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Foreign policy scholars distinguish offensive and defensive foreign policy (Schweller, 1994), imperialistic and status-quo states (Morgenthau, 1948), satisfied and dissatisfied states (E. H. Carr, 1946), revolutionary and status-quo states (Kissinger, 1957). But for power transition theorists, rising powers want more influence on world affairs, while existing ruling powers resent and prevent it from happening. So rising powers are bound to be revisionist, while existing ruling powers are status quo powers. Is this right? How do we define “revisionism” in international relations? How can we identify revisionist states? In this talk, Professor Hu introduces a definition and classification of revisionism, which helps us to put things into perspectives. He argues that the binary assignment of states into the revisionist and status-quo category is unhelpful. It would be more productive to assess the extent to which a country is revisionist or status-quo oriented. A country can strive to improve its share of the distribution of benefits in international relations while try to preserve the existing international order. A country can be both pro-status quo and revisionist, depending on issues and situations.