed., *Prisoner of the State: The Secret Journal of Premier Zhao Ziyang* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2009).
61. S.P. Huntington, 'Democracy's Third Wave', *The Journal of Democracy*, 2(2), 1991, pp. 12–34; Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man* (New York: Free Press, 1992).
62. David Shambaugh, *China's Communist Party: Atrophy and Adaptation* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2008).
63. Fierke, 'Whereof We Can Speak, Thereof We Must Not Be Silent', p. 476.

64. Wang, *Never Forget National Humiliation; Yong Deng, China's Struggle for Status: The Realignment of International Relations* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008); Suisheng Zhao, *A Nation-State by Construction: Dynamics of Modern Chinese Nationalism* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2004).
65. P. Saurette, 'You Dissin Me? Humiliation and Post 9/11 Global Politics', *Review of International Studies*, 32, 2006, pp. 495–522.
66. Callahan, 'National Insecurities: Humiliation, Salvation, and Chinese Nationalism', p. 206.
67. This includes in China very prominent predictions of China's 'coming collapse' voiced in the 1990s, for example, in: Gordon G. Chang, *The Coming Collapse of China* (New York: Random House, 2001).
68. See also W.A. Callahan, 'History, Identity, and Security: Producing and Consuming Nationalism in China', *Critical Asian Studies*, 38, 2006, pp. 185–7.
69. Callahan, 'History, Identity, and Security'.
70. W.A. Callahan, 'The Cartography of National Humiliation and the Emergence of China's Geobody', *Public Culture*, 21(1), 2009, pp. 141–73.
71. Bill Hayton, *The South China Sea: The Struggle for Power in Asia* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2014).
72. Suwendrini Perera, *Australia and the Insular Imagination: Beaches, Borders, Boats, and Bodies* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), p. 18, original emphasis; Thongchai Winichakul, *Siam Mapped: A History of the Geo-Body of a Nation* (Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press, 1994), p. 17.
73. Z. Xie, 'Understanding China's Maritime Aspirations', *Japan Times*, 2 July 2013, available at: <http://www.japantimes.co.jp/opinion/2013/07/02/commentary/understanding-chinas-maritime-aspirations/#.Ugi86vg6nDd> (accessed 27 December 2018).
74. K. Zou, 'China's Ocean Policymaking: Practice and Lessons', *Coastal Management*, 40(2), 2012, pp. 145–60.
75. State Council of the People's Republic of China, 'The Development of China's Marine Programs', July 1998, available at: <http://www.china.org.cn/e-white/6/index.htm> (accessed 27 June 2017).
76. World Bank, *INFRA Update*, June 2010, available at: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTSDNET/Resources/5944695-1247775731647/INFRA_China_Newsletter.pdf (accessed 27 December 2018); S. Liu, 'China's Marine Economy', *East Asia Forum*, 17 November 2011; Personal conversation, Qingdao, August 2013.
77. China Institute for Maritime Affairs, Ocean Development Strategy Research Center [Guojia haiyang ju, haiyang fazhan zhanlue yanjiu suo], *Zhongguo haiyang fazhan baogao 2008* [China Ocean Development Report 2008], available at: http://www.cima.gov.cn/_d270568139.htm (accessed 27 December 2018).
78. X. Yan, 'The Rise of China and its Power Status', *Chinese Journal of International Politics*, 1, 2006, pp. 5–33.
79. J. Li and C. Zhang, 'The Uncharted Waters of the Future', *China Daily*, 11 January 2013, available at: http://usa.chinadaily.com.cn/weekly/2013-01/11/content_16104497.htm (accessed 27 December 2018).
80. H. Zhou, 'A New Engine for Economic Growth', *China Daily*, 14 January 2013, available at: http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/bizchina/2013-01/14/content_16112232.htm (accessed 27 December 2018).
81. *People's Daily*, 'China Accelerates "Blue Economy" Development: Experts', *People's Daily*, 18 October 2012, available at: <http://english.peopledaily.com.cn/90778/7981158.html> (accessed 27 December 2018).

82. The 2011 white paper on China's Peaceful Development explicitly aims at 'making people rich and the country strong': State Council, 'China's Peaceful Development'.
83. C. Li, 'Shiba da baogao shou ti 'haiyang qiangguo' juyou zhongyao de xianshi he zhan-lue yiyi [The Strategic Significance and Practical Implication of the First Mentioning of 'Maritime Power' in the Report to the 18th Party Congress]', *Zhongguo Haiyang Bao* [China Ocean News], 12 November 2012, available at: <http://epaper.oceanol.com/shtml/zghyb/20121112/73065.shtml> (accessed 27 December 2018).
84. *Xinhua*, 'Full Text: Report on the Work of the Government', *Xinhua*, 14 March 2014, available at: http://english.www.gov.cn/archive/publications/2014/08/23/content_281474982987826.htm (accessed 4 September 2019).
85. Xie, 'Understanding China's Maritime Aspirations'. See also State Council, 'China's Peaceful Development'.
86. Q. Wang, 'Watchdog Issues Plan to Protect the Islands', *China Daily*, 20 April 2012, available at: http://usa.chinadaily.com.cn/epaper/2012-04/20/content_15100358.htm (accessed 27 December 2018).
87. See Chinese views on imperial powers' instrumentalization of international law: Dong Wang, *China's Unequal Treaties: Narrating National History* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2005).
88. R.S. Ross, 'China's Naval Nationalism: Sources, Prospects, and the U.S. Response', *International Security*, 34(2), 2009, pp. 46–81.
89. Z. Wang, 'Chinese Discourse on the "Nine-Dashed Line": Rights, Interests, and Nationalism', *Asian Survey*, 55(3), 2015, pp. 502–24.
90. R. Pedrozo, 'Close Encounters at Sea: The USNS Impeccable Incident', *Naval War College Review*, 62(3), 2009, pp. 101–11.
91. *CNN News*, 'Pentagon Says Chinese Vessels Harassed U.S. Ship', *CNN News*, 9 March 2009, available at: http://edition.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/03/09/us.navy.china/index.html?_s=PM:POLITICS (accessed 27 December 2018).
92. M. Schuler, 'USNS Victorious Harassed by Chinese Fishing Vessels – FAQ', *gCaptain*, 7 May 2009, available at: <http://gcaptain.com/usns-victorious-harrassed-chinese/> (accessed 27 December 2018).
93. Waijiao bu fayan ren ma zhaoxu juxing li xing jizhe hui [Ministry of Foreign Affairs Spokesperson Ma Zhaoxu's Regular Press Conference], 10 March 2009, available at: <http://au.china-embassy.org/chn/fyrth/t541516.htm> (accessed 27 December 2018).
94. J. Pomfret, 'U.S. Takes a Tougher Tone with China', *The Washington Post*, 30 July 2010, available at: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/07/29/AR2010072906416.html?hpid=topnews&noredirect=on>
95. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 'Vice Foreign Minister Zhang Zhijun Gave Briefing to Chinese and Foreign Journalists on the Diaoyu Dao Issue (Transcript)', 27 October 2012, available at: http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/mfa_eng/topics_665678/diaodao_665718/t983015.shtml (accessed 4 September 2019).
96. *Xinhua*, 'Chinese VP Reiterates [sic] Diaoyu Islands in Meeting', 12 September 2012, available at: <http://en.people.cn/90785/7945372.html> (accessed 27 December 2016).
97. Christian Wirth, *Danger, Development and Legitimacy in East Asian Maritime Politics: Securing the Seas Securing the State* (London: Routledge, 2018).
98. M.E. Manyin, 'The Senkakus (Diaoyu/Diaoyutai) Dispute: U.S. Treaty Obligations', Report R42761, 14 October 2016 (Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service).
99. T. J. Christensen, 'Shaping China's Global Choices through Diplomacy', Statement before the U.S. – China Economic and Security Review Commission, Washington, DC, 18 March 2008, available at: <https://2001-2009.state.gov/p/eap/rls/rm/2008/03/102327.htm> (accessed 27 December 2018).

100. J. Harper, 'Chinese Warship Nearly Collided with USS Cowpens', *Stars and Stripes*, 13 December 2013, available at: <http://www.stripes.com/news/pacific/chinese-warship-nearly-collided-with-uss-cowpens-1.257478>; C. Thayer, 'USS Cowpens Incident Reveals Strategic Mistrust between U.S. and China', *The Diplomat*, 17 December 2013, available at: <http://thediplomat.com/2013/12/uss-cowpens-incident-reveals-strategic-mistrust-between-u-s-and-china/> (accessed 27 December 2018).
101. D. Majumdar, 'Chinese Fighter Buzzes U.S. Navy Surveillance Plane, Pentagon Upset', *USNI News*, 22 August 2014, available at: <https://news.usni.org/2014/08/22/chinese-fighter-buzzes-u-s-navy-surveillance-plane-pentagon-upset> (accessed 27 December 2018).
102. M. Yeo, 'Analysis: Can China Enforce a South China Sea Air-Defense Identification Zone?', *USNI News*, 18 July 2016, available at: <https://news.usni.org/2016/07/18/analysis-can-china-enforce-south-china-sea-air-defense-identification-zone> (accessed 27 December 2018).
103. *BBC News*, 'Chuck Hagel: Beijing "Destabilising" South China Sea', *BBC News*, 31 May 2009, available at: <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-27646223> (accessed 27 December 2018).
104. US Council on Foreign Relations, 'Remarks by Chinese Lieutenant General Wang at the Shangri-La Dialogue', 1 June 2014, available at: <http://www.cfr.org/asia-and-pacific/remarks-chinese-lieutenant-general-wang-shangri-la-dialogue/p33054> (accessed 27 December 2018).
105. R. Jennings, 'Japan Pushed World Leaders to Warn China over Maritime Expansion', *VOA News*, 5 June 2017, available at: <https://www.voanews.com/a/japan-pushed-world-leaders-to-warn-china-over-maritime-expansion/3887084.html> (accessed 27 December 2018).
106. M. Zaharia and C.Y. Lee, 'In Pushback to U.S., China Says "Has No Fear of Trouble" in South China Sea', *Reuters*, 5 June 2016, available at: <http://in.reuters.com/article/south-china-sea-security-idINKCN0YR052> (accessed 27 December 2018).
107. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, press conference, 1 February 2016, available at: http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/web/wjdt_674879/fyrbt_674889/t1336958.shtml (accessed 27 December 2018).
108. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, press conference, 26 April 2016, available at: http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/web/fyrbt_673021/t1358589.shtml (accessed 27 December 2018).
109. L. Xue and Y. Xu, 'How the US Misjudged the South China Sea, Part I', *The Diplomat*, 4 August 2016, available at: <http://thediplomat.com/2016/08/how-the-us-misjudged-the-south-china-sea-part-i/> (accessed 27 December 2018), emphasis added.
110. M. Taylor Fravel and C.P. Twomey, 'Projecting Strategy: The Myth of Chinese Counter-Intervention', *The Washington Quarterly*, 37(4), 2014, pp. 171–87.
111. Y. Fu and S. Wu, 'South China Sea: How We Got to This Stage', *The National Interest*, 9 May 2016, available at: <https://nationalinterest.org/feature/south-china-sea-how-we-got-stage-16118>
112. Fu and Wu, 'South China Sea: How We Got to This Stage'.
113. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 'Statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China on the Award of 12 July 2016 of the Arbitral Tribunal in the South China Sea Arbitration Established at the Request of the Republic of the Philippines', 12 July 2016, available at: http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/nanhai/eng/snhwtclcwj_1/t1379492.htm (accessed 27 December 2018).
114. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 'Yao sipo zhongcai ting de miansha [Tear Up the Veil of the Permanent Court of Arbitration!]', 13 July 2016, available at: http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/web/ziliao_674904/zyjh_674906/t1380841.shtml (accessed 27 December 2018).
115. *Global Times*, 'Arbitration Award More Shameless than Worst Prediction', 12 July 2016, available at: http://www.globaltimes.cn/content/993855.shtml?utm_content=buffer182b0&utm_medium=social&utm_source=twitter.com&utm_campaign=buffer (accessed 27 December 2018).

116. *Xinhua Net*, 'Shuishi caozong nanhai wenti de muhou heishou [Who Is Manipulating the South China Sea Issue]', *Xinhua Net*, 13 July 2016, available at: http://news.xinhuanet.com/2016-07/13/c_1119209940.htm (accessed 27 December 2018); Xue and Xu, 'How the US Misjudged the South China Sea, Part I'.
117. *China Daily*, 'China Will Not Swallow Bitter Pill of Humiliation', *China Daily*, 5 July 2016, available at: http://usa.chinadaily.com.cn/opinion/2016-07/05/content_25965816.htm (accessed 27 December 2018), emphasis added.
118. State Council, 'China's Peaceful Development'.
119. This inability could also be ascribed to other great powers; Xi Jinping, 'Speech Delivered by the President of the People's Republic of China, Xi Jinping, to the Koerber Foundation', Hotel InterContinental, Berlin, 28 March 2014, p. 2.
120. State Council, 'China's Peaceful Development'.
121. Xi, 'Speech Delivered by the President of the People's Republic of China', p. 2.
122. Fierke, 'Whereof We Can Speak, Thereof We Must Not Be Silent', p. 488.
123. Edkins, Trauma and the Memory of Politics.
124. Fierke, 'Whereof We Can Speak, Thereof We Must Not Be Silent', p. 490.
125. K. He, 'Gentlemen's Competition in the South China Sea', *Griffith Asia Insights*, 16 November 2015, available at: <https://blogs.griffith.edu.au/asiainsights/gentlemens-competition/> (accessed 27 December 2018).
126. C. Li and L. Xu, 'Chinese Enthusiasm and American Cynicism Over the "New Type of Great Power Relations"', *Brookings*, 4 December 2014, available at: <http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2014/12/05-chinese-pessimism-american-cynicism-great-power-li-xu> (accessed 27 December 2018).
127. Xi, 'Speech Delivered by the President of the People's Republic of China', p. 6.

Author biography

Christian Wirth is Research Fellow at the GIGA German Institute of Global and Area Studies and an Adjunct Research Fellow at the Griffith Asia Institute. Most recently, he held the position of a University Lecturer (Assistant Professor) at Leiden University. His research interests focus on manifestations of knowledge and power structures in the maritime sphere and the consequences of socio-economic change for state legitimacy. In addition to the monograph *Danger, Development and Legitimacy in East Asian Maritime Politics: Securing the Sea Securing the State* (Routledge Asia's Transformations, 2018), he has published articles in *Political Geography*, *Geopolitics*, *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, and *The Pacific Review*.