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Abstract

There are some who see China’s sudden rise to the position of power and influence on the globe as a threat to their position and place in world economy. Current trends in world politics however reveals that the quest to rise to the place of hegemony and the need to sustain once position as the dominant hegemony in international politics have set into motion, series of actions leading to various kinds of espionage campaign between the countries involved. This study is a critical evaluation of the intrigues and politics of power which raises the ultimate question of “who is a friend or an enemy in the emerging global system”? The paper adopts the traditional methods of critical analysis in philosophy to evaluate data collected from secondary sources with a view to evaluate and analyse the strengths and weaknesses of the propositions and assumptions arising from the situation. The paper identifies some degree of exaggeration in the fears which Americans are nursing presently. The paper recommends that the countries under review need adopt the complex independent theory of international relations which has the capacity to synthesize elements of the realist and the liberal thoughts among the countries under review.
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1. Introduction

The relations between China and the United States constitute a major preoccupation of the chattering classes (bloggers, the media, politicians, international bureaucrats). The analysis is usually posed as the relationship between a declining superpower, and the rapidly rising Nation. As at 2011, the United States was the world's largest economy and China came second. China has the world's largest population and the United States came third after India. The two countries are the largest consumers of motor vehicles and oil, (CNN NEWS, 2009) and the two greatest emitters of greenhouse gases (BBC NWS, 2009). In the western world, the relationship is usually defined negatively, China is seen as a “threat.” But threat to whom, and in what sense?

There are some who see China’s “rise” as the resumption of a central position on the globe, having been there at some point in time. There are some who see it as a recent development (China’s new role in the shifting geopolitics and world-economic relations in contemporary global system). Consequently, the Sino-American (also known as the China – US) relationship has been described by top leaders and academics as the world's most important bilateral
relationship of the 21st century (BBC NEWS, 2010); (Clark Randt, 2010). Current trends in world politics however, reveal that the quest to rise to the place of hegemony and the need to sustain once position as the dominant hegemony in international politics have set into motion series of actions leading to various kinds of espionage campaign between China and the United States of America. This reality is substantiated by recent reports (Marcus, 2013) of cyber – attacks on America by China, which so far has been denied and termed misdirected by the Chinese government. Since 2008, the United States has charged at least 57 defendants for attempting to spy for China (Arrillaga, 2011). The US on the other hand are thought to be behind a number of computer virus attacks against elements of Iran's nuclear programme; this new trend of action is seen as a small glimpse of what the future of warfare may look like. Marcus. (2013).

2. Historical Background To The Study

Since the middle of the nineteenth century, the relations between the two countries (China & U.S) have been ambiguous. At the turn of the twentieth century, the United States proclaimed the Open Door Policy (Wikipedia, 2013) which was less directed against China than against other European powers. Back at home however, it - via trade unions - sought to prevent the Chinese from immigrating to the United States.

Different kinds of relations have existed between China, Taiwan, The Asian Race and the United State of America from the time of the Chinese revolution in 1911, during the reign of Yat-Sen, to the World War II era, when the United States formally declared war on Japan in December 1941, following the Japanese surprise attack on Pearl Harbor, which brought the Americans into World War II. Other periods of flurry relations between the US and China include the period of hostility between the Republic of China and the Communist Party of China which exploded into an open civil war in 1945. There was also a record of economic relations during the cold war era after the Korean War broke out. The Truman Administration then resumed economic and military aid to the Republic of China (ROC) and neutralized Taiwan threat by deploying the United States Seventh Fleet to stop a communist invasion of Formosa. Until the US formally recognized the PRC in 1979, Washington provided ROC with financial grants based on the Foreign Assistance Act. (MashallFoundation.org.)

Between the 1954 through to 1979 a separate Sino-American Mutual Defense Treaty was signed between the two governments of US and ROC in 1954 which lasted until 1979 (Sheng v. Rogers, 2010). But on January 1, 1979, the United States changed its diplomatic recognition of Chinese government from the ROC to the People’s Republic of China (PRC). While the collapse of the Soviet Union rendered irrelevant any Chinese-U.S. alliance against it, the relations between the two countries did not really change. They became, if anything, much closer (Dunbabin, 1996:225). Following this, President Nixon believed it was necessary again to forge a relationship with China when he made a ground breaking visit to China in 1972, even though, there were enormous differences between the two countries (Dube, 2011).

In return, Vice Premier Deng Xiaoping's January 1979 visit to Washington, DC initiated a series of important, high-level exchanges which continued until the spring of 1989. This resulted in many bilateral agreements, especially in the fields of scientific, technological, and cultural interchange, as well as trade relations. Since early 1979, the United
States and the PRC have initiated hundreds of joint research projects and cooperative programmes under the Agreement on Cooperation in Science and Technology, (ACST) the largest bilateral programme between both countries (US-China Institute, 2010). Outside other minor issues bothering on the economy and security issues, this paper notes that a cordial and mutual relation existed between both countries all through the administrations of President Jimmy Carter, Clinton and George W. Bush.

The September 11, 2001 attacks on the American soil however, changed radically, the Sino-American relations. This new development indicated that the PRC was no longer a primary security threat to the United States. This notwithstanding, there have been different opinions about the threat which China, a communist nation seeking hegemony in world politics can pose on a nation whose hegemony was already establishes in world politics. This fear for instance, constituted one of the major themes of debate between Barack Obama and John McCain in the build up to the 2008 US presidential elections which focused on issues of war, economic recession and US policy towards China (Video on Obama & McCain, 2008). Both favoured cooperation with China on major issues, but they differed with regard to trade policy. Obama expressed concern that the value of China's currency was being deliberately set low to benefit China's exporters. McCain argued that free trade was crucial and was having a transformative effect in China. Still, McCain noted that while China might have shared interests with the US, it did not share American values (The Economist, 2013). These fears for the Americans calls for cautions towards whatever policy the Chinese government made in the areas of trade, economics and security.

Both nations now seem conscious of each other’s strength and relevance in global affairs. This perhaps explains why this paper sees the Barak Obama’s presidency as fostering hopes for increased co-operation between the two nations. Consequently, on November 8, 2008, Hu Jintao and Barak Obama shared a phone conversation in which the Chinese President congratulated Obama on his election victory. During the conversation both parties agreed that the development of US-China relations is not only in the interest of both nations, but also in the interests of the world (Asiaone.com, 2008). Both countries however could not help watch closely and monitor every move and policy made and implemented in the political arena. This created the feeling of suspicion and mistrust between America and China; often resulting in sanctions wherever each country felt threatened by the others action.

The recent attack on America’s cyber space by a PLA-affiliated hacking group based outside Shanghai has heightened the level of threat and suspicion on the Chinese government (Phillips, 2013). This group has been found to be responsible for more than 100 attacks on United States government departments, American companies, and journalist website. On the other hand, China responded that the accusations of hacking are flawed and unreliable (Ben Blanchard; Sui-Lee Wee; Huang Yan; Sanjeev Miglani, 2013). They instead accuse the Americans of being the originators of cyber attacks on Chinese military websites (Neuman, 28 February 2013). This recent mutual suspicion has caused many to wonder if China is really a friend to the United States of America or an enemy to watch. This is the focus of this paper.
3. Friends Or Enemies? A Theoretical And Conceptual Clarification

3.1. Friends and Enemies

A disciple of Socrates once had this to say about friends and enemies: “There are only two people who can tell you the truth about yourself – an enemy who has lost his temper and a friend who loves you dearly.” (Antisthenes, 2003)

For another thinker (Moliere, 1622), “the more we love our friends, the less we flatter them; it is by excusing nothing that pure love shows itself.” In the opinion of Oscar Wilde, “true friends are the once who stab you in the front when you are hugging them, your enemies would rather come from behind when you least expect”. In the words of Anais Nin, “…each friend represents a world in us, a world possibly not born until they arrive, and it is only by this meeting that a new world is born”. Elbert Hubbard opines “that your friend is the man who knows all about you and still like you”. Yet another unknown thinker was of the opinion that “we really don’t have enemies. It’s just that some of our best friends are trying to kill us”. One contemporary thinker is of the opinion that “the tender friendships one gives up, on parting, leave their bite on the heart, but also a curious feeling of a treasure somewhere buried” (Antoine de Saint, 2013).

These various conceptions of who, what and how friends or enemies have been conceived in one situation or the other, speaks volumes about the various kinds of relations that existed and still exist between friends, people, communities and nations today. This paper shall attempt to situate the emerging relationship (friends or enemies) that exists between the Peoples’ Republic of China (PRC) and the United States of America (USA). The success of the above objective will be premised on this paper’s ability to identify relevant theories in international relations which best describe the relationship between the US and PRC.

3.2. Hegemony

The word Hegemony originates from a Greek word hēgemonia, from hēgēmōn literally interpreted to mean a leader, from hēgeisthai to lead. In today’s English, Hegemony is conceived as a kind of predominant influence or authority over others as in the concept of dominion (Ask.com, 2013). It has also been conceived as social, cultural, ideological, or economic influence exerted by a dominant group of persons, individuals or even a person, as in the word ‘hegemonic.’ Italian communist thinker, activist and political leader; Antonio Gramsci (1891-1937) is perhaps the theorist most closely associated with the concept of hegemony. Roughly speaking, Gramsci’s “hegemony” refers to a process of moral and intellectual leadership through which dominant or subordinate classes of post-1870 industrial Western European nations consent to their own domination by ruling classes, as opposed to being simply forced or coerced into accepting inferior positions (Wikipedia, 2013:1-2).

The PRC and the USA are major trade partners. Their trade relationship is the second largest in the world as such their economies have grown to the point where it has placed them both in positions of influence, the kind which Gramsci readily explains as mentioned above. The effect of this hegemony and the implications of the need to sustain the positions of influence already attained by concerned countries in world politics constitute the main preoccupation of this paper.
4. Theoretical Discourse

4.1. Imperialism Theory: Hans J. Morgenthau, a leading proponent of this theory of international relations, defines imperialism as “a national foreign policy aimed at acquiring more power than the state actually has, through a reversal of existing power relations. In other words, a favourable change in power status” Morgenthau, (1948:5). Imperialism as a national foreign policy is in contrast to ‘status quo’ foreign policy and a foreign policy of ‘prestige.’ The policy of imperialism assumes the classical realist theory perspective of analysis at the unit level in international relations. Morgenthau, (1948) Furthermore, imperialism is based on a ‘balance-of-power’ construct in international relations. The three types of imperialism outlined by Morgenthau, found to be evidently displayed in China’s quest for hegemony in Taiwan, Pakistan, India, Vietnam and in other countries around Asia and beyond include: (1) The Marxist theory of Imperialism which rests on the foundation that all political phenomena are the reflection of economic forces; (2) The Liberal Theory of Imperialism which is a consequence of maladjustments in the global capitalist system (e.g., surplus of goods and capital which seek outlets in foreign markets); and finally, (3) The ‘Devil’s’ Theory of Imperialism which posits that manufacturers and bankers plan wars in order to enrich themselves. The relevance of this theory to China’s quest for hegemony in world politics will be discussed later.

4.2. Balance of Power Theory

The Balance of Power theory as a theory in international relations, originates from the realist school of thought and the proponents include: Barry Posen and Michael Mastanduno (Taliaferro, (2001:152-186) and Neo-realists like Kenneth Waltz, and Robert Jarvis (Mearsheimer, (2002). The Balance of power theory posits that rapid changes in international power and status—especially attempts by one state to conquer a region—will provoke counterbalancing actions (Encarta, 2000). For this reason, the balancing process helps to maintain the stability of relations between states. A balance of power system functions most effectively when alliances are fluid, when they are easily formed or broken on the basis of expediency, regardless of values, religion, history, or form of government. Occasionally a single state plays a balancer role, shifting its support to oppose whatever state or alliance is strongest. A major weakness of the balance of power concept is the difficulty in measuring power.

4.3. Application of Theory and Further Discussion

Recent studies on the Chinas: Sutter, (2005); Lampton, (2001) and Gries, (2004) indicate that the Chinese government has - via imperialistic tendencies - actively conducted diplomacy at 4 different levels. On the first level, they have created strategic partnership involving second class world powers by signing strategic partnership treaties with countries such as Russia, India and the EU with the view to strengthening their relationships and positions not just with the countries mentioned but to also balance her power with those of their American counterpart. On the second level, china is seen presently to promote “good neighbour policy” in the Asian pacific regions. This they have done by increasing trade relations in surplus measures with the countries in the Asian pacific and environs such that they enjoy certain degree of surplus trade benefits thereby positioning themselves as an important trade partners with these countries. It is on record that during the 1997 Asian financial crisis, china restrained from devaluing its currency for the purpose of helping to stabilize the regional economy through the mobilization of its foreign currency reserves. This singular act has not only entered China into a mechanism of regional cooperation with the countries in this
region, it has also won positive reactions from countries in the region and the U.S. It is therefore evidently clear how China strives - via imperialistic tendencies - to achieve a balance of power construct (acquiring more power than the state actually has as posited by Morgenthau) in international relations.

The balance of power theory can also be seen at play in China’s attitude of seeking to cooperate with these second class power countries and avoiding open confrontation with the Americans. Subsequently, they have sent envoys to America repeatedly to re-instates the fact that they are merely a conservative power, as such, they have no intention to upset the status quo—namely the U.S. as the sole superpower in the world. Another vivid example portraying the Balance of Power theory can be seen in China’s attitude to neglect Japan. As China has successfully managed relationships with the sole superpower, the second-tier strategic partners, and neighbouring countries, China is able to afford to ignore Japan’s occasional show of toughness for the greater cause which she has taken upon herself (Sutter, 2005).

Since after the September 11 attack on US soil by terrorists, there is strong evidence of the Balance of Power theory found to exist in US disposition towards China. The US seem to have become more provocative towards China and any other country known to have the degree of power and influence, or who has the capacity to pose a threat to her position at the helm of affairs in world politics. If the US for instance shifts its policy to a hard-line toward China, the cyclical turbulence in the Sino-American relationship may soon resurface. This scenario analyst believe, might jeopardize China’s plan of a peaceful rise. Lampton, (2001) and Gries, (2004).

Indeed, Claude, (1984:245) and Taliaferro, (2001:156-186) arguments in support of the Balance of Power theory reinforces the fact that any calculated attempts for a country to strive to rise to the place of hegemony - where such country would be in a position to “conquer, reign or dominate a region” in both economic and military aspects - will more often than not, provoke counterbalancing actions from the other countries who stand to be subjected under the power and influence of this new hegemony.

5. A Comparative Analysis of PRC And USA (See Fig. 1 & Fig. 2 on The Last Page)

A comparative analysis of the information in (Table 1) above further bears credence in support of the reasons adduced for the fears and suspicions which- now more than ever - exists between rising hegemonies and other countries striving to sustain their position of influence and power. A comparative analysis of the physical and economic strengths of the countries under study for example, illustrates why fears and suspicions continue to grow between the nations under study. In the area of population, while China’s population ranks 1st in the world with a total of 19.1% of the entire world’s population, America’s populations only stands at 3rd position with 4.46% of the entire world’s population.

A comparative study of their (USA and PRC) area land mass by Britannica, places China at 3rd position with a total of 9,572,900km² while America ranks 4th place with 9,526,468km². The results of the comparative study conducted in 2011 places the results of the GDP (normal) per capita at $5,413 (90th position) for China and $28,363 (15th position) for America. A comparative study of their military expenditure as at 2011 for China stands at 4,585,000 people (representing about 1 military or paramilitary personnel per 294 persons). For America there are 3,000,000 persons.
(representing about 1 military or paramilitary personnel per 105 persons. This means that the Chinese spends more to maintain their military or paramilitary personnel than the Americans. This also means that the Chinese have more military or paramilitary personnel than the Americans. The labour force of both countries stands at 780,000,000 for China and 154,900,000 for the Americans. These developments naturally provokes and sets into motions what Claude, (1984:245) and Taliaferro, (2001:152-186) calls a counterbalancing action from other countries who stands to be subjected under the power and influence of the new hege mony. The countries affected by these tussle for power and hegemony can’t help but resort to applying either Balance of Power or Imperialistic theories in dealing with the matters arising from these quest or completion for power and hegemony. In the light of the above, the question which now stares us in the face is “can the Chinese really be considered a friend or an enemy to the Americans”?

6. Is China A Friend Or An Enemy To The USA?

A survey of various commentaries and reportby analysts and professional commentators on the subject of this paper - as it affects international relations and politics - reveals that so many factors influence the kind of answers and responses which have been gathered since the question took centre stage in world politics. While some reactions to these questions have been influenced by mere personal and subjective bias, only a few arise from empiric and scientific studies and evaluations. This section shall consider and analyse both kinds of commentaries and reactions to the subject of the paper.

6.1. Results And Analysis Of Commentaries On The Main Subject Of The Study

Etzioni, (2012) in responding to the main questions for this study, made reference to a speech by the president Barak Obama on CNN indicating the trend of thoughts of the American people:

…President Barack Obama unveiled a new military strategy. It calls for "pivoting" from the Middle East to the Far East, focusing partly on the military build-up of China. Without a major public debate of the kind we have about raising taxes, or a congressional vote, the U.S. government is moving slowly but surely toward characterizing China as an aggressive superpower and is preparing for war, should it become necessary (Etzioni, 2012).

Reacting to the above quotation, James Clapper, a retired lieutenant general and current director of National Intelligence, characterized China, "growing and its military capabilities," as a "mortal threat" to the United States. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, said, "The Chinese Military openly regards the United States as an enemy. We should not undermine our own security by thinking we can make friends with self-proclaimed adversaries with hospitality and open arms." On the other hand, Chinese leaders tend to stress that they do not seek a confrontation. Foreign Ministry spokesman, Hong Lein stated noted that "China from beginning to end, pursues a defensive national defence policy, and sticks to the path of peaceful development."

From another perspective, one can readily find belligerent voices from China. Gen. Zhu Chenghu expressed willingness to abandon China's "no first use" nuclear weapons policy, to defend its claim over Taiwan and argued that China should use nuclear weapons against the United States, should its military interfere. In another encounter, a 2011 editorial in the Global Times (an English edition of the Communist Party of China's official newspaper) warned that countries involved in sea disputes with China "need to prepare for the sounds of cannons." (CNN, 2011) From the
above opinions on the threat to security nursed by the PRC and USA, it is clear how these provocative actions and comments re-enforce and bears relevance to the theoretical framework adopted for this paper.

6.2. Current Commentaries and Analysis of Responses to the Main Question of this Paper

A recent report by Marcus, (2013) from the United States recorded that:

China's government and their military have targeted US government computers as part of a cyber-espionage campaign, a US report on China says. Intrusions were focused on collecting intelligence on US diplomatic, economic and defence sectors which could benefit China's own defence programme, it says. This is the first time the Pentagon's annual report has directly linked such attacks to the Beijing government (Marcus, 2013).

Responding to the above report, China had this to say:

China called the above report "groundless", saying it represented "US distrust". A report from state news agency Xinhua cited Sr. Col Wang Xinjun, a People's Liberation Army (PLA) researcher, describing the report as "irresponsible and harmful to the mutual trust between the two countries". Both China and the US were victims of cybercrimes and should work together to tackle the problems, the agency quoted him as saying (Marcus, 2013).

This is the most explicit US statement so far charging that it is the Chinese Government and military that is behind, at least, some of the many intrusions into US government computer systems. It marked a general toughening of the US position over the course of the year (2013). President Barak Obama raised the cyber-security threat in a telephone call to Chinese President Xi Jinping in March, 2013. The issue figured prominently when US Treasury Secretary Jacob Lew visited Beijing a few days later. There have long been fears about China's ability to steal technical and industrial secrets, but this latest Pentagon report warns that China's activities go well beyond this "building a picture of US defence networks, logistics and related military capabilities that could be exploited during a crisis" (Marcus, 2013).

On the above note, US experts believe that China's "area denial" as a strategy – its effort to push US naval forces well away from its shores - could have a significant cyber dimension. As a counter, the United States is also rapidly developing capabilities to counter-cyber-attacks and to go on the offensive itself. Indeed this is a field where the boundaries between offence and defence are blurred. US Cyber Command is expanding rapidly. The US and others are thought to be behind a number of computer virus attacks against elements of Iran's nuclear programme; a small glimpse of what the future of warfare may look like (Marcus, 2013). The individual efforts made by the countries under study to protect its territorial rights and integrity are indicative of the relevance of the effect of the theoretical framework (Imperialism and Balance of Power theories) adopted in this paper.

6.3. An Analysis of a “GULLUP” report on the Main question of the paper (See Fig3 & Fig4 At the End of The Page)

From the general survey and consideration of the commentaries and opinions considered so far on the main question of this paper, it appears that the subject of study is more a challenge for citizens in the United States of America than
it is for citizens in the PRC. In this section, we shall consider - via the use of data constituting the charts and histograms below to analyse - the results of an opinion poll conducted by GULLUP in June 2013.

The histogram and the charts below is an outcome of a poll conducted in Preston, New Jersey. These charts and histogram are illustrative and bear relevance to the on-going discussion on the nature of relations which exist between the PRC and USA. The opinion poll was based on a random sampling of 1,529 adults, aged between 18 years and above, residing in 50 states of the USA. GULLUP noted with 95% confidence on marginal sampling error of ±3 percentage point. The research question is as stated in the Histogram below in Fig.3.

The results of the survey revealed that 55% of Americans view China as either an ally, (11%) or a nation friendly to the U.S. (44%), while 40% says it is either unfriendly (26%) or an enemy (14%). Before this particular poll was taken, the Chinese president Xi Jinping travelled to the United States to meet with President Obama for talks in the heat of the somewhat uneasy relations between the two countries, with disputes over alleged cyber hacking, unfair trade practices and North Korea's nuclear program. Despite these issues, the survey results indicated that only 14% of Americans view China as "enemy" of the United States. In turn, 11% say it is an ally, with most Americans having a more moderate positive or negative view of China in the June 1-4 poll.

This study notes that earlier results from surveys conducted by this same organizations (13 years ago), reveals that Americans have generally been positive toward China. Apart from a sharp negative turn in 2001, after a Chinese fighter Jet collided with a U.S. surveillance plane. (The U.S. plane made an emergency landing but the Chinese government detained the U.S. crew for 12 days before releasing them). The results obtained from Americans indicated a tilt to the negative than the positive toward China when GALLUP, in its annual February, 2013 World Affairs poll, asked whether Americans have favourable or unfavourable opinions of their Chinese counterparts. This result suggests that Americans may not like certain things about China or its policies, causing them to view the country unfavourably, but not to the degree that they see China as hostile toward the U.S.

The results of the data collected and represented in the table below in Fig. 4 tends to show that Younger Americans and Democrats are more likely to see China as a friend to the U.S. than are older Americans and Republicans as indicated in the table below in fig 4 at the last page

The age differences in views of China have been consistent in recent updates on this question. However, that Democrats' have more positive disposition towards China may not necessarily be the norm, as there have been times in the past when GALLUP found no meaningful party differences.

Americans have mixed views of China, with few describing the emerging superpower as an ally or an enemy of the United States, but more viewing it as friendly than an unfriendly nation. Presidents Obama and Xi Jinping hopes to establish a new course in US-China relations in future meetings in view of the history of uneasy relationship which has existed between the two countries for many decades. These meetings may not dramatically alter Americans' perceptions of China in the short term, but they might establish a more cooperative and friendly relationship between China and the United States that could lead to more Americans viewing China as a friend or an ally over time.
7. Conclusion And Recommendations

7.1. Summary

The paper among other things discussed the various factors influencing the relationship between the United States and China. Their relationship was categorized in at least three different periods: from 1784 through to the 20th century; 1900-1979; and the post-1970s era. Conceptual clarifications and theoretical analysis of the terms and relevant theories necessary for the study were proposed and analysed with the view to elucidating the complexities that exists between rising hegemonies and already established hegemonies in international relations and world politics. The Imperialist theory and the Balance of Power theories proved to be most relevant for the nature of study adopted in the paper. A comparative analysis was also conducted between the PRC and the USA to examine some of the pertinent factors which seem to influence a state of competition among countries seeking for power and influence and those seeking to sustain their positions of power and influence in world politics.

A section was dedicated to addressing the main question in this study: (Is China a friend to USA or an enemy)? Here, the paper didn’t just relied on the opinions of individuals, international organisations and news agencies for the kind of relations which exist between the U. S and the PRC, the paper also saw the need to draw inferences from empirical data and results of surveys recently conducted by an international organisation: GALLUP who - over an expansive period of time - had collected via scientific methods, extensive data geared towards capturing and analysing responses related to the issues raised by the theme of this study (Is China a friend to USA or an enemy). The results gathered revealed that most of the conclusions which were previously reached were not entirely true about the nature and relationship existing between the US and China. Put simply, the conclusions reached by most commentators where totally over-blown and unfounded in most cases.

7.2. Conclusion

From the analysis and application of the theories adopted for this paper, and from the analysis of opinions and empirical data collected by GALLUP in the study, the paper observes that the theories proposed for the study offered justifications for the fears and suspicions which now exist between the two countries under focus. The study noted that where theories such as the balance of power theories and imperialism theories were at play among, countries seeking or sustaining power and influence in international relations, there are bound to be fears, acrimony, provocations, accusations, and threats amongst the affected nations.

This paper observes that Americans have mixed views of China, but more Americans view China as a friendly than an unfriendly nation. This paper therefore takes the following stand with regards to the pertinent poser set at the beginning of this study:

1. Are China and the United States rivals? Yes, up to a point.
2. Are they enemies? No, they are not enemies.
3. Are they collaborators? They are already more than they are willing to admit, and would be much more in the future.
7.3. Recommendations

1. China and the U.S. would require clearer objectives directed at answering the questions: "Why can't we be friends with differences or partners in competition"? This paper opines that such objectives are pertinent to fostering healthy and stable relationships and cooperation between the two countries. This paper believes that defining such objectives should constitute a long-term goal for both countries. Such objectives, this paper notes, will make for greater peace and stability not just in the affected countries but also in the world generally.

2. The U.S. could agree with China to settle in an international court or through negotiations, their differences about claims over the South China Sea; and stop calling on China's neighbouring countries to get together to oppose China's legitimate interests.

3. The relationship between China and the United States is likely to define the nature of world politics throughout this century, if however, the history of rising powers is associated with conflicts, provocations and threats of war as seen in the study carried out so far, there are troubled times ahead. But all these could be curbed if both countries would clearly adopt and apply the complex interdependence theory of international relations which was developed by Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye. This theory argues that the decline of military force as a policy tool and the increase in economic and other forms of interdependence should increase the probability of cooperation among states. The complex interdependence framework can be seen as an attempt to synthesise elements of the realist and liberal thoughts. This theory will also reduce the desire to cheat, steal or to obtain by false or wrong means any information that tends to give one country an edge over the other as is the case with the proliferation of the cyber hacking scandals between the US and China.
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Table 1. A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PRC AND USA AT A GLANCE, Wikipedia, (2013:3-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA</th>
<th>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>1,347,350,000 (1st) (19.1% of the world population)</td>
<td>314,256,000 (3rd) (4.46% of the world population)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area (total area)</td>
<td>9,572,900 km² (3rd)</td>
<td>9,526,468 km² (4th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>139.6/km² (363.3/sq mi)</td>
<td>33.7/km² (87.4/sq mi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Beijing</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Socialist Single-party state</td>
<td>Federal presidential constitutional republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Leader</td>
<td>MáoZédōng</td>
<td>George Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Leader</td>
<td>Xi Jinping</td>
<td>Barack Obama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official languages</td>
<td>Standard Chinese</td>
<td>None English (de facto)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main religions</td>
<td>42% Agnostic or atheist, 30% Folk religions and Taoism, 18% Buddhist, 4% Islamic, 4%</td>
<td>78.4% Christianity, 16.1% non-Religious, 1.7% Judaism, 0.7% Buddhism, 0.6% Islam, 0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic minorities indigenous religions (including Vajrayana and Theravada), 2% Christianity</td>
<td>Hinduism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic groups</td>
<td>91.51% Han Chinese, 55 recognised minorities,</td>
<td>74% White American, 14.8% Hispanic and Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.30% Zhuang, 0.86% Manchu, 0.79% Uyghur, 0.79% Hui, 0.72% Miao, 0.65% Yi, 0.62% Tuja, 0.47%</td>
<td>Americans (of any race), 13.4% African American,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mongol, 0.44% Tibetan, 0.26% Buyei, 0.15% Korean, 1.05% other (See List of ethnic groups in</td>
<td>6.5% Some other race, 4.4% Asian American,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>China)</td>
<td>2.0% Two or more races, 0.68% American Indian or Alaska Native, 0.14% Native Hawaiian or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP (nominal) (2011 estimate)</td>
<td>$7.298 trillion (2nd)</td>
<td>$15.094 trillion (1st)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP (nominal) per capita(2011 estimate)</td>
<td>$5,413 (90th)</td>
<td>$48,386 (150h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP (PPP) (2011 estimate)</td>
<td>$11.299 trillion (2nd)</td>
<td>$15.094 trillion (1st)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP (PPP) per capita (2011 estimate)</td>
<td>$8,382 (91st)</td>
<td>$48,386 (6th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI (2011)</td>
<td>0.663 (medium) (89th)</td>
<td>0.910 (very high) (4th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currency</td>
<td>Rénmínbì (yuán) (¥)</td>
<td>United States dollar ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Americans</td>
<td>110,000 American born people living in China</td>
<td>3,794,673 People of Chinese origin living in the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military expenditures</td>
<td>4,585,000 (about 1 military or paramilitary personnel per 294 persons)</td>
<td>3,000,000 (about 1 military or paramilitary personnel per 105 persons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Troops</td>
<td>4,585,000 (about 1 military or paramilitary personnel per 294 persons)</td>
<td>3,000,000 (about 1 military or paramilitary personnel per 105 persons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Speakers</td>
<td>10,000,000,000 (0.74% of the total population)</td>
<td>267,444,149 (85.1% of the total population)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour Forces</td>
<td>780,000,000</td>
<td>154,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications(Mobile Phones)</td>
<td>1,046,510,000</td>
<td>327,577,529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3: Responses to the Main Question of the Paper

Please say whether you consider China an ally of the United States, friendly, not an ally, unfriendly, or an enemy of the United States.

Recent trend

% Ally/Friendly % Unfriendly/Enemy

43 27

51 69

42 53

50 60
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(This Chart shows a graphical illustration of the Distribution of opinions about U.S./China Relations June 1-4, 2013 from GALLUP)

Fig. 4: Views of Americans by Age and Party Affiliations

Views of China, by Age and Party Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Ally</th>
<th>Friendly, but not an ally</th>
<th>Unfriendly</th>
<th>Enemy</th>
<th>Total ally/friendly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 to 29 years</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 49 years</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 64 years</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ years</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

June 1-4, 2013

GALLUP

(This Chart shows the Numerical Distribution of the views of China by Age & Party Identification as at June 1-4, 2013 from GALLUP)