

Cambridge University Press

0521819725 - War and State Formation in Ancient China and Early Modern Europe

Victoria Tin-bor Hui

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

## War and State Formation in Ancient China and Early Modern Europe

The Eurocentric conventional wisdom holds that the West is unique in having a multistate system in international relations and liberal democracy in state-society relations. At the same time, the Sinocentric perspective maintains that China is destined to have authoritarian rule under a unified empire. In fact, China in the Spring and Autumn and Warring States periods (656–221 BC) was a system of sovereign territorial states similar to Europe in the early modern period. In both cases this formative period witnessed the prevalence of war, formation of alliances, development of centralized bureaucracy, emergence of citizenship rights, and expansion of international trade. This book examines why China and Europe shared similar processes but experienced opposite outcomes. This historical comparison of China and Europe challenges the presumption that Europe was destined to enjoy checks and balances while China was preordained to suffer under a coercive universal empire.

Victoria Tin-bor Hui is a visiting Assistant Professor in Political Science at the University of Notre Dame. She was an Assistant Professor in Political Science at the University of Illinois. She received a Ph.D. from Columbia University and has received fellowships from the John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies at Harvard University, the Center for International Security and Cooperation at Stanford University, the Helen Kellogg Institute for International Studies at the University of Notre Dame, the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation, and the Institute for the Study of World Politics.

Cambridge University Press

0521819725 - War and State Formation in Ancient China and Early Modern Europe

Victoria Tin-bor Hui

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

# War and State Formation in Ancient China and Early Modern Europe

VICTORIA TIN-BOR HUI

*University of Notre Dame*



**CAMBRIDGE**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press  
 0521819725 - War and State Formation in Ancient China and Early Modern Europe  
 Victoria Tin-bor Hui  
 Frontmatter  
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
 Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press  
 40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA  
[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)  
 Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9780521819725](http://www.cambridge.org/9780521819725)

© Victoria Tin-bor Hui 2005

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2005

Printed in the United States of America

*A catalog record for this publication is available from the British Library.*

*Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data*

Hui, Victoria Tin-bor, 1967–  
 War and state formation in ancient China and early modern Europe /  
 Victoria Tin-bor Hui.  
 p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 0-521-81972-5 (hardback) – ISBN 0-521-52576-4 (pbk.)

1. World politics. 2. China – Politics and government – To 221 B.C. 3. Europe – Politics and government. 4. State, The. 5. War. I. Title.

D32.H85 2005

931 – dc22

2004024989

ISBN-13 978-0-521-81972-5 hardback

ISBN-10 0-521-81972-5 hardback

ISBN-13 978-0-521-52576-3 paperback

ISBN-10 0-521-52576-4 paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party Internet Web sites referred to in this book and does not guarantee that any content on such Web sites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Cambridge University Press

0521819725 - War and State Formation in Ancient China and Early Modern Europe

Victoria Tin-bor Hui

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

---

*To Mike and Mom, who give me unconditional support*

*To Hana Meihan, who grows up with this project*

## Contents

<i>List of Tables and Maps</i>	<i>page</i> x
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xi
1 A Dynamic Theory of World Politics	1
1.1 Cases	2
1.2 Method	7
1.3 Building Blocks for a Dynamic Theory of World Politics	10
1.4 Dynamics of International Politics	24
1.5 Dynamics of State Formation	38
1.6 Self-Strengthening Reforms Versus Self-Weakening Expedients: Other Things Are Rarely Equal in Comparative History	50
1.7 “Alternative” Explanations	52
2 The Dynamics of International Politics in Ancient China	54
2.1 Early Triumph of the Logic of Balancing (656–284 BC)	55
2.2 Qin’s Rise from Relative Weakness to Universal Domination (356–221 BC)	64
2.3 Overcoming the Balance of Power	67
2.4 Overcoming the Rising Costs of Expansion	79
2.5 Launching the Final Wars of Unification	99
2.6 Why Did Qin Develop Cleverer Strategies?	101
2.7 Conclusion	107
3 Rethinking the Dynamics of International Politics in Early Modern Europe	109
3.1 The Balance of Relative Weaknesses Between Self-Weakened France and the Self-Weakened Habsburg Empire (1495–1659)	111
	vii

3.2	<i>Competition Between Self-Weakened France and Self-Strengthened Britain (1661–1715)</i>	120
3.3	<i>Near Domination by the Self-Strengthened Revolutionary and Napoleonic France</i>	127
3.4	<i>Initial and Environmental Conditions</i>	139
3.5	<i>Divergent Models of Self-Strengthening Reforms in Early Modern Europe</i>	142
3.6	<i>Comparing the Intensity of War</i>	149
3.7	<i>Was the Ancient Chinese System More Hobbesian and Machiavellian Than the Early Modern European System?</i>	156
3.8	<i>“Alternative” Explanations</i>	159
3.9	<i>Conclusion</i>	166
4	<i>The Dynamics of State Formation and Transformation</i>	168
4.1	<i>The Logic of Balancing in State Formation</i>	170
4.2	<i>Self-Strengthening Reforms, State Formation, and the Coercive State in Ancient China</i>	178
4.3	<i>Self-Weakening Expedients, State Deformation, and the Constitutional State in Early Modern Europe</i>	190
4.4	<i>Initial and Environmental Conditions</i>	195
4.5	<i>Diversity in State Formation and State Strength</i>	207
4.6	<i>Collapse of the Qin Dynasty and Transformation of State-Society Relations in the Han Dynasty</i>	216
5	<i>Conclusion and Implications</i>	224
5.1	<i>Rejoining the Dynamics of International Politics and State Formation</i>	224
5.2	<i>Transformation of World Politics in the Post-Napoleonic Era</i>	231
APPENDIXES		
I	<i>List of Wars Involving Great Powers in Early Modern Europe (1495–1815)</i>	239
II	<i>List of Wars Involving Great Powers in Ancient China (656–221 BC)</i>	242
III	<i>Operational Criteria for the Lists of Wars Involving Great Powers</i>	249
	<i>Inclusion and Exclusion of Wars Involving Great Powers</i>	249
	<i>Delineation of Wars Involving Great Powers</i>	252
	<i>Identification of Great Powers</i>	253
	<i>Participation</i>	255
	<i>Identification of Initiators, Winners, and Losers</i>	256

Cambridge University Press  
0521819725 - War and State Formation in Ancient China and Early Modern Europe  
Victoria Tin-bor Hui  
Frontmatter  
[More information](#)

---

<i>Contents</i>	ix
IV Chronology of Periods of Unification and Division in Chinese History	257
<i>Bibliography</i>	259
<i>Index</i>	285

## Tables and Maps

### Tables

1	A Dynamic Framework of Competing Logics	<i>page</i> II
2	Mutual Constitution of International Competition and State Formation Through Self-Strengthening Reforms	3I
3	Self-Strengthening Reforms Versus Self-Weakening Expedients	34
4	Self-Strengthening Reforms and the Simultaneous Enhancement of the Logic of Domination in Both International Competition and State Formation	44
5	Mutual Constitution of Self-Weakening Expedients and State <i>Deformation</i>	49

### Maps

1	Ancient China in the Middle to Late Spring and Autumn Period	56
2	Ancient China ca. 450 BC	6I
3	Ancient China ca. 350 BC	63
4	Ancient China ca. 257 BC	66

## Acknowledgments

I have become heavily indebted in the course of writing this book. First of all, I must thank my dissertation advisers, who guided me through the difficult dissertation writing process. Jack Snyder, in particular, was responsible for inspiring me to embark on a comparison of ancient China and early modern Europe. In the initial stage, most professors thought that my topic was a crazy one – because no one would care about ancient China, because there could not possibly be enough sources to work with, or because it would not be possible to write a dissertation on two civilizations. Sinologists further believed that any work on pre-1949 China belonged to the history department rather than the political science department. There were many moments when I felt discouraged, but Jack gave me unswerving support. This research would not have been possible without him. While Jack inspired me to analyze the balance of power in ancient China, Ira Katznelson stimulated my interest in state-society relations. His graduate seminar “The State” in spring 1996 was so stimulating that I remain nostalgic about it to this day. Moreover, I want to thank Thomas Bernstein for agreeing to risk his reputation on my research and for keeping me aware of the expectations of China specialists. In this spirit, Andrew Nathan likewise challenged me to face various sinological assumptions.

My intellectual debts can also be traced to Charles Tilly, Robert Jervis, and Jon Elster. Chuck’s theory of state formation forms the backbone of this book. Chuck is not just a master in his own work but also a legendary mentor for graduate students. He was just as heavily and directly involved with my dissertation as my advisers. He would share with me his manuscripts and offer speedy (sometimes overnight) comments on my

Cambridge University Press

0521819725 - War and State Formation in Ancient China and Early Modern Europe

Victoria Tin-bor Hui

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

multiple drafts. In addition, I borrow heavily from Robert Jervis's systems theory, Jon Elster's brand of rational choice theory, and Julian Franklin's take on classical and modern political theories. Jon Elster also deeply influenced my thinking and writing styles. It was a most embarrassing and enlightening experience when such a senior professor took more than two hours to explain to me (a then-second-year graduate student) why my draft class paper was completely incoherent. This book represents my efforts at blending the best teaching on international relations, comparative politics, and political theory, which I am happy to say is all available at Columbia University.

I have equally fond memories of my short stays at the John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies at Harvard University in 2000–2001 and the Center for International Security and Cooperation at Stanford University in 2001–2002. In addition to support from the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation and the Institute for the Study of World Politics, these two fellowships provided the necessary resources for my earlier research. Most of all, faculty members and Fellows provided valuable comments as well as moral support. I specifically thank Fiona Adamson, Robert Art, Bear Braumoeller, Lars-Erik Cederman, Thomas Christensen, Charles Cogan, Lynn Eden, Taylor Fravel, Stacey Goddard, Iain Johnston, Andrew Kydd, Gregory Mitrovitch, Alex Montgomery, Daniel Nexon, Stephen Rosen, Scott Sagan, Mark Sheetz, Monica Toft, Benjamin Valentino, and Erik Voeten. Moreover, Scott Mainwaring provided a “home” for me at the Helen Kellogg Institute for International Studies at the University of Notre Dame when the manuscript entered the final production stage.

I should also express my gratitude to other colleagues. Participants at the Dartmouth Workshop “Hierarchy and Balance in International Systems,” including William Wohlforth, William Brenner, Daniel Deudney, Arthur Eckstein, David Kang, Stuart Kaufman, Richard Little, and Charles Jones, offered helpful suggestions. In addition, Gary Bass, Daniel Bell, Joseph Chan, Claudio Cioffi-Revilla, Michael Freeman, Robert Goodin, John Ikenberry, Lionel Jensen, Edward Kolodziej, Jack Levy, Marc Plattner, Samuel Popkin, Sidney Rittenberg, Richard Rosecrance, Peter Rutland, Richard Snyder, Harrison Wagner, Yu Xingzhong, Zhao Dingxin, and participants at various presentations and conferences provided criticisms of different aspects of my argument.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, I am thankful to Chang Wejen of the Academia Sinica for hosting my research

<sup>1</sup> Chinese names follow the Chinese convention by beginning with surnames.

*Acknowledgments*

xiii

trip to Taipei in September 1997, and to Zhu Feng of Peking University for hosting my research trip to Beijing in November 1997.

For a book that bridges political science and history, I extend my special thanks to historians. Political scientists in general and realist scholars in particular are often criticized for abusing history. For this reason, I have been very mindful not to distort history – especially Chinese history – myself. So Kee-long provided informal suggestions on historical sources. Mark Lewis and Bin Wong gave me precious comments on my dissertation. Ralph Sawyer and Douglas Henderson examined the revised draft. Bruce Brooks scrutinized my draft Chapter Two in excruciating detail and answered innumerable questions on different aspects of ancient Chinese history. I am also indebted to members of the Warring States Working Group and the China/Greece Colloquium listservs for sharing their opinions. I benefited immensely, in particular, from Stephen Angle, Thomas Bartlett, Christopher Beckwith, Taeko Brooks, Chow Kai-wing, Steve Farmer, Paul Goldin, Andrew Huxley, Whalen Lai, Victor Mair, John Major, Yuri Pines, Moss Roberts, Steven Sage, David Schaberg, Raphael Sealey, and Adam Smith. As Chinese records are extremely controversial, I do not always follow the suggestions of historians. Bruce Brooks, for instance, fiercely argues that classical texts except the *Chunqiu* (Spring and Autumn Annals) involve retrospective reconstruction and should not be used as historical sources at face value. I share Bruce's view that historical records are inevitably products of political struggles. But if that is true, then I am skeptical of his efforts to establish *the* truth about ancient Chinese history. It is difficult enough to establish truths in contentious politics even in our own time – witness the arduous tasks faced by various truth commissions and war crimes tribunals.

As this book potentially challenges mainstream theories in political science and conventional wisdoms about two civilizations, I have taken too long to sharpen the theoretical arguments and substantiate the historical details. I am exceptionally grateful to Cambridge University Press for the advance contract and various editors for their patience and assistance. The one person I cannot possibly thank enough is my husband, Michael Davis. As a professor of comparative constitutionalism, international law, and human rights, he first convinced me to attend graduate school and then encouraged me to “follow my heart” in tracking my own path in my research. Although many people thought that my topic was tantamount to “a kiss of death,” Mike gave me unyielding moral and financial support. While I was writing this book, he had to tolerate many obscure

Cambridge University Press

0521819725 - War and State Formation in Ancient China and Early Modern Europe  
Victoria Tin-bor Hui

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

---

xiv

*Acknowledgments*

discussions (such as comparison of the Mencians and the Huguenots) at the dinner table. His inputs are everywhere in the text. Moreover, I must also thank my mom, who supports whatever I do even though she does not know what my scholarly work is about. Furthermore, I owe my little girl, Hana, all the lost time she could not spend with her mommy.