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Recent Trends in the Study of Cold War History in China*

Zhi Liang, Yafeng Xia, Ming Chen

In a 2008 survey article, Yafeng Xia outlined the study of Cold War international history in China and introduced China’s new research centers for Cold War history, the process of opening up Chinese archives and publishing historical materials in China, and the major historical studies about the Cold War completed by Chinese scholars since the 1990s. Xia paired his introduction with an assessment of the challenges, obstacles, and opportunities within the field of Cold War studies in the People’s Republic of China (PRC) and called upon Chinese scholars to step out of their comfort zones and “expand” into new “research areas and topics.”¹

Building on Xia’s initial study and arguments, the authors of the present article suggest that the study of Cold War history in China has continued to evolve and improve over the last decade and particularly over the last five years. Indeed, while in early 2004, a noted Chinese scholar made the argument that “the study of Cold War history has become a new point of growth for academics in China,” today Cold War studies has matured to a point where it now rivals other, previously more prominent academic disciplines in China.²

Chinese perspectives on the Cold War are now even being incorporated into mainstream international scholarship and debated amongst non-Chinese scholars, an accomplishment which truly sets Cold War studies apart from many other academic disciplines in the PRC.

This article highlights several salient aspects of the study of Cold War history in China which have developed over the past decade. Specifically, the article demonstrates how this academic field has evolved in three areas: new fields and topics, new methods and paths, and the ongoing efforts to translate and disseminate foreign archival materials. The article

* This article only aims at reviewing published articles written by Mainland Chinese scholars in Chinese (including journal articles, papers in edited volumes, degree theses and conference papers) and books. The authors made no attempt to assess scholarship published in Hong Kong, Macao, and Taiwan. This article is an initial result of a China National Social Science Foundation (NSSF) funded junior scholars project entitled “Study of the Tension on the Korean Peninsula and Growing Distrust between the United States and South Korea (1953-1976).” (12CSS006)


concludes by raising several challenges and opportunities facing the field of study both at present and in the future. Although the study of China’s foreign relations during the Cold War falls into the category of Cold War history, and earlier survey articles only covered this topic up to 2006, we think it is a relatively independent topic for inquiry and needs a separate article to introduce its recent development. Thus, we make no attempt to cover this subject in greater length in this article.3

New Research Topics

The study of Cold War history in China has developed significantly over the past ten years. Today, Chinese scholars are gradually closing the gap between themselves and their foreign colleagues. In several areas of Cold War studies, including Sino-Soviet relations, Sino-American relations, Japanese-American relations, and the history of the Korean War, Chinese scholarship has truly blossomed and many Chinese scholars are respected globally for their cutting edge research. In addition, a number of Chinese Cold War historians have conducted innovative research and presented findings on a variety of heretofore untapped issues.

The economic Cold War, economic relations among socialist countries, covert operations, psychological warfare, and the impact of the Cold War on science have figured prominently into the emerging Chinese-language historiography.4 Additionally, Chinese Cold War historians have begun to reassess a number of other novel topics, including American policy toward outer space and Antarctica; nuclear issues outside of the mainstream; border and immigration issues among socialist countries and between socialist countries and Third World countries; Soviet policy toward Czechoslovakia; the history of the Communist Information Bureau (Cominform); and American policy toward Austria, Finland, Iceland, Nepal, and Thailand, among other countries. In the following section, we offer an overview

---


4 According to the definition of National Security Council of the United States, covert operation includes propaganda warfare, economic warfare, preventive direct action, subversion of regimes, and so on. See “National Security Council, NSC10/2,” 18 June 1948, in Dennis Merrill, ed., Documentary History of the Truman Presidency, Vol. 23, The Central Intelligence Agency: Its Founding and the Dispute over Its Mission, 1945-1954 (Bethesda, MD: University Publications of America, 1998), Doc.70. Since U. S. economic warfare and psychological warfare toward socialist countries can be divided into open and secret ones, we divide them into two different research areas: economic Cold War; and psychological warfare and covert action.
of Chinese scholarship on some of these topics and themes in the study of Cold War history.

**Economic Cold War**

There can be little doubt that the economic Cold War was a crucial component of the global Cold War, but the term itself, “economic Cold War,” remains ill-defined. For example, does economic Cold War refer only to “the economic containment policy against the Communist bloc adopted by the U.S. along with its allies during the Cold War era”? Rather than adopt a limited view such as this, however, Chinese scholars have instead argued that the economic Cold War involved more than just economic competition between the U.S. and the Soviet Union and their respective blocs and also included the economic aid which the two superpowers and other regional powers gave to Third World countries. This idea of an economic Cold War appeared as a secondary consequence of the formulation and administration of economic aid. In most cases, the primary goal of the donor countries was not to improve the welfare of aid recipients, but to show the superiority of their own social system and draw countries from the nonaligned zone to their own side. From this perspective, Cold War-era economic aid can be viewed as a kind of “economic containment.”

In studying the economic Cold War, Chinese scholars have paid the most attention to the trade control policies of Western countries and especially those of the United States. This trend dates back at least to the early 1990s, when America’s economic warfare against “New China” emerged as a popular research topic for Chinese Cold War historians. Strictly speaking, however, Chinese scholars at that time still lacked a comprehensive understanding of the history of the Coordinating Committee for Export to Communist Countries (COCOM)

---


6 For an excellent analysis, see Melvyn P. Leffler, *For the Soul of Mankind: The United States, the Soviet Union, and the Cold War* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2007).

In the early 2000s, Cui Pi, now a professor at East China Normal University in Shanghai began a broader survey of the rise and fall of COCOM and CHINCOM from the perspective of American Cold War strategy based on his in-depth research at archives in the United States, Britain, and Japan. While Cui Pi was perhaps the most prolific writer on this subject, he was certainly not the only Chinese scholar to explore Western trade control policy during the Cold War. Zhang Shuguang, now a professor at Macau University of Science and Technology, for example, produced a detailed study of the economic sanctions placed on the PRC by the United States from 1949 to 1972, using this episode as a case study in his broader theoretical exploration of the use of economic sanctions in diplomacy. Respectively, Guo Youxin (Jinan University), Deng Feng (Shanghai Jiaotong University), and Gong Xuping (Air Force Command University of the PLA) have also made inquiries into the nature of U.S. economic defense policy toward Hong Kong from 1949 to 1954; U.S. trade control policy toward the PRC from 1948 to 1958 and Sino-Japanese trade relations; and U.S. trade policy toward China during the Lyndon B. Johnson administration. Yao Yu (South China Normal University) and Guo Youxin have also analyzed the responses and countermeasures of the Eisenhower administration toward the crisis in the global rubber market in 1952, revealing how America’s rubber embargo against China gradually collapsed. Outside of the context of U.S.-China economic relations, Liu Zikui (Shanghai

8 COCOM was an international organization, established in 1949 under U.S. initiative with headquarter in Paris. Its purpose was to coordinate trade embargo and restriction against socialist bloc countries. It had 17 member states, including the U.S., UK, France, West Germany, Canada, Japan and Australia. It was dissolved in 1994. CHINCOM was a sub-committee of COCOM, established in 1952. Pressured by Washington, the committee imposed for stricter foreign trade barriers on China than those applied to the Soviet Union and its allies, leading to the China “differential”.
Normal University) has focused on the conflict between the U.S. and the UK regarding the control of exports to the Soviet Union and Eastern European socialist countries during the Kennedy administration.  

In addition to the direct containment policies adopted by the United States toward socialist countries, the U.S. also offered Third World countries considerable amounts of economic and technical assistance. Here as well, Chinese scholars have studied the dynamics and logic of U.S. Cold War policy. In the opinion of Xie Hua (Shanxi Provincial CCP Party School), for example, the aim of Truman’s Point Four Program was never “to give every Hottentot a quart of milk,” but to send technical experts to the “frontlines of the Cold War,” or Asia, Africa, and Latin America.  

Liu Guozhu (Zhejiang University) and Guo Peiqing (Ocean University of China) have conducted a careful investigation on the establishment of the Eisenhower administration’s “trade, not aid” policy, and how this policy was later transformed into “trade plus aid.” Other scholars, including, Wang Huiying (Zhanjiang Normal University), have explored the Kennedy administration’s foreign aid policy. Chinese scholars have also assessed Food for Peace, the Peace Corps, and the Alliance for Progress, three aid programs promoted by the U.S. government in the early 1960s.

At the East Asian regional level, Chinese scholars have been most concerned with the United States’ aid policies toward South Korea and Taiwan. Liang Zhi (East China Normal University) has analyzed U.S. aid policy toward South Korea in the postwar period, finding that economic development in South Korea cannot substantiate the universality of the Western model or the American model. On the same subject, Dong Xiangrong (Chinese

18 Liang Zhi, “The Eisenhower Administration’s Aid Policy toward the Republic of Korea,” Meiguo yanjiu, No.
Academy of Social Sciences) has divided U.S. aid policy toward South Korea into five stages, highlighting how American economic aid helped to build and safeguard the capitalist developmental model in South Korea. Concerning Taiwan, a study by Liu Yajun (Hebei Normal University) found that the Truman administration sought to foster a highly developed economy on the island which could then become a laboratory for launching psychological warfare against the PRC. Cui Pi has additionally found that the amount of aid given to Taiwan during the Eisenhower administration ranked third behind South Korea and South Vietnam, though military aid to these countries always remained higher than economic and technical aid. In Cui’s view, the large amount of aid from the U.S. was essential for the regime in Taiwan to maintain its confrontation with the Mainland. Lastly, and parallel to Liang Zhi’s views on the South Korean case, Niu Ke (Beijing University) has argued that despite the tremendous political influence that the United States amassed with its foreign aid programs, Taiwan’s economic system was not a replica of the American development model based on free enterprise.

In contrast to the many studies on America’s foreign economic policies completed by Chinese scholars, research on the aid policies of the socialist bloc toward the Third World is still very much in an initial stage. The existing literature is primarily concerned with Chinese foreign policy, focusing in particular on the macro evolution of China’s foreign economic and technical aid policy, as well as China’s assistance to Africa from the end of the 1950s to the 1970s.
Economic Relations between Socialist Countries

Socialist countries, including the Soviet Union and the PRC, did not sit quietly as their rivals pursued policies of economic containment. Rather, the Soviet Union, China, and others in the communist bloc sought not just to disrupt the trade control system instituted by the West, but also to construct a unified socialist market for the sake of mutual development.

The study of economic relations between socialist countries began in earnest in the PRC in the early 2000s, and scholars have since delved deeply into the issue of Sino-Soviet economic collaboration. Shen Zhihua (East China Normal University), for example, has assessed Sino-Soviet economic relations prior to and immediately after the founding of New China in several of his cutting edge works.\(^\text{25}\) In addition to providing overarching assessments of the Sino-Soviet economic relationship, Chinese scholars have also produced detailed case studies. Yao Yu, for example, made use of Chinese local archives to determine how China provided aid to the Soviet Union through the production and sale of rubber in the early 1950s.\(^\text{26}\) A study by Wen Ting (Simao Teachers College) has also helped to reveal that the Sino-Soviet Rubber Agreement of 1952 promoted the establishment of agricultural reclamation and the development of rubber production bases in Yunnan.\(^\text{27}\)

Beyond Sino-Soviet relations, Chinese scholars have also researched China’s foreign economic relations with other socialist countries. Shen Zhihua and Dong Jie (Beijing University), for example, have researched the large scale aid offered by China to North Korea


following the end of the Korean War. Additionally, Dong Jie, Liang Zhi, Jiang Huajie (East China Normal University), and Ge Jun (East China Normal University) have also produced individual case studies about the training of North Korean, Albanian, and Cuban mechanics and technicians in China, arguing that these types of training programs constituted a significant aspect of China’s overall economic and technical aid to fraternal socialist countries.

Covert Operations and Psychological Warfare

Immediately after World War II, and before the Cold War had fully set in, the U.S. government began to develop strategies for covert operations and psychological warfare, eventually putting them into practice in Western Europe, the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, the Middle East, and Latin America. In the 1950s, the Eisenhower administration maintained that covert operations and psychological warfare were essential to U.S. national security strategy and emphasized that these strategies must be paired with more conventional policies, such as political and economic measures. Until the collapse of the Soviet Union and the Eastern European Communist regimes in the early 1990s, covert operations and psychological warfare remained an important Cold War tool for the United States.

Chinese scholars began to research U.S. covert operations and strategies in the mid-1990s, but did so on a limited and localized scale. It was not until the early 2000s that


30 On 30 October 1953, the U.S. National Security Council released its document no.162/2, stating “Accordingly, the United States should take feasible political, economic, propaganda and covert measures designed to create and exploit troublesome problems for the USSR, impair Soviet relations with Communist China, complicate control in the satellites, and retard the growth of the military and economic potential of the Soviet bloc.” See “NSC162/2, Basic National Security Policy,” 30 October 1953, in Digital National Security Archive, ProQuest Information and Learning Company, 2010, PD00353.

Chinese historians initiated a broader discussion on this topic, an effort which was aided by Bai Jiancai (Shaanxi Normal University), who divided American covert operations policy into four periods for separate inquiry. Other Chinese scholars have conducted a series of case studies on covert operations, including Operation PBSUCCESS, which successfully overthrew the Árbenz administration in Guatemala between 1953 and 1954; the intervention of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) in the rebellion on the Outer Islands of Indonesia between 1956 and 1958; and Operation Mongoose, a campaign secretly executed in Cuba by the Kennedy administration.

Chinese scholars have also studied U.S. psychological warfare strategy. Guo Youxin, for example, has analyzed America’s overall propaganda policy at the beginning of the Cold War. Other scholars have completed smaller scale research, examining individual cases of psychological warfare and country-specific projects, including “the overseas libraries program,” “Project TROY,” and “the overseas Chinese program.” More country-specific research completed by Chinese scholars have included studies on the “Demagnetize Plan” in Italy in 1952; psychological warfare against the USSR in the wake of Joseph Stalin’s


death; \(^{39}\) U.S. psychological warfare in Iraq, Iran, and Japan in the early years of the postwar period; \(^{40}\) psychological warfare conducted by the Eisenhower administration in the Buddhist countries of Southeast Asia; \(^{41}\) American psychological warfare operations in the Middle East in the early 1950s; \(^{42}\) and U.S. covert action in response to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. \(^{43}\)

**The Cold War and Science**

Both natural and social scientists, as well as their sponsoring institutions, played important roles in the conduct of World War II. After 1947, as the Cold War expanded and became a globalized struggle, the U.S. government began to mobilize power and resources from many fields—including from intelligence agencies and academia—in an attempt to contain socialist countries and simultaneously “safeguard the security of the free world.” Together, these policies contributed to an atmosphere of “total war.” The U.S. government and the private sector both invested huge sums of money into scientific research related to national security, and many scientists applied their professional knowledge to Cold War decision-making, some even becoming government officials. These interactions resulted in a close relationship between science and American Cold War strategy.

Chinese Cold War historians first delved into the topic of the Cold War and science in the early 2000s, writing on the role of universities in the American military-industrial-academic complex; the participation of American scientists in politics; and the extent to which public and private funding influenced scientific research. Of these topics, Yu Rong (Zhejiang Normal University) has surveyed academic research at American universities during the Cold War; Ma Hong has looked specifically at research on military technology at American universities and at the science and technology policies of the U.S.

---

government; and Zhang Yang (Northeast China Normal University) has focused on the role of scientists in the transformation of American outer space policy.\textsuperscript{44} Additionally, other Chinese scholars have shown an interest in the relationship between the Cold War and social sciences in the United States.\textsuperscript{45} Yu Qun (Northeast China Normal University), for example, has focused on the Doctrinal Program, examining the interaction between social science research and American psychological strategies in the Cold War;\textsuperscript{46} Niu Ke has explored the historical background of modernization theory in the United States;\textsuperscript{47} and Liang Zhi has elaborated further on the ideological meaning and influence of the “stages of growth” economic model developed by Walt Rostow and, in another article, has discussed the link between American national security and the rise of “area studies” in the U.S.\textsuperscript{48} Han Tie (Nankai University), Wu Yuanyuan (East China Normal University), and Liang Zhi have also produced individual examinations of Chinese studies and Latin American studies in the U.S. as examples of the development of regional studies in the U.S.\textsuperscript{49}

\textit{New Topics in Cold War Studies}

In addition to the four new areas mentioned above, Chinese scholars have also ventured into other new terrain in Cold War studies. The novel dimensions of Cold War history explored by Chinese scholars have included the evolution of American policy toward


\textsuperscript{46} The Doctrinal Program was a planned and systematic attack against a basic hostile doctrinal system conducted concurrently with a positive advocacy of the basic philosophy of one’s own system. It was a form of U.S. psychological warfare against the Socialist bloc during the Cold War. See Yu Qun, “Social Science Research and American Psychological Warfare Strategy: Focusing on the Doctrinal Program,” \textit{Meiguo yanjiu}, No. 2 (2007), pp. 68-82.


outer space and Antarctica; \(^{50}\) American drug diplomacy during the Cold War; \(^{51}\) nuclear issues outside of the mainstream, including Soviet aid in the development of China’s nuclear weapons program, nuclear threats from the U.S. during the Korean War, American intelligence assessments of the PRC’s missile project, and American nuclear deployments in the Pacific region during the Cold War; \(^{52}\) and boundary and immigration issues between socialist countries as well as between socialist countries and the Third World. Of this last category, studies have included investigations of Soviet immigration into Xinjiang, the Sino-Korean border negotiations, Sino-Indian border clashes, and Sino-Soviet border conflicts. \(^{53}\) Chinese scholars have also produced research on a number of other countries and issues during the Cold War, including Soviet policy toward Czechoslovakia; the history of the

---


**New Methods and Paths**

In China, there is an obvious gap between the study of Cold War history and the study of modern international relations theory. Scholars in one field rarely interact with scholars in the other even though these two fields do overlap in their objectives. Furthermore, the perspectives and research methods utilized in each field can complement one another. Given this overlap between the two communities, a handful of Chinese scholars have recently proposed that the study of Cold War history must be combined with the study of modern international relations theory.\footnote{Zhang Shuguang, “Reconciling International Relations Theory with Cold War International History: A Plausible Direction for Chinese IR Research,” Shijie jingji yu zhengzhi [World Economics and Politics], No. 2 (2007), pp. 7-14. Wang Lixin, “Interdisciplinary Approaches and Cold War History Study,” Shixue jikan [Collected Papers of History Studies], No. 1 (2010), pp. 26-34.} It is notable that some Chinese Cold War historians have recently attempted to utilize terminology and theoretical frameworks from the study of modern international relations, consciously presenting their research results to international relations theorists. These attempts have so far centered on three theories: the theory of international crisis management, alliance theory, and the theory of “perception and misperception.”\footnote{Other scholars have called for the utilization of multi-disciplinary theories and approaches. See Chen Jian and Yu Weimin, “The Origins, Main Features and Critique of New Cold War History Studies,” Lishi yanjiu, No. 3 (2003), pp. 3-23. Xu Youzhen has utilized theory on recognizing newly-established political regimes in international law and relevant methodologies in her study of the issue of recognizing New China in Anglo-American Relations. See Xu Youzhen, Fenqi yu xietiao: MeiYing guanxi zhong de chengren xin Zhongguo wenti, 1949-1951 [Controversy and Coordination: The Issue of Recognizing New China in Anglo-American Relations, 1949-1951] (Wuhan: Wuhan Daxue Chubanshe, 2007).}

Relying on the theory of “limited rationality” during international crisis management, Rong Zhengtong and Hu Lizhong (Shanghai International Studies University) have
reinterpreted American decision-making during the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis. Liang Zhi has summarized the fundamental doctrines of negotiation strategy in international crises based on his case study of the USS *Pueblo* Crisis in 1968. In his reevaluation of the trilateral relationship between the U.S., Japan, and South Korea, Wang Weimin (Fudan University) has referenced Victor D. Cha’s quasi-alliance theory and Glenn H. Snyder’s theory of the alliance security dilemma. Wang Fan (China Foreign Affairs University) has utilized alliance theory to illustrate America’s reaction to and countermeasures during the two Taiwan Strait Crises in the 1950s, concluding that the crises pushed the U.S.-Taiwan alliance into a dilemma over military cooperation. Liang Zhi, in another article, has cited the definitions for “abandonment” and “entrapment” from Snyder’s dilemma in alliance theory to explain the origins and basic functions of the alliance between the U.S. and South Korea, as well as why distrust has been such a recurring theme throughout the history of this alliance. Zhang Yang has referred to Robert Jervis’s theory of “perception and misperception” in her analysis of U.S. space policy. These case studies demonstrate that to study Cold War international history issues by utilizing international relations theories would help to form useful theses and syntheses from complex archival documents. On the contrary, such studies may also provide antithesis or counter-example for international relations theory studies.

**Toward Multilingual and Multi-Archival Research**

When the study of Cold War history in China was still in an initial stage of development in the mid-1980s, scholars researched American policy toward China with the help of the documents published in the *Foreign Relations of the United States* (FRUS) series.

---

58 Rong Zhengtong and Hu Lizhong, “‘Limited Rationality’ in International Crisis Management -- the Cuban Missile Crisis as Example,” *Guoji luntan* [International Forum], No. 1 (2007), pp. 1-5.
60 Wang Weimin, “The Trilateral Relations among the U.S., Japan and South Korea: From the Perspective of Quasi Alliance and Dilemma in Alliance,” *Guoji zhengzhi yanjiu* [Studies of International Politics], No. 4 (2005), pp. 116-27.
Since then, an increasing number of archives in China (including both the Mainland and Taiwan), the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, Japan, and Britain have gradually become more accessible. In turn, the number of studies based on multi-archival research has greatly increased.

The spirit of multi-archival research advocated by “new Cold War history” has indeed taken root in China. For example, Shen Zhihua, relying on archives from Russia, Hungary, and Poland, as well as Chinese memoirs and oral histories, has conducted pioneering research on China’s reaction to the Polish and Hungarian crises of 1956, clarifying many previously held misunderstandings about these events. As another example, although the Inter-Governmental Group on Indonesia (IGGI) has long been a neglected topic in Cold War studies in China and elsewhere, Ji Zong’an (Jinan University) and Cui Pi recently utilized American, Japanese, and British archives to analyze the origins and influence of the IGGI. The establishment of diplomatic relations between France and the PRC in 1964 is also a prime example of successful multi-archival research carried out by Chinese scholars. Rather than approach the event purely as a bilateral affair, Yao Baihui (Capital Normal University) consulted holdings in French, Chinese, and American archives to flesh out the trilateral dimensions of Sino-French diplomacy.

The Translation and Publication of Foreign Archival Documents

While some Chinese scholars have already published important works by utilizing multi-archival documents, other scholars have made great efforts to collect, translate and


publish foreign archival documents. In order to advance Cold War history studies, the Cold War International History Project at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars has made systematic efforts to collect and translate Cold War era archival documents from many different countries. Chinese scholars have also devoted significant time and effort to translating and compiling documents from a number of foreign archives. As early as the 1980s, the Shanghai Association of International Relations took the lead in publishing a series of volumes entitled *Zhanhou guoji guanxi shiliao* (Historical Material on Postwar International Relations). This work was continued into the 1990s with volumes by Liu Tongshun (Fudan University) and Mei Zi (China’s Institute of Contemporary International Relations), who translated and/or compiled additional files from American archives. During this period, however, relatively few documents were actually translated, and the documents themselves were not selected systematically. Nonetheless, it was widely used in China before 2000. Since 2000, there has been a renewed effort to publish the holdings from Russian archives and American archives. All collections of translated foreign archives during this period have specific themes, are from larger pools of original documents, and thus have high academic value.

In 2002, *Sulian lishi dang’an xuanbian* (Collection of Selected Soviet Historical Documents) was published after more than a decade of research. Led by Executive Editor-in-Chief Shen Zhihua, research for the collection was completed by more than 100 scholars, who amassed 8,000 documents from archives, libraries, and research organizations in Russia, the United States, Germany, and Holland. The documents, which were translated into Chinese, detail nearly every aspect of the Soviet Union’s internal and external affairs from 1917 through the early 1990s, including many relevant to the study of Cold War history. Due to the fact that it had previously been very difficult for Chinese scholars to

---


69 When first published, the collection was for internal use only (*neibu faxing*), i.e., available only to full professors and to officials with a rank higher than director-general in a central government ministry or its equivalent in a provincial government. In recent years, however, this collection has been made available to the public.
consult archives and obtain documents from the former Soviet Union, the publication of this collection has greatly advanced the study of Cold War history in China. Additionally, Shen Zhihua has compiled another collection of documents entitled *Chaoxian zhanzheng: Eguo dang’anguan de jiemi wenxian* (The Korean War: Declassified Documents from the Russian Archives), which is based on more than 700 Russian archival documents regarding the Korean War. In early 2000s, the study of the Korean War was still a politically sensitive topic in China. This is the main reason why this collection of declassified Russian documents on the Korean War was published in Taiwan, not mainland China. Collections such as these, which have already become invaluable resources for Chinese historians, are continually published in China and several new collections are presently underway.

For many years, Chinese scholars relied largely upon the *Foreign Relations of the United States* series to study Sino-American relations and U.S. policy toward China. However, only a handful of organizations in China hold copies of *FRUS* in their collections. To facilitate the use of these materials in China, Tao Wenzhao (Chinese Academy of Social Sciences) and Niu Jun (Beijing University) led an effort to categorize the China-related documents published in *FRUS* by time and/or topic and translate these records into Chinese. Tao and Niu’s efforts culminated with the publication of three volumes of *Meiguo dui Hua zhengce wenjianji* (Documents on U.S. Policy toward China), published in 2003, 2004, and 2005, respectively. Other efforts have also been made to get American documents into the hands of Chinese historians. Several years ago, for example, Zhang Shuguang and Zhou Jianming (Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences) selected eighty documents about Taiwan from the Nixon Presidential Materials Project at the U.S. National Archives, and had these records published in Chinese translation. The most ambitious project has certainly been the 2006 effort led by Shen Zhihua and Yang Kuisong (East China Normal University) to gather...
more than 6,000 U.S. intelligence reports on China and to translate 500 of these records into Chinese for publication in *Meiguo dui Hua qingbao jiemi dang’an 1948-1976* (Selected Declassified U.S. Intelligence Estimates on China, 1948-1976).\(^\text{74}\)

Another new and significant development is *Lengzhan guojishi yanjiu* (Cold War International History Studies), the first and only regular scholarly journal in China exclusively concerned with Cold War studies.\(^\text{75}\) Published by the Center for Cold War International History Studies at East China Normal University (ECNU) since 2004, its editor-in-chief Li Danhui has noted that the most important feature of *Lengzhan guojishi yanjiu* is the inclusion of archival documents, both domestic and foreign, and oral history materials in each issue.\(^\text{76}\) Many of the document collections included in *Lengzhan guojishi yanjiu* are multi-archival in scope, including “Guanyu Xiongylali shijian de dang’an wenxian: Eguo, Xiongylali deng guo jimi dang’an” (“Archival Documents on the Hungarian Crisis: Declassified Documents from Russia, Hungary, and Other Countries”), compiled by Li Rui (Chinese Academy of Social Sciences) in 2006, and “Zhong Fa jianjiao duoguo dang’an xuanbian—Fa De Ao jiemi dang’an” (“Selected French, German, and Australian Archival Documents on the Establishment of Diplomatic Relations between China and France”), compiled by Yao Baihui in 2011.\(^\text{77}\) There is no doubt that the publication of foreign documents has opened up new opportunities for Chinese Cold War historians and encouraged Cold War history studies in China to become more international. These sources have created a solid base for the continued development of Cold War international history in China.

**Impact on Chinese Society**

High-quality publications on Cold War history, and especially those concerned with great power relations, have been received well by Chinese society. For instance, *Zhong Su guanxi shigang, 1917-1991* (An Outline of the History of Sino-Soviet Relations), a

---

\(^{74}\) Shen Zhihu and Yang Kuaisong, chief eds., *Meiguo dui Hua qingbao jiemi dang’an, 1948-1976* [The Declassified Documents of American Intelligence about China] (Shanghai: Dongfang Chuhan Zhongxin, 2009), 8 vols.

\(^{75}\) This journal has been published in the form of a book, normally two volumes a year. So far, 12 volumes have been published. The first volume was named *guoji lengzhanshi yanjiu* [International Cold War History Studies], and its name was altered to *Lengzhan guojishi yanjiu* [Cold War International History Studies] from the second volume.


---

www.cwihp.org
collaborative work written by Shen Zhihua, Yang Kuisong, Li Danhui (East China Normal University), and Luan Jinghe (Chinese Academy of Social Sciences), received the first-class prize for “Outstanding Achievement in Scientific Research at Colleges and Universities (Humanities and Social Sciences) of the Ministry of Education,” as well as the first-class prize for “Outstanding Achievement in Philosophy and Social Sciences” in Shanghai.  

Meiguo dui Hua qingbao jiemi dang’an 1948-1976, edited by Shen Zhihua and Yang Kuisong, was also nominated for the Chinese Government Publication Prize and a first-class prize for the Shanghai Book Award.

Furthermore, Chinese scholars are beginning to step outside of their own academic organizations and participate in more broad-based events for civic education. In 2011, Shanghai Satellite TV produced the television show “Archival Documents” which ran a series of programs entitled “Declassifying Sino-Soviet Diplomatic Documents.” The show invited well-known scholars Shen Zhihua and Li Danhui to interpret significant historical events in Sino-Soviet relations during the Cold War based on the available archival documents. The program received high audience ratings, and Shanghai Satellite TV is now ready to produce another similar program entitled “Declassifying Sino-American Diplomatic Documents.”

In addition to the efforts of scholars, funding and support from the Chinese government and non-governmental organizations have contributed to the development of Cold War history in China. In recent years, both central and local governments in China have prioritized and supported the development of Cold War studies. For example, in November 2011, “Studies on the Evolution of International Structure and Great Power Interactions in the Twentieth Century,” led by Professor Xu Lan of Capital Normal University, was designated as a Key Project of the National Social Science Foundation—the highest grant for state-sponsored social science research. Professor Xu Lan and her team, most of whom are Cold War historians, have received ¥ 600,000 ($95,420) from the Chinese government to research relations between the great powers during the Cold War. Additionally, Cold War history research projects have appeared annually and in greater numbers in the award lists of

the National Social Science Foundation (NSSF). The field of Cold War studies has also fared well in competitions for funding from provincial governments in China. For instance, Shen Zhihua’s project, “The Reorganization and Study of Russian Documents Regarding Sino-Soviet Relations, 1945-1979,” has been chosen as a “Key Research Topic of Philosophy and Social Science Planning in Shanghai,” with a subsidy of ¥200,000 ($31,800). Shen’s other project, “The Reorganization and Study of Eastern European Archival Documents,” described below, was also designated as a “Specially Entrusted Topic of Philosophy and Social Science Planning in Shanghai,” with a subsidy of ¥500,000 ($79,500).

Civilian organizations have also played a role in advancing Cold War history in China. Among these, Dongfang Lishi Yanjiuhui (Association of Oriental History Studies) is perhaps the most important. Since 1994, this association has assisted with the publication of more than eighty books and monographs and facilitated other academic activities, many on Cold War history. Since 2010, Dongfang Lishi Yanjiuhui, with financial support from numerous Chinese entrepreneurs, has sponsored a number of junior scholars and doctoral students to conduct research and publish new findings.

Research Opportunities and Prospects

In 2012, 56 proposed studies on world history were funded by the NSSF. Eight out of the 56 proposed studies were on Cold War studies, including Zhao Xuegong (Nankai University), “Study on Nuclear Weapons and U.S. Foreign Relations” (general category project); Zhang Xiaoxin (Jinan University), “Regional Development under the Cold War – Indonesian and Malaysian Conflict and Formation of Southeast Asia Treaty Organization” (general category project); Liang Zhi (East China Normal University); Xiao Yu (Sun Yat-sen University), “Soviet-Israel Relations in the Early Cold War Era” (junior scholar project); Bai Jiaping (Gansu Nationalities Normal University), “U.S. Management of Latin America during the Cold War” (junior scholar project); Fang Jianguo (Minjiang College), “The U.S. and Post-war Decolonization in Africa” (junior scholar project); Zhang Weizhen (Jinan University), “Study on U.S. Army Corps in China” (junior scholar project); Yao Baihui, “U.S.–France Relations in De Gaulle’s Second Government, 1959-1969,” (junior scholar project). The following is a list of those studies on Cold War history funded by NSSF from 2008 to 2011. Cui Pi (East China Normal University), “A Study on U.S.-Japanese Relations during the Cold War” (later phase grant project of 2011); Xie Hua (Shanxi Provincial CCP Party School), “Ideology, Economics and Cold War New Frontier: A Study on the Point Four Program of the U.S.” (later phase project of 2011); Gao Huikai (East China University of Political Science and Law), “A Study on the Role of CIA’s Covert Operation in American Diplomacy” (general category project); You Jianshe (Xuchang College), “A Study on U.S. Aid to South Asia during the Cold War” (junior scholar project of 2011); Shi Bin (Nanjing University), “A Study on America’s Korean Policy during the Cold War” (junior scholar project of 2011); Liu Qun (Northeast China Normal University), “A Study on Psychological Warfare of the U.S.” (general category project of 2009); Zheng Yi (Beihua University), “A Study of Yoshida Shigeru’s Empire Consciousness and Conception of Japan’s China Policy” (general category project of 2008); Yao Yu (South China Normal University), “The United States’ Cognition and Countermeasures to the Economic Relations between China and Underdeveloped Countries during the Cold War” (junior scholar project of 2008).
Of course, the intent of the above discussion is not to conceal flaws or challenges in the study of Cold War history in China, but rather to demonstrate that progress has been achieved, even if some problems still exist. Many of the existing historiographical problems, however, can in turn become new research opportunities for Chinese scholars in this field. We highlight three of these problems in this section.

First, because of primary source and language limitations, Chinese historians have still not tapped into a variety of other topics in Cold War history, including the economic containment policies pursued by capitalist countries other than the United States; the counter blockade measures adopted by socialist countries; economic relations between the socialist camp and the Third World; covert operations and psychological warfare executed by the Soviet Union; and the correlation between the Cold War and scientific development in socialist countries, such as the Soviet Union and China.

While some Chinese scholars have recently explored economic relations between socialist countries, they have done so only on a case-by-case basis. Newly declassified archival documents from Britain, Japan, China, and Eastern Europe should be utilized by Chinese scholars to investigate the trade control policies of Britain and Japan; economic relations between China and East European countries; China’s economic and technical aid policy toward Africa; and China’s training programs for mechanics and technicians from fraternal socialist countries, among other topics. Additionally, Chinese historians should expand the study of the United States during the Cold War to include America’s economic aid to Africa, Latin America, and Southeast Asia; America’s covert operations and psychological warfare during the Korean War and the Vietnam War; the propaganda campaigns carried out by Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty against socialist countries; the role of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT)’s Center for International Studies (CENIS)

---

80 In fact, related work has already been started. Shen Zhihua has selected one or two scholars from each of the eight former Socialist countries to look for the Eastern European archival documents on East European Communist countries’ China policies and on the high-level decision-making during their social transformation in late 1980s and early 1990s. Professor Peter Vamos, Institute of History, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, is the liaison. After locating these documents, this group will proceed to translate and compile the documents. This project will certainly deepen our understanding of the economic relations between China and East European countries in the period of East-West confrontation.

81 With the financial aid from Dongfang Lishi Yanjiuhui, several junior scholars and graduate students from Center for Cold War International History Studies, East China Normal University have been conducting a research project named “A historical study of the interns in China from other Socialist countries -- concentrating on the North Korean, Vietnamese, Cuban and Albanian interns in Shanghai.”
Recent Trends in the Study of Cold War History in China

during the Cold War;\textsuperscript{82} Project Camelot;\textsuperscript{83} and the rise of communication studies and behavioral sciences in the U.S. during the Cold War, among other subjects. Furthermore, there are many other topics which have yet to be researched by historians, whether American or Chinese. Chinese scholars who conduct multi-archival research thus have a unique opportunity to make original contributions to the study of Cold War history and to enter into the mainstream of international scholarship.

Second, although Chinese Cold War historians have done their best to draw lessons from the study of modern international relations theory, these efforts have been limited to only a few theories. Many other theoretical concepts and frameworks have yet to be explored or integrated into the existing historiography, including the theory of hegemonic stability, the theory on polarity and international stability, the theory of collective security, the theory of conflict and war, the theory of deterrence, the theory of mutual interdependence, the theory of international cooperation and integration, and the theory of soft power. Naturally, the definitions and frameworks which these theories provide can be helpful to reassess significant historical phenomena, such as the origins of the Cold War, U.S. containment strategy, the global structural transformation from a bipolar to a multipolar world, local wars, equilibrium due to nuclear threat, and the end of the Cold War. Conversely, original archival documents can help to explain historical phenomena, which would in turn assist modern international relations theorists in China to revise or reconsider certain undefined theoretical models. For example, Joseph Nye has argued that the soft power of a country rests primarily on three resources: its culture and the places where it is attractive to others; the political ideals that they strive to embody at home and abroad; and its foreign policies, when they are seen as legitimate and have moral authority.\textsuperscript{84} This “soft power” theory has proved accurate in the

\textsuperscript{82} In January 1952, Max F. Millikan and Walt Rostow jointly established Center for International Studies at Massachusetts Institute of Technology with the purpose of bringing public policy into the field of academic studies, resolving the problems faced by the United States globally through fundamental social sciences research and generating substitutes to Marxism. That center, with its participants, could be viewed as a typical example of how the American universities, research institutes and social scientists have taken part in the Cold War.

\textsuperscript{83} In December 1964, the American army invested $ 6,000,000 in Project Camelot, with the aim of preventing Asia, African, Latin America and Middle East from political and social collapse. An U.S. assistant professor of anthropology tried to invite some Chilean social scientists to take part in that project, but his request was turned down. This incident caused a severe diplomatic conflict between the U.S. and Chile, while the neutrality of social sciences and autonomy of academic research started to be debated in the United States.

objective analysis of the U.S. Peace Corps, psychological warfare, and the ideological conflicts between the U.S. and the Soviet Union during the Cold War era. Meanwhile, Cold War historians have found many original documents which substantiate the enormous and attractive power hidden behind the economic and military capabilities of the United States. These historical discoveries may encourage Joseph Nye to reconsider whether it is proper to categorize material attraction as “hard power” only. Similarly, scholars can expand previous research on asymmetric alliances by looking at those alliances formed during the Cold War between more powerful and relatively weaker states, such as the U.S. and South Korea, the U.S. and Taiwan, the Soviet Union and China, and the Soviet Union and North Korea. Cold War historians can make use of archival documents to reassess allies’ psychological “fear of abandonment” and “fear of entrapment,” as proposed by Glenn Snyder, and to perfect this theoretical framework.85

Until recently, only a handful of Chinese scholars had utilized multi-archival documentation in their research. However, studies based on multi-archival documentation are likely to become the universal academic norm in the future. It is only through this method that scholars can more accurately convey historical contexts and more systematically understand the essence of the bloc confrontation during the Cold War. Of course, it is important that Chinese scholars must adhere to this trend in order to stay in the mainstream.

Two examples illustrate how Chinese scholars can conduct multi-archival research to advance the field of Cold War studies in China. The first concerns the Colombo Plan, which was the first international intergovernmental aid project in Asia. In 2001, the British publishing house Adam Matthew Company released a collection of documents via microform entitled *Asian Economic History Series II: Brunei, Hong Kong, Malaya, Singapore, South Korea and Taiwan, 1950-1980*. Parts 1-4 of this collection have been published, spanning 108 volumes, and include a variety of British documents related to the Colombo Plan.86 In the

85 It has been largely proved by existing studies that the U.S. seldom worried about being abandoned by South Korea or Taiwan; on the other hand, South Korea and Taiwan basically did not take into consideration the risk of being entrapped by the U.S. Around the period of the Taiwan Strait Crisis in 1958 and the Pueblo Crisis in 1968, neither China nor North Korea had feared that their unilateral action would be punished by the Soviet Union and thus being abandoned. Conversely, it was the Soviet Union who was afraid of being entrapped into a war against the U.S. by its allies.

86 *Asian Economic History, Series 2, Economic Development in Brunei, Hong Kong, Malaysia, Singapore, South Korea and Taiwan, 1950-1980* [microform]: Public Record Office files from the Foreign Office, Colonial
United States, archival documents concerning the Colombo Plan have also gradually been declassified by the Department of State since 1976. Many of these documents have been included in *FRUS*, while other documents have been reproduced in the Declassified Documents Reference System (DDRS) database. In 2004, the Australian Departments of Foreign Affairs and Trade jointly published a collection of documents entitled “Australia and the Colombo Plan, 1949-1957” as part of the series *Documents on Australian Foreign Policy*. Similarly, the Canadian government has released many documents about the Colombo Plan in *Documents on Canadian External Relations*, starting from volume 16. Thus, conditions are now ideal for scholars to investigate the Colombo Plan on the basis of multi-archival documents, and Chinese scholars have begun taking advantage of these documents in their own studies.

The second example concerns the USS *Pueblo* Crisis of 1968, a significant event involving the U.S., the Soviet Union, North Korea, and South Korea. Since the end of the 1990s, a considerable number of American, Soviet, and Eastern European documents have been published in *FRUS*, DDRS, the Digital National Security Archive, as well as two other document collections: *Crisis and Confrontation on the Korean Peninsula, 1968-1969* and, second, *New Evidence on North Korea*. In addition, South Korea has declassified some relevant original documents in *Diplomatic Documents of the Republic of Korea*. There is now adequate material to conduct studies on the *Pueblo* Crisis from the perspective of international history.

Since 2000, Chinese scholars have achieved remarkable results in translating and publishing Soviet and American archival materials, but document collections on Britain, Japan, South Korea, and Eastern European countries are still unavailable. This may be the third existing problem. However, it appears that this situation will soon change. Led by Shen

---

88 For details, see the website of Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada. http://www.international.gc.ca/department/history-histoire/ dcer/browse-en.asp.
Zhuhua at East China Normal University, the Eastern European Studies Project expects to publish two collections of documents on Eastern Europe during the Cold War, including “The Policies of East European Countries toward China during the Cold War” and “High-Level Decision-Making in Eastern European Countries during the Social Transformations of the 1980s.” The latter project was recently awarded 800,000 Renminbi (127,227 USD) in research grant from China's National Social Science Foundation. Additionally, Yao Baihui of Capital Normal University is leading a key project commissioned by the Beijing Municipal Education Commission entitled “The Reorganization and Study of Historical Materials in International Relations (Phase I).” Yao is now in the process of translating a collection of British archival documents on the origins of the Cold War as part of this project. Once published, these document collections will provide ample opportunities for Chinese scholars to expand the scope of their own research and explore new topics in the study of Cold War history.

Epilogue

Both the opportunities and problems facing the field of Cold War studies in China weighed heavily on the authors during the writing of the initial drafts of this article. On one hand, in the last five years, Chinese Cold War scholars have benefited from greater funding opportunities to travel abroad for research and to attend international conferences. These funding opportunities have in turn netted many tangible results. Several leading Chinese Cold War scholars have published books and major articles in English and other foreign languages. Furthermore, the ECNU-Wilson Center Cold War Studies Initiative, inaugurated
in August 2011, offers Chinese Cold War scholars and doctoral students new opportunities to conduct research in the United States. On the other hand, because of the systems for education and evaluating academic research in the PRC, Cold War studies in China faces many obstacles. For example, due to political sensitivity, if scholars in China wish to secure government research grants, publish their work, and/or hold desirable professional positions, they must avoid severe criticism of China’s leaders.

To assist the authors with accurately assessing the state of the field, on 5 June 2012, Professor Shen Zhihua, director of the Center for Cold War International History Studies at ECNU, organized a special session to discuss the challenges, obstacles, and opportunities in Cold War studies. ECNU scholars Cui Pi, Li Danhui, Yu Weimin, Dai Chaowu, Chen Bo, and Liang Zhi were present at the discussion. Chen Jian (Cornell University), Xiaoyuan Liu (Iowa State University), and Yafeng Xia, three Chinese Cold War scholars based in the U.S., also travelled to Shanghai for the occasion.

The discussion focused on three broader questions. First, why do so many Chinese scholars choose to study U.S. foreign relations during the Cold War? Second, what are the unique contributions of Chinese scholars studying U.S. foreign relations during the Cold War? And lastly, is nationalistic sentiment reflected in Chinese scholarship and, if so, is nationalism a constraint on the quality of Chinese scholarship?

The overwhelming amount of Chinese scholarship on the United States during the Cold War stems in large part from the accessibility of U.S. archival documents. Furthermore, not only are these documents available, but they are also easier to use. After all, English is singlehandedly the most common foreign language studied by the Chinese people. Outside of these two factors, the United States was one of two superpowers during the Cold War, while today the U.S.-China relationship ranks among the most important in the world. Thus, a combination of archival accessibility, ease of use, and academic interests have pushed Chinese scholars to research and publish on the United States during the Cold War more than any other topic.


www.cwihp.org
The participants at the discussion reached a consensus that Chinese scholars have made unique contributions to the study of American foreign relations during the Cold War. Among these contributions, made by Professor Cui Pi of East China Normal University and Professors Yu Qun and Zhang Yang of Northeast China Normal University are worthy of special mention. Primarily for political correctness and sensitivity, Chinese scholars have long held the view that U.S. “psychological warfare” equals to U.S. “peaceful evolution” policy and censured it. According to Yu and Zhang, U.S. “peaceful evolution” policy is only part of U.S. psychological strategy. It was not the focal point of U.S. psychological strategy toward China. Yu and Zhang have made important contribution to restore the historical context of U.S. psychological warfare toward China (including “peaceful evolution,” but more on information dissemination and clashes of ideologies) from an academic perspective. Their studies have also put U.S. “psychological warfare” toward China in a broader international context, exploring its complexities and contradictory nature. Utilizing archival documents from the U.S., Japan, and the UK, Cui Pi has completed research on several major historical events, including the Inter-Governmental Group on Indonesia (IGGI), which thus far had received little scholarly attention. Cui, along with Ji Zong’an, conclude that the IGGI initiated a transition from the Cold War system to the system of development in Southeast Asia, with Japan gradually replacing the U.S. as the most important international force driving the system of development in Southeast Asia. Cui’s other study also reveals long-concealed evidence that Japan compensated the U.S. financially while signing the “Agreement between the United States of America and Japan Concerning the Ryukyu Islands and the Daito Islands.”

Cui’s studies have thus uncovered and clarified important facts in the history of U.S.-Japan relations. His scholarship stands among the best in Cold War international history.

On the role of nationalism in Chinese scholarship, the prevalent view among Chinese academics is that they have their own intellectual concerns, just as academics in other countries do. As Cold War scholars, they conduct research to examine and clarify historical facts; they neither defend nor apologize for Chinese government policies. While it is also possible that some scholars do not criticize Chinese leaders’ past mistakes because, for

---

patriotic reasons, they assume that China was in the right and some foreign power was in the wrong, nationalism still does not tend to be a constraint on historical objectivity in the PRC.

Looking forward, the study of Cold War history in China has great prospects for continued growth and development. In 2011, the Academic Degrees Committee of China’s State Council and the Ministry of Education jointly issued a notice on new “Degrees Awarded and Personnel Training Discipline Catalogue, 2011,” in which the largest change pertains to the category of history. The discipline of “history” has been expanded from one first-class discipline into three first-class disciplines: archaeology, Chinese history, and world history. The promotion of world history to the status of a first-class discipline demonstrates the Chinese government’s growing emphasis on the study of international history and will inevitably be accompanied by enormous financial investments in teaching and research in this field. In China, universities and academic organizations are now expanding their enrollment for both researchers and students focusing on world history. The study of Cold War history, in particular, will certainly be one of the greatest beneficiaries of the expansion in this area.
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