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Abstract

The 21st century began with two major features—global governance and China rising. An important aspect for investigating if China will turn into a responsible great power or the contrary is to see how China deals with pariah states which have been targets of international intervention. Yet China seems to fail the expectation by blocking proposals of interventions in the Security Council. The main task of this dissertation is to investigate why China holds negative attitude toward intervention via coercive means on so-called pariah states. This research project firstly investigates the realist assumption that China rejects to support intervention for immediate and apparent material interests. The second level of investigation is pillared by constructivism and focuses on the power of social pressure and China’s relations with the target states. The third level is looking for the answers from inner perspectives, i.e. China’s evaluation of the cases of intervention and how such evaluation is shaped by Chinese worldview and political culture. The two cases selected are North Korea and Myanmar. This dissertation provides evidences via detailed case studies and nullifies the conventional explanations. It further depicts the Chinese pattern of intervention and the specific style constructed on China’s pursuit of relational security. The finding of this research should contribute to the theoretical and empirical studies of the evolution and diversity of global governance.
Acknowledgements

I wish to express my indebtedness to the following persons, all of whom have guided and helped me so much along the way of pursuing the doctoral degree: my advisor Suisheng Zhao, the readers including Chih-yu Shih, Paul Viotti, and Kathy Green. I would like to thank in particular the following institutes which have provided me great financial supports and opportunities to expand my scope of scholarship and living experiences: the National Science Council in Taiwan, Studies and Cross-Taiwan Strait Relations of the Department of Political Science at National Taiwan University, German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), the Chinese Academia of Social Science (CASS), the Department of Sinology at Friedrich-Alexander University, Erlangen-Nuremberg. My gratitude is also due to Peizhong He, Tingyang Zhao, Marc Matten, Klaus Brummer, and Mingde Wang. I am grateful to all my friends in Taiwan, United States, China, Germany, and South Korea. Among all, QJ’s provocative but warm challenges and the frequent exchanges of thoughts have contributed most to my intellectual development. Most of all, thank my parents and my family, without whom this dissertation would never have been written.
# Table of Contents

Chapter One: INTRODUCTION ................................................................................................. 1  
  History of Nonintervention? .............................................................................................. 9  
  Defining Intervention: Aims and Means ........................................................................... 14  
  Mapping Theories: What the Existing Literature Has Provided for Knowing China and International Intervention ................................................................. 19  
     Calculation of National Interests in China’s Foreign Policy ........................................ 22  
     Identity, Social Learning, and the Power of Norms and International Institutions .................................................................................................................. 27  
     Humanitarian Intervention and China’s Response ...................................................... 30  
     History, Culture, and Confucianism: The Chinese Style of Global Governance ........................................................................................................ 34  
  Research Design and the Main Themes .......................................................................... 39  
  Methodology and the Organization of Chapters ................................................................ 47  

Chapter Two: THE CHINESE NONINTERVENTION POLICY TOWARD NORTH KOREA ................................................................. 54  
  Borders and China’s Attitude toward Intervention in the DPRK ................................. 58  
     Border and China’s Nonintervention: The Unsolved but Pacified Border Disputes ................................................................................................................. 60  
     Stability and the Desire to Gain a “Win-Win” Solution along the Border .................. 63  
  Raw Materials and China’s Nonintervention Decision .................................................. 67  
     North Korea’s Capability of Providing Raw Materials to China .............................. 68  
     Unstable Supply of Raw Materials in North Korea .................................................... 71  
  Social Pressure and China’s Policies toward North Korea ............................................. 73  
     Social Pressure on Beijing’s Attitude toward the North Korean Nuclear Crisis ........ 75  
     China’s Seemingly Unresponsive Responses to Social Pressure .............................. 78  
  Role of Guanxi in China’s Nonintervention Policy toward North Korea .................... 81  
     Amity Based on Personal Relationship: The Kim Family’s Guanxi with China and the CCP ............................................................................................................. 83  
     Amity Based on Communist Comradeship: Historical Events in the 1950s and 1960s ............................................................................................................. 86  
     Complication in the CCP-Kim Regime Relationship: Discrepancy in the Sphere of Ideology ........................................................................................................ 87  
     Complication in the CCP-Kim Regime Relationship: Impact of the Cultural Revolution and the Sino-South Korean Formal Relationship .... 89  
  Ability of the Regimes in Targeted States and China’s Attitude toward Intervention ......................................................................................................................... 91  
  Perception of China toward the Issue of Nuclear Crisis and Appeal of Intervention ......................................................................................................................... 100  
     Review of China’s Responses to the North Korean Nuclear Crisis ........................... 103  
     Factors Determining China’s Insistence on Non-Coercive Means for Solving North Korean Nuclear Crisis ................................................................. 106  
     Importance of Being the “Mediator” .............................................................................. 110
Chapter Three: CHINESE NONINTERVENTION POLICY TOWARD MYANMAR

Border, Ethnic Conflicts, and China’s Policy toward Myanmar

China’s Concern about Its Image and Its Dealing with the Border Dispute with Myanmar

Concern for Stability: Problems of the Armed Ethnic Minority Forces in Myanmar

China’s Pursuit of Energy Resources and the Nonintervention Policy

Production and Supply of Energy Resources in Myanmar

Another strategic concern: Building pipeline through Myanmar

Social Pressure and Unwillingness of China to Support Intervention

China’s Response to Western Criticism

Another Source of Social Pressure: ASEAN and the Principle of Nonintervention

Dilemma of the Chinese “Guanxi” with Myanmar and the Chinese Nonintervention Policy

Rise and Fall of the Sino-Burmese Relations: From the 1950s to the Early 1980s

Elaborate Guanxi Process: Sino-Burmese Relations After the 1980s

Evaluation of the Regime Ability and China’s Nonintervention Policy toward Myanmar

Capability of the Regime: Domestic Upheavals in Myanmar

Attitude of Other States in the Region: ASEAN’s Concern

Chinese Perception on the Myanmar Issue

Factors Benefiting the Choice of Non-Coercive Means

Definition of Being a Mediator and the Unpredictable Future of the Sino-Burmese Relation

Chapter Four: CONSTRUCTING THE CHINESE PATTERN OF INTERVENTION

Response of China to the Appeal of International Intervention in East Asia: One Picture Depicted by the Six Hypotheses

Shared Borders and the Rationale of Nonintervention

Pursuit of Raw Materials and Nonintervention Policy of China

International Pressure and China’s Response to the Call of Intervention

Importance of Guanxi in China’s Nonintervention Policy

Evaluation of Regime Ability and China’s Nonintervention Policy

Engagement Rather Than Intervention: China’s Insistence on Non-Coercive Means

International Interventions in Other Regions and China’s Responses

Humanitarian Crises in Africa and China’s Responses to the Call for Intervention

Nuclear Threat and Civil War: Cases in the Middle East

Harmonious Intervention: A Pattern in Process under a View of World Order

Pragmatism in the Chinese Pattern of Intervention

Philosophy Behind “Intervention Without Confrontation”
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

In 2007, after the atrocity of the Darfur crisis shocked the international society, China (also known as the People’s Republic of China, the PRC) supported the United Nations (UN) deployment of the peacekeeping mission in Sudan. However, China’s act of complying with the expectation of its Western counterparts did not last long. In March 2011, the UN Security Council passed Resolution 1973, which allowed the imposition of international intervention on Libya. Although this resolution gained the approval of most Western great powers and the support of the Arab League, China abstained from the voting process, together with Germany, Russia, India, and Brazil.¹ Later in the same year, when a similar event occurred in Syria, China joined Russia and opted to veto the resolution proposed in the Security Council. The same proposal to impose intervention on Syria was again brought up in 2012, and China still vetoed the resolution despite severe condemnation from international society. Observing China’s conduct in the issues related to international intervention, one question becomes evident: Why has China behaved inconsistently?

China has risen and played an important role in the international arena. Numerous debates and discussions have taken place regarding the impact of the rise of China; most

¹ The resolution details of setting a no-fly zone in Libya and the voting process can be read online: http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2011/sc10200.doc.htm.
of them are centered on the role that China is going to take on as a newborn/reborn great power in international society. Realists suggest that a rising power always brings challenges to the status quo powers, and conflicts and instability are inevitable because clashes of interests necessarily arise between the two sides. Different from the realist perspective, the constructivism in international relations (IR) theory discusses how much China has accommodated itself into international norms and institutions (i.e., the degree to which China has been “socialized”). They assume China eventually will fit itself into international society once the socialization process goes deeper. With a conformable China rising to the great-power club, the international society shall stay stable and peaceful.

One of the criteria for investigating the degree to which China has been accommodated in international society is to see if China has taken the responsibility to manage international crises. If China acts consistently with international regulations as well as expectations from other status quo powers, then China would hardly become a threat to international society. However, such an expectation of consistency seems lacking when observing China’s attitude toward states that cause trouble and violate international laws. The three examples addressed in the beginning of this chapter have provided good evidence.

---


To begin with, the “Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence” has notably become the guideline and historical basis of China’s nonintervention policy since 1954. Before the end of the Cold War, the PRC had repeatedly denounced major interstate interventions both led by single states, especially the actions led by the United States (US), and authorized by the UN. For example, China criticized the UN mission in Congo in 1964 as an evildoing (Zhao 2005, 64); Beijing accused the UN-authorized mission on the independence of Bangladesh in 1971 as an intervention in the internal affairs of Pakistan (Prakash Gupta 1971, 12–27); and in 1999, China severely condemned the US-led NATO bombing of Yugoslavia under the pretext of humanitarian intervention. However, China itself had been involved in the internal affairs of other states in the same period. Its vow to the Communist International led to Chinese support of many subversive activities in the Third World countries during the Cold War. A famous example is the PRC’s support for the independence movement in East Timor, and its condemnation of the US support of the Indonesia invasion in 1975.4

After the PRC began economic reform in 1979, it greatly reduced its support of revolutionary activities in other countries. However, China retained the principle of nonintervention and remained doubtful about the UN-authorized peacekeeping missions for quite some time. The change might be slow yet still evident: in the case of East Timor, China changed its attitude—from blocking proposals related to self-determination of East Timor5 to supporting UN resolutions and joining the peacekeeping force (INTERFET) imposed on East Timor. Another example of change is China’s

---

4 Ironically, after the economic reform began, Beijing quickly readjusted its policy toward Indonesia and turned to support Jakarta’s occupation of East Timor.

5 China has been blocking such a proposal from being brought up in The Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities of the UN since 1987.
involvement in persuading Sudan to accept the UN intervention. These changes in
Beijing’s attitude might be attributed to the same reasons. Nevertheless, China has not
been consistent in dealing with international interventions imposed on pariah states. If the
PRC has acted consistently, it should have helped intervene in all the cases involving
multinational actions of intervention. Many controversial cases have aroused the serious
appeal of international intervention; some cases relate to the violation of nuclear non-
proliferation, and others concern the violation of human rights and the atrocity of
humanity. The Western world has been expecting China to intervene or at least wield its
influence on these cases arousing the appeal of international intervention; however, China
seems indifferent to such an expectation.

China has been criticized by the Western media and international public opinion
for protecting the regimes that violate international institutions and human rights. For
example, in November 2010, a 75-page report alleging North Korea’s transfer of ballistic
missile and nuclear technology to other pariah states (i.e., Syria, Iran, and Myanmar) was
blocked from release by the PRC. China may have blocked such a report to prevent a
more severe sanction against North Korea issued by the Security Council (Lynch 2010).
Many Western experts believe that China and North Korea share overlapping interests,
and Beijing has increasingly deepened its relationship with Pyongyang despite
condemnation from the international society. The DPRK (Democratic People’s Republic
of Korea, the official name of North Korea) has been a notorious troublemaker in world
politics; such infamous reputation comes from evil deeds, including Pyongyang’s
development of nuclear weapons, violation of the rights of North Koreans, and aggressive
actions toward South Korea, such as the sinking of the warship Cheonan and striking of a South Korean-owned island with artillery fire (Carlin and Lewis 2010).

China’s efforts to shield the DPRK from the imposition of international intervention seem irrational. According to the realists, North Korea is far weaker in terms of national power than China. How could a state with stronger material power tolerate its neighbor’s development of nuclear weapons, which poses an enormous threat to its national security and the stability in the surrounding environment? Even if the PRC has been in good relations with the DPRK, Pyongyang’s violation of the rule of nuclear nonproliferation has aroused severe condemnation in international society, and China was forced to face criticism regarding its tolerance toward the North. Being a rising great power, China has been known to care considerably about its reputation and relations with the international community. Why did Beijing risk its reputation and refuse to intervene or support the Security Council intervention in North Korean nuclear crisis? The example of China’s North Korea policy is only one of the controversial issues regarding the potential style of Beijing’s crisis management. Whenever similar crises occurred, China’s responses have often stirred ardent discussions in the global media and academia. This research plans to answer directly the debates in the literature between realism and constructivism concerning the impact of China’s rise on global governance and international stability. This research project aims to look into the following enigma: Why does China sometimes support intervention in states involving the violation of international institutions, and sometimes does not? Furthermore, what are the criteria for China to decide when to intervene and not to intervene? Is the decision due to the
calculation of national interests, like realists predict, or do other factors influence China’s non/intervention decisions?

For many years, China had insisted on noninterference in others’ internal affairs and refused to follow the Western great powers’ ways of dealing with states violating international laws and human rights. Thus, Beijing has been severely criticized by global public opinion; some critics suggest that China is the obstacle to the rescue of humanity and the counterforce of liberating societies under the domination of despots. Apparently, China has not yet fully reached the expectations of major Western great powers, and its attitude of opposing international intervention has deepened the suspicion that China may become a potential threat to international society. China’s obvious unwillingness to intervene in those troublemaker regimes has contradicted its enthusiastic pursuit of promoting the PRC’s international prestige. If China wishes to improve its reputation and materialize the claim of peaceful rise, it should have substantially fulfilled the expectation of its Western counterparts. Concerning the roles that great powers should play in international society, literature on the IR theories has provided diverse arguments. For instance, the English School has argued that great powers should share the responsibility of maintaining international order. To reach this goal, great powers are in charge of the preservation of the general balance and the control of crises, especially in the regions where their territories located. Therefore, interferences in others’ domain for crises management are allowed and expected. If China wants to match the expectation of the role described by the English School, it will have to adopt the Western standard of

---

6 The classical discussion on roles of great powers in the international society provided by the English School can be found in Hedley Bull’s The Anarchical Society (Bull 1977).
imposing international intervention. Apparently China’s performance in terms of intervention is still a gray zone.

Many propositions have been provided to explain China’s hesitation to follow the Western intervention pattern. Most of them are based on realist perspectives and claim that China’s unwillingness to follow the Western standard of imposing intervention is due to the pursuit of national interests. These national interests include economic benefits, the gain of resources including raw materials and fuel, and the physical stability along China’s borders. However, China’s involvement in the Darfur crisis and the independence of East Timor have been counterexamples to the abovementioned realist explanation. Sudan has been one of the important suppliers of oil and gas for China. Supporting the UN-authorized peacekeeping mission wielded in Darfur would have done nothing but harm China’s interests in Sudan. The antagonist force in the independence of East Timor, Indonesia, has been of essential geostrategic value for the PRC, and Beijing has been developing relations with Jakarta since the 1980s. Another conventional thinking explaining China’s nonintervention argues that the PRC remains weak to intervene in the pariah states. Moreover, if the argument focusing on China’s concern of stability in the bordering area is tenable, the North Korea case would become controversial for testing the realist hypothesis. The PRC has been the most important source of foreign aid for North Korea; Beijing has even become Pyongyang’s most crucial trade partner since the end of the Cold War (Bajoria 2010). If China wants, it

could easily “bring the North Korean economy to its knees” (Richburg 2010). Thus, intervention in North Korea should not be an impossible mission for China.

On the other hand, although China has valued sovereignty and equality among states as the most important institutions in international society, it has shown much devotion to the UN peacekeeping missions. If China has subscribed to the realist logic, it should not have devoted itself so deeply to the UN peacekeeping missions, nor should Beijing have sent personnel to participate in the missions imposed on states targeted as the object of international intervention. Hence, the inconsistency in China’s attitude toward intervention could not be solved and understood simply by the mainstream IR theories, such as the realist arguments. We need to look at the empirical issues through perspectives that are unfamiliar to both realism and constructivism, and could be reached only from the internal side of the research object.

Based on the foregoing understanding, the following questions provide clues to the main concern of this research. They also point out the major field of investigation of this book. These questions are: What are the main criteria for determining whether or not China will intervene? Have China’s intervention behaviors been greatly different from those of its Western counterparts? If so, why does China hesitate to follow the Western ways of intervention? Moreover, if China has presented a different intervention pattern, how has such a difference reflected or transcended the discrepancy between the Western and the Chinese view of the world order? Finally, how will the answer help predict the future of international society with a risen China that holds a different attitude of dealing with controversial issues and crises? Before introducing the research design of this book,
for the better understanding, an overview of the history of contemporary Chinese foreign policy regarding the issue of international intervention is necessary.

**History of Nonintervention?**

Just like other state actors in world politics, China has been holding different views and attitudes toward international affairs in different time periods, and the changes in the attitude often shape its foreign policy to some degree. Likewise, the change in views occurred on China’s foreign policy toward international intervention. In the 1950s and 1960s, the making of Chinese foreign policy was primarily based on the communist ideology. This was also the early stage of the nation building for the PRC. At that time, China joined the alliance with the Soviet Union and treated the Western bloc led by the US as its major enemy. In addition, China had allied itself with many small powers among the developing countries. Beijing has even maintained the image that China is the representative of all the Third World nations. Efforts to create such an image have greatly impacted China’s attitude toward the imposition of international intervention. After breaking the alliance with the Soviet Union, the PRC focused on launching world revolutions wherever it could wield power. China’s efforts to spread the proletarian revolution were in line with the doctrines of Marxism. At that time, China’s interpretation of world order is deeply rooted in its faith of communism. The PRC remained poor and weak, yet China’s deep involvement in the Korea War and Vietnam War has provided evidence that China did actively participate once in international interventions.⁸

---

⁸ The case studies of China’s involvement in the Korean War and Vietnam War can be found in Andrew Scobell’s article “Soldiers, Statesmen, Strategic Culture, and China’s 1950 Intervention in Korea” and Mao Lin’s “China and the Escalation of Vietnam War.” Furthermore, Lorenz Lüthi’s “The Vietnam War and China’s Third-Line Defense Planning Before the Cultural Revolution, 1964–1966” has provided profound analysis of the relations between China’s domestic politics and its foreign policy (Scobell 2004; Mao 2009, 2009).
Moreover, China had been providing limited economic aid and political support to socialist movements in areas like Southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America, including bolstering Cuba’s confrontation with the US in the 1960s (Chen 2007, 24–42). These acts were all related to the PRC following the Marxist doctrine of exporting revolutions.

The Cultural Revolution brought a period of suspension to China’s foreign relations; China became almost totally isolated from the international society. The country had thus halted all the interventionary-like actions (including providing continuous support to Viet Cong in the Vietnam War), and focused on its inward chaos (Keylor 2009, 303). The PRC did not settle the internal turmoil until the second half of the 1970s. After the Cultural Revolution, China gradually opened itself to international society. Its faith in communist ideology had not yet faded then, but the creed of exporting proletarian revolutions no longer prevailed in its foreign relations. One episode that occurred at that time akin to an interventionary act was China’s armed conflict with Vietnam. China sent 200,000 troops and 1,200 tanks across the borderline into Vietnam to “teach it a lesson.” Beijing had claimed its act as the response to Vietnam’s invasion of Cambodia. This war has been an interesting case; it lasted for only two weeks and ended with China’s sudden withdrawal from Vietnam. Beijing made the unilateral announcement to end the warfare without any physical gains or rewards. Such a perfunctory action was apparently for symbolic reasons only; the PRC did not do this for material interests. The war resulted in severe casualties in China (Adelman and Shih 35–69; Lüthi 2008, 26–51).

China had been supporting the Khmer Rouge government in Cambodia. Deng Xiaoping complained about Vietnam’s aggression toward Cambodia in a meeting with US President Jimmy Carter. Carter showed his disapproval of China’s intervention plan. However, Deng still took action on his way back to Beijing (Keylor 2009, 317).
China did not even compel Vietnam to withdraw from Cambodia; consequentially, China waging war against Hanoi drove Vietnam to get closer to China’s rival, the Soviet Union (Keylor 2009, 317).

The 1980s is the watershed in China’s domestic politics and foreign policy. This was the time when China sought to resume the normalization of foreign relations with the Western world. A short honeymoon period occurred between the PRC and the Western great powers. However, the Tiananmen Square incident caused the sudden suspension of the normalization process. Beijing was sanctioned by the West for its bloody suppression of the students who protested in the Tiananmen Square. This event forced the PRC to turn the focus to its domestic affairs and economic development. When the US-led Western states proposed resolutions imposing economic sanctions on China in the UN, only Cuba and Pakistan stood against the proposal in the voting process. China’s old leagues, Russia and North Korea, abstained. Since then, the principle of “tao guang yang hui” (to conceal one’s ability and bide one’s time) advocated by Deng Xiaoping became the main theme of the Chinese foreign policy.

In the 1990s, “tao guang yang hui” remained the PRC guideline for managing its foreign relations; the “Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence”\(^\text{10}\) is still one of the crucial doctrines in the Chinese foreign policy. Among these five principles, mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, and noninterference in each other’s internal affairs have been the essential principles that dominate China’s attitude and policy toward international intervention. The “Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence” can be seen as

---

\(^{10}\)“The Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence” was established in the process of China’s negotiation with India on the Tibetan issue in late 1953 and early 1954. Chinese Premier Zhou Enlai proposed these principles to the Indian delegation; later, these principles were officially adopted into the agreement.
one of the foundations constituting China’s view of order for the world politics. Sovereignty and equality among states have been very important for China; even after the PRC had risen to the status of great power, sovereignty remains the prioritized institutions compared to other international norms.

Although “tao guang yang hui” and noninterference in each other’s internal affairs remain the guideline in China’s foreign policy making, Beijing has begun the process of readjusting to accommodate itself to the prevailing international institutions and norms. Its growing role in the UN peacekeeping missions provides strong empirical evidence of such an adjustment. Before the 1980s, China severely opposed any UN peacekeeping operation. The reason is that China had viewed UN as the instrument for the two hegemonic powers to wield their influence on weaker nations. In the early 1980s, Deng Xiaoping started the opening and reform policy. China’s attitude toward UN peacekeeping was then adjusted from strong opposition to cooperation by acquiescence.

In the late 1980s, China became a member of the UN General Assembly’s Special Committee for Peacekeeping Operations. Since then, China started to show strong support to the UN peacekeeping operations. In the beginning of the 21st century, China became the second-largest provider of peacekeepers among the five members of the UN Security Council. In 2008, China increased its financial contribution to 3% of the UN peacekeeping budget. According to the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, China has greatly helped fill the demand for peacekeeping missions by contributing police

---

11 The change in China’s attitude toward peacekeeping was actually related to the United States. In 1990, China joined the UN peacekeeping, which led to the cancellation of US sanction on it (the sanction was imposed due to the Tiananmen Square incident). The other event that strengthened China’s support to UN peacekeeping is NATO’s military intervention in the Kosovo crisis. The PRC realized that if it kept a reluctant attitude toward the UN authorized missions, it might face the risk of potential damage to China’s national interests and status in global politics.
personnel and enablers to join the group of UN peacekeepers (International Crisis Group 2009a).

Although China has shown strong support to the UN peacekeeping operations, the “Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence” remains the main theme in China’s attitude toward international invention, especially the type of intervention that uses military force and economic sanctions. China has encountered severe criticism and condemnation of its tolerant attitude toward states violating international laws due to its strong insistence on the noninterference principle. The frequent rejection and abstention China adopted to show its opposition against the proposal of intervention in the UN Security Council has provoked the accusation that China always supports a string of despots, nuclear proliferators, and genocidal regimes, and China often shields them from international pressure and thus reverses potential improvement in the human rights conditions in these pariah states (Kleine–Ahlbrandt and Small 2008, 38; Kristof 2008). Such an accusation was combined with the Western states’ concern about the “China threat.” Some arguments strongly assert that China has formed a “charm offensive” to compete with the US. They contend that China is applying a soft power strategy to woo these pariah states and other Third World countries to expand its influence on international politics. By boosting the nonintervention principle, showing great respect to other nations’ internal affairs, and expressing support to the current regimes (even doing so is against its Maoist tradition), the PRC has gained the allegiance and friendship offered by many authoritarian regimes (Kurlantzick 2007).
Defining Intervention: Aims and Means

Cynthia Weber has pointed out, “Intervention is an essentially uncontested concept. The uncontestedness of intervention has to do with its coupling with sovereignty” (Weber 1995, 11). Defining the concept of intervention has indeed been a controversial issue in the IR theories. Nevertheless, Weber is right in indicating the link and confrontation between the concept of intervention and state sovereignty. Hence, even if the perspectives concerning international intervention provided by different theories greatly varied, no discussion on intervention could leave out the debate on sovereignty. If the concept of intervention is considered from the aspect of state sovereignty, one will find that intervention is always associated with two characteristics relating to the change of sovereignty: convention-breaking and authority-oriented. Based on these two special properties of intervention, James Rosenau provides a definition for making the concept of intervention operational:

The behavior of one international actor toward another as interventionary whenever the form of the behavior constitutes a sharp break with then-existing forms and whenever it is directed at changing or preserving the structure of political authority in the target society (Rosenau 1968, p. 167).

Such a definition apparently covers the general understanding of the intervention concept; however, some have criticized that Rosenau’s definition neglected to take the motivation of the intervening party into account, and foreign aid as a very common means for intervention in modern international politics is totally excluded (Little 1975, 2).

Considering the essentiality of motivation and the means when a policy of imposing intervention was taken, especially in the situation of civil war within a nation state, Richard Little has tried to provide a more precise differentiation between
intervention and nonintervention. According to Little’s definition, when the intervening party develops/maintains relationship with one side of the belligerent actors involved in the domestic conflict, such behavior could be defined as intervention; if the intervening party maintains a relationship with both sides, Little defines such action as nonintervention. Furthermore, concerning the means a behavior of intervention might adopt, Little argues that the application of not only coercive means (i.e., military force) should be counted as interventionary action, but the utilitarian means (i.e., economic sanctions) and identitive ways of response (i.e., spreading propaganda) should also be considered as an important medium for imposing intervention (Little 1975, 8–9). In other words, Little’s definition of intervention is broad because it includes all kinds of measurement that could result in explicit impacts on the internal affairs of other states.

Contrary to Little’s adoption of a broad definition of intervention, Martha Finnemore has focused her research on the type of intervention that involves military action. In her work, Finnemore has defined the term “international intervention” as follows: the intervening party must acknowledge and identify their behavior as intervening in the domestic affairs of other state, the military action must be literally called “intervention” when reported during and after the occurrence of the event, and such military action must encounter counter-intervention in the process. Finnemore limited the scope of definition of intervention to investigate how the change in the legitimate causes for imposing intervention has shaped the beliefs on the legitimate use of military force. Her analysis has never turned away from questioning the concept of sovereignty. She even points out that the intervention policy formulates the idea of state sovereignty. In her work, Finnemore uses three case studies to show how and why the
norms regarding the legitimate cause to impose intervention have alternated in international society. These three cases include the intervention imposed on the debtor state by the creditor (normally they were the European great powers), humanitarian intervention, and intervention on the excuse of maintaining international order (Finnemore 2009, Ch.1). Through her work, a genealogical study on the legitimacy of military intervention has been clearly presented. However, Finnemore is not the sole scholar who has questioned the uncontestedness of the concept of intervention.

As briefly cited in the beginning of this section, Cynthia Weber has also addressed inquiries toward the mutually constructive relations between the concept of state sovereignty and the legitimate cause for imposing intervention. She compares the norms regarding the legal application of military interventions in the 19th century (supported mainly by the Concert of Europe) to the cases of interventions that occurred in the 20th century, including the interventions the US had imposed on Spain, Naples, Grenada, and Panama. According to Weber’s investigation, the determination of the criteria for legitimate intervention is deeply related to how the definition of the rightful sovereign state was constructed in a specific time and space. For example, in the period when the Concert of Europe dominated the world, a rightful state meant the type of regime ruled by absolute monarchies. At that time, intervention was often applied as a means to deter or oppress revolutions in foreign lands. In other words, the purpose of imposing intervention was to prevent or hinder the overturn of the monarchic system in a specific state. In contrast, the US intervention imposed on others’ domain was done to promote democracy; regardless the reality, at least promoting democracy was often used by Washington as an excuse to use force against other countries. In certain cases,
Washington would even support and aid the revolutionary parties in the target states, and popular democracy has been claimed as the sole legitimate form of sovereignty since the 20th century (Weber 1995, Ch. 2, 4, 5, and 6).

In sum, finding a universally applicable definition of intervention is difficult, because the meaning of intervention is still in process. Diverse scholars have provided various theoretical perspectives. A reasonable definition for conceptualizing and operationalizing international intervention should only be determined depending on the research purpose. Slightly different from the abovementioned studies, the term “international” has been added ahead of the word “intervention” in the current study. This addition is necessary because the kind of intervention that the present study will investigate is the one wielded on the basis of multinational cooperation. In the 21st century, almost all examples of military intervention would have cooperation between or among the states involved. Even the US war on Iraq in 2003 was a combined operation with the support of Britain. In addition, as Little has claimed, multiple ways have been used to wield influence on other states, and they could all be called “intervention;” nevertheless, the type of intervention to be discussed in the study will be limited to those that apply coercive means, that is, military intervention and economic sanction. The reason is that the main theme of this research is the role of China in crisis management and global governance. The use of coercion as a measurement of managing crises and maintaining international order has always been intensely debated. Specifically, the PRC has confronted the most serious controversy with its Western counterparts on the issues with such a type of intervention involved.
As claimed by Finnermore and Weber, one must work on the study of the historical context of a specific time when the policies were made to depict the phenomenon of the intervention. The object of this research is the PRC and its foreign policy, especially the policies made after Deng Xiaoping started the economic reform. It is reasonable to investigate whether China will become a responsible great power by observing its interventionary pattern since the beginning era of its rise. On the other hand, humanitarian intervention has become the legitimate form of intervention in contemporary international society. Beijing has been facing severe challenges on the disputes involving humanitarian appeal. The call for the imposition of international intervention based on humanitarian reasons has greatly conflicted with China’s principle of treating sovereignty as the priori above all other international norms. China remains most unwilling to see the use of force against other states on the excuse of protecting human rights.

Finally, for the comprehensibility of the following discussion, providing a definition for the operational purpose is important. In this research, intervention refers to an act of intrusion that aims exclusively at changing the policy of the target state(s) to preserve a specific (internal as well as external) order. Such conduct could accompany the use of military force or non-military but still coercive means, such as economic sanctions, and propaganda that brings a negative influence to the reputation and foreign relations of the target states. In other words, the type of intervention investigated in this research operates on the basis of applying hard power (mainly military and economic powers), and is wielded by a single state or a group of states.
Mapping Theories: What the Existing Literature Has Provided for Knowing China and International Intervention

The rise of China has been such a popular topic in the study of IR that almost all major theories in the field have provided specific perspectives for explaining Beijing’s foreign policy making. China’s attitude toward international intervention has been one of the most perplexing topics in the research of Chinese foreign policy. Among the major theoretical arguments, realism and constructivism have provided not only explanations, but also predictions of the future international arena with a powerful China taking on the crucial role in maintaining order and security. In this section, the liberalism arguments are not addressed heavily, because the purpose of this study is to depict how the existing literature in the field of security studies has presented China’s intervention behaviors. The liberalism theory focuses more on the factors of trade and the integration of global market, and its arguments quite often merge with the realist perspective in terms of how the pursuit of economic interests has shaped China’s attitude toward international intervention imposed on pariah states. On the other hand, liberalism’s discussion on the integration brought about by the globalization process is an approach similar to the constructivist argument concerning the power of norms and institutions. Therefore, in this section, most works analyzed are selected from realism and constructivism, except some literature providing special perspectives from the aspect of traditional Chinese culture.

The realist perspective on the interventionary behaviors of states emphasizes the calculation of national interests, especially the material interests, such as the gain of territory and vassal, expansion of military power, and economic interests like the sources of raw material or market. The factors that determine the states’ behaviors, in the realist
view, are nothing but structural (i.e., the ability of a state to survive and expand its power, polarity in the international system, and the discrepancy between great powers and weak states). All these factors decide how states respond to international affairs.\(^{12}\) Thus, the realists assume that China’s unwillingness to intervene in pariah states is either for its pursuit of economic benefits and the dependence on the energy resources provided by those authoritarian regimes, or because China needs to ally with these despots and utilizes the support gained from these pariah states to challenge the status quo powers, especially the US. The typical prediction of offensive realism even suggests that China will eventually wage conflict with the dominant hegemon and create turbulence in the existing international order (Mearsheimer 2001, Ch. 1). Hence, China’s national interests will always inescapably clash with those of the US, and China’s unwillingness to intervene in pariah states should be seen as a strategy of balancing the influence of the US and an ambition to challenge the existing international system.

The constructivist perspective for explaining China’s response to international crises often combines with the degree to which China has adopted to comply with the international norms and institutions. Constructivists argue that the extent to which China has internalized these norms and institutions determines the way Beijing responds to the call for international intervention. The issue concerning international intervention is deeply related to the existing value system in international society, especially the criteria

\(^{12}\) The most classic arguments of how the structural factors have shaped states’ behaviors are provided by Kenneth Waltz. However, some realist scholars in the later time have criticized Waltz’s hypotheses as oversimplified and unable to provide accurate explanation and prediction of a state’s actions. Hence, many revisions of Waltz’s structural realism have been made. New debate has thus emerged: Could the revised version of structural realism still be named “realism?” The current paper does not plan to pursue a follow-up of the debate on the essence of realism; however, regardless of how the hypotheses were revised, the core of the realist arguments remains the focus of the determining the power of the states’ calculation of national interests, and only of the type of material interests (Waltz 1986, Ch. 2–5; Legro and Moravcsik 1999, 5–55).
for simply waging war and defending human rights in others’ domains. China’s internalization of such norms and criteria is the key to its self-image regarding the role China is going to take on in global governance and its relations with other states. The self-image China constructed helps formulate the PRC’s attitude when dealing with international crises caused by pariah states. However, most works done by the constructivists analyzing China’s socialization into global governance suggest that China will eventually perform like other Western great powers. Suggesting a destination for China to be completely socialized/Westernized has been the prevailing characteristic in the constructivist argument on the subject.

The realist perspective that focuses on the impact of the state’s calculation of national interests and the constructivist approach emphasizing the great effect of socialization have both provided good analytical perspectives for investigating China’s interventionary behaviors. Nonetheless, both theories address only structural factors. This research suggests that the internal factors shaped by the state’s culture and history also weigh equally in the formulation of the state’s intervention pattern. In the following section, the review of existing literature regarding China’s policy toward crisis management and international intervention will be done from four aspects: the realist assumption regarding the impact of the states’ calculation of national interests, identity, socialization and the power of norms and institutions, emergence of the norm of humanitarian intervention, and influence of the Chinese traditional thought on its involvement in international intervention.
Calculation of National Interests in China’s Foreign Policy

The conventional perspective on China’s decision of intervention and nonintervention tends to assume that the consideration of national interests is the major drive of Beijing’s policy making. Such an argument is never the unique creation of the realism in the study of IR; however, the realist explanation suggests that the pursuit of national interests is the sole cause of the intervention policy of states, and China’s response and behavior are no exception. The calculation of national interests in terms of policy making for response to the appeal of international intervention often focuses on the pursuit of material interests, such as the concern about the distribution of power, pursuit of energy and raw materials, need to expand market and trade, and preservation of security and stability in the region. Although the content of the realist arguments regarding China’s foreign policy has never been in chorus, they have all expressed doubt on the claim of the peaceful rise of China. The more extreme realist perspective even suggests the inevitability of future conflict between China and the current dominant power, the US.

The typical realist argument concerning the future international arena with China becoming the dominant figure in international politics suggests that the PRC would eventually act aggressively and challenge the position of the US. Such an argument is frequently combined with the “China threat” discourses. The argument often suggests that China is like another Nazi Germany or imperialist Japan; the historical records of Germany and Japan have forecasted how the PRC will behave once it accumulates enough power. John Mearsheimer has offered a similar prediction and claimed that the offensive-orientated nature of the state will finally lead China to pursue the position of
regional hegemon; once it becomes powerful enough to dominate the region, the next step for Beijing is to challenge the leadership of Washington. He further argues that China is already a potential threat to the US in the Asia Pacific due to China’s increasing economic and military power. Great powers in Mearsheimer’s version of international politics always compete with each other for the maximization of material power; China will certainly act like one once it joins the great-power club. When China reaches the goal of becoming a regional hegemon, it will certainly intervene in other minor states in the neighboring area to control them for the expansion of the sphere of influence and accumulate enough capability to confront the US. Hence, in Mearsheimer’s version of China’s rise, future international politics will hardly be more peaceful with a strong China taking part in crisis management. On the contrary, China is going to be the most dangerous enemy not just for the US, but also for the existing international order (Mearsheimer 2001, Ch. 10).

To date, whether Mearsheimer’s prediction has become reality or not is still too early to say. However, one certainty is the existence of clashes of interests between China and the US. Among all the issues regarding the potential antagonism between China and the US, energy security has been one of the most noticeable, because it is the most possible cause of heightening confrontation between the two great powers. The competition on energy security between China and the US has been widely discussed in academia and policy-making groups; many experts have argued that China will apply

---

13 One of the examples is about rare earth minerals. Rare earth minerals have been crucial for manufacturing advanced technology. In 2010, about 97 percent of the world supply of rare earth minerals was produced by China (Spotts 2010). In other words, all most all the advanced Western and non-Western states have relied heavily on the rare earth elements exported by China, including the U.S. Although it has not yet been an issue causing crisis, there have been suspicions regarding the negative result of the over
every possible means to gain more sources of energy and secure those that are already in-hand. For the sake of energy security, China neglects the value of justice and human rights; Beijing has not only opposed intervention on states which could provide it oil and gas, but has also allied with these regimes whose poor records have indicated their lack of respect toward the dignity and well-being of their citizens (Dreyer 2007, Ch. 11). For example, China has greatly relied on the oil supplied by Iran. Beijing’s growing relations with Teheran have undermined the effects of sanctions imposed by the Western great powers for Iran’s violation of nuclear nonproliferation.

Suisheng Zhao has further pointed out:

China’s ‘holistic approach’—offering exploration, development and financing package to its African partners—has become an attractive alternative to traditional Western companies, which do not have a similar integrated package of carrots to offer (Zhao 2008, p. 212).

It is argued that China’s relationship-building with these countries based on its need of energy resources has contributed to Beijing’s reluctance to support the appeal of international intervention. Although the US has been making great efforts in the UN to pressure the rogue regimes to compromise and stop human rights violation, such efforts have rarely reached their aim without the PRC providing support and assistance (Ziegler 2006, 10–16). Sudan is another notorious example. Sudan is viewed by China as a key energy supplier in Africa. Jonathan Holslag has suggested that if it were not for the escalating violence in Darfur that threatened China’s economic interests in Sudan, Beijing might not have supported and cooperated with the UN intervention mission (Holslag 2008, 74).

reliance on Chinese rare earth against the energy security of the U.S. (Vafeiadis 2012).
The abovementioned literature has all supported the proposition that China’s concern for energy security and economic interests is the prior and sole cause of its negative attitude toward intervention imposed on pariah states. On the other hand, some arguments have pointed out that China did wield intervention for security and survival reasons. For instance, Andrew Scobell investigates the attitudes of Chinese military figures and the civilian leaders in the event of 1950, when China intervened in the Korean War. He concludes that the Chinese civilian leaders were actually no less hawkish than the military figures. Moreover, Mao Zedong’s decision to intervene in the Korean Peninsula was not merely for ideational reasons; the most important cause was the perception that the US troops were threatening China’s bordering area and might invade the Northeast part of the Chinese territory (Scobell 2004). In the present time, the nuclear proliferation crisis in North Korea has caused severe tension in Northeast Asia, and the PRC has been expected by its Western counterparts to take responsibility for handling Pyongyang’s nuclear program development. However, an isolated North Korea might be in China’s diplomatic interest, as claimed by You Ji, because “when the DPRK cannot talk to its hostile neighbors by itself, China’s role as the indispensable mediator will give it a lot to say in the settlement of the conflict.” (You 2001, 392) You Ji further argued that China could also use its role as an indispensable mediator between North Korea and the outside world for balancing China’s relations with the US (You ibid.). At the same time, facing North Korea’s testing of long-range missiles, Beijing did show a strong attitude by supporting two UN resolutions against Pyongyang. In addition, China cut off its oil supply and military cooperation with North Korea. In Cristopher Twomey’s
analysis, China’s responses to the nuclear proliferation issue caused by North Korea can be best captured by defensive realism (Twomey 2008).

In their analyses of China’s relations with North Korea, both Scobell and Twomey use the argument of “strategic culture” to compare their assumptions. According to Iain Johnston, the strategic culture is:

An integrated system of symbols (i.e., argumentation structures, languages, analogies, metaphors, etc.) that acts to establish pervasive and long-lasting grand strategic preferences by formulating concepts of the role and efficacy of military force in interstate political affairs, and by clothing these conceptions with such an aura of factuality that the strategic preferences seem uniquely realistic and efficacious (Johnston 1995, p. 36).

Johnston has established an argument of China’s strategic culture by investigating the classical Chinese literature Seven Military Classics. He has found his argument to be the empirical support from the warfare in the Ming dynasty. He concludes that although the Confucian-Mencian paradigm is still there, it is more applied as a symbolic discourse in Chinese official language by the strategists. The parabellum paradigm could be read in both Chinese classics and the practice done in the Ming dynasty. Johnston thus argues that China does have its strategic culture; such strategic culture “is not self-evidently unique, or different from certain strains in Western realpolitik thought and practice” (Johnston ibid., 31). Notably, although Johnston’s conclusion is corresponding to the realist assumption, the approach and argument he has provided is very much constructivist-oriented. This has made Johnston’s observation a very interesting sample for understanding the Chinese foreign policy via both theoretical perspectives.
Identity, Social Learning, and the Power of Norms and International Institutions

Recognizing the realistic inclination in Chinese foreign policy making, constructivism in IR theory has attempted to explain the deep root of such an inclination. In his analysis of China’s intervention paradigm from the 1950s to the early 1970s, Krishna Prakash Gupta has argued that the PRC had been acting on its own criteria regarding its attitude toward international intervention. Gupta criticizes that China’s interventionary behaviors were inconsistent; Beijing (known as “Peking” in the cited article) would claim and support intervention when the intervening party was defined as its friend, and the intervened regimes were identified as its enemy. On the contrary, when the intervening state was viewed by China as the enemy, it would severely criticize the intervention action as immoral and unjust. Moreover, the standard for China to identify a friend or an enemy is deeply related to how Beijing has defined its national interests. Thus, Gupta has argued that China’s claim of “principle of noninterference” would only be materialized based on Beijing’s needs and deeds (Gupta 1971, 15–22).

Meanwhile, some scholars have adopted the constructivist approach and assumed the social learning process is happening in China. They suggested that the pressure from the Western world has been shaping the way China deals with foreign issues. This perspective provides a prediction of a bright future, with China becoming more “socialized” and integrated with the international community. Constructivists even picture that China will ultimately internalize the Western values and act like its Western counterparts. Such an argument has not been the main trend in the analysis of China’s participation in international politics, yet it is neither the seldom seen proposition in terms of the future of international society. For instance, in his other work, Johnston treats
realist ideas and the corresponding behaviors (what he calls realist ideology) as a once prevalent norm that formed through the socialization process in world history. However, the realist style of causal explanations based on the function of material effect has failed to provide insights for analyzing the states’ preferences and behavior change, especially their participation in international institutions in the post-Cold War era (Johnston 2008, Ch. 1).

Johnston’s book, *Social States: China in International Institutions*, is meant to explain why and how China’s preferences and behaviors have changed toward a more non-realpolitik direction on certain issues in the post-Cold War period. Johnston has provided a model of socialization; under the socialization procedure, the states’ preferences and corresponding behaviors will be changed. Three steps or degrees are outlined in Johnston’s model of socialization: mimicking, social influence, and persuasion. Johnston’s work further implies a positive future of China’s merging into international society. As he has argued, China will eventually internalize the prevailing international institutions and norms and become more compliant with the existing international order (Johnston 2009, Ch. 1 and 5). The major case studies Johnston has done in his book are mainly on China’s participation in the global and regional apparatuses of international security. Johnston also provided a short explanation of China’s attitude toward the norms regarding the protection of human rights. Chen Dingding accepted the constructivist arguments about how the structural factors have brought up China’s changing attitude toward the international human rights regime. However, he suggests that the constructivist explanation is not sufficient for constructing a profound understanding of China’s developing human rights policy; he has investigated
the agency of the PRC regarding the influence of China’s shifting identity and attitude toward the Western world (Chen 2009).

Allen Carlson used to hold similar views of positive teleology when investigating the evolution of China’s view of sovereignty and attitude toward the norms of humanitarian intervention after the Tiananmen Square incident. He points out the change in attitudes of Chinese scholars and experts toward the norms of sovereignty and intervention. In the Chinese academia and non-official fora, the acceptance of limited sovereignty and intervention for humanitarian reasons has apparently started to prevail. Carlson cites China’s active participation in the UN peacekeeping and China’s voting for the UN-authorized mission on East Timor as examples that the PRC is in the socialization process of becoming more like its Western counterparts (Carlson 2006, 217–241). In his later work, Carlson analyzed the newly emerged concept of tianxia and its impact on China’s seemingly shifting idea about sovereignty. Although Carlson does not point it out explicitly, he seems to have changed the previous view regarding the positive future of China being socialized into the existing international order. In his analysis of the potential influence of the discourse of tianxia, Carlson argues that the impacts will have two possibilities; in other words, China’s developing world view formed on the basis of the concept of tianxia might bring greater stability as well as a deleterious outcome to East Asian international politics (Carlson 2009). Regarding China’s performance in global governance, especially its role in humanitarian intervention, it remains difficult to forecast Beijing’s response and future inclination.
Humanitarian Intervention and China’s Response

In the Cold War era, the imposition of international intervention, regardless of the reasons, was viewed as illegitimate and against the principle of state sovereignty. Interventions in the name of regional security often involved ideological competition between the two camps, and the widespread application of force as the means to intervene in weaker states was frequent at that time. Thus, intervention was the other form of coercion that great powers applied to dominate international politics. Macfarlane even suggests that the existence of intervention policy not only damages the international order, but also widens the existing conflicts within the target states (Macfarlane 1985, 55–56). The other notable fact is that the UN condemned almost all military interventions in the Cold War era. The reason was quite straightforward; as Adam Roberts has stated:

In the UN Charter, the prohibition of attacks on states is fundamental; and self-defense against armed attack is the one remaining completely unambiguous justification for states using force. The Charter even places limits in the famous Article 2(7) on intervention within states by the UN itself (Roberts 1993, p. 433).

However, such phenomena no longer prevailed after the Cold War, and a new norm emerged to justify the application of military force as the means of international intervention.14

The new emerged norm is the result of the changing ideas about universal human rights in international society. It has become a negation to the traditional thought regarding state sovereignty and authority over its own domain. The protection of human

---

14 In the current study, the humanitarian intervention is cited as an emerged new norm for contrasting purpose only. As earlier addressed in the arguments provided by Cynthia Weber and Martha Finnemore in the previous section, the just cause for imposing intervention has been in flux. In the Cold War era, the preservation of international order could be used by great powers as a justification to impose intervention. Humanitarian intervention has become the mainstream in the discourse of imposing international intervention since the post-Cold War era, yet the concept itself is never new. Terry Nardin has analyzed the moral basis of humanitarian intervention, and traced the root back to natural law that originated in the medieval age (Nardin 2002).
rights provides the foundation for international intervention wielded in the name of humanitarianism. In the post-Cold War era, humanitarian intervention has gradually become the source that provides legitimacy for military intervention. Humanitarian intervention is viewed as the materialization of the protection and improvement of universal human rights; the actions are taken by the coalition of states in response to the suppression of popular will, even if such actions violate the sovereign rights of other states. Roberts has indicated such a change of international norms. For rescuing and liberating the suppressed popular will, the application of external military action to end the suppression could be justified in some circumstances (Roberts 1993, 435). However, how a target of humanitarian intervention is identified and how to evaluate the appropriate time and appropriate use of military force remain complicated and controversial issues that have always stirred debates in the international arena. Another focal point regarding the controversy in the application of force for intervention is the host states’ consensus and the UN auspices (Roberts ibid., 445–446). The host states’ consent and the UN auspices are actually the key factors for determining whether the PRC would support international intervention or not. China is often criticized by the public opinion supporting the norm of humanitarianism that its insistence on the criteria of host state consensus and the UN authorization is quite outdated and has been the obstacle for rescuing victims in the target nations.

The absence of the consent of host states and lack of UN auspices were the major reasons for China’s severe condemnation of NATO’s action in Kosovo, which represents the doctrine of humanitarian intervention. The Kosovo case of humanitarian intervention had greatly caused anxiety to China, because this coalition military action reminded
China of its past when the Western countries intervened in China, conquered its territories, and imposed the so-called “civilized standard” on Chinese. Beijing tended to believe that humanitarian intervention is nothing but a cover for advanced states to hide their evil intentions and gain strategic interests at the cost of weaker nations. Another reason for China’s opposition to the humanitarian intervention in Kosovo is related to the potential conflict in the Korean Peninsula. China was worried that the United States might use humanitarian intervention as a cover to intervene in North Korea. If unilateral military action were applied against North Korea, China would eventually get involved in the warfare with the Western great powers again. If the situation in the Korean Peninsula became unstable, China’s core interests concerning its economic development and security around the neighboring area would be risked, which is totally against China’s national interests (Zhang 2000, 117–127).

In the debate between the value of universal human rights and sovereignty of states, China obviously has treasured the latter much more than the former. The Darfur crisis could be viewed as an apt example. Ian Taylor has pointed out in his article that China had long been criticized by the Western commentators for supporting the regime in Khartoum because of the concern for oil and economic interests in Sudan. The government in Khartoum had been found by the UN’s International Commission of Inquiry on Darfur as complicit in massacres and crimes against humanity. However, Beijing had insisted that the consent and cooperation from the Sudanese government was necessary for the UN-led peacekeeping mission. Meanwhile, Chinese representatives in Sudan had repeated China’s strong position on opposing the application of sanction and isolation. China had made a firm announcement of opposing any sanction against Sudan,
because they never believed that sanction and isolation would bring the situation to a more positive direction. While trying to prevent sanctions from being carried out, China also sent an envoy to Sudan and pushed Khartoum to accept the UN-authorized intervention. China’s response toward the Darfur crisis showed its belief that no human rights should be spoken of in the absence of state sovereignty (Taylor 2010, 181–187).

State sovereignty has been treated as priority among all the international institutions for China. If international intervention is unavoidable, the PRC always insists that peaceful means including dialogue and coordination should be first considered when imposing humanitarian intervention. On the other hand, China’s attitude toward humanitarian intervention has represented its view of human rights. Unlike the Western tradition of liberalism, the civil and political rights have been seen as secondary to people’s living/economic rights. Mark Evans applies the theoretical framework based on cases studies on weak states and the idea of “state making” to analyze China’s reaction to humanitarian intervention. He points out that “the need to trade off human rights in favor of economic development is a common and powerful argument” in the PRC (Evans 2004, 115). In the development process, the repression of civil and political rights is inevitable. Moreover, Evans suggests that the Chinese culture emphasizes the need for social and political stability, and the repression of people’s political rights is necessary for the maintenance of stability. Thus, the existing regime has to remain in power to assure the stability of China’s social and political environment (Evans ibid.). China believes that the current regime has to keep its control over the domain, and repression is inevitable for the goal of economic development; hence, Evans’ argument implies that China could never actively support humanitarian intervention, especially the type that uses military force.
Hence, in the foreseeable future, it is close to impossible that China will issue approval to the newly emerged norm, “the responsibility to protect.”

History, Culture, and Confucianism: The Chinese Style of Global Governance

One perspective applied in the analysis of the Chinese foreign policy suggests that Confucianism and China’s practice of socialism have crucial impact on Beijing’s foreign policy making. Such a perspective suggests that China will not support the type of intervention to plant a specific ideology or nurture certain types of regimes. The principle of “seeking common ground while reserving differences (qiu tong cun yi),” known as one of the main themes in the Confucian ideal, remains the major principle for China to manage disputes with other nations. Neither will China initiate intervention to seek a hegemonic position or accumulate power. Such a viewpoint assumes that harmony and selfless “kingly way (wangdao)” are the ultimate goal in China’s dealing with foreign relations.

David Kang holds a similar viewpoint that China does not apply force to intervene in its neighboring countries for the purpose of conquest or seeking the position of hegemony. The main theme of his book, *China Rising: Peace, Power and Order in East Asia*, is to answer the question of the absence of obvious fear and antagonism toward China’s rise to the dominant position in East Asia, and examine the reason for the East Asian countries’ non-formation of a coalition or lack of efforts to bring the other
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15 In September 2000, a group of states, represented by Canada, announced the establishment of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) at the UN General Assembly. They published a brochure titled “The Responsibility to Protect” in the following year. In this brochure, ICISS argues for the need to redefine the concept of the state’s responsibility over human rights in other states’ domain. They also provide the scope of the operational dimension of materializing the responsibility to protect. In terms of the question of authorization, the ICISS agrees on the necessity of the role of the UN Security Council. However, it has implicitly preserved the space of states acting independently for just cause when the Security Council fails to respond to the crisis efficaciously. The details regarding the ICISS version of the concept is available online: http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/ICISSL20Report.pdf
great power into the region for balancing China. His investigation focuses on the East Asian international system in the early modern period (1300 A.D. to 1900 A.D.). The failure of a rising/risen China in causing the instability of the system can be attributed to the function of the tribute system, power, and cost-benefit equation, shared culture and ideas, and China’s long institutional reach. Kang concludes that when China was strong, the East Asian international system remained stable and order had been preserved; in contrast, when China turned weak, chaos and conflict began in East Asia (Kang 2007, Ch. 1). In Kang’s analysis, China has maintained the hierarchical system by widespread cultural values and other nations’ mimicking of the Chinese institutions. China rarely applied force to intervene in other countries. Even when the rare cases of Chinese intervention occurred, China applied military force to reestablish the hierarchical system that had been violated by the target nations.16

David Kang applies the tribute system as an institution installed in the East Asian international politics in the early modern period; nevertheless, other interpretations of the Sino-centric tribute system exist. One of these interpretations treats the tribute system as a preeminently cultural system sustained by precepts and practices that run the Chinese world order. The instruments that China used to maintain such a system and expand its influence in the region were cultural attraction and the “rule by virtue” (Zhang 2009, 549, , Tan 1978)). The tribute system was also part of the elements that construct the idea of “tianxia” (all-under-heaven). Zhao Tingyang has tried to promote tianxia for solving problems that could have been misconstrued by the international theories created in the Western world (Zhao 2009, 12). The ideal of tianxia is to build a world where nothing is

16 Kang mentions the example of the Qing dynasty waging war against the Korean Choson regime in the early 17th century. The war was meant to consolidate and demarcate the borders (Kang 2007, 37).
left out and no one is treated as an outsider. It does not pursue sameness; on the contrary, it pursues a world order that will maintain harmony, which is a necessary ontological condition for different nations to coexist and develop. Harmony in the Chinese ideal of tianxia is defined as “reciprocal dependence, reciprocal improvement or the perfect fitting for different things” (Zhao ibid., 14).

The epistemology of tianxia focuses on “guanxi” (reciprocal relationship). The Chinese philosophy defines everything in terms of guanxi. Zhao Tingyang provides an interesting point that the reciprocal relationship decides how one views his relations with the outside world: “we find somebody friendly when we treat him in friendly manner; in other circumstances, we might have the opposite idea of him if we treat him wrongly” (Zhao 2009, 10). Such a claim might explain the cultural aspect of why China has acted more cautiously toward the pariah regimes. China tends to oppose the application of military intervention and economic sanctions on other states, because these actions would break the existing guanxi.

The other type of argument suggests that the Chinese style of applying force in dealing with international crises has been adopted for the symbolic meaning rather than the gain of material interests. Such an argument found empirical evidence in the military conflicts between China and its neighboring states. The PRC has repeatedly resorted to military force when managing disputes with other states, yet each time, the action hardly yielded a substantial gain for Beijing. The use of military force could be seen as China’s effort to reestablish the order that is consistent with its own worldview. Chih-yu Shih adopts the approach of the psychocultural cybernetic model and provides several case studies in *The Spirit of Chinese Foreign Policy*. He has argued that the Chinese use of
force may represent several meanings, including eliminating a challenge to China’s national image, signifying China’s disapproval of certain environmental events, signaling the emergence of a new image command, managing the servomechanism by targeting an indirect target, or searching for a national self-identity (Shih 1990, 188). Violence against a foreign country has always had to be conceived of as self-discipline (Shih 2010, 552-553). In other words, China and its targets compose a greater self, to the preservation of which their proper and stable relationship is essential.

Shih’s work has provided a special perspective that China’s application of force in dealing with its foreign relations is deeply related to how China has perceived its image in the international system, and how it wishes its image to be perceived internally and externally. John Garver has similar views in his investigation of the causes that made Chinese leaders determined to wage war against India in 1962. He concludes that such a decision is made because of “a belief that India’s leaders did not appreciate the fact that the People’s Republic of China was a ‘new China’ that had ‘stood up’ and, unlike pre-1949 ‘old China,’ could no longer be ‘bullied’ and ‘humiliated’ by foreign powers” (Garver 2006, 123). Garver’s argument has corresponded to China’s involvement in warfare since the late 19th century, which has often represented Beijing’s dismay over the violation of the hierarchical order in the Chinese worldview. After the PRC was established, it had fought several wars (including the one against India) for symbolic meanings rather than for expanding its power in the region (Shih 1990, 122).

China’s foreign policy making and its practice in international affairs are deeply related to its worldview. The question now becomes the following: What has the Chinese worldview shaped its foreign policy and response to international crises? Martin
Jacques’s *When China Rules the World* is written to address these questions. In his book, he also predicts how the world order would be shaped when China takes over the dominant position as a super power. His investigation follows the historical path that starts from the rise of the Western nation-states, and enters what he calls “the age of China.” To answer the question of how the world order will become when China rules the world, Jacques concludes that:

China will act as an alternative model to the West, embodying a very different kind of political tradition—a post-colonial, developing country, a Communist regime, a highly sophisticated statecraft, and an authoritarian Confucian rather than democratic polity (Jacques 2009, p. 397).

Such development is formed based on several historical and cultural elements. First, China had never been a nation-state until very recently (even now, China is a nation-state in name only). China has been a “civilization-state” that embodies and allows a plurality of systems. The civilization is constructed with the five millennia of history, in which China has long defined itself as the Middle Kingdom. Chinese civilization and the long history have also become the primary sources of how Chinese people identify themselves. Second, the territory of China has been a continent whose political system could not be measured against the standard of Western nation-state (which is often the small to medium-sized state). The vast size of China forces its leaders to adopt flexibility and pragmatism as the theme in their rule. Third, even after the PRC took over the regime, the traditional Confucian idea that rulers/central government represents the universal interest (the only interest accepted in official language) and the belief that rulers should administer with highest ethical values still prevail. Fourth, China has no tradition of expansion. A record of continental increment exists in Chinese history, but China has never sought to project itself outside of its own land or the territory it has claimed.
Compared to its Western counterparts, expansionism and imperialism have never been the Chinese way of thinking and behaving (Jacques ibid., 390).

In sum, the pluralism in terms of conducting different systems to co-exist harmoniously within its territory and the characteristic of being a civilization-state make China adopt a very different thinking for dealing with foreign nations. Such a characteristic also corresponds to the ideal of tianxia and helps explain China’s attitude toward other states with diverse political systems.

**Research Design and the Main Themes**

Different theoretical perspectives have provided diverse explanations for the driving force behind China’s decision making in response to the appeal of international intervention. They all pointed out certain facts regarding China’s opposition and participation in international intervention missions. However, a further and more comprehensive study of China’s pattern of intervention is still lacking. Such a study should provide an analysis based on the examination of empirical cases and investigation of the applicability of the existing propositions provided by the existing IR literature. In the previous parts, a quick browse of the PRC’s increasing involvement and support toward the UN-authorized humanitarian missions has been made. Since the economic reform era, China has gradually adjusted its foreign policy to be more smoothly integrated with international society. However, based on majority of cases calling for intervention, China has rarely given its consent; sometimes Beijing even wielded its veto power to force the suspension of the proposal. Hence, the common opinion concerning China’s attitude toward international intervention remains negative.
This research proposes that the focus for observing China’s intervention pattern should be its attitude toward the states violating international institutions in Asia, especially those that used to have deep historical ties with China. Moreover, one of the research purposes is concerned with the comparison of the Chinese views of world order in the past and present time; thus, the scope of the detailed empirical investigation will be restricted within a certain geographic area (i.e., the East Asia where most countries shared parts in the China-centered tribute system in the past centuries). On the other hand, China has been one of the great regional powers in East Asia; it has been especially expected by its Western counterparts to take responsibility for managing crises and maintaining order in this region. By investigating China’s attitude toward interventions proposed and imposed in the geographical region where it is located, predicting the future orientation of the Chinese interventionary pattern and the prospective global governance with Beijing taking on a greater role is presumably more efficacious.

Based on the observation and information described above, the research question is as follows: Why does China hold a negative attitude toward intervention imposed on states committing the violation of international institutions in East Asia? The “negative attitude” in this statement-like question infers both opposition and abstention whenever the intervention proposal was proffered either in the official documents provided by other states, or in occasions relating to the UN Security Council operations. In addition, an important point regarding the purpose of this study needs to be clarified; although the research question and the scope of empirical studies are limited in the region of East Asia, the eventual goal of this work is to present the pattern of Chinese intervention and nonintervention, and such a pattern should be capable of being applied on events that
occur in other areas. The details for materializing the whole project will be further explained in the following discussion of the methodology adopted in this book.

The clues to why China has been holding a negative attitude toward intervention on East Asian pariah states should be found in the theoretical perspectives investigated in the literature discussed in previous sections. Both realism and constructivism in the IR theory have attempted to provide explanations; the current work has also presented arguments made on the Chinese political philosophy and the past East Asian international system. Given that realist assumptions are the first level of explanations, the material structure concerning strategic and economic interests that relate to China’s needs for national security and economic development might play the key factor that shapes the Chinese policy and position toward international intervention. Hypotheses 1 and 2 of this research are created for responding to the realist assumption. These hypotheses adopt China’s concern about the long term but indefinite interest, i.e. stability around the bordering areas, and immediate and concrete interests, i.e. the economic interests the PRC has in the target states. Hence, the variables chosen for investigation include the shared borders and supply of raw materials.

Hypothesis 1: If the target states share border(s) with China, China will neither initiate nor support intervention.

The concern of the shared borders is crucial for the PRC’s claim of peaceful rising. For China to rise smoothly to the status of great power, a stable international environment is necessary. Such a statement has been frequently expressed in speeches of
Chinese officials and the news media. Creating and maintaining an international environment that is advantageous to China’s national development has long been claimed as the major goal of Chinese foreign policy. Particularly in its neighboring area, the preservation of peace and stability is essential. As long as intervention always involves the use of coercion, the damage on regional security and stability is difficult to prevent once intervention is imposed. The states whose territories are located next to China are especially influential. If intervention is wielded against China’s neighboring states, problems of refugees, threats to security on China’s borders, and the risk of entanglement (i.e., China getting involved in the crises) will inevitably arise. Therefore, China’s avoidance of intervention in countries that share borders with it is consistent with the Chinese logic to assume. On the other hand, if China subscribes to the realist logic, it should keep opposing any form of international intervention imposed on the region where it is located initiated by other great powers; and China should have monopolized the power to wield influence in this region. Intervention through the use of force means the expansion of the field of influence. If China supports the proposal of international intervention, it is supposed to initiate such proposal; otherwise it would risk the danger of other great powers spreading power into East Asia where China used to play the role as a dominator.

**Hypothesis 2:** If regimes in target states are the major suppliers of raw materials, China will neither initiate nor support intervention.
The major concern for China since the 1980s has been continuing the economic reform and national development. The energy security has long been an important issue for the Chinese leaders, bureaucrats, and economic experts. International intervention would bring disturbance to every aspect of the target states’ domestic conditions; thus, the risk that the regimes of the target states lose control over the production of raw materials and consequently suspend other economic activities always exists. This situation is definitely what China will be most unwilling to see, especially when intervention is imposed on a state that has been a major supplier of raw materials to the PRC. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 suggests that for the sake of economic interests and its energy security, China will oppose intervention in states that are capable of providing raw materials.

Similar to the first level of assumptions constructed mainly for targeting the realist assumption, the second level of explanation is epistemologically structural as well. Unlike the realist perspective that focuses only on immediate and concrete as well as material interests, Hypotheses 3 and 4 emphasize China’s consideration of ideational factors (i.e., the gain and loss of reputation, relationship with other states, and its image in international society). In this part, the two hypotheses suggest that the nonmaterial factors also play a key role in determining China’s attitude toward international intervention. The constructivist approach leads the formation of Hypothesis 3 to focus on the power of international institutions and public opinions. Meanwhile, Hypothesis 4 is based on constructivism and Chinese political philosophy; the main theme of this hypothesis assumes that the idea of reciprocal relationship (guanxi) has played an essential role in China’s attitude and policy in response to international intervention.
Hypothesis 3: If the pressure coming from international society regarding the violation of international institutions committed by target states is not strong enough, China will neither initiate nor support intervention.

Pressure is not anything concrete to be measured. However, the extent to which the attitude of international community has been unified on certain issues could be viewed as one criterion for helping gauge international pressure. Second, the responses from other states aimed at a state’s non-action could also be treated as one source of pressure. For example, in the case of East Timor, the US changed its attitude from supporting the military factions that controlled Indonesia de facto to agreeing with the intervention in the independence of East Timor. Some arguments suggest that Washington’s shifting decision to support the self-determination of East Timor was driven by the pressure coming from the popularity of the emerging norm “the responsibility to protect” and the propaganda made by Australia (Gunn 2008, Ch. 9).

Thus, Hypothesis 3 suggests that the external pressure coming from international society should have played a key role in determining whether or not China will intervene in the pariah states in East Asia. If the PRC does not take the external pressure caused by its non-action into serious account, it will not perceive the necessity to consent to the proposal of intervention, even if such an action is authorized by the UN Security Council.

Hypothesis 4: If the relationship between the PRC and the regimes in the target states is not weakened, China will neither initiate nor support intervention.
In the constructivist approach of the IR theory, a state’s foreign policy making is determined by how it perceives its role in the international system. A state’s evaluation and knowledge of its own role is the compound of self-identity, its relations with other actors within the system, and its understanding of world order. Hypothesis 4 focuses on China’s relations with the target states of intervention. The reciprocal relationship (guanxi) has been the conspicuous characteristic in Chinese political tradition. Guanxi is usually seen as both the means and the end in the Chinese political life. Moreover, the consideration of guanxi could be the very realistic savor of rational calculation. Nevertheless, maintaining guanxi is important for keeping allies, and having allies is crucial for any state in the international arena to survive and maintain its status. The investigation of Hypothesis 4 will also cover China’s guanxi with other states and the coalition of states involved in the issue calling for intervention. The variable of guanxi suggests that China’s relations with the intervening parties and other relating actors would shape Beijing’s attitude and policy making when facing the crisis stirring the appeal of intervention.

In contrast to the preceding hypotheses that are more concerned about the external structure, Hypotheses 5 and 6 intend to provide explanations based on China’s internal evaluation. Hypothesis 5 is designed on the basis of the Chinese tradition and political philosophy that true leadership is demonstrated through the demonstration of empathy, personal responsibility, and reciprocal relationship (guanxi). It is also deeply related to China’s insistence on the institution of sovereignty and equality among states. Hypothesis
6 is about the Confucian political tradition that emphasizes the consultation-oriented style of dealing with controversy.

**Hypothesis 5:** If the regime of the target states maintains the strong control of domestic affairs, China will neither initiate nor support intervention.

China’s insistence on the institution of sovereignty has been the foundation of its nonintervention principle. State sovereignty includes the rights to build a country with different types of political systems. Traditionally, Chinese political thought, tyranny is believed to eventually vanish through the revolt of its own people. Regarding the interstate relations, respecting different types of regimes and seeking a peaceful way of coexistence are the core factors in building a harmonious world in the Chinese political ideal. Thus, Hypothesis 5 suggests that China will agree to intervene or support intervention only when the regimes in the target states lose the ability to control the internal turmoil. Otherwise, all states in international society should own the rights of self-governance and should not be intervened, even under the name of humanitarian appeal.

**Hypothesis 6:** If the PRC perceives non-coercive means are still functional for dealing with target states, China will neither initiate nor support intervention.

Intervention with coercive means always defeats the purpose of preserving and restoring relations, which is against the Chinese political tradition that has highly valued
guanxi. Intervention through soft means or non-coercive ways would better demonstrate the attraction of relationship. In China’s view, wielding coercion could only be short-term and punitive in nature. Even if the punished party does not lose its territory, its dignity would still be damaged, and the unwanted situation could become the result of intervention. Hypothesis 6 thus suggests that China will not be a motivated practitioner of intervention unless China’s appropriate place in the guanxi is refused, and the non-coercive means have no function in dealing with disputes and crises.

The investigation of the abovementioned hypotheses will form the main themes in the following chapters. They will pillar the structure of the case studies done in Chapters Two and Three. These hypotheses have embraced the variables designed for testing the theoretical assumptions discussed in the previous section. They also include the most popular conventional thinking when debating the issue of China’s participation in crisis management. More importantly, the design of these hypotheses has taken both the structural factors and agency of China into account. The next section will focus on the discussion of the methodology adopted in this research. The method selected corresponds to the purpose of the whole research design.

**Methodology and the Organization of Chapters**

The very first task one should encounter when starting a research design is to define the level of study for the ongoing project. This research is located in the category what Kenneth Waltz defined as the “unit-level.” As a unit-level study, the purpose of this research is to “explain international politics by references through the properties and interactions of ‘agents’ (states)” (Wendt 1999, 12). It plans to evaluate the actions and interactions of states, and how they would continually produce and reproduce concepts of
and practice of intervention. Among these factors, the identities and interests of the states are always in process (Wendt ibid., 36) and should not be taken as a given. This research attempts to adopt a case study as the major tool of investigation to understand the in-process identity and interests of China in its response and reaction toward international intervention. The research examines the policies, narratives, and analyses done by the Chinese as well as the Western intellectuals by reading official statements and core texts. How all these have affected the actor’s (China’s) identity and image building, and shaped the actor’s decision making and the corresponding behaviors, is then analyzed.

The following chapters will apply a case study to explore how the prevailing words and phrases that construct the official attitude and existing policy orientation are made meaningful, and how they contribute to the constitution of social reality by making meanings. Doing a case study needs the supplementary skill of text analysis. The goal of text analysis, as Phillips and Hardy have pointed out, is to “explore how the socially produced ideas and objects that populate the world were created in the first place and how they are maintained and held in place over time” (Phillips and Hardy 2002, 6). What the current study plans to present is not the “ideas and objects that populate the world,” but simply the thoughts about the legitimacy to impose intervention that have convinced the PRC. The texts that will be adopted as the sources for gathering information include the following:

1. Official documents released by international organizations, governments of individual states, publications of the UN Security Council and other sub-institutions, and the reports of global mass media. Examples of such

---

17 For the current research, the idea of methodology was derived from Nelson Phillips and Cynthia Hardy’s work, Discourse Analysis: Investigating Processes of Social Construction. Although the method of discourse analysis will not be relayed heavily here, the skill taught in their book provides inspiration for reading through the information collected for the case study (Phillips and Hardy 2002, 4).
types of texts include UN resolutions regarding sanctions, condemnations, or even collected military actions, proposals and formal announcements of states and international organizations, and news and analysis reports released by major mass media;

2. Official statements Beijing has released to its domestic and international audiences; reports done by both the central and local authorities; Chinese academic works that trace and explain the origins and meanings of policies as a response to the cases investigated in the following chapters; discourse and information shown through the mass media supported by the central regime, and which have represented the official attitude. The Chinese documents are very important sources for reference, although they have often drifted toward propaganda for political purposes.

The social and historical background, which the following investigation will mainly focus on, is the PRC after the economic reform era; China’s policy making before 1979 will also be reviewed. By contrasting Beijing’s attitudes toward similar events before and after the reform era, the route of Chinese foreign policy formation will be better depicted. At the same time, China’s participation in international institutions and the change in the structure of international environment will be investigated. The social practices of China’s foreign policy will be treated as the evidence that proves the constituted and constitutive characteristic in the Chinese interventionary pattern.

The major goal of doing a case study is to find empirical evidence and counter evidence for testing hypotheses and constructing a further understanding or correcting the falsity of existing assumptions. The criteria for choosing cases in this research design include the following:

Considering that this is a unit-level research, China’s interactions with other states will be the focus. In other words, states’ actions will be the main subject of the case studies. China’s policies toward certain states that are involved in the issues of international intervention will be investigated.
The first condition in selecting cases for studying China’s interventionary behaviors is to choose the case of states that have been the targets of international intervention. States that are currently or were previously involved in foreign intervention debates/actions could be the objects of study. The goal of this research is to understand China’s intervention and nonintervention patterns; hence, states on the target list of international intervention will be used to examine the hypotheses and answer the research question. A broad scope will be applied in searching for suitable cases; as long as a state is identified by international organizations and major great powers as violating international law and institutions, and as long as the appeal of intervention imposed on such a state has figured in public opinion and global mass media, this state will be categorized as a possible object of the case study.

The potential objects for the case study should be the states that have profound political and geographical, as well as historical and cultural, links with China. Moreover, they must be defined as foreign nations by the PRC. China had built a hierarchical order in the East Asian international system for thousands of years. The pattern of Chinese intervention in East Asia must be identified; thus, the legacy of traditional political thoughts that helped construct the tribute system should be investigated as well. Such a legacy is supposed to have crucial influence on today’s Chinese foreign policy. On the other hand, only states defined as “foreign” will be tackled in this research. This limitation will be applied to avoid the potential analytical confusion caused by Beijing’s deliberate use of a different political lingo, and prevent the complexities of dealing with the controversial issues regarding the debates of sovereignty and secessionism. Thus, the cases of Xinjiang, Tibet, and Taiwan will not be listed in the selection pool.
States that other great powers have wished or claimed to intervene in or have urged China to intervene in are especially important for the current case studies. The attitude of China toward intervention will be compared with the major Western great powers by selecting cases once involved in foreign intervention action/debate under a multilateral framework, such as UN operations and resolutions, or once having been the core spot of the debates in the UN Security Council or General Assembly.

According to the criteria discussed above, the results of the selection of cases are Myanmar and North Korea. The notorious militant junta, smothered democracy, and poor record of human rights have set Myanmar on top of the list of Western intervention. However, China has turned down several UN resolutions and sanctions against Myanmar. Similar situations happened in the case of North Korea. The violation of nuclear nonproliferation, the despotic Kim dynasty, and the atrocity of human rights violation have made North Korea a real trouble maker in East Asia. Both Myanmar and North Korea belong to the category of pariah states that most Western politicians and experts believe should be dealt with, and they all expect China to take the responsibility and manage crises caused by regimes in these two states. However, China has refused to intervene through coercive means, and has tried to prevent Western powers from imposing sanctions or even military actions against them. These two states have been under the influence of Confucian culture for a long time and have had profound relations with China. An investigation of the cases of Myanmar and North Korea is necessary to understand China’s interventionary pattern and its unwillingness to support intervention in pariah states in East Asia.
The organization of chapters in this research will follow the logic of positivism, meaning that the arguments will come after the investigation of cases and the collection of evidence and counter evidence. The investigations and analyses of the cases of North Korea and Myanmar separately pillar the main theme of Chapters Two and Three. Both chapters begin with a brief introduction of the historical background of China’s relations with these two states, the major issues that caused international attention, the orientation of their foreign policies, and the causes of the call for intervention imposed on them. China’s relations with the regimes in these two states and the official attitude shown by Beijing toward issues that made both states the targets of intervention will be the first focus in the following investigation. The major task of Chapters Two and Three is to examine the change and constancy of China’s policies and responses to the appeals for intervention regarding crises that occurred in North Korea and Myanmar. The UN-authorized missions relating to these two states, the bilateral and multilateral cooperation initiated by other great powers, and the attitude and policies of the regional governmental organizations will also be examined. Information derived from the abovementioned sources will help increase the depth of the empirical study, which will provide a strong basis for testing the designed hypotheses.

In Chapter Four, more case studies regarding China’s actions and responses to the proposal of international intervention in other regions will be provided. The cases will be relatively short and precise. The purpose of doing so is to have more empirical evidences for evaluating and comparing the findings from the hypotheses testing gained in the previous chapters. Given more case studies and a comprehensive comparison of China’s attitudes and policies in different areas, the pattern and the uniqueness of China’s logic in
making policies for international intervention will be clearly depicted. Different angles for understanding a rising China and its impact on future international politics could be provided in this chapter after the comparison and evaluation. The main arguments based on the findings derived from case studies will also be presented in Chapter Four. The conclusion of the whole research will be presented in Chapter Five. In the final section of this research, the Chinese intervention pattern is discussed, as well as China’s evaluation of the world order and how it might influence the existing style of global governance.
CHAPTER TWO: THE CHINESE NONINTERVENTION POLICY TOWARD NORTH KOREA

According to many Western observers, the PRC has been a strong ally of the regime in North Korea (Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, DPRK). Since the 1940s, the two regimes had built a tight connection; after the fall of the Soviet Union, the PRC had even become the only comrade and the main supporter of the DPRK. The long-term alliance and China’s role in North Korean economic development have led to the belief that the PRC is capable of wielding great influence on the DPRK. Such a viewpoint could be seen clearly when international society urged the PRC to take more responsibility for the crisis caused by North Korea.

The major reasons categorizing North Korea as the target to be intervened include the following: first, the dreary human rights record; and second, the more crucial one, the DPRK’s development of nuclear weapons. The infamous record of human rights abuses is undisputedly the cause of appealing for intervention on the Kim family’s regime by many international organizations. According to the annual report published by the UN Human Rights Council, North Koreans are still suffering severe food scarcity and high oppression of freedom of opinion and expression. In addition, the serious violation of human rights in the correctional centers has caused great concern, and the abduction cases after the Korean War (mainly involving the citizens of South Korea and Japan) also
generate criticism and reproach in many East Asian countries (UN Human Rights Council 2011).

After the Korean War, the US imposed full-scale sanctions on the DPRK. In 1987, the US listed North Korea as “State Sponsors of Terrorism” and did not remove the title until 2008 as the exchange for DPRK’s agreeing to comply with the nuclear verification requirement. Japan is the major neighboring country that keeps imposing economic sanctions on North Korea. In addition, North Korea made itself the target of multilateral sanctions in 2006. The test of nuclear weapons finally pushed the UN Security Council to pass Resolution 1718 to impose financial sanctions on North Korea.

Sanction as a coercive means for impacting and changing the behaviors of states has been viewed as one type of intervention. China has insisted on the principle of nonintervention and opposed the imposition of any type of coercive measures on North Korea. Pyongyang’s violation of human rights has not been seen as an urgent crisis by China despite Beijing’s attempts to prevent the problem of North Korean refugees from deteriorating.\(^\text{18}\) Beijing would most probably be strongly opposed to intervention imposed on North Korea under the name of humanitarianism. To date, humanitarian intervention has rarely been the cause of appeal for a single state or group of states to take action on the Korean Peninsula.\(^\text{19}\) However, with regard to the issue of nuclear

---

\(^{18}\) For example, the grave situation regarding food security in North Korea may have forced the PRC to build higher fences to block the intrusion of North Korean refugees. China started to build fences more than 13 feet high along the Yalu River since October 2010; the possible reason is the fear of the continued famine that drove many North Koreans to flee over the border (Foster 2011).

\(^{19}\) Many cases of intervention have been wielded in the name of humanitarianism but with the ‘side-effect’ of regime change, such as when Vietnam intervened in Cambodia in 1978, the US intervened in Panama in 1989, and Tanzania intervened in Uganda 1979. However, the US is the one keeping severe financial sanctions on the North for both humanitarian reasons and the appeal of international security (Rennie 2003).
nonproliferation, China does face intense pressure (Zhu 2006a, 32). Since the DPRK’s nuclear program was revealed, and the country has become the potential supplier of weapons of mass destruction to other pariah states and terrorists, the voice urging China to take more actions has prevailed, especially among Western academia and policy makers (Pomfret 2010).

The PRC’s responses to the nuclear crisis in the Korean Peninsula are often viewed as the prophecy of how China will play the role as a responsible great power in global affairs. Obviously, China has rarely agreed with its Western counterparts on how to deal with the crises caused by the DPRK. After the Korean War, China vetoed almost all the pleas to use coercive means to punish or intervene in North Korea. Even in the discussion process of the UN Security Council Resolution 1718, China strongly opposed the first draft of the resolution made by the US and its allies. Beijing even publicly threatened to veto the resolution if the first draft was totally adopted without revision. The final version of Resolution 1718 is the product of concession and negotiation wherein China and Russia paid great efforts to make the result less severe than their Western counterparts had expected20 (Liu 2006).

The major goal of this chapter is to investigate why and how China has been holding a negative attitude toward intervention imposed on North Korea. Many explanations have been provided; however, the most typical and popular one is the realist

---

20 Under the strong insistence made by Beijing and Moscow, the Resolution 1718 only includes Article 41 (stating the non-coercive means as the main measure to deal with crises), but not includes Article 42 in the UN Charter, which addresses the application of air, sea or land force as the necessary measure for maintaining or restoring international peace and security. Moreover, China opposed the provision regarding the inspection of shipments of cargo going to and from North Korea. The US insisted that the inspection of North Korean cargos is necessary. In the end, the content of this provision became that the UN appeals its member states to do the inspection; it has never become an obligation which would have even more greatly irritated Pyangyong (Liu 2006, 34-35).
logic that often oversimplifies the issue by applying the term “national interests” as the omnipotent answer to everything. This research does not oppose the adoption of national interests as an analytical perspective for investigation; on the contrary, the research decides to follow the clue of national interests and explore the elements that have shaped the Chinese definition of national interests and correspond to Beijing’s (non)intervention decisions. However, this chapter does disagree with the oversimplified application of national interests. The sole answer of national interests could apparently be used to support the PRC’s intervention and nonintervention decisions, and thus create confusion. A simple example is Mao Zedong’s act of sending troops over the Yalu River and assisting North Korea to fight the US-led allied force in 1950. The logical thinking of national interests had made the US intelligence believe that China would never intervene in the Korean War.\textsuperscript{21} Such logic is straightforwardly realist. How could any state as weak and poor as the PRC possibly dare to challenge a super power like the US (Den 2007)? Conversely, the concept of national interests also provides an explanation for Mao Zedong’s decision. The consideration was made out of the fear of possible invasion by Western force from the borders China shares with North Korea (Scobell 2004). To prevent such possibility from happening, Mao decided to send the “volunteer army” to assist Kim Il-sung, instead of claiming neutrality as many weaker states would have done facing belligerency in the neighboring area. Thus, this chapter suggests that to contribute

\textsuperscript{21} At that time, CIA assumed that the PRC was the vassal state of the Soviet Union, and it would not intervene in the warfare in Korea Peninsula. Moreover, in the beginning of the war, the Soviet Union conveyed its disinterest in becoming involved in the military conflict. The White House in the US negated the possibility of the PRC sending troops over the Yalu River, despite Zhou Enlai’s repeated expression of the PRC’s determination to intervene in the war through Indian ambassador Panikkar if the US military crossed over the 38th parallel (Den 2007; Niu 2000; Shen 1996).
to further understanding of China’s attitude toward intervention, an explanation should be
provided by investigating the factors underlying the PRC’s consideration of national
interests.

The following sections will provide more details of China’s logic of decision
making on the issue of intervention regarding the crises caused by North Korea. The
main theme of this chapter is constructed by six analytical perspectives based on the
hypotheses provided in Chapter One. Both material and nonmaterial national interests are
included in the analysis to facilitate a more comprehensive understanding. A typical
realist explanation for China’s intervention behavior suggests that only material kinds of
national interest count. The consideration of nonmaterial interests has been proven to
have a great impact on the actions of states, and such a proposition is important and
complementary to the deficiency of the realist logic. Thus, the following sections will
discuss how China’s attitude and decision making related to intervention imposed on
North Korea are affected by the consideration of both material and nonmaterial factors,
and how these factors have contributed to China’s evaluation of national interests and
crieses management.

Borders and China’s Attitude toward Intervention in the DPRK

Hypothesis 1: If the target states share border(s) with China, China will neither
initiate nor support intervention.

22 The constructivism in the IR theory, for example the social constructivism of Alexander Wendt, has
proven how ideational power works in IR. In the field of Chinese studies, scholars like Ian Johnston and
Alan Carlson have applied the constructivist approach to analyze the process of China being socialized into
In world history, many cases have occurred in which states invade their neighboring countries when they are in the more advantageous position regarding the disparity of material power. For example, the US waged wars with its two neighbors when it was in the stage of “rising”: the US invaded Canada in 1812 (when it was still a British colony), and waged war against Mexico in 1846 to 1848. In the first half of the 20th century, such a situation still occurred frequently, such as Nazi Germany’s invasion of other countries in the region when Hitler was in power. These episodes in international politics have provided a strong foundation for the realism in IR theory to construct its core argument that power and survival are the two most important goals for states to act in the international system. Following this logic, it is rational for any state in the process of rising to accumulate as much material power as possible and build its sphere of influence to challenge the status quo. Therefore, applying military force to conquer its neighboring and relatively weaker countries is necessary and natural according to the realist rationale.23

In contemporary international society, conquering other states to gain territories or for other self-interested reasons is illegal and illegitimate. However, great powers (both the US and the former Soviet Union) still apply military force to achieve different goals and satisfy their national interests; such actions often proceed in the form of military intervention. The reasons and excuses for waging intervention could be diverse; the true intentions in most cases are way more complicated than they would seem at first glance. However, in the realist logic, great powers, especially the rising ones, would

23 Mearsheimer’s core argument, the offensive realism, has provided a succinct analysis of such behaviors of great powers (of intruding the weaker states). For more details, see Mearscheimer 2001.
intervene in other states to fulfill self-interests. Hence, when China began to rise, the “China threat” theory started to spread in East Asia (Roy 1994) as well as the whole world (Gertz 2000; Mearscheimer 2001, Ch. 10).

In the history of the PRC’s foreign relations, its dealings with neighboring states (zhou bian guo jia) have played an important role. Among all these relations, those with North Korea are a very controversial issue. Being socialist comrades for decades, the PRC and the DPRK appear united but are indeed divided at heart. Many reports reveal that the PRC actually has little to say on the DPRK foreign policy orientation, especially the DPRK’s determination to develop nuclear weapons. The PRC has found itself burdened with a truly difficult task regarding the nuclear proliferation in the Korean Peninsula. However, in contrast to the US preference for a radical and efficient approach (i.e., regime change), Beijing strongly opposes the application of intervention to force the DPRK to give up the nuclear program. One essential clue to Chinese logic involves the border shared by China and North Korea.

Border and China’s Nonintervention: The Unsolved but Pacified Border Disputes

For a long time, China and North Korea demarcated their border vaguely via the Yalu River and Tumen River. They did not have a formal treaty to settle the border issues until 1962. However, this treaty (Sino-Korean border treaty) did not completely solve the delimitation problem; instead, the treaty was mainly about the cooperation of both nations to develop and exploit the resources along the shared borders. The remaining disputes include the islands in the Yalu River that have not yet been marked into either
side’s sovereigns, and the PRC’s right to build harbors in the outward sections of the Tumen River.

In the beginning of the negotiation, the possession of islands in the outfall of Yalu River was distributed according to the nationality of the major populations inhabiting each island. About 80% of these islands are recognized by the PRC as under the DPRK’s authority. Nevertheless, since 1990, 10 islands in the Yalu River have remained undecided. The most famous case is Chouduan Dao (Pidan in Korean), which is also the biggest island in the archipelago in the Yalu outfall. The major inhabitants of Chouduan Dao are of Chinese origin, but the island had been controlled by North Korea before the PRC was established. In the early 1950s, the DPRK had offered ownership of this island as a gift to thank China for its assistance to the DPRK in the Korean War. However, no formal document had ever been signed; although China had treated Chouduan Dao as its territory after 1950, in the end the DPRK did not recognize the PRC’s sovereign rights over Chouduan Dao, and the PRC was once forced to evacuate nearly 50 families living on that island (Gomà 2006, 873). Nowadays, on the official map of China’s northeast part, Chouduan Dao is not categorized as the PRC’s domain, and the delimitation line is not drawn over the island either.

The other controversial issue is related to the PRC’s rights to build harbors in the outfall of the Tumen River. China could not occupy any strategic spot for building ports to access the Sea of Japan. China has shared most of the Tumen River as border with North Korea; however, the last and also the only navigable section (about 85 kilometers out of the total length of 521 kilometers) has become the boundary between North Korea
and Russia. This has made it almost impossible for the PRC to build a harbor in the useful portion of the Tumen River. The unsolved border disputes with North Korea have led the PRC to face difficulty in having free access to the Sea of Japan. Such a situation results in heavy losses for the PRC; the most important one is the loss of a strategic advantage in constructing China’s naval power in the Sea of Japan, where China’s major rivals have gained good positions (Gomà 2006, 874).

Instead of threatening North Korea to yield via its obviously stronger military power, Beijing adopts a soft way to deal with the tension with Pyongyang. China once invited the DPRK to investigate the border problems in the 1990s; nevertheless, the dispute regarding those controversial islands remains unsolved. The Sino-Korean border disputes have been put aside since 1992. The PRC has apparently made a great concession on the border issues with the DPRK. Such behavior is against the realist logic; the strong side normally makes the weak to yield. The disputes caused by the border issues should have provided an intention for China to intervene in North Korea through military force. Especially in 1993, when the DPRK recognized its developing nuclear program, China could have intervened in North Korea under the excuse of protecting the nuclear nonproliferation treaty. If China had done so, it would have gained legitimacy and won the disputed territory. Some have argued that China did not use force to win over the border disputes with the DPRK to keep having the upper hand in its relation with the North (Gomà 2006, 877). This argument is impotent. No state would

---

24 As a case of comparison, Qing China’s infamous concession of Ryukyu to Japan in the 1870s to produce the misperception of weakness was in fact an attempt to protect the alleged moral superiority of China from falling over a dispute that would have contradicted the image of selfless China reigning in a harmonious world (Chen 2012).
give up the strategic advantage regarding the establishment of naval power in the neighboring ocean, if such a state is rational and acts on the realist logic. In the realist logic, China’s competition with other great powers in the region (Russia, Japan, and the US) is way more important than its relation with Pyongyang. The PRC must have prioritized other values that made it refuse to apply coercive means against the DPRK even if doing so would be favorable to its strategic interests.

Stability and the Desire to Gain a “Win-Win” Solution along the Border

Beijing has not just once announced that stability in China’s bordering area is correspondent with its national security. The preservation of stability is the prevention of any disturbance from happening; this concept has provided a straightforward explanation of China’s reluctance to apply military intervention on North Korea. China seems to prefer a more peaceful and reciprocally beneficial way of solving problems regarding border disputes and conflicts due to territory demarcation; although doing so would take Beijing more time to solve the disputes, the preference for a low-key method still prevails in the PRC’s style of foreign policy, especially in the post-Deng era.

Such a preference leads the PRC to apply conversation and negotiation instead of coercive means to deal with the lack of access to the Sea of Japan. China eventually gained the access through peaceful means. In early 2010, the governor of the Chao Xian Zu autonomous prefecture in the Jilin province, Li Longxi, announced that Jilin has signed the lease with the DPRK and extended the using rights of the Luojin harbor in the northeast side of the Korean Peninsula. Luojin is close to the outfall of Tumen River.

---

25 Chao Xian Zu is the ethnic minority living in Northeast China with Korean kinship.
26 The PRC’s extending the using rights of Luojin Harbor to North Korea has caused great concern in the
Holding the harbor using rights is a great achievement for the PRC, because China’s economic and strategic interests in Northeast Asia will be greatly improved due to the direct access to the Sea of Japan. On the other hand, in 2009, when Chinese Prime Minister Wen Jiabao visited the DPRK, he had made Pyongyang agree to cooperate with the PRC on the building of Yalu Bridge that connects two sides of the river, which will promote transportation between China and North Korea. The Yalu Bridge construction deal and the extension of the using rights of Luojin harbor prove that Beijing could have Pyongyang cooperate and promote interests for both sides through a non-coercive approach. Hence, China insists that the conversation among the states involved in the nuclear nonproliferation issue (i.e., the Six-Party Talks) is more operative and could bring win-win solutions to all.

China prefers to use non-coercive means instead of imposing military intervention to solve disputes with North Korea. There have been two levels of consideration in Beijing’s decision-making logic. The first level is the rational thinking on material interests, which relates to the three northeast provinces (the dong bei san sheng) of China. These three provinces have been the core of Chinese heavy industry. The plenteous resources and the advanced technology developed in this area have made it the most important supplier of central China, including Beijing, Tianjin, Shanxi, and Hebei. In region. Russia, Japan, and the US have been paying intense attention to China’s actions relating to this harbor. Keith Luse, a US expert on North Korean issues, commented that the PRC rents the Luojin Harbor not just for improving the export of Chinese products, but also for expanding its influence in Northeast Asia (Wenwei 2011).

27 The expense of building the Yalu Bridge is about 150 million dollars, and will be borne by China. Beijing has been persuading the DPRK to accept the deal for establishing Yalu Bridge; however, Pyongyang had repeatedly rejected the proposal due to concerns that the Yalu Bridge will open the door for China to wield military influence on North Korea. Nevertheless, the establishment of the Yalu Bridge will not only bring huge benefits to commerce between China and North Korea, but also bring Pyongyang more economic interests from Chinese tourists (China Review News 2009a).
addition, these three provinces play a key role in China’s exportation and trade with Northeast Asian countries. Considering that these three provinces are located right next to the borders with North Korea, China does not intend to cause a disturbance in the DPRK. If military intervention is imposed, the flood of refugees from North Korea will bring disaster to China’s northeast area, and the spill-over effect of military conflict will also damage the industrial development of those three provinces. Consequently, it will be a great disaster to China’s competitiveness not just in Northeast Asia, but in the whole world as well.

The second level of consideration is the internal harmony and stability among China’s ethnic groups. One of the major ethnic minorities in China’s northeast area is the Chao Xian Zu, who has been living along the Sino-Korean border for more than 100 years. The origins of the Chao Xian Zu were refugees escaping the Korean Peninsula due to natural and man-made calamities since the mid-19th century. They have been issued citizenship since the Qing dynasty (Sun and Shen 2006). Most Chao Xian Zu remain the cultural link to their Korean ancestry in the Yan Bian autonomous prefecture, 28 Korean is still a more popular language than Mandarin (Wang 2008). 29 The Chinese Communist Party (CCP) had noticed the identity issue of the Chao Xian Zu even before the establishment of the PRC. In 1946, to solve the identity problem of the Chao Xian Zu who had joined the Chinese army to fight Japan, some cadre members of the CCP

---

28 The largest population of overseas Koreans is found in the northeast provinces. The Yan Bian autonomous prefecture of Chao Xian Zu is located in Jilin Province; more than one-third of the Sino-Korean border is occupied by this autonomous prefecture.
29 Korean is also the official language in schools of Yan Bian autonomous prefecture up to high school, amounting to 10 years (including one year of pre-school) of Korean curricula (Shih 2002, 175–178).
suggested the central leaders recognize the dual nationality of the Chao Xian Zu, and such suggestion was accepted (Sun and Shen 2006).

The dual identification of the Chao Xian Zu is constructed by the blood ties and cultural heritage; after the economic reform era, the ties between the Chao Xian Zu and the Korean Peninsula have been strengthened by frequent trade, tourism, and marriage between China and both Koreas. The CCP has been making efforts to improve the economic situation of the ethnic minority; the Yan Bian autonomous prefecture is one of the focal spots. The increasing economic ties between the Chao Xian Zu and the Korean Peninsula are consistent with the PRC’s policy goal. Furthermore, given that the Chao Xian Zu has deepened their connection with both Koreas, the CCP has to pay extra attention to prevent any disturbance in its harmonious relationship with the Chao Xian Zu.  

The application of intervention on North Korea would not be Beijing’s preference, because the use of force on North Korea could easily harm the interests of the Chao Xian Zu, and damage the relationship between the CCP and the Chao Xian Zu. Moreover, any military conflict in North Korea will impact people’s lives and those living on the borders; economic sanctions imposed on the DPRK would not just influence North Koreans, but also damage the economic rights of the Chao Xian Zu, who has invested and traded a lot with the North Koreans. Thus, all the above concerns have driven China to prevent intervention from being imposed on North Korea.

---

30 There have been accusations that both Korean regimes keep preaching the reunification of Chao Xian Zu with Korea. In addition, hearsay information indicates the active missionary work of South Korean Christian groups has caused suspicion that they are alienating Chao Xian Zu from the CCP (Yan 2005). On the other hand, some opinions on the issue of Sino-North Korean relations mention that the possible trend of refugees caused by military conflict along the border might stir the tension between the CCP and Chao Xian Zu. The reason is that the Chao Xian Zu still holds such a strong ethnic identity that once the flood of North Korean refugees flees into Yan Bian, they might ask the central government for more autonomous power (China Review News 2011a).
Raw Materials and China’s Nonintervention Decision

Hypothesis 2: If regimes in target states are the major suppliers of raw materials, China will neither initiate nor support intervention.

The geographical position of North Korea contains rich resources of mines. The major mineral resources include iron ores, coal, and magnesite. North Korea has been exporting valuable products of iron ore, steel, and anthracite (hard coal). It has been reported that the iron ore deposit in North Korea is the largest in Asia; the Mao-shan iron mine is even manageable for opencast mining (Ren 2006, 11). Such a report has generated the attention of public institutes and private enterprises of many states. However, due to the difficulties in the political aspect, very few nations have gained permission to the Mao-shan mine. Chinese enterprises have been among the very few involved in the development of the mining industry in Mao-shan.31

After the fall of the Soviet Union, China has become the most significant trade partner of Pyongyang.32 This development seems to bring China to a more advantageous position in terms of having the rights to the mining of iron ores in North Korea. The rapid economic development has pushed China to seek more stable sources of raw materials; preserving the access to the iron ores in North Korea is beneficial for the PRC to increase its strategic interests. Therefore, it is rational for the PRC to keep the source of raw material in North Korea from being disturbed by outside forces, and such intention

31 In 2004, a group of Chinese representatives from Beijing went to North Korea. They had promised to provide 300 million US dollars to invest in the local iron factory in Mao-shan. The eventual goal is to produce two million tons of iron ore annually, and 80% of the production will be exported to China (Ren 2006, 11).
32 In the early 1990s, the proportion of Sino-North Korean trade was only 11.6% of the North Korean total trade amount. Around the mid-1990s, the proportion increased to 30%. In 2007, the rate increased to 41.71%, whereas the ratio of trade between the two Koreas was 37.9% in the same year (Lin 2009, 38).
should have provided a good explanation for China’s unwillingness to intervene and its
desire to prevent others from intervening in the DPRK.

The intention to protect the sources of raw materials in North Korea corresponds
to Hypothesis 2. China has been criticized by its Western counterparts for its negative
attitude toward intervention in pariah states with rich deposits of raw materials, such as
Iran and Sudan. China is believed to value the sources of raw materials over justice and
human rights (Ziegler 2006; Dreyer 2007; Zhao 2008). However, the detailed
investigation in the following sections leads to the conclusion that Hypothesis 2 is null or
irrelevant in the case of North Korea.

North Korea’s Capability of Providing Raw Materials to China

According to the annual statistics released by the PRC General Administration of
Customs, the three major source-countries of China’s iron ore imports are Australia,
Brazil, and India. North Korea does contribute a part of China’s imported iron ores;
however, the amount could not compete with those of the major countries (see Table 2.1).
For example, data of annual imported iron ores in 2009 show that it is only in the item
“average particle ≥ 6.3 mm” that North Korea’s contribution could be listed as the 10th
source-countries. Nevertheless, the amount of iron ores North Korea exported to China
was much less than 1% of the annual total. In the item “sintering iron ores,” North Korea
is even far less than those major source providers (see Table 2.2).

Table 2.1. Countries where China imports non-sintering iron ores with average
particle ≥ 6.3 mm (kg.), 2007–2009
### Table 2.2. Countries where China imports sintering iron ores (kg.), 2007–2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>40,750,789,855</td>
<td>51,426,074,674</td>
<td>71,929,586,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(annual total)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>6,018,041,478</td>
<td>5,204,760,517</td>
<td>4,933,389,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(annual total)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>15,849,913,125</td>
<td>11,843,859,879</td>
<td>13,327,006,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(annual total)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>3,298,031,070</td>
<td>5,253,153,547</td>
<td>16,446,452,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(annual total)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Korea</td>
<td>211,565,273</td>
<td>395,739,951</td>
<td>408,834,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(annual total)</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Other mineral products that North Korea exports to China do not make the DPRK a major provider of raw material either. For example, hard coal has been one of the
relatively precious products that North Korea exports to China. However, more than 80% of China’s imported hard coal comes from Australia and Vietnam. North Korea only contributes 10% of China’s imported hard coal (PRC General Administration of Customs Statistic Yearbook 2009). In addition, hard coal is not as precious as coke coal, which is important as fuel and agent in the iron industry. Not only could China not import coke coal from North Korea, but China has also been providing coke coal to the DPRK for assisting in its economic development.

North Korea has been facing a severe energy deficiency. Such shortage has led to tardy economic development and a difficult civilian living. Since the 1990s, the PRC has been the major energy supplier to the DPRK; the oil exported from China to North Korea has supported 80% to 100% of the total amount that the DPRK needs (Lin 2009, 38). China has been increasing its supply of oil to North Korea; in 2009, the total amount of oil exportation was approximately 520 million kilograms. Evidently, China does not rely on the source of raw materials that North Korea provides. On the contrary, China has to support North Korea’s need for energy and other major resources. Hence, Hypothesis 2 cannot support the reasons for China’s unwillingness to intervene in or sanction North Korea. Compared to the danger of nuclear proliferation in the Korean Peninsula, the iron ores China imports from the North are not crucial at all.

33 Australia has been the major source providing the largest portion of Chinese imposed coke coal, which supports about 10% of China’s need in the iron industry.
34 According to data collected by the author from the Statistics Yearbook published by the PRC General Administration of Customs, PRC has been increasing its supply of oil to the DPRK year by year since 2001. The only exception is in 2007, which might be attributed to the sanction imposed on North Korea by the UN Security Council in 2006. However, in 2008 the Chinese supply of oil to North Korea increased again, and the ration was almost double than the previous years.
Unstable Supply of Raw Materials in North Korea

Rapid economic development has urged China to seek more stable sources of raw materials. Chinese economists and policy makers have shown high interest in the mineral deposits in North Korea, especially the iron ores and the potential energy resources such as oil and gas. In 2005, some Chinese enterprises from Jilin Province signed contracts with the DPRK and gained access to the Mao-shan iron mine. Some other Chinese companies have successfully made the DPRK sign contracts regarding the cooperation of investigating and exploiting oil under the seabed of the Sea of Japan (Zhang 2006, 64). However, while making great efforts on cooperation with the DPRK, Chinese scholars and businessmen have frequently complained about the difficulty in gaining benefits for both sides under the tough political environment in North Korea.

There have been several factors that aggravate the obstacles to Chinese investment and cooperation with the DPRK. First, about 70% of the North Korean industry is in stoppage due to the severe food and energy shortage. This situation has led to the acute limitation in the scale of Sino-Korean trade. Although North Korea owns rich iron mine deposits, the ability to fully exploit the resource is too weak to support itself and continue exportation to China. Second, North Korea is one of the very few states in international society that has been excluded from the global financial system. Hence, secure and legitimate channels (normally provided by international institutions) for account settlement are unavailable, thus making trading with the DPRK complicated and risky. Third, the DPRK has been defaulting on its loans from China; in the early 1990s, the huge amount of arrears of loans the DPRK owed even caused the bankruptcy of many
Chinese enterprises. Subsequently, China has been trying to force the DPRK to pay at the same time of delivery. However, such strategy has never succeeded, because the DPRK then created many trading rules, including justifying the detainment of products ready for export, to evade paying its arrears (Lin 2009, 41).

The worst factor that contributes to the difficulty of sufficient supply of raw materials in North Korea is the DPRK’s developing nuclear program. The violation of nuclear nonproliferation has made the investment environment tough. Moreover, the continued unilateral sanctions imposed on North Korea by states like the US and Japan caused inconvenience for foreign investment and transportation. These factors have worsened the already tardy economic development in North Korea (Shen 2009, 119). Under these harsh conditions, it is impossible for China to create the maximum benefit from the deposit of raw materials that North Korea owns. The most effective solution would be changing the political and economic structure of the DPRK. Therefore, China’s insistence on a nonintervention policy toward North is irrational. If China could adopt the opposite choice, it will increase its material interests by stabilizing the resources and investment in North Korea.

In sum, the rich iron ore deposits and the potential oil reserve in North Korea do make the DPRK a future possible core supplier of raw materials to China. However, in reality, the amount of exported iron ores is far less than expected. China’s deficient supply of raw materials could hardly be solved due to the current political and economic difficulty in North Korea. China should have opted for intervention if it acts according to the realist logic. Hypothesis 2 fails to provide an explanation for China’s insistence on a
nonintervention policy. There should be other factors that dominate the logic and rationale in China’s policy toward North Korea.

**Social Pressure and China’s Policies toward North Korea**

*Hypothesis 3: If the pressure coming from international society regarding the violation of international institutions committed by target states is not strong enough, China will neither initiate nor support intervention.*

According to the Oxford Dictionary, one of the definitions of pressure is “the use of persuasion or intimidation to make someone do something.” Social pressure is something given by an actor’s peer group for making it act, accept, or confirm certain values. In international society, pressure given by other actor(s) in the international community for making one yield could be in many forms; threat, condemnation, and persuasion are the three most prevalent forms of pressure giving. “Threat” refers to the claim of the possible use of coercive means for forcing the target to change attitudes and take actions preferred by the pressure giver. For example, after North Korea revealed its developing nuclear plan, both the US and Japan threatened Pyongyang by claiming to impose more severe sanctions unless it gives up the development of nuclear weapons. “Condemnation” is a public expression of complete disapproval of someone’s act(s). Condemnation is often seen in states’ official declaration regarding to policies, crimes, and turmoil happening in the domains of other states. Condemnation issued by the Security Council through UN resolutions is viewed as the most severe type in international society. “Persuasion” for the purpose of giving pressure is an act designed to change one’s mind without the implication of material coercion. Such exercise should
bring the effect of creating mental power that makes the target to act against his conscious wishes. Persuasion often proceeds in a non-public or unofficial diplomatic way.

The investigation of the effect of social pressure should focus not just on the forms of pressure giving; whether and how actor responses to pressure are more crucial for understanding the relations between social pressure and states’ behaviors should be determined as well. The nuclear crisis in the Korean Peninsula in the post-Cold War era has deeply impacted international stability and security. Pyongyang has encountered tremendous pressure. Beijing, as its long-term ally, has also endured pressure from the Western world. The type of social pressure regarding China’s response to North Korea’s nuclear program is mainly in the form of appeal and criticism. Appeal and criticism are the mild versions of condemnation. At first glance, such types of pressure seem to be ineffective to China, because there is no clear change in its policy toward North Korea. However, it does not mean China never responds to the pressure caused by the nuclear crisis in the Korean Peninsula. The Chinese style of responding to social pressure in the post-Cold War era is hardly correspondent to what the Western great powers have expected. History has shown that intervention through coercive means has hardly been listed as a priority among all the options for China when encountering crises and social pressure. Especially after the economic reform era, with the increased level of pressure, Beijing often intensifies its voice and warns all involved parties to avoid reckless action. However, China’s taking a strong action either for dealing with the crisis in question or negating the source of pressure is a rare instance.
Social Pressure on Beijing’s Attitude toward the North Korean Nuclear Crisis

Since North Korea’s nuclear program was revealed in 2002, the pressure on China’s inaction in terms of preventing the DPRK from joining the nuclear club has been enormous.\textsuperscript{35} Severe criticism had been seen regularly on Western media. For example, in December 2002, the \textit{London Times} had quoted the message sent to Beijing by an anonymous diplomat: “Stop sitting on the fence. We know you have influence in Pyongyang. Now is the time to start using it” (August 2002). China is believed by its Western counterparts to have great influence on the North, because the relationship between the two communist comrades has been formed since the Korean War. When Pyongyang revealed its nuclear program, Beijing was flayed for failing to curb North Korea’s evil ambition (ibid). China faced a strong appeal, asking it to halt its provocative neighbor again in 2006 after North Korea claimed a successful missile test. At that time, the Western mass media had reported how other great powers were urging China to take more actions. \textit{The New York Times} said US officials were pressing China to intervene in the DPRK (Sanger and Yardley 2006); the French press quoted the US representative to the Six-Party Talks Christopher Hill: “We need China to be very, very firm with their neighbors and frankly with their long-term allies the North Koreans, on what is acceptable behavior and what is not acceptable behavior” (Saiget 2006). \textit{The Daily Telegraph} in London also noted that attention on the nuclear crisis would also turn to China regarding its role as the major food and energy supplier to North Korea (Spencer

\textsuperscript{35} North Korea has been said to have intended to develop nuclear weapons since the 1990s. However, the plan had never materialized publicly until 2002. In October 2002, US Secretary of State Collin Powell announced that the DPRK had officially recognized its nuclear program to the US special emissary early that month (Xu 2002). Since then, the North Korea nuclear issue has become an indefinite bomb and caused severe tension on many occasions.
2006). In 2009, the *Washington Post* reported that the US might potentially create an anti-China bloc with Japan and South Korea, for China was “enabling North Korea to start a uranium enrichment program and to launch attacks on South Korea” (Pomfret 2009).

Inside China, most noticeably in Chinese academia, the social pressure from international society was viewed as an unfair accusation against Beijing. Chinese scholars criticized the US for sending high officials to impose pressure on China (e.g., Collin Powell met with Chinese leaders in Beijing in 2003, and Condoleezza Rice visited China twice in 2005) and trying to make China the “power broker” between Pyongyang and Washington (Chen 2005, 57; Zhu 2006, 28). The scholars claimed that it is against China’s principle to choose sides in such a controversial issue, and China would not agree with the US intention of solving the problem through force. The other type discussing social pressure posed on China in Chinese academia took the route of comparing the discourses of “China threat” and “China responsibility.” Such viewpoint suggests that the expectation imposed on China asking it to take more responsibility reveals the international society’s recognition of the PRC’s status as a great power. This explains why the US and its allies have been pressing China to impose more pressure on North Korea. Only by doing so could China prove itself as qualified to fit the role as a responsible great power. However, the new discourse of “China responsibility” does not entirely replace the old “China threat” theory. Expecting Beijing to take more responsibility does not exclude the Western great powers’ distrust of China; thus, Beijing’s attitude toward pariah states, such as North Korea, Myanmar, and Sudan,
becomes an important test in the eyes of Western observers (Niu 2007; Jin 2009).

Overall, the Chinese scholars’ opinions on the social pressure regarding North Korea’s nuclear program are consistent with and correspond to the official policies. They criticized the pressure given by the West, and mostly in their works, they praised Beijing’s efforts as the mediator between Pyongyang and the outside world.

Beijing has rarely expressed official disagreement with the social pressure from the Western world. The major approach of giving pressure on China’s inaction comes from criticism of Western high officials and mass media, and for the most part, such criticism would never be reported officially in China. These criticism are a mild level of condemnation, and possibly Beijing does not view them as severe enough to challenge its principles and interests. In July 2010, the pressure once became concrete and rose to the level that China viewed it as a threat. Although the event was indirectly related to the nuclear crisis, the accumulated tension and provocation caused by the Cheonan sinking led to the US-South Korea military maneuver and the US intention of sending aircraft carrier into the Yellow Sea, which has been viewed as the exclusive economic zone of the PRC. The current US-South Korea military maneuver has been an annual practice since 1992. In the past years, after the release of news regarding the US-South Korea military maneuver, the spokesman of the PRC Ministry of Foreign Affairs would express China’s disapproval of such action and repeat its wish of peace and stability in the Korean Peninsula. The low tune disapproval became high tune “strong opposition” in 2010, when the release of the US-South Korea military maneuver program once included taking actions in the Yellow Sea. The PRC spokesman described the behavior of the US and
South Korea as a threat to China’s core national interests (Ding 2010). If one of the goals of the 2010 U.S.-South Korea military maneuver is to force China to take side with the US, obviously, then the goal failed. The increase in tension caused by the military maneuver only made China take a stronger position in defending its principle and policy toward the crises in the Korean Peninsula.

China’s Seemingly Unresponsive Responses to Social Pressure

In terms of the nuclear crisis in the Korean Peninsula and the conflicts between two Korean regimes, Beijing’s response to social pressure remains the same: adopt mediation as a principle, and avoid the use of coercive means. Despite criticism of its hesitant and slow reaction, Beijing has hardly changed its position on the North Korean issue. The opinions expressed in the Chinese mass media and academia have represented the biggest part of Beijing’s attitude; China tends to believe the American (and other Western great powers’) style of intervening in pariah states is hawkish and useless for problem solving. Nevertheless, this perspective does not mean Beijing has not responded to the social pressure at all even though it refuses to follow the Western great powers’ intervention in the North Korean nuclear crisis through force. China’s responses could be categorized into two levels. The first one is the materialization of its basic principle, which is sending special emissaries to all related parties (i.e., North Korea, US, Japan, Russia, and South Korea), and increased frequency of Sino-North Korea reciprocal visits to persuade Pyongyang to accept mediation. The second one is the application of a hard-line attitude to the critical party who violates China’s basic principle.
The first level of Beijing’s response to social pressure is mediation through multiple channels to connect the related parties for promoting conversation and negotiation. Among all the efforts the PRC has made to mitigate the tension, its interaction with Pyongyang is the most crucial one. Although the two nations have had a long-term relationship as intimate communist comrades, there was a time when the interactions between Beijing and Pyongyang were aloof. During the decade after the Cold War, Beijing had a hard time dealing with the relationship with Pyongyang for two reasons. First, the PRC was readjusting the style of foreign policy from being guided by ideology to being more pragmatic. Second, China and South Korea established a formal relationship, which had angered Pyongyang and chilled the Sino-North Korea relationship. According to the database published by the People’s Daily, before 2003, the frequency of reciprocal exchange missions between the PRC and the DPRK after the Cold War had been relatively low. No publicly celebrated meetings were held other than relatively low-profile exchanges between the functional institutions of the two regimes; the Chinese delegations visiting North Korea were often organized by the People’s Congress (Renmin Daibiao Dahui) or executive branches, for example, the Political Consultative Conference (Zhengzhi Xieshang Huiyi), Ministry of Defense, and Ministry of Foreign Affairs.\(^{36}\) Compared to other neighboring states that China has been dealing

\(^{36}\) Except Jiang Ze Ming’s visiting Pyongyang in September 2001 and Kim Jong Il’s two visits in 2000 and 2001. The visits of the Chinese delegation to North Korea before 2003 were often treated as normal diplomatic activities in the People’s Daily. The news release was often in the form of annual reports of certain governmental branches, such as the annual summary of the People’s Congress. Moreover, the content of the report would not just focus on the visit to North Korea; Pyongyang was also treated as one stop of the many destinations of the Chinese delegation.
with in the same period, the scale and magnitude of the Chinese delegation to Pyongyang were average and not specifically crucial.

Since 2003, Beijing started to send special emissaries to Pyongyang frequently, and the reciprocal visits at the level of the head of states have also greatly increased. China not just sent high level emissary Dai Bingguo to Pyongyang to persuade North Korea to participate in the Six-Party Talks (*People’s Daily* 2003), but the PRC paramount leader Hu Jintao had also invited DPRK leader Kim Jong Il to visit China three times in six years. Hu Jintao also frequently sent verbal messages to Kim Jong Il through the visits of Chinese special emissaries after North Korea announced to withdraw from the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and reinstate its nuclear facilities in 2003 (Zhao 2005; Zhou 2007). Furthermore, many important figures in the Chinese leading group have visited North Korea after 2003. Even the frequency of news regarding Sino-North Korea reciprocal visits reported in the *People’s Daily* has greatly increased as well. The increase in the news frequency means that the PRC is showing the efforts it has made toward pushing Pyongyang to stop its provocative actions. However, in the eyes of Western observers, Beijing’s behaviors were explained as strengthening its relations with the North to protect the overlapped interests of both sides at the expense of other countries (Carlin and Lewis 2010).

---


38 Compared to the news about the exchange visits between China and North Korea before 2003, which were often concealed in the “Statement of Ministry of Foreign Affairs” (*Wai Jiao Bu Fa Yan*), the news released after 2003 have adopted a designated title on the subject. Such change could be construed that the Chinese central authority has given increasing importance to North Korean issues.
The second level of Beijing’s response is verbal condemnation. China has applied harsh language as its response to the DPRK’s nuclear tests in 2006 and 2009. In 2009, China even voted in favor of the UN Resolution 1874 condemning the DPRK’s nuclear weapons testing on May 25 in the same year. Resolution 1874 included the agreements to impose tougher sanctions on the DPRK compared to Resolution 1718 in 2006.\(^\text{39}\)

Although mainly at the verbal level, the PRC’s adoption of a harsh gesture toward Pyongyang is rare in its policy toward North Korea. Beijing has repeatedly issued a resolute appeal for Pyongyang to stop its nuclear program and fulfill the commitment of denuclearization (Glaser 2009, 2–3).

**Role of Guanxi in China’s Nonintervention Policy toward North Korea**

*Hypothesis 4: If the relationship between the PRC and the regimes in the target states is not weakened, China will neither initiate nor support intervention.*

The relationship between the regimes of the PRC and the DPRK has to be traced back to the early 20\(^{\text{th}}\) century, when the entire Korean Peninsula was still colonized by Japan. At that time, the CCP and the Korean Independent force led by Kim Il Sung had cooperated to fight the Japanese invasion. The amity of communist comrades established since the colonial period had contributed to China’s decision to send troops over the Yalu River to fight the Korean War with Kim. The DPRK has been a regime that strongly insists on following an extreme socialist course. After the fall of the Soviet Union, North

\(^{39}\) The Resolution 1874 was designed within the scope of UN Charter Article 41, which was the same as Resolution 1718. However, in Resolution 1874, the Security Council had sharpened its weapons import-export ban on the North by “calling on States to inspect, seize and dispose of the items and by denying fuel or supplies to service the vessels carrying them.” Here the “items” indicates “armoured combat vehicles, large calibre artillery systems, attack helicopters, warships and missiles and spare parts.” (Security Council News Letter 2009). Regarding the inspections on North Korean ships and cargos, the Resolution 1874 has made more clear and detailed interpretation than the Resolution 1718. On the other hand, the expression of appeal to member states to executing the inspections has been stronger than the Resolution 1718.
Korea found itself almost totally isolated from international society. Since then, China has become its only and strongest ally. China has been the major food and energy supplier to North Korea. Although in some years South Korea replaced China as the major supplier to the DPRK, the PRC is the only regime that constantly supports the DPRK by providing essential materials to its needs and taking the same political position with it before 1979. China has never abandoned North Korea; even when the North was sanctioned by international society for its nuclear program development, China continued to provide food and energy supplies to the DPRK.

The Sino-North Korean relationship has been a strong factor that shapes Beijing’s policy toward Pyongyang. In the Chinese political culture, guanxi (reciprocal relationship that determines the mutual role conceptions and nullifies unilateral action based on self-interests) is important that the logic of making priority is often influenced by the guanxi between China and the relative party in question. North Korean leaders have been long-term allies of the CCP; since the establishment of the PRC, the exchange visits between the heads of two nations have been more frequent than other countries. China has been supporting the DPRK for over 50 years; although there was a time when the guanxi was aloof, the PRC’s support to the DPRK has never been severed. Clearly for the Chinese leaders, the regime in North Korea holds a special status that China could never break up the guanxi with the DPRK.

However, the depth of guanxi between the two regimes does not guarantee the ease of maintaining amity. Several factors contribute to the ups and downs in the Sino-North Korean relationship. First, due to the fear of becoming the vassal state of any great
power, DPRK Premier Kim Il Sung tried to develop the specific Korean characteristic of socialist ideology; additionally, the DPRK leaders had never accepted the Chinese way of social and economic reform because of its resolute persistence on ideology. Second, the PRC’s establishment of a diplomatic relationship with the Republic of Korea (South Korea, the ROK) had damaged the amity with the DPRK. The DPRK has been in the status of hostilities with the ROK since 1950. The establishment of a formal relationship between the PRC and the ROK has been viewed as a betrayal of their long-term friendship by the DPRK.

In sum, the PRC and the DPRK have been long-term allies since the 1950s. The building of friendship is based on the personal relationship of the leaders on both sides and the shared memory as communist comrades fighting against imperialism. However, the complexity in their relationship has restrained the PRC’s ability to wield influence on the DPRK. The degree of current guanxi between the two regimes has been weaker compared to the 1950s and 1960s. However, China still provides a shield to North Korea whenever the DPRK requests.

Amity Based on Personal Relationship: The Kim Family’s Guanxi with China and the CCP

The relationship between the PRC and the DPRK is mainly based on the friendship between their leaders. The first premier of the DPRK, Kim Il Sung, had been educated in a Chinese elementary school and lived in China for 25 years. Kim Il Sung inherited his father’s unfulfilled wish and had devoted himself to fight Japanese imperialism in the early 20th century. Kim Il Sung’s father, Kim Hyong-jik, had been on
the blacklist of the Japanese colonial regime in Korea. To evade arrest by the Japanese police, Kim Hyong-jik and his family sailed across the Yalu River and settled in Lin Jiang (now called Hun Jiang in the Jilin province). Kim Il Sung had studied in Lin Jiang Elementary School and learned to speak Chinese fluently. He returned to his birthplace to continue his education\(^40\) (Kim 1994, Book I), and after graduating from elementary school, he went back to Jilin and started to build a network in northeast China.\(^41\)

Life in Jilin had a special meaning to Kim Il Sung as he himself had narrated in his memoir (Kim 1994, 167). It was in Jilin where Kim Il Sung first learned about Marxism and met many Chinese comrades who later became his lifetime friends. One of them, Shang Yue,\(^42\) had greatly influenced Kim Il Sung. Shang Yue had been a member of the CCP at that time; he taught Chinese Literature in Yu Wen High School where Kim obtained his high school education. Shang Yue became very close to Kim when they met in Yu Wen High School. He led Kim to read *The Dream of the Red Chamber* (or *the Story of the Stone*), *Lu Xun Selected Works*, and *Chen Duxiu Selected Works* (Kim 1994, 169). Such literature had inspired Kim Il Sung and made him resolute in building Korea

---

\(^{40}\) According Kim Il Sung’s Memoir, he was asked to return to his birthplace by his father. His father wished Kim Il Sung could be educated by a Korean teacher and under Korean culture. Kim Il Sung was about 10 years old at that time. From Lin Jiang to his birthplace, Wan Jing Tai (the Chinese translation), is a long way full of mountains and rivers. Kim said when he successfully returned to his birthplace, his childhood friends often asked him to speak Chinese as entertainment. Kim rejected and claimed that Koreans should speak only their national language. The main reason that Kim Il Sung did not stay in Wan Jing Tai and attend high school was that the textbooks were written in Japanese, and teachers in high school were forced to teach in Japanese to correspond with the Kominka Movement (Japanization of Japan’s colonies, including Korea and Taiwan) (Kim 1994, Ch. 1).

\(^{41}\) Not very long after Kim Il Sung returned to Jilin, his father passed away. He then attended a military school there that was managed by Korean nationalists. However, he quit that school in a short while, because Kim disagree with the ideology of Korean nationalism. Afterward, Kim Il Sung went to Yu Wen High School, a high school organized by local Chinese (Kim 1994, Book I).

\(^{42}\) After the PRC was established, Shang Yue became a professor at Renmin University. He did not have a chance to meet with Kim Il Sung again after he was arrested by the Chinese Nationalist Army in Yu Wen (Kim 1994, Book I)).
into a socialist state. It was also in that period in Yu Wen when Kim Il Sung learned the traditional Chinese entertainment, “storytelling” (Shuo Shu), and developed the skill of propagandizing the communist ideology to the Korean populace (Kim 1994, 163).

Kim Il Sung first connected with the CCP in 1931 (Kim 1994, 325). Kim led his Korean fellows to join the anti-Japanese resistance with the CCP in Manchuria. He also decided to set up the base of military action for Korean independence in Mt. Baekdu (Mt. Changbai in Chinese). Kim Il Sung had been good friends with several CCP core members (among whom Zhou Baozhong and Tong Changrong were especially close to Kim); their friendship began in 1931, when the Korean guerilla met with the CCP during the famous Mingyuegou meeting. After the DPRK was established, whenever a dispute ensued between China and North Korea, Mao Zedong would send Zhou or Tong as his representative to meet and negotiate with Kim Il Sung (Kim 1994, 374).

On the Chinese side, Mao Zedong did recognize the relationship between the leaders of the two regimes. There were Korean units in the People’s Liberation Army (PLA), and Mao might have even “authorized a transfer of one fully equipped PLA Korean division requested by Kim in January 1950” (Petrov 1994, 20). Mao also knew that within the Korean Communist Party, there existed the Yan-an faction that was close to the CCP. These factors contributed to part of the reason that PRC sent troops to help the DPRK fight the US coalition army in 1950. In addition, Mao’s sole son Mao Anying

---

43 Mt. Baekdu/Changbai later became part of the problem in the Sino-North Korean border disputes. Many Chinese insist that the entire Mt. Changbai belongs to China. They claim that Mt. Changbai was demarcated into the DPRK by the CCP for the convenience of Kim Il Sung so that he could legitimatize his status as the ruler of North Korea.

44 The Yan-an faction was eventually eliminated by Kim Il Sung to stabilize his authority in the party, and ensure the Korean communists would not greatly influenced by the CCP (Petrov 1994, 29).
died in the Korean War and was buried in North Korea; this incident had also made North Korea an affectively special country for the CCP and the Chinese civilians to maintain the friendship with and provide a shield for. Moreover, PRC Premier Zhou Enlai maintained a good personal friendship with Kim Il Sung.

Amity Based on Communist Comradeship: Historical Events in the 1950s and 1960s

The Kim family’s ties with the CCP started during the war against Japanese imperialism in the early 20th century, and were strengthened by the Korean War. On June 25, 1950, Kim Il Sung initiated the Korean War. Mao disagreed with Kim’s ambition to reunite Korea at the time when both the PRC and the DPRK were still very weak. Nevertheless, Mao still sent out troops to assist North Korea when the US intervened in Kim’s attack on South Korea. Mao’s decision to be involved in the Korean War was irrational in the realist logic. The discrepancy in military capability between China and the US was huge at that time. The US intervention in the Korean Peninsula threatened the security and stability of China’s bordering area with the DPRK. However, involvement in the war was not the wisest option for Beijing. Still, with great sacrifice of Chinese soldiers’ lives and equipment, the PRC helped the DPRK survive the Korean War. The memory of fighting the war together has contributed to the strong foundation of the relationship between the two regimes.

Later on, the DPRK repaid China by providing loyalty to Beijing when the relationship between the PRC and the Soviet Union began to worsen in the late 1950s and early 1960s. The DPRK stayed in the neutral position in the beginning, but gradually tended to the Chinese side. In August 1961, Kim Il Sung led a group of North Korean
representatives and visited China. At that time, the “Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Assistance between the People’s Republic of China and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea” was signed. This treaty caused the unpleasantness of the Soviet Union and its clans in Eastern Europe. North Korea then faced the situation of being isolated by the Soviets, and the assistance in the economy, supply of military force, and political support were all cut off. Although the PRC had tried to provide the best support it could afford to North Korea, the DPRK still encountered great losses due to its show of loyalty to China (Liu, Pan, Pan, and Li 2006, 9). For such reason, China had highly valued its friendship with the DPRK. Even at a later time when suspension and declination occurred in their friendship, China still tried its best to maintain a firm hold on the guanxi with the DPRK.

Complication in the CCP-Kim Regime Relationship: Discrepancy in the Sphere of Ideology

After Kim Il Sung stabilized his position in the DPRK, he started to develop his own interpretation of the correct practice of socialism, which is called “Juche” in Korean. When translated into Chinese, Juche is called “the theory of main subject,” meaning self-reliance and the subjectivity of people. Kim Il Sung defined Juche theory as the guideline for achieving independence, liberty, and creativity of people. The three major principles of Kim Il Sung’s Juche theory include political independence, economic self-reliance, and self-defense of national security (Wu and He 2004, 5–6). Thus, Juche theory could also be viewed as the goal of nation building for North Korea. When Kim Il Sung created the idea of Juche, it was the period when the ideological competition between the Soviet
Union and China reached its climax. Juche theory was created to become the national ideology for resisting the domination of any great power. Such national ideology was meant to differentiate North Korea from both China and the Soviet Union; to materialize the theme and slogan of Juche, Kim Il Sung also publicly criticized the Cultural Revolution in China and the Soviet revisionism led by Khrushchev (Hwang 2008, 41–46).

Kim Il Sung’s Juche theory emphasized the North Korean way of revolution and socialism. Kim Il Sung himself was mistrustful of China and the Soviet Union. It was said both the occurrence of the Korean War and China’s participation in the war were partly due to Kim’s “not fully reporting the truth” to Mao and Stalin (Petrov 1994, 21). Kim Il Sung not only disagreed with Mao’s Cultural Revolution, but he and his successor Kim Jong-Il also assailed Deng Xiaoping and Chinese economic reform. They criticized Deng as the “Chinese Khrushchev,” meaning that Deng betrayed the socialist ideology, leaned to the right wing, and even became the capitalist camps. When Kim Il Sung passed away and Kim Jong-Il succeeded to the position as the highest ruler of the DPRK, the Sino-North Korean relationship declined to a freezing point. However, the relationship increasingly recovered after 2000, the time when the DPRK started its nuclear program and needed the shield provided by the PRC. Kim Jong-Il understood the

---

45 Mao often called Kim Il Sung “buffoon” when discussing the Korean War with his associates. He referred Kim as not competent to conduct military operations and “regarded the rapid advance of the KPA down the peninsula as utterly reckless” (Pertov 1994, 22).

46 The evidences that showed the coldness of Sino-North Korean relationship include: first, in early 1997 DPRK signed a contract with Taipower Company and promised to take over the nuclear waste for Taiwan; second, when Deng Xiaoping passed away in 1997, Kim Jong-Il did not immediately send an official condolence (Hwang 2008, 12). Thirdly, when the formal North Korean Chairman of People’s Supreme Assembly, also Kim Jong-Il’s advisor and a close vassal of Kim Il Sung’s, Hwang Jung-yop, defected to South Korea via his official trip in Beijing, the PRC did not answer the DPRK’s request of detaining or arresting Hwang. Instead, Beijing helped Hwang gain political asylum and flee to Seoul. In his memoir, Hwang was actually surprised that Beijing would help and protect him from being captured or assassinated by the DPRK. He thought Beijing should have treasured the relationship with Kim Jong-Il more than his life (Hwang 2008, 8).
importance of keeping China as his ally to support North Korea in the possible confrontation with the US-led Western world. Nevertheless, the connection between China and North Korea could not compete with how it was when Kim Il Sung reigned. In addition, Kim Jong-Il never provided Beijing with clear information about his nuclear program. The PRC was only notified briefly before North Korea released the news and made the nuclear test materialize.\(^47\)

Complication in the CCP-Kim Regime Relationship: Impact of the Cultural Revolution and the Sino-South Korean Formal Relationship

During the Cultural Revolution period, tension arose in the relationship between the PRC and the DPRK. The main reasons included the Chinese Red Guard’s public criticism of Kim Il Sung, and China’s closure of the passageway to North Korea in 1968. Kim Il Sung retaliated against the PRC with a public critique of the Cultural Revolution, and withdrew the North Korean ambassador in Beijing. No conventions were signed and no exchange visits between the officials in the two regimes occurred from 1965 to 1969 (Liu, Pan, Pan, and Li 2006, 9). In 1970, Zhou Enlai rebuilt the relationship by restarting the official exchange visit. In 1975, Kim Il Sung officially visited China again; the kind of mutually bonded guanxi of the two regimes seemed to have recovered well. In the 1980s, the PRC and the DPRK resumed their deep relationship as close communist

\(^{47}\) In late May 2010, I was a volunteer assistant in the annual conference of the Center for China-US Cooperation. The title of the conference was “China on the World Stage: The Struggle of a Rising Power.” It was my very good luck to listen to the panel presented by Dr. Yao Yunzhu, a senior colonel of the People’s Liberation Army of China. In the final remarks of her presentation (whose title was “Sino-American Relationship: The Nuclear Aspect”), Dr. Yao told the audience a joke, and used it as a metaphor for the Sino-North Korean relationship on the nuclear issue: “One day, a North Korean general sent a text message to the Chinese Minister of Defense’s cell phone and said, ‘We are going to test nuclear weapon.’ The Chinese minister then became very nervous. He replied to the North Korean general immediately and asked: ‘When will you test it?’ After a couple of minutes, the North Korean replied: ‘Five, four, three, two, one…. Now!’”
comrades. However, in the beginning of the 1990s, with the normalization of Sino-South Korean relationship, the friendship of China and North Korea encountered an immense crunch.

When China began its economic reform, it needed to normalize its relationships with the neighboring countries. The ROK has been one of the non-great power Asian states with outstanding economic development in the Cold War era. China recognized the need to learn the economic reform experience from South Korea. Therefore, since 1983, there have been frequent cultural and economic exchange visits between Beijing and Seoul. Gradually, Deng Xiaoping agreed that China had to build formal and diplomatic relationships with South Korea. On August 24, 1992, the PRC and the ROK announced the establishment of a diplomatic relationship between the two nations (Liu, Pan, Pan, and Li 2006, 18–19). Although Beijing had sent special emissaries to Pyongyang and explained China’s decision a year before the formal announcement was made, North Korea was still irate over the Chinese leaders’ decision. Since then, the Sino-North Korean relationship became aloof, and the exchange visits between the leaders of the two states were suspended again. However, China continually made efforts to maintain the friendship with North Korea. Despite the absence of high-level interactions between the two regimes since 1993, China kept sending party-level delegations to North Korea to maintain its connection with Pyongyang (Liu, Pan, Pan, and Li 2006, 11).48

The relationship between the PRC and the DPRK recovered after 2000. Nevertheless, the guanxi that still bonds them through the sense of reciprocal duty is

---

48 In May 2001, Kim Jong-Il visited China. This was his second visit to the PRC 17 years after his first visit (Liu, Pan, Pan, and Li 2006, 13).
apparently weaker than before. The foundation of their guanxi is still strong enough for the DPRK to oblige China to shield the former from being intervened by the Western great powers. Moreover, the shared memory of the past still yields enormous influence that China is taking both the burden and leverage in dealing with the North Korean nuclear crisis. Although China has to consider its relations with other states whose interests frequently conflict with those of North Korea, there is no evidence showing China would sacrifice or abandon the DPRK for the interests regarding to its relationship with others.

China’s efforts to maintain its relationship with North Korea regardless of the possible damage to its relations with other states is again counter to the realist logic. Considering that North Korea is a very isolated nation in the region, China should have improved its relationship with other core players in Northeast Asia if Beijing supports the intention to correct the DPRK’s provocative behaviors. Nevertheless, China has refused to do so, and insisted on the peaceful way to solve the problems caused by North Korea. The Chinese logic in its decision-making process regarding the Korean issues is apparent: Unless the conducts of the DPRK severely violate the reciprocal guanxi with China, China would not support any actions or policies of imposing intervention on North Korea, not even at the time when their relationship has weakened to a certain degree.

**Ability of the Regimes in Targeted States and China’s Attitude toward Intervention**

*Hypothesis 5: If the regime of the target states retains strong control of the domestic affairs, China will neither initiate nor support intervention.*
The focal point of Hypothesis 5 is the ability of the regime in the target state to manage crises and maintain internal and regional stability. The emphasis of regime ability is related to China’s insistence on the consent of the target state of international intervention. In the cases of international intervention supported by the PRC, the crucial factors (also the preconditions) to have China vote in favor instead of veto or abstention are UN authorization and the consent of target state. Jonathan E. Davis has provided nine cases for studying China’s attitude toward humanitarian intervention in the post-Cold War era. In these cases, China did not act as most Western observers have predicted; they expected Beijing would still stand firm on the principle of noninterference, take sovereignty as the highest value in international system, and never allow space for flexible adjustment. The case studies done by Davis have proved that Beijing did not block all the humanitarian interventions proposed in the UN Security Council. Davis suggests these cases have supported the argument that China is adjusting its principle of taking the states’ sovereignty as the prior norm in the international system to a more pragmatic approach (Davis 2011). This chapter suggests that it is more accurate to say Beijing would support international intervention with great caution; once it chose to support international intervention, there must be considerations that allow Beijing to legitimize its decision without creating a clash between action and principle.

To say the ability of a regime in the target state to control the chaotic situation within its domain is the key for China to decide its attitude on intervention is quite far

---

49 Jonathan Davis quoted Michael Davis and said: “As one commentator put it, ‘either China is perceived to be irrelevant to emerging post-Cold War norms in this area, or it is viewed as simply an insurmountable obstacle, so far out of step with the rest of the world that it should be ignored.’” His article held an opposite viewpoint to the above argument (Davis 2011, 219).
from actuality. If this were the case, the PRC would have proposed to intervene more in African countries, where the long-term chaos has become too common to be handled.\textsuperscript{50} Sovereignty is still treated as the most important international institution in China. However, it is very difficult to see Beijing initiate or even support intervention on other states without the prior consent of the target states. Regime ability could be the key to determining Beijing’s support or opposition to intervention proposed in the Security Council only under special circumstances. Empirical evidence shows that when the regimes of the target states obviously could not control the internal chaotic situation, China not simply stopped holding a negative attitude toward the request of imposing intervention, but mostly Beijing would agree to apply force with a humanitarian purpose and be active in providing humanitarian aid. Even when the regime in the target state rejects to consent to the intervention, China would use its resources, including economic power and personal relations, to fulfill the precondition of consent of the target state.\textsuperscript{51} Like the case of Sudan, Beijing had not opposed the deployment of UN troops to Darfur, but it rejected any proposed resolution without Khartoum’s consent in the Security Council. For example, China abstained from voting on Resolution 1706, which was an important step forward in the preparation of troop deployment in Darfur (Holslag 2008, 76). The reason for China’s abstention in the voting process of Resolution 1706 was the Sudanese government’s strong objection; in Beijing’s position, without the consent of the

\textsuperscript{50} According to “The Failed States Index 2011” done by the Washington-based NGO The Fund of Peace and published in \textit{Foreign Policy} magazine, Africa has been the continent with the most failed states on earth. Among these states, Somalia, Chad, and Sudan are the top three on the list, and 14 of the top 20 on the list are all African countries. For more details, visit this link: http://www.fundforpeace.org/global/?q=fsi-grid2011.

\textsuperscript{51} Jonathan Davis’s article on China’s position toward humanitarian intervention agrees with my argument; he suggests China would use its growing power to secure consent from the target regime to make intervention workable (Davis 2011, 218).
regime in the target state, intervention could never be legal and legitimate (ifeng.com Feng Yun Dui Hua 2007b). Although China did not vote in favor of Resolution 1706, it did try its best to use its influence on Khartoum and play the role as a mediator between Sudan and the outside world. Such an effort was evident in PRC President Hu Jintao’s visit to Khartoum and his public urging of Omar Hassan al-Bashir to accept the UN deployment of a peacekeeping force in 2007. Moreover, China kept sending special emissaries to Sudan, including the PRC Deputy Foreign Minister Zhai Jun and Chinese Special Envoy to Africa Liu Guijin, to persuade Khartoum and connect the Sudanese government with both the UN and the African Union (Davis 2011, 269; Holslag 2008, 77–81).

Why China would initiate engagement and make the Sudanese government accept the UN peacekeeping force could be attributed to multiple factors. First, China needed to dissolve the call for boycotting the 2008 Beijing Olympics.52 Maintaining China’s face and guanxi in international society to a great extent shapes the Chinese rationale in the PRC’s foreign policy making. Second, Sudan has been an important provider of oil to the PRC. To secure the origin of energy resources, China does have the motivation to mitigate the disorder in Darfur. The last reason is the inability of Khartoum to stabilize the internal situation, and China recognized such a fact. The Darfur case has been on the debate of categorization (civil war or genocide) in the UN; Beijing also agreed that the long-time disorder in Darfur is dangerous to the region, and if the chaos in Sudan becomes out of control, the danger would spread all over the African continent.

52 There have been many severe critiques against the Beijing Olympics in 2008; one representative work is on the website of Human Rights Watch: http://china.hrw.org/press/news_release/the_real_china_and_the_olympics.
The Sudanese ambassador in Beijing, Mirghani Mohamed Salih, had argued that the problem in Darfur was caused by the uneven distribution of resources and the disparity in economic development among different tribes. He urged for more humanitarian aid from international society, and claimed that the West had misunderstood Sudan for a long time. In an interview with the Chinese media, Salih indicated that the Western intervention always involves the self-interests of a single state. This assertion might explain why China had tried to keep the UN peacekeeping force in Darfur low key, and focused more on peacekeeping and economic aid rather than peacekeeping enforcement.

Moreover, the case of intervention in East Timor’s independence also proved that China would support international intervention with caution, and Beijing could spare space for negotiation and adjustment if the conditions allowed China to balance its support of intervention and the principle of taking sovereignty as the highest value. The national independence movement in East Timor had expanded to a bloody fight between pro-independence Timorese and the militia supported by the Indonesian military in 1999. In the early stage of this case, the PRC could impossibly support intervention in the East Timor due to its effort of rebuilding a relationship with Indonesia. Since the economic reform era, Beijing had tried to fix the rift with Jakarta in the Mao era and establish close ties with Indonesia. On Beijing’s position, it was against Chinese national interest to

---

53 In the interview with Feng Huang TV (ifeng.com), Salih criticized that the Western media had exaggerated the Darfur issue. He explained that the conflicts in Darfur were caused by the scarcity of resources, and the belligerent parties are mainly Arabic tribes, not the Arab-killing Africans like the Westerners have claimed. He believed that the Western media and officials had applied a double standard on Sudan, and the major purpose of the US imposition of sanctions on Sudan is to control oil resources. For more details, see http://phtv.ifeng.com/program/fydh/200710/1018_2144_264205_1.shtml.
support intervention, which was strongly opposed by the Indonesian government. China did not change its position until October 1999 when the new regime in Indonesia had sent consent to the Security Council’s deployment of a peacekeeping force in East Timor. In the review of the policy to support intervention in East Timor’s independence, China recognized the severe human rights atrocities in East Timor and the urgency to manage the crisis caused by the fight between the Timorese and Indonesian militia. However, Beijing’s changing attitude toward the East Timor case did not mean China has devaluated the principle of sovereignty. In an interview with the French newspaper Le Figaro, Jiang Zemin expressed that China could only accept the East Timor issue be solved under UN authorization, and the type of intervention like the NATO interference in Kosovo without both the consent of the host state and the UN authorization should never happen in East Asia (China Report 2010, Vol. II; Davis 2011, 251–254).

Beijing’s insistence on the regime ability and consent from the target state as the necessary preconditions might be influenced by the frequent failures on the record of humanitarian intervention in the post-Cold War era. Many failed cases of intervention applied by the international community or single states exist. For example, the US intervention in Somalia in 1993 and the war against Iraq in 1991 and 2003 had resulted in

---

54 China and Indonesia suspended their diplomatic relationship in 1967. In 1990, Chinese Premier Li Peng visited Indonesia, and the two states formally restored their relationship. When Beijing negotiated with Jakarta for rebuilding the formal relationship, one of the conditions was that China would never interfere in Indonesian internal affairs, including the independence movement of East Timor. Thus, the PRC did not support the intervention on the East Timor independence process until September 1999 after the new regime in Indonesia (represented by Abdurrahmann Wahid) announced that Indonesia would accept the UN-authorized and Australia-led intervention in East Timor. Right after China voted in favor of the resolution of sending a UN peacekeeping mission in East Timor, Beijing received both the visit of Wahid and the leader of the East Timor independence movement (Niu 2007).
the creation of more fail-states.\textsuperscript{55} The examples of the NATO intervention in Kosovo and Libya without UN authorization have aroused severe critiques in many non-Western countries; the PRC expressed concern that Western great powers might use humanitarian intervention as an excuse to expand influence on the Third World (Williams 2004). These examples had made Beijing more cautious about the imposition of intervention through coercive means, especially the wielding of military force under the name of humanitarianism. Although the effort had failed, the intervention in Somalia actually gained support from the PRC. China voted in favor of the resolution to impose humanitarian intervention in the UN Security Council. Support with clear caution and doubt, China proclaimed that its support of the intervention in Somalia is based on “an exceptional action in view of the unique situation” that there was clear absence of a functioning Somali government to deal with the harsh atrocities in Somalia (Davis 2011, 231–232).

The case of North Korea in the present day might not be fitting for examining Hypothesis 5. The reasons that North Korea would be the target for intervention are its development of nuclear weapons and its infamous human rights record. When Pyongyang recognized the nuclear reprocessing plant built at Yongbyon in 2003, the US had

\textsuperscript{55} In 1993, Washington decided to send a military force to Somalia to stop the severe human security atrocities and provide humanitarian aid. However, with the loss of American soldiers’ lives and the increasing critiques from domestic voices, the Clinton administration could do nothing but immediately withdrew from Somalia. The goals of stopping human atrocities and nation building in Somalia failed. Since then, Somalia has been ranked first on the fail-state list published by \textit{Foreign Policy} magazine. A similar case is the US intervention in Iraq. The Bush administration claimed that Saddam Hussein was harboring al-Qaeda members and developing weapons of mass destruction. The evidence for the above arguments asserted by the US turned out to be null after the invasion took place. Hussein was later executed by the US, and Iraq has been one of the top 10 fail-states ranked by \textit{Foreign Policy} magazine. The ranking of fail states published by \textit{Foreign Policy} could be found at: http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/06/17/2011_failed_states_index_interactive_map_and_rankings.
considered taking military action against North Korea. However, in the end, the Bush administration decided that it was too risky to intervene in North Korea through force, and instead took the approach of negotiation (Sanger 2003). Had the US proposed the application of force and intervention in North Korea in the Security Council, China would definitely veto the resolution. It is quite impossible for Kim Jong-Il to accept intervention imposed by either the UN or other states. Additionally, the Kim administration is still the only capable regime in North Korea that can be negotiated with and can take charge of its own conduct. On the other hand, the DPRK government run by the Kim family has been an authoritarian state with extreme concentration of power and severe control of information. North Koreans are under great oppression imposed by the regime, and the access to the knowledge about the outside world is under drastic control by the government (Kim 2008; Huang 2008). Living in such a closed political environment limited the North Koreans’ knowledge about the reality of world affairs, and made it difficult for the outside world to know the internal situation in North Korea. The blockage of information in North Korea has led to two crucial results. First, it is hard for North Koreans to unite and fight the authoritarian regime. Second, it is not easy for international organizations and other states to collect evidence and appeal to intervention when access to the internal situation of North Korea is frequently blocked.\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{56} Information about the internal situation of North Korea is normally collected from refugees, asylum seekers, and foreign institutions with a mission of humanitarian aid. However, problems of bias always emerge in the information from refugees and asylum seekers, because it is not easy to examine the correctness of the information through empirical investigation. On the other hand, members of foreign institutions who work in North Korea could hardly move around in the country as they wish. They would be strictly monitored by the DPRK government and could hardly communicate with civilians (Bak 2008).
In the current stage, it is still difficult to predict China’s action if a severe catastrophe or atrocity to the level of genocide happens in North Korea. From the historical experiences of the Korean War in the 1950s, China did intervene by providing Kim Il Sung with troops and weapons to fight the coalition army led by the US. However, the decision was made under the following premises: 1) Kim Il Sung had kept asking Mao Zedong for assistance in his Korean reunification plan; 2) China defined the Korean War was aroused by the US initiating intervention in the internal affairs of the Korean Peninsula; thus, China was negating the illegitimate US intervention by waging force; and 3) PRC leaders suspected that the US might invade China’s northeast area if it gained victory in the Korean War; hence, to prevent a potential threat to China’s national security, Beijing decided to intervene (Scobell 2004). Although China has given up on being led by ideology and has become more pragmatic in foreign policy making, the Chinese leaders’ attitude toward intervention imposed on the Korean Peninsula is still very cautious and protective. If one day, the regime controlled by the Kim family in North Korea could no longer maintain domestic stability, or the danger caused by Pyongyang’s nuclear plan extends to the level of concrete threat to the entire world (with China’s national security included), China might agree to the necessity of intervention on North Korea. Nevertheless, the means to intervene will be strongly debated. China might wish to take more leads and still apply the non-coercive means before the further aggravation of situation. Keeping the use of force as the last resort to the problem,

---

57 After the Korean War broke out, the Chinese leaders’ major viewpoint about the war was that the US was wielding the imperialist ambition to conquer the weaker states; if China did not stop such evil intention, North Korea would only become the first step of the imperialist plan; other former colonial states like Vietnam would be next and be conquered again by Western imperialism (Niu 2000).
gaining the consent of the target state, and having authorization from the UN Security Council shall remain the major principles for China to agree with the imposition of intervention on North Korea.

**Perception of China toward the Issue of Nuclear Crisis and Appeal of Intervention**

_Hypothesis 6: If the PRC perceives non-coercive means are still functional for dealing with target states, China will neither initiate nor support intervention._

The development of a nuclear program and the violation of nuclear nonproliferation contribute to the major reasons why North Korea has been the target of international intervention. North Korea’s determination of owning nuclear weapons originated from its fear of being attacked and exterminated by the imperialist states, and its major enemy in principle is the United States. North Korea has been one of the very few states that act upon the need of survival; such decision-making logic is due to the long-term isolation and the perception of being surrounded by a hostile international environment. In short, at the ideological level, North Korea remains in the Cold War era. The major state actors involved in the North Korean nuclear crisis all perceive such a fact: The North Korean nuclear issue is not a single event that could be easily solved; the root is the “North Korean issue,” which means the extreme insecurity of North Korean regime grown under the long-term isolation and the distorted view about world politics (Zhang 2003; Zhu 2005). The significant controversy among states involved in the issue is not simply about how to solve the problem, but how to comprehend the entire issue as well.
For the US and Japan, the in-depth problem is the current regime in Pyongyang; thus, solving the North Korean nuclear crisis and managing the “North Korean issue” could and should be done simultaneously (Zhu 2005). This reason explains the strong support of the US and Japan for the application of coercive means to force North Korea to give up the development of a nuclear program. In February 2002, the Bush administration had defined North Korea as part of the “axis of evil,” and looked for the possibility of a regime change in North Korea (Rennie 2003). The way that the US manages the North Korean nuclear crisis can be concluded as the “Cold War thinking logic.” Such logic simplifies the issue by defining and deciding who the enemy is, applying the containment policy, and believing military force is always an option for solving problems caused by the evil regimes (Chivers 2008; Shih 2010). On the other hand, while South Korea has been shifting its position on dealing with the North Korean nuclear crisis, Russia and China have been standing firm on rejecting the use of force; China has especially insisted that holding the Six-Party Talks is the best way to manage the nuclear crisis in the Korean Peninsula.

Hypothesis 6 suggests that if China perceives that alternative solutions exist rather than imposing intervention with force, then the country will not support the application of coercive means to intervene in other states, including military intervention and economic sanctions. In the North Korea case, China believes that the Six-Party Talks are the most and probably the only acceptable and functional approach to finding solutions. The creation of the Six-Party Talks is an interesting case for investigating China’s attitude toward intervention. The PRC has no longer found itself stuck with the noninterference
principle, and allowed flexibility in its attitude toward international intervention. Thus, while rejecting the proposal of severe economic sanctions and preventing the possibility of military intervention imposed on North Korea, China has made great efforts to play the role as a mediator between North Korea and the outside world. Meanwhile, China has been the host and planner of the Six-Party Talks. The Six-Party Talks seem to be the apparatus that provides China with a platform for using its power and influence to develop a distinct kind of intervention, and such apparatus might be designed to differentiate the Chinese style of intervention from the current ones that are often dominated by the Western great powers. In the Darfur case, China had tried to make a similar effort and the result turned out well: The intervention gained the consent from the Sudanese government and allowed the UN peacekeeping force to proceed and rebuild stability in the region. Although the Six-Party Talks are still a mechanism in process, they have provided a clear comparison between China and other great powers involved in the issue in terms of perceptions and responses to intervention imposed on North Korea. Unlike the US and Japan that combine the North Korean nuclear crisis and the “North Korean issue” together, China comprehends the need to solve the two issues separately. Hence, China has insisted that the measures cannot be too harsh, such that Pyongyang’s insecurity will increase and the situation will worsen.

To investigate Hypothesis 6, the question should not be about the kind of non-coercive measure China would perceive as still functional and better than the use of force. Instead, the question seeks to determine the reason for China’s insistence that the non-coercive approach is more workable, and the circumstances under which China
would perceive the impossibility for non-coercive means to function and might decide to
support intervention with coercion. The answer(s) to these questions as well as
Hypothesis 6 are deeply related to the previous sections of this chapter. Navigating the
abovementioned hypotheses should provide clues for understanding the important role
the Six-Party Talks have played in China’s dealing with the North Korean nuclear crisis
and the “North Korean issue.” Before searching for the clue, a review of China’s
responses to the DPRK’s nuclear program development since 1992 is needed. The reason
is that knowing how China has changed its attitude is crucial for investigating how
Beijing decided that non-coercive means are workable and should not be taken off the
table.

Review of China’s Responses to the North Korean Nuclear Crisis

Since the early 1990s, the US intelligence and the South Korean government had
suspected that North Korea owns the ability to develop nuclear weapons, and claimed
that the program should have been developed underground. Since then, the states
involved in Northeast Asian regional security (including the US, Japan, Russia, China,
and South Korea) urged North Korea to accept the International Atomic Energy Agency
(IAEA) inspections of its facilities; otherwise, they would cut off the non-military
supplies to the DPRK (Yonhap News Agency 1991; Lewis 1994; Oberdorfer and Reid
1991). Pyongyang responded that if the US withdrew all its nuclear weapons from South
Korea and guaranteed that it would never apply nuclear weapons against North Korea, it
would agree to sign the IAEA nuclear safeguards agreement (Jones 1991). At that time,

58 Based on satellite photographs, the area of Yongbyon had been revealed to be the possible base where
North Korea builds its nuclear facility (Mackay 1991).
Beijing’s response was that China supported the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula (People’s Daily 1991), but insisted this issue was only a dispute between the US and the DPRK and should not be exaggerated to the level of an international crisis (Liu, Pan, Pan, and Li 2006). After the IAEA inspection, equipment capable of producing a tiny amount of plutonium was found in Yongbyon. Although the amount was miniscule to produce nuclear weapons, the inspection results still aroused serious concern. The IAEA further requested the DPRK to allow the inspectors to the other two sites in Yongbyon, where they believed undeclared plutonium was hidden. North Korea rejected the IAEA’s request and threatened to withdraw from the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) in March 1993.  

Pyongyang’s announcement of withdrawal from the NPT caused a huge disturbance in international society. The US, Japan, and South Korea were planning to propose an appeal in the UN Security Council, whereas China publicly expressed its unwillingness to support such an appeal and its intention to veto the proposal in question. Beijing emphasized that the UN Security Council should not get involved in the North Korean nuclear issue, because such an act would only further complicate the crisis and make it more difficult to deal with (People’s Daily 1993).

China started to change its perception of the North Korean nuclear issue in 2002, when DPRK officials recognized the existence of their nuclear arms program during the reception of the visit of the US Assistant Secretary of State James Kelly (Wang and Li 2009). Beijing had sensed that the dispute caused by the DPRK’s tenacious attitude toward the US and the IAEA had inevitably enlarged the crisis to become a concrete

59 About the negotiation process between the IAEA and the DPRK, more details can be read in the IAEA online archive: http://www.iaea.org/newscenter/focus/iaeadprk/fact_sheet_may2003.shtml (accessed on July 12, 2011).
threat to global security.\textsuperscript{60} The US had reiterated that the option of military intervention against the North Korean nuclear program was never off the table (\textit{The Korea Times} 2008), whereas China decided to expand the scale of dialogue. Beijing had played the role as a host and invited both Russia and Japan into a conversation with the DPRK. Since the beginning of 2003, Chinese leaders and special emissaries had frequently contacted leaders and officials of the US, South Korea, UN Security Council, and North Korea. Moreover, the frequency of related news on the North Korean nuclear crisis released by Xinhua News and the \textit{People’s Daily} had greatly increased. This situation was quite abnormal compared to the previous one;\textsuperscript{61} before 2003, news about the Chinese officials’ public speeches or acts related to the nuclear crisis in the Korean Peninsula was rarely seen. Such a phenomenon showed China’s strong resolution to make peaceful conversation as the major approach to solve the North Korea nuclear issue. Under the PRC officials’ active coordination, the first round of the Six-Party Talks was held in Beijing on August 27, 2003.

From 2003 to March 2007, six rounds of formal meetings of the Six-Party Talks hosted by Beijing have been conducted. Meanwhile, the disputes have never ceased; with North Korea testing multiple ballistic missiles over the Sea of Japan in 2006 and announcing its nuclear weapons tests in 2009, the crisis has escalated twice. The Six-Party Talks have been suspended since 2008, and the agreement signed in 2007 that

\textsuperscript{60} In 2002, US Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld said he believed North Korea already has nuclear weapons (BBC News 2002); meanwhile, DPRK Foreign Minister Paek Nam Sun expressed that North Korea would never accept the terms proposed by the IAEA, because the DPRK believes that the organization is manipulated by the US, which is the major threat to North Korea (BBC News 2002).

\textsuperscript{61} For example, in early 2003, both media representing the attitude of Chinese officials had frequently reported the official speech made by PRC leaders, foreign minister, and ambassadors to the US, South Korea, and UN. Xinhua News even released part of the exchange of opinions between PRC President Jiang Zemin and US President George W. Bush on March 10, 2003 (Xinhua News 2003).
focused on North Korea dismantling the equipment designed for producing plutonium in Yongbyon (Xinhua News 2007) was abandoned by Pyongyang. North Korea even announced its withdrawal from the Six-Party Talks in 2009; however, after two years, it expressed its intention to return to the Six-Party Talks unconditionally (Zhang 2011). Facing North Korea’s capricious reactions and other states’ suspicions on the effectiveness of negotiating with Pyongyang, China still insists upon the Six-Party Talks as the major approach to deal with the nuclear crisis. Nevertheless, North Korea’s two nuclear tests in 2006 and 2009 had pushed China to agree to the necessity of the UN Security Council’s involvement. Although Beijing opposed the application of coercive means as an effective way of solving problems, it still voted in favor of Resolution 1718 in 2006 and Resolution 1874 in 2009.62

Factors Determining China’s Insistence on Non-Coercive Means for Solving North Korean Nuclear Crisis

Facing the nuclear crisis in the Korean Peninsula, China changed its attitude from refusing to interfere (and preventing others from intervening) to actively initiating the Six-Party Talks and supporting sanctions imposed on the DPRK to a limited extent. China has perceived that the North Korean nuclear crisis could not be set aside as Beijing had intended to do in the early 1990s. Had China not taken action, the crisis might worsen to the level that military intervention led by the US would happen again in the

---

62 The main content of Resolution 1718 includes the following: call for the DPRK to abandon the nuclear test and the test-fire of ballistic missiles, prohibition of the exportation of any materials related to the production of weapons of mass destruction and luxury goods to North Korea, and permission to block the DPRK’s foreign account if necessary. Resolution 1874 asks for the full execution of Resolution 1718, prohibition of exportation of North Korean-made weapons, examination of incoming and outgoing vessels in North Korean harbors, and prohibition of foreign finance aimed to support the research of nuclear arms and weapons of mass destruction in North Korea (Zhu 2009, 47–48).
Korean Peninsula. Chinese officials have repeatedly expressed in many public occasions that Beijing does not wish to see the application of force or other coercive means as a measure for solving problems; they insist that the dispute regarding North Korea’s nuclear program should be solved peacefully. The major reason for China’s insistence is related to the maintenance of stability in Northeast Asia. Stability in the neighboring area remains of highest value in Chinese foreign policy. On the other hand, two other goals concerning China’s position on the North Korean nuclear crisis have been set: the denuclearization in the Korean Peninsula, and balancing China’s relations with major states involved in the crisis. Achieving these goals in the current stage are clearly difficult; in many circumstances, they even conflict with each other. The most obvious example is the maintenance of regional stability and relationship with core actors in the crisis; oftentimes, North Korea’s caprice has trapped China in the dilemma that the Six-Party Talks seem only to provide Pyongyang space and time to play delaying tactics. This situation also contributes to the suspicion that China remains allied with evil regimes and will never become a responsible great power in the future. Facing the difficulties of solving the North Korean nuclear crisis with the inefficient (and possibly ineffective) Six-Party Talks, why does China still insist on the feasibility of non-coercive means?

Despite the long-term relationship between the Kim regime of the DPRK and the CCP leaders of the preceding generation, Chinese decision makers do have different perspectives of the North Korean nuclear crisis. First, Chinese decision makers have attributed the root of problem to the political isolation of North Korea and insisted on the necessity of maintaining contact with Pyongyang. Beijing has repeatedly invited the
DPRK leaders to visit the Chinese special economic zones; moreover, China has continually provided aid and foreign investment to North Korea. These gestures are designed with the hope that North Korea will follow the Chinese path of reform and opening to the outside world. If China could help North Korea improve its economic development, the result would not only be beneficial to North Korea, but also to China itself. As discussed in the first section of this chapter, the shared borders with North Korea and the influence of cross-boundary ethnic minority (Chao Xian Zu) both have impacted China’s decision making of its Korean policy. The stability in the bordering area is significant to China’s Northeast provinces, where the Chinese heavy industries are located. In addition, although the influence is minor, the Chao Xian Zu as a cross-boundary ethnic minority has assisted the Chinese central government in negotiating with North Korea, which is helpful for economic cooperation between the two states (Zhu 2000).

The concern of the shared borders and the role of cross-boundary ethnic minority contribute to China’s preference for negotiation and peaceful conversation with North Korea. On the other hand, although some Chinese scholars have doubted the authenticity of the DPRK’s reform and opening, the official attitude seems to consistently support the DPRK’s economic development. North Korea is not the major provider of raw

---

63 Chinese domestic media had frequently reported the news about DPRK leaders visiting the special economic zones in China and emphasized the positive side of such events. Meanwhile, some Chinese scholars had investigated the responses represented in the North Korean media, and pointed out the absence of a sign of North Korea’s resoluteness in adopting the reform and opening policy. Zhang Liangui has indicated that the most important mass media outlet in North Korea, Laodong Net, has posted articles to severely attack the reform and opening policy. Laodong Net has criticized that the reform and opening policy is the conspiracy of Western imperialism and its followers (implying China). The main theme of these articles is to propagate the danger of reform and opening to the outside world, and link such a policy to the scheme of toppling the North Korean socialist society (Zhang 2010, 40–41).
materials to China; nevertheless, China continues to provide aid and investments to develop North Korean industries and facilitate the production of raw materials, such as the iron ore in Mao-shan. Apparently, supporting North Korea’s reform and opening has been the major strategy for China to solve the “North Korea issue,” which is the root of the North Korean nuclear crisis. Given that Chinese leaders have perceived that making North Koreans rich and pushing the regime to be socialized into international society is better than creating a failed state through military intervention, China could never support coercive means as the major approach to resolve the problem.

However, facing North Korea’s capricious behaviors and the social pressure from international society, the PRC does need the multilateral mechanism to both bind North Korea to negotiate with the outside world and maintain China’s relationship with other core actors in the region. The Six-Party Talks are the product of such thinking logic. Receiving social pressure due to its non-action and slow response to the nuclear crisis, China developed the strategy of coordinating and hosting the Six-Party Talks; in the Chinese logic, doing so allows China to present itself as a responsible rising power to international society. Nevertheless, China is notably playing the role as a host, but not a leader, which most Western great powers have often taken on in many cases of international interventions. Meanwhile, Beijing has kept expressing the limitation of its influence on restricting North Korea.

In addition, the guanxi between the DPRK regime and the CCP leading group keeps China from taking a harsh approach toward North Korea. While acting capriciously, the Kim family has been seeking support and protection from the PRC.
Being the representation of the Third World states as China has self-praised, it is quite impossible for China to abandon a nation that has voluntarily sought its protection, not to mention Pyongyang has been a long-term ally of Beijing. If China agrees with the Western great powers and intervened in North Korea with coercion, it is equal to sending negative messages to China’s other Third World allies. China’s image and credibility will be discredited, and its relations with other states, especially those ruled by authoritarian regimes, will be damaged to a great extent.

Importance of Being the “Mediator”

The long-term relationship between the CCP and the DPRK allows China to take on the role as a mediator in the North Korea nuclear crisis. However, China’s support of UN Security Council Resolutions 1718 and 1874 provides an interesting empirical angle for investigating China’s perception of being a mediator, and determining how such perception would shape Chinese attitude toward intervention. China supported the imposition of economic sanctions on North Korea at the same time when it tried persuading others to accept non-coercive means as the measurement to solve the dispute. The answer to the controversy could not be simplified to a mere response to international pressure. Instead, the answer represents a symbolic meaning rather than an action to achieve a concrete gain. Upon the investigation of the details of the two resolutions, the impacts of sanctions (especially on the civilian aspect) are revealed to be minor compared to the sanctions imposed on Iraq initiated by the US before the invasion in 2003.

Resolutions 1718 and 1874 focus mainly on slashing North Korea’s military industry,

64 The expert of North Korea, Rüdiger Frank, from University of Vienna holds a similar opinion. He indicates that China’s concern plus the worry about the refugees (if the Kim regime collapses) have restrained Beijing’s ability to wield influence on Pyongyang (China Review News 2010).
especially its access to sources for making nuclear weapons. The major reason for
Beijing’s support of the imposition of economic sanctions on North Korea while reducing
the efficacy of the resolutions is to punish Pyongyang for not communicating with China
before pushing through with the nuclear test. By so doing, the intimidation from China’s
supporting sanctions will force the North to go back to the table and accept negotiation
with the outside world. China’s main purpose is to caution North Korea but not penalize
it to the extent that Pyongyang loses authority and is exploited by other great powers.

Being the mediator, it is crucial for China to determine if the application of non-
coercive means is still possible and functional, especially in cases where the intervention
target has a deep relationship with China. Whether the target state opens itself to the
communication process with the outside world is less the point for China than whether
the target state keeps communicating with Beijing and endorsing its capability of taking
on the role as a mediator. The role of a mediator is the way for China to implement
harmony in dealing with international intervention. If the target state rejects to
communicate with China, there is a higher possibility that China would support
intervention with coercion. In the North Korea case, the seeming confrontational
behavior made by Pyongyang is conducive to the enforcement of China’s will of
improving its credibility in front of international society. However, Beijing does not wish
to injure Pyongyang’s ability to maintain regime stability and control its domain. Thus,
an affirmative vote on Resolutions 1718 and 1814 becomes Beijing’s signal to the North
to get the DPRK back to the negotiation table. Had Pyongyang adopted a more extreme
action and violated China’s perception as a mediator, the possibility that China would
vote for supporting more coercive intervention imposed on North Korea is likely to increase. Nevertheless, as long as North Korea keeps the access open for China to mediate between its baffling ruler and the outside world, the PRC’s support of intervention with coercive means on North Korea is quite unlikely.
CHAPTER THREE: CHINESE NONINTERVENTION POLICY TOWARD MYANMAR

China has been viewed as a loyal ally of the other notorious regime in East Asia, Myanmar. Since the political coup in 1962, Myanmar has been under the dominance of the military regime until 2011, when the elected administration led by Thein Sein took over office from the military junta. Myanmar has been criticized by Western states for its infamous human rights record. The application of extreme oppression on its people, the exploitation of Burmese civilians’ freedom of speech and political rights, and the detention of political prisoners have intensified the voice of wielding international intervention on the military regime of Myanmar. China has been blocking such appeals in all occasions, most notably in the UN Security Council. This chapter aims to investigate the reason for China’s insistence on a nonintervention policy toward Myanmar. The six hypotheses will be adopted again as the pillars for analysis of the logic of China’s nonintervention toward the Myanmar case.

Myanmar has been ranked 18th in the 2011 Failed States Index; such record also shows that Myanmar is the type of state with the worst economic and political conditions. Myanmar has been one of the most impoverished states in East Asia since 2008.65 The

65 North Korea and East Timor have moved downward on the ranking, whereas Myanmar remains in the list of the top 20 states that are most likely to fail. For more information, visit the official website of Foreign Policy: http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/06/17/2011_failed_states_index_interactive_map_and_ranking
retardation of economic development in Myanmar is partly attributed to the sanctions imposed by the Western countries. In addition, the long-term isolation from international society also worsens the internal situation of Myanmar. The former totalitarian regime, which controls the domestic politics by military force, adopted the extreme nationalization policy that has proven to be a great failure and led to the dire poverty of the Burmese people. Moreover, as Jurgen Haacke has pointed out, the challenges of the armed minority forces and the opposition parties, plus the unfriendly international environment, have driven the Myanmar military junta to make political security as the imperative for their foreign policy. That is to say, the essential goal of Myanmar’s foreign policy is to prevent national unity and domestic stability from being threatened by any external and internal force (Haacke 2006, 17–21). Thus, sovereignty and the independence of the state remain the highest principle of Myanmar’s foreign policy. The emerging norm of humanitarian intervention is unacceptable for the military junta and the recent elected regime.

Three events, which occurred after the military junta took over the reins, excited the proposals of intervention imposed on Myanmar. The first event comprised the violently quelled protests in 1988, which led to the death of about 3,000 people (Erlanger 1990). The second event consisted of the Buddhist monk-led protests in 2007, which ended up with one more bloody suppression ordered by the military junta. The third event was the destructive management of Cyclone Nargis in 2008, which incurred terrible loss of Burmese lives and properties due to the delay of humanitarian aid caused by the

The European Union (EU) has decided to suspend the sanctions against Myanmar for one year to show agreement with the democratic reform starting since the 2010 general election (Pawlak and Moffett 2012).
military junta’s suspicion of Western countries. These events had aroused the condemnation of the atrocity of the military junta, and stimulated the appeal for adopting more coercive means against Myanmar, including imposing international intervention.

The other crucial reason that had made Myanmar the target of international intervention (aside from human rights violation) was the strangled development of democracy since the coup d’état in 1962. Myanmar had been ruled by the military regime; general elections had been held in 1990, but the military junta overturned the outcome of the elections and refused to hand over power to the democratic clique represented by Aung San Suu Kyi.67 The Myanmar military junta has adopted severe measures toward political opposition, especially the National League of Democracy (NLD) led by Suu Kyi. The NLD was the party that won the 1990 elections; they won more than 80% of the seats in the Parliament. However, the military regime not only refused to recognize the election results, but it also detained Suu Kyi by placing her under house arrest for many years beginning in 1990 (Mydans 2008).

Suu Kyi became the Nobel Peace Prize winner in 1991; she was praised by the committee as “an outstanding example of the power of the powerless” (BBC News 2010). The detention of Suu Kyi had greatly sunk the reputation of the Myanmar military junta. Later on, the 1988 protest and the 2007 Saffron Revolution worsened the situation to the extent that Myanmar has been under severe sanctions imposed by the Western great

67 From 1962 to 1997, Myanmar was controlled by the armed forces called State Law and Order Restoration Council (SLORC); SLORC was renamed State Peace and Development Council from 1998 to March 2011. The 1990 general election had been declared as invalid by the SLORC. On November 7, 2010, Myanmar held the first “valid” national elections in 20 years. However, the election results were greatly criticized by international society. The impartiality of the elections was called in question, because the military-backed party overwhelmingly won the elections.
powers. Western observers depicted the two large-scale protests as the Burmese people’s call for democratic reforms; however, the deep root of these mass protests was economic rather than political.

In September 1987, the leader of the military administration, Ne Win, proclaimed a new policy: Only the paper money with the face value of 45 and 90 kyat could still be used and circulated in the market. The other paper money with different face values would be voided. This policy caused a great rebound in the Burmese society, because it immediately impoverished a huge portion of the population. College students led the beginning of the protest. On March 13, 1988, a student was shot to death by the troops upon the order of the junta. This event brought about the expansion and aggravation of the protest (Yang 2007). A bloody military suppression ended the protest, which caused serious concern in international society and led the Western great powers to impose sanctions on Myanmar.

The 2007 Saffron Revolution even provoked a more severe condemnation from international society. The cause of this large-scale civilian protest was mainly the rising prices of oil and related products. Although Myanmar is one of the very few states equipped with great deposits of oil and gas, due to the unproductive management and the retardation of facilities, the Burmese people could not enjoy any of the benefits of these natural resources. A quintessential phenomenon contributed to the well-known event: Burmese monks led the movement (He and Li 2009). Buddhist monks are known for their detachment from secular business and being stereotyped as perpetual peace
pursuers. The involvement of monks in the 2007 protest has made the event the symbol of resistance of the Burmese people against the totalitarian regime.

The appeal of intervention on Myanmar could hardly be materialized; one of the major reasons relates to the political culture in Southeast Asia. Most of the Southeast Asian states had been colonized by the Western great powers; such historical past has led these states to value sovereignty and noninterference in each other’s domains as the highest principles among all the international institutions. Therefore, when the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) was established in 1967, the founding states (Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand) had made it clear that “noninterference in the internal affairs of one another” is one of the six fundamental principles for ASEAN members.  

68 The principle of noninterference fits well with the foreign policy goal of the Myanmar military junta. Myanmar joined the ASEAN in 1997. The ASEAN’s “constructive engagement” policy toward Myanmar was once expected to bring positive change in terms of the democratization of the regime. However, the limited effects of the ASEAN’s engagement policy on democratizing Myanmar have been proven (Jha 2009).
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The other five principles include the following: mutual respect for the independence, sovereignty, equality, territorial integrity, and national identity of all nations; the right of every state to lead its national existence free from external interference, subversion, or coercion; settlement of differences or disputes through a peaceful manner; renunciation of the threat or use of force; and effective cooperation among themselves. For more details about ASEAN and the founding principles, visit its official website at http://www.asean.org/about_ASEAN.html.

68 Myanmar did not ratify the Charter of the ASEAN until 2008. Ratifying the Charter means Myanmar has accepted all the provisions that construct the foundation and purpose of the ASEAN, including the establishment of human rights body—the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission Human Rights (AICHR). Apparently, AICHR has not modified the ASEAN’s official policy toward Myanmar, and the controversy between Myanmar’s notorious human rights record and the goal of AICHR remains (Arendshorst 2009).
The principle of noninterference in its member states’ internal affairs in the ASEAN Charter is consistent with China’s attitude toward the appeal of intervention on Myanmar. The Sino-Burmese relationship also plays a key role in China’s attitude of nonintervention. Myanmar is the first non-socialist state that recognized the PRC right after its establishment; however, Myanmar’s relationship with China is not always on a smooth path. In the early period when the formal relationship just began, the interactions between Beijing and Yangon were actually cool and gloomy. China distrusted Burma and suspected that Yangon might be a follower of Western imperialism. On the other hand, the Burmese leaders worried that China would eventually become the major threat to Burma’s national security (Fan 2008, 137). As both Badgley and Van Ness have pointed out, Mao Zedong’s decision to secretly support the Burmese communists and Beijing’s enthusiastic propaganda of communist ideology during the Cultural Revolution had deteriorated the relationship between the two states (Badgley 1967; Van Ness 1970). Nevertheless, there has never been severe antagonism between China and Myanmar, and the relationship started to recover after the Chinese economic reform policy took off.

The military junta in Myanmar started to incline toward China to seek political and military support in the late 1980s. With the disintegration of the Burmese communists and the international condemnation Beijing faced due to the Tiananmen incident in 1989, the relationship between Myanmar and China has since greatly progressed (Haacke 2006, 26). China has become the most important ally of the Myanmar military junta. Beijing has not only provided financial aid and facilities (for

---

70 Burma was the first democratic regime that recognized the PRC in 1949. This historical fact has given Myanmar a special position in Beijing’s foreign policy decision making (Van Ness 1970).
both civilian and military purposes) to Myanmar, but more importantly, it has been the major actor that shields Myanmar from severe international intervention on many crucial occasions. China’s behavior expectedly incurred criticism from international society; especially for its Western counterparts, China’s shielding of the Myanmar military junta is tantamount to supporting and even sponsoring the atrocity of the regime and its violation of human rights of the Burmese civilians. China’s act is certainly against its wish of building the image as a responsible great power. The core question is: Why does China still insist on the nonintervention policy toward Myanmar?

This chapter is designed to investigate the abovementioned question. The analytical structure is the same as that in Chapter Two, which means the six hypotheses adopted in this research agenda will again be the pillars for composing the complete investigation. However, the comparison between the two cases will not be made in this chapter. Here, the analytical work will focus only on the examination of the hypotheses and the investigation of China’s nonintervention toward Myanmar.

**Border, Ethnic Conflicts, and China’s Policy toward Myanmar**

*Hypothesis 1: If the target states share border(s) with China, China will neither initiate nor support intervention.*

The shared border between China and Myanmar is as long as 2,186 kilometers, and a big part of the borderline on the Chinese side is located in Yunnan Province (Lu 2006). Considering that China and Myanmar share such a long borderline, Beijing has to be more cautious in its policy toward Myanmar. The major factors that might shape Chinese nonintervention toward Myanmar regarding the shared border include the
complexity around the bordering area (especially the ethnic minority conflicts in the Myanmar side), and the image that China has been trying to build in Southeast Asia. Notably, Myanmar has been known for the long-term conflicts between the central regime and the armed ethnic minorities. This fact has increased the complication of the shared border between Myanmar and China, and deepened the influence of the ethnic minority issues on Sino-Burmese relations.

As most states in the post-colonial period have encountered, long-term Sino-Burmese border disputes erupted before 1960. The border disputes were the relics of the colonial history of Myanmar. Myanmar (Burma)\textsuperscript{71} was one of the British colonies from the early 19\textsuperscript{th} century until 1948. The root of the border disputes between China and Myanmar was related to the delayed development of the concepts of sovereignty and modern state system in East Asia. Before the concepts of sovereignty and modern state system were embedded in China and most East Asian countries, the idea of border was very vague idea and had hardly been practiced with precision among East Asian states. China and its neighboring countries did not mark precise borderlines, but shared rough consents about the edges of their territories defined by traditions and conventions. The British imperialists had taken advantage of such a distinguishing feature of East Asian culture and seized many territories, including those traditionally defined as China’s domain but shared with the Chinese vassal states (Wang 1879).

In the late 19\textsuperscript{th} century, the Qing dynasty was in decline and had been too weak to protect its Southwestern frontier; it was even impossible for China to guard its vassal

\textsuperscript{71} Burma changed its name to Myanmar in 1989. To present the historical background more clearly, this section uses “Burma” more frequently to suit the period when these historical events happened.
states from the invasion of the Western imperialists in that era. The Qing emperor had failed to claim his domain over the former vassal state Burma.\(^2\) Knowing the powerlessness of the Qing dynasty, the British imperialists exploited more lands from China under the excuse of redrawing borderlines between China, Burma, and India. Although the Qing emperor had sent envoys to negotiate with British governors, the result remained the same: the British imperialists continued to seize the occupied lands, and the border between China and Burma became a controversial issue (Xie 2000). The British colonial government had demarcated borderlines without China’s consent. The border disputes between Myanmar and China before 1960 included the “1941 Line,” the “MacMahon Line,” and the permanent leasehold of the Mengmao Delta.\(^3\) The borderlines demarcated by the British colonial government had been rejected by the Qing dynasty. However, China’s extremely weak national power in that era did not allow it to fight the British imperialists in the border disputes. The succeeding republican government controlled by the Nationalists (Kuomitang, KMT) also disagreed with the

---

\(^2\) When Britain occupied Burma and claimed it as a British colony in November 1885, the Qing dynasty expressed its condemnation and argued that China was the suzerain of Burma, and the British Queen should have consulted with China before the invasion. Britain had never recognized the suzerain position of the Qing dynasty. Nevertheless, in July 1996, the British governor in Burma still signed an agreement with China, which allowed Burma to keep sending tributes to China once every 10 years (Shi Nian Yi Gong). This agreement was voided in 1894, which evidenced the further decline of the Qing dynasty (He 2006).

\(^3\) The “1941 Line” referred to the Southern section of undecided border between Burma and China before 1960. The “MacMahon Line,” which was the borderline marked by Sir Henry MacMahon, referred to the Northern section of the undecided border. The “MacMahon Line” was the agreement between the British colonial government and Tibetan autonomy in 1941 (Zhu 2007); it was a proposal of how to mark the borderline rather than a treaty with precise on-the-spot investigation. The “MacMahon Line” also defined the boundary between China and India. China had never recognized the legitimacy and legality of both cases. Later, when Zhou En-lai accepted the Burmese request on the border issues, the act was tantamount to the PRC’s indirect acceptance of the materialization of both the “1941 Line” and the “MacMahon Line.” This event provided India with the grounds that China had accepted the legitimization of the “MacMahon Line” (Zhu 2007, 295).

\(^4\) The permanent leasehold of the Mengmao Delta was the result of the treaty between the Qing dynasty and the British colonial government in Burma. According to the treaty, Burma won the administration rights over the converging area of Nanwan River and Ruili River, which was called the Mengmao Delta (Zhu 2011, 29).
“1941 Line” and “MacMahon Line;” nevertheless, they still could not solve the disputes and had set aside the issue due to the outbreak of the Second World War and the following civil war with the Chinese Communists.

When the PRC was established in 1949, the border disputes between China and Myanmar remained a thorny problem. Although the CCP had won the civil war and took over power, in the early 1950s, there were remaining KMT troops along the Sino-Burmese bordering area and within Burma. The remaining KMT troops constantly provoked armed conflicts with the People’s Liberation Army of the PRC (PLA) in those areas.75 The Burmese army had also encountered armed conflicts with these remaining KMT troops. Therefore, the KMT troops had been seen as a threat to the national security of Burma by the regime in Yangon. However, the Burmese leaders had restrained themselves from asking China to give a hand on this issue despite Burma’s inability to eradicate the problem on its own. The Chinese government initiated the offer of assisting Burma in the fight with the remaining KMT troops.76 China could not provide the offer earlier as there had been strong suspicion and hesitation on the Burmese side about China’s intention and ambition. The offer of helping Burma to eradicate the remaining KMT troops materialized in 1960 after the settlement of the border issue.

75 The beginning of these remaining KMT troops in Burma was organized by Commander Guohui Li and Zhong Tan. They combined two branches of the KMT army in the bordering area between Burma and Thailand, which is also named “Golden Triangle.” These troops named themselves “revival force” (Fu Xing Bu Dui), whose major task was to regain the possession of the lost territory from the CCP. They had continued to recruit men and enlarge the army to the scale of 3,000 soldiers. Afterward, with the aid from Taiwan and the US in 1951, the “revival force” was able to expand to the scale of almost 7,000 people (Kong 2010, 57).

76 The offer of assisting Burma to fight with the remaining KMT troops was made by Zhou En-lai. After signing the agreement on border issues, Zhou initiated the offer to the Burmese Premier Ne Win. It was said that Burma had been wishing to ask China for help but had difficulty to speak the request out; and Zhou En-lai was aware of Burmese leader’s intentions; thus, he initiated the offer (Kong 2010, 58).
The border disputes between China and Myanmar were resolved in 1960. The PRC gave up a great portion of the disputed lands to Myanmar. The reasons driving Beijing’s decision making included the concern about the responses from the Southeast Asian states and the need for stability in the neighboring area. With regard to the notorious ethnic minority issues in Myanmar, China has acted with more caution. China’s concern has greatly influenced its nonintervention policy toward Myanmar.

China’s Concern about Its Image and Its Dealing with the Border Dispute with Myanmar

According to the analysis of Fang, PRC did not sense the importance of settling the border disputes with its neighbor states until the mid-1950s. China maintained the policy of “never recognize the 1941 line” on its dealings with the Sino-Burmese border disputes (Fan 2010, 37). The direct cause of the awakening of Beijing on the issue was the “Yellow Orchard Event (Huang Guo Yuan Shi Jian)”. This event happened in 1955, when the Burmese army encountered the People’s Liberation Army (PLA), which was sent by Beijing for the extermination of the remnants of the KMT troops in Burma. The vagueness of the undefined borderlines caused the PLA to run into the section the Burmese army defined as the territory of Burma. The “Yellow Orchard Event” became a minor armed conflict, but the event did not cause serious rifts in the Sino-Burmese

---

77 The other crucial cause is India’s claim of sovereignty over the whole Akesai Qin as one of its provinces. Beijing saw such an act of India as an invasion on the sovereign rights of China (Zhu 2011, 29).

78 The second civil war between CCP and Kuomintang (KMT) from 1945 to 1949 forced some KMT armies to retreat to Burma and wait for the chance to counterattack. At that time, one branch of the remnant KMT army led by General Li Mi had been attacking the border area in the Yunnan Province since 1951. In 1952, CCP sent PLA to cross the provisional borderline to exterminate the troops of Li Mi. Although the Burmese central government had not yet been able to reach the border area controlled mainly by ethnic armed groups, the intrusion of PLA in its presumed territory still provoked condemnation inside Burma (Zhu ibid.).
relations. Nevertheless, the event induced PRC to ponder on the severity of the unsolved border dispute with Burma (Zhu 2011, 29-30).

Allegedly, China was urged to solve the border dispute with Burma for two main reasons: its need for a stable and peaceful international environment in the Southeast Asia and the need for avoiding the creation of the image that China is pursuing hegemony in the region. The Southeast Asian states have been sensitive about the behavior of China and the possibility of Beijing seeking to become a hegemon in the region. Such suspicion was formed because of the great disparity in size, population, and military capability between China and other Southeast Asian countries. When the former Burmese premier U Nu visited China in 1956, he expressed the fear and suspicion of the neighboring countries of China by applying the metaphor of elephant (China) and lambs (Burma and other Southeast Asian states) (Tian 2009). In fact, the Burmese government utilized such fear to force Beijing to negotiate with it and make concessions on the border disputes. After the “Yellow Orchard Event” occurred, the major newspaper in Burma, The Nation, which was published in English, reported that the Chinese Communist army had occupied some northern territories of Burma and had been approaching the further interior part of the country. This news report immediately stirred international attention. Anonymous Burmese officials recognized the validity of the news report from interviews by Western media, even though no official support was given to the news agency in public. While fighting back by making counter reports through the People’s Daily, China started processing the negotiation with Burma (Fan 2010, 38-39).
To cease the suspicion of the Southeast Asian states and to create a friendlier international environment for future development, Beijing decided to compromise on the border dispute with Burma. After the negotiation was done, the three major disputed areas concerning the Sino-Burmese border, that is, the “1941 line,” the “MacMahon Line,” and the Mengmao Delta, were all settled. To a great extent, China let these disputed territories follow what Burma had requested. The most interesting case is the transference of the Mengmao Delta. Exploited and occupied rapaciously by the British Empire in the late 19th century, the Mengmao Delta was consistently recognized as Chinese territory throughout the dispute period by both the British colonial administration and the Burmese government after its independence. The creation of this disputed land symbolized the avarice of imperialism and evidenced how the old China was exploited by the Western powers. Such legacy of Western imperialism should have intensified the memory of National Humiliation (Guo Chi) and restrained Beijing from negotiating and compromising with Burma on the border issue. However, China still yielded to its smaller and weaker neighbor and gave up a vast territory. In return, China only gained the ownership of three villages back (i.e., Pinama, Gulang, and Gangfang) (Fan 2010, 40). The estimate of the total measure of the disputed areas between China and Burma was 1909 square kilometers. However, in the end, China regained only 18% of the disputed lands (Zhu 2011, 31).

Had China subscribed to realism, it would have never made concessions on the border dispute to a state whose size and power were far lesser. The concession on the border disputes with Burma was related to the image building of China more than to
material interests. The Burmese formal premier U Nu had once said in front of the Chinese media that he was fearful of China. He described China as the big elephant and Burma was the lamb; when the elephant wags, the lamb would not be able to stand (Zhao 1996; Tian 2009). Beijing understood the fear that Burma, as well as other Southeast Asian countries, had held because of the suspicion that China might pursue the position of hegemony in the region. The Chinese leaders, including Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai, tried to convince their Southeast Asian neighbors that China did not aspire to be a hegemon and would never invade its neighbors. To maintain good relations with Burma and most importantly to promote the image of China as a peace-loving nation in front of the Third World countries, Zhou Enlai visited Yangon in June 1954 and announced the joint-declaration of the “Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence” with U Nu (Zhao 1996; Xiong 1996). In December of the same year, U Nu was invited to meet with Mao Zedong in Beijing. During this period, Chinese leaders tried their best to persuade their counterparts that China treated the principle of sovereignty and equality among states as the priority international institutions to follow (Tian ibid.). These promises explain why after the “Yellow Orchard Event” occurred, Beijing conceded most of the disputed territory to the domain of Burma.

Regarding the border issue with Burma and the Sino-Burmese relationship, the Chinese leaders were unwilling to be viewed as inconsistent on their claim of equality among states, and they did not want the border disputes to become the excuse for others to accuse China of pursuing hegemony. They needed to prove that China did not possess the ambition to annex the domains of others, and thus the Chinese leaders chose to
transfer some of its territories to the smaller and weaker neighbors to consolidate friendship and “brotherhood”\textsuperscript{79} with Burma. Such logic in thinking obviously continues to wield influence on the attitude and policy making of China regarding the proposal of international intervention imposed on Myanmar. Intervention through the use of force is still a controversial topic among ASEAN states. At a time when most Southeast Asian nations were still sensitive about its intention and movement, Beijing would not easily allow itself to take the blame for supporting intervention through force, even though such action was initiated by the Western states. Although in reality China has been the strongest state in the region, image building is still significant for PRC such that Beijing will not make any rash movement to cause hostility around its neighboring area.

Concern for Stability: Problems of the Armed Ethnic Minority Forces in Myanmar

In the case of Myanmar, the complicated ethnic minority problem, which would easily disturb the stability in the Southwestern frontier of China, contributes to another crucial factor why Beijing does not support intervention in Myanmar. There have been long-term arm conflicts between the ruling military junta and the minority groups. The constant warfare has not only caused difficulties for Myanmar to materialize the economic and social reforms but also threatened the security and stability of the bordering areas it shares with China. PRC has been alerted about the spread-over effect of the armed conflicts between the Myanmar central regime and the ethnic minority groups. The entangled issues accompanying the ethnic minority problems in Myanmar also resulted in drug trafficking, spreading of HIV and AIDS, and smuggling of weapons.

\textsuperscript{79} The leaders of Myanmar have recognized China as their “senior” in their “paukphaw” relationship (which means “cousin”) (Haacke 2006, 28).
For the Chinese leaders, opposing the international intervention imposed on the Myanmar military junta is pragmatic, as such act would only worsen the already complicated situations mentioned above. Concerning the abovementioned issues, the realist thinking logic could have deterred PRC from supporting the imposition of intervention. These issues are out of the category of conventional threat to the national security of the states. Although these issues do not threaten the sovereignty and survival of China, their deterioration will lead to China facing more severe situations and possible spending at a higher price for handling them.

The ethnic minority problems of Myanmar have a long history. The major cause of the conflicts between the central regime and the ethnic minorities is the “divide and rule” policy adopted by rulers in Burma in different historical eras. The number and distribution of the ethnic minority groups also generate the complexity of the relationship between the central regime and the ethnic minorities. In general, the largest resident ethnicity in Myanmar is called Bamar, which is composed of less than 70% of the total population. The rest of the ethnic groups are various ethnic minorities. Although their number is only slightly over 30% of the total population, they occupy more than half of the territory of Myanmar. The Bamar resides in the plain areas in the center of Myanmar, whereas most of the ethnic minorities live in the bordering areas where the major landforms are mountains with lofty ranges. Such differences represented by the diverse living environments between the Bamar and the ethnic minorities have caused disparity in their economic life and social status. Whereas Bamar enjoyed a more advanced
economic and social status, the ethnic minorities were treated as less civilized and were not issued equal status in the political and economic spheres (Zhu 1957, 34).

Historically, the entanglement between the Bamar and the ethnic minorities can be traced back to the 11th century (Liu 1997, 17). There had been conflicts between the ruling Bamar and the ethnic minorities from time to time, but the disputes greatly deteriorated when the British imperialists came and made Burma a province of British India. British colonists recognized the disparity between the Bamar and the ethnic minorities, and they utilized such disparity and adopted the policy of “divide and rule,” which later deepened the future estrangement between the central government and the ethnic minorities. In the process of fighting the British colonialism and struggling for national independence, the Bamar and the ethnic minority groups had once united and successfully established the Republic of the Union of Burma in 1948. However, the temporary unification encountered enormous challenges after Burma became an independent state. Facing the issues of distributing power and interests, conflicts between the Bamar and ethnic minorities inevitably intensified.

Among all the ethnic minorities in Burma, Karen and Shan are the largest two groups composed of about 8% and 7% of the total population, respectively (Wang 1979, 31; Shi 1999, 12). They provoked the anti-government armed conflicts against the ruling

---

80 Burma had not been a united multi-national state led by the Bamar people until 1044. At that time, the relationship between other ethnic minorities and the Bamar was similar to the tribute system. Owing to the geographical futures (the disconnection made by mountains), ancient Burma did not form a centralized government, and thus the central regime controlled by the Barma could hardly expand its authority over the ethnic minorities (Liu 1997, 17).

81 The British colonists ruled the Bamar directly, whereas they ruled the ethnic minorities residing in the mountain areas by controlling the chieftain of the local tribes (Liu 1997, 17).

82 In 1989, the military junta changed the official name of the state to “The Republic of the Union of Myanmar.”
Bamar soon after the independence of Burma (Liu 1997, 18). The central regime represented by U Nu failed to pacify these armed ethnic minorities and only ignited more conflicts with them. The following military regime led by Ne Win adopted even more severe means to fight these armed ethnic minority forces.\textsuperscript{83} The iron fist policy of Ne Win was meant to extirpate the armed ethnic minority forces. However, the policy failed and worsened the conflicts to the extent that the small-scale conflicts almost became a civil war (Shi 1999, 14; Liu 1997, 19-20; Zhong 1978).

The armed conflicts between the Myanmar military junta and the ethnic minorities lasted for 40 years (Liu 1997, 21). The sign of a ceasefire did not show until 1989. The turning point was related to the decline of the Burmese Communist Party. The Burmese Communist Party had been a combination of different ethnic minorities since its establishment. In 1989, the Burmese Communist Party finally dissolved. Four troops led by the formal communist cadres, who were also leaders of four ethnic minority groups, surrendered to the central government.\textsuperscript{84} To pacify these armed ethnic minority groups and recruit them into the domestic political system, the military junta allowed these factions to establish special autonomous administrations in their residences. These ethnic minority groups were also allowed to keep their armed forces. This episode became the

\textsuperscript{83} Before the armed forces of the ethnic minorities were recruited by the central government (beginning in 1989), there were 16 armed ethnic minority forces in Burma.

\textsuperscript{84} The dissolution of the Burmese Communist Party was not an occasional event. Although the leaders of the Burmese Communist Party were Bamar, the party was composed of different minority groups that maintained their own armed forces and regularly defied orders from the Party center. The ethnic minority groups joined the Burmese Communist Party not because they shared the same ideal of realizing socialism or communism but because they fought the same enemy. However, the conflicts of interests, the bias based on different nationalities, and the retarding economic development all ignited the animosity between the leading group and the ethnic minorities in the Burmese Communist Party (Zhong 1978, 60-61; Shi 1999, 15-16). The four branches of the Burmese Communist Party that surrendered to the central government includes Kokang, Wa, Shan, and Kachin.
starting point of armistice between the military junta and the ethnic minorities. Other ethnic minority armed groups followed the pattern established by the 1989 episode and surrendered to the military junta. In 1997, the last anti-government minority armed force, Karen, signed a ceasefire agreement with the central government and accepted the recruitment arranged by the military junta (Liu 1997, 20-21). Henceforth, the long-term conflict between the Myanmar military junta and the armed forces of the ethnic minorities formally proceeded to cessation.

Nevertheless, the final truce achieved in 1997 did not guarantee the realization of perpetual peace and stability in Myanmar. The ethnic minority groups still had troops and armed forces. In addition, they had almost full authority in the autonomous regions where they have been issued the power to build their own administrations. For the military junta, allowing the existence of several highly autonomous ethnic minority divisions was not too far from tolerating separatist forces within the Myanmar territory. After two decades, the pacification policy adopted by the junta since the 1990s might be terminated. There has been a sign indicating that the Myanmar military junta is changing its attitude and policy toward the armed minority divisions. In 2009, the military junta disarmed the autonomous administration of Kokang and recruited it into the central administrative system. The Kokang soldiers resisted and fought back the governmental troops. Thus, a new round of armed conflicts between the military junta and the ethnic minority group began. After the war broke out, more than 10,000 Kokang refugees fled across the border to Yunnan and sought shelter from the Chinese government (Zhu 2009, 29; China Review News 2009b). Beijing immediately sent PLA to the bordering area to handle the
situation and build camps for the Kokang refugees. Beijing was very unhappy about the sudden crisis. The Chinese leaders were upset because the Myanmar military junta did not send advance notification. The international community paid close attention to the event. Some experts suggested that the possible negative effect on the Sino-Myanmar relations due to the Kokang crisis (He 2009).

Despite providing humanitarian aid to the Kokang refugees, China did not intervene in the conflict between the Myanmar military junta and the Kokang troops. While the international community watched China deal with the Kokang crisis, voices emerged from the Chinese domestic internet urging the government to take a strong position against the Myanmar military junta. The reason for such call is straightforward: the Kokang people have shared blood ties with the Chinese. Ethnically, they are of Chinese origin. The major language used in the Kokang autonomous district is Mandarin. The blood and culture Kokang inherited from their Chinese origin stirred sympathy in the domestic society of PRC. Many bloggers criticized the insistence on the non-intervention policy in the Kokang crisis of Beijing (Thompson 2009, 14). However, the official policy of Beijing remained unmoved. From the beginning to the end, PRC had defined the Kokang issue as an internal affair of the Myanmar government, so external forces should not intervene.  

The official stand and policy of PRC were created not only based on the consideration of stability in the bordering area. More importantly, had Beijing intervened

---

85 The attitude of Beijing on the Kokang event can be read from the interview of the formal Chinese ambassador to Myanmar Cheng Ruisheng. According to Cheng, although the Kokang event had caused great damage to life and property of Chinese citizens living in the bordering area and threatened its national security in its frontier, Beijing still defined the event as an internal affair of the Myanmar government, indicating that no external forces should be involved in the event (Wu 2009).
in the Kokang event, it would have faced the danger of being trapped into the endless armed conflicts between the central government of Myanmar and the ethnic minorities. Observers of ethnic minority issues in Myanmar, for example, Wu Sizhen in the Minzu University of China, have indicated that the military junta is adjusting the policy toward the armed ethnic minorities from pacifying to disarming and suppressing. In March 2011, there was another military conflict between the Myanmar central regime and the northern Shan minority armed force. Later in June, the military junta fought with the Kachin. The conflict between the military junta and the Kachin once again disturbed the Southwestern frontier of PRC. The war also damaged the Chinese business and investments in the area. However, Beijing remained on the sidelines and did not intervene in this warfare (Wu 2011). Such inaction reveals two levels of concerns in the policy of China toward Myanmar. First, sharing a border with Myanmar increases the risk of being trapped into the armed conflicts between the central regime in Nay Pyi Taw and the ethnic minorities. Thus, nonintervention is the means to prevent China from being further involved in such a complicated and thorny problem. Second, historical records show that the ethnic minority issues have never been solved by any ruling party in Myanmar. For the Chinese decision makers, as the outsider watching the development of the issue, nonintervention would not help settle the issues, but it would certainly save China from bearing the risk of the worsening the crisis.

**China’s Pursuit of Energy Resources and the Nonintervention Policy**

*Hypothesis 2: If regimes in target states are the major suppliers of raw materials, China will neither initiate nor support intervention.*
Rapid economic development pushed China to seek more sources for raw materials. Among all varieties of raw materials, energy resources are especially significant for PRC. The pursuit of energy resources played a crucial role in making the foreign policy of China. Many experts suggest that China’s need for energy greatly affects the Chinese foreign policy. As Ziegler pointed out, PRC has been standing on the opposite position against the US Middle East policy, as Beijing is in great need of assuring the stability of oil sources provided by the authoritarian regimes in that area (Ziegler 2006, 19). Most targets of international intervention are the authoritarian regimes, which control important sources of energy and raw materials. China is often criticized because of its unwillingness to support intervention that relates to its pursuit of oil and raw materials.

A conventional saying argues that China makes friends with all the dictatorships to secure its sources of energy and raw materials. However, such argument contradicts empirical evidence. The most obvious examples include the policies of China toward Iran and Libya. If China emphasizes the gain of energy resources over other values, neither would it vote in favor of imposing punitive sanctions against Tehran in the Security Council in 2006 and 2008 nor displease Tehran by sharing information with the IAEA about the nuclear program of Iran in 2008 (Lee, Chan, and Chan 2009, 105). If China prioritizes the pursuit of energy, it would have immediately recognized the legitimate

86 David Lampton held a similar argument by claiming that China makes friends with regimes that cannot provide it with energy resources, regardless of the poor human rights record and the violation of international institutions done by the regime in question (quoted by Lee, Chan, and Chan 2009, 102; also see Lampton 2008, 246)
leadership of the Libyan rebels after the former dictator Qaddafi had obviously lost.\(^8\)

Yet, China did not recognize the Libyan rebel force in the first place, even if it would have the chance to damage the interests concerning the Chinese investment in the oil business in Libya (China Review News 2011d).

Accordingly, the consideration of China in opposing the intervention imposed on Myanmar to be driven by its pursuit of energy resources is doubtful. The examples of Iran and Libya prove that the energy factor is not the priority in the foreign policy making of Beijing. In addition, statistic data show that Myanmar is not the major provider of energy resources for China. In fact, Myanmar plays only a small role as a source of external raw materials for China. A more surprising reality revealed in the data shows that Myanmar even relied on China for fuel to support its domestic needs. Moreover, the onshore deposits of crude oil in Myanmar have almost been exhausted in recent years. For example, in 2005, only three of the six newly found oil fields were producing crude oil, and the production of the total oil fields in Myanmar could hardly compete with the standards in the early 1980s (Tin Maung Maung Than 2005, 258).

Production and Supply of Energy Resources in Myanmar

Table 3.1 Crude Oil Production in Myanmar (1980–2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Averag e Production (Thousand Barrels Per Day)</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Change</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^8\) France was the first country that recognized the Libyan rebel regime. London immediately kept pace with Paris and so did the US and many other EU member states. The remote attitude played by China, Russia, and Brazil has caused the Libyan rebel regime to prevent these countries from sharing exploiting rights over its crude oil (Piao 2011).
Myanmar is one of the very rare states that own deposits of crude oil and gas in East Asia. However, as Table 3.1 shows, the crude oil production of Myanmar has greatly reduced since the mid-1980s. The major reasons for the decline of production include exhaustion of deposit in the current oil fields, lack of technology, and funding deficiency due to the unwillingness of the Myanmar government to allow the involvement of foreign enterprises in the exploitation and production process (Gong 2011, 78). The continuing decline of oil production brought the Burmese economic life to a dire situation. In 1988, the Myanmar military junta amended the laws on foreign capital invested in domestic industries. The new policy allows international enterprises to invest in the exploration of new oil fields. The gradual releasing policy of foreign investment was of great help to the oil production. In early 2007, foreign investment on oil exploration in Myanmar reached USD689 million, which is roughly 30% of the direct foreign investment Myanmar received in the same period of time. The production of crude oil has started to increase again since 2006 (ibid., 79).

China is one of the major sources of direct foreign investment in the oil exploration and exploitation of Myanmar. However, the amount of crude oil that Myanmar can supply for China is very limited. As shown in Table 3.2, the major trade partners in the field of China’s imported oil remain to be the countries in the Middle East and Africa. Among these countries, Saudi Arabia, Angola, Iran, and Sudan have been the four major oil suppliers to China. The main trade partner in the exportation of oil (and gas) of Myanmar is not China. In the export of gas, products from two major gas fields,
Yadana and Yegagun, have been shipped to Thailand since the 1990s (Kong 2009, 23).

The other fact, which has reversed conventional thinking, is shown in Table 3.3.

Myanmar is not only unable to supply adequate amount of crude oil to China, but it has also continued to purchase fuel for civilian use from PRC. In other words, the production of energy resources of Myanmar seems to be insufficient for its domestic demands. Predicting that Myanmar can hardly become a crucial supplier of oil for China in the future is fair. Accordingly, that the energy factor can have any influence on the nonintervention policy of China toward Myanmar is impossible.

| Table 3.2 Countries from which China Imports Crude Oil (kg.) (2007–2009) |
|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
*The result of the calculation is actually “4.63348526 × 10⁻⁹,” which is close to zero. **The year 2008 is not the sole case that China did not import crude oil from Myanmar. In 2005 and 2006, China did not import crude oil from Myanmar either.
Another strategic concern: Building pipeline through Myanmar

Although the production of crude oil in Myanmar does not weigh much in the imported energy resources of China, Myanmar’s geopolitical position does possess strategic importance for the energy security of China. Beijing has been seeking Myanmar’s cooperation in building an oil pipeline from the Middle East and Africa to China. If China could build a pipeline through Myanmar and transport oil from the Middle East to Kunming (the capital of Yunnan Province), it would greatly reduce the risk and expense of transporting oil and gas through the sea route. Currently, 80% of China’s imported energy needs to be transported via the Malacca Strait. This way is a high-risk route. Piracy, maritime terrorism, and the threat coming from other great powers (here, the major source of threat for China is the US naval power\footnote{Many reports show that the agreement on allowing US military forces to be stationed in Singapore is about to be reached. If the negotiation process runs well, then the LCS-s “Independence” Littoral Combat Ship will be the first US battleship to gain permanent presence in Singapore. This agreement will increase US influence and control over the Malacca Strait, which is the lifeline of the energy supply of many East Asian countries, including China (Cai and Sun 2011).}) made the Malacca Strait the choke point in the energy security of China (Lee, Chan, and Chan 2009, 103; Gong 2011, 78). In 2007, China won the contract to build the pipeline through Myanmar as it had been urging, with the Myanmar military junta denying the same.
request from India and South Korea. The reason why Myanmar accepted China but declined India and South Korea is that the permanent position of China in the UN Security Council provides the military junta strong protection from international intervention. The Myanmar military junta needs China to stand on its side and shield it from further sanctions and interventions from other great powers. In addition, the military junta has been enthusiastic about constructing a nuclear reactor (under the claim of civilian purpose). China and Pakistan supported such a plan, and thus the Myanmar military regime rewarded PRC for its support and willingly accepted the request of China to build a pipeline (Gong 2011, 80).

The pipeline has been under construction since 2009. The building of the pipeline must have pushed China to stand firmer on maintaining security and stability in the region. China will not want to have any disturbance and will block all potential threats to the stability of the area of the pipeline. How the extent of the concern for pipeline building could shape China’s decision to support or decline intervention remains an open question. If the central regime of Myanmar could no longer handle the balance of its ethnic minority politics or if Myanmar starts to build nuclear weapons and threaten the regional security, with pressure coming from the international community (especially the regional international organization), China might adopt a different attitude toward the issue of intervention. Nevertheless, in the current stage, China will never initiate international intervention on Myanmar, and the proposal of imposing sanctions or military intervention will not gain support from Beijing.
Social Pressure and Unwillingness of China to Support Intervention

Hypothesis 3: If pressure coming from the international community regarding the violation of international institutions committed by target states is not strong enough, China will neither initiate nor support intervention.

Myanmar has been facing condemnation from the international community for the violation of human rights and obstruction of the development of democracy. The US and the European Union (EU) have imposed unilateral sanctions on Myanmar to pressure the military junta to adjust its domestic policy and release its political prisoners, including the Nobel Peace Prize winner Aung San Suu Kyi. Western countries have labeled China as the closest associate of Myanmar. As a rising power, China is expected to take the responsibility of hedging the conduct of the military regime in Myanmar. However, China has not only failed such expectation, but Beijing has even shielded Myanmar from the multilateral condemnation and sanctions of the UN Security Council. Many criticisms have been made to censure the behavior of China as allying the dictatorship and

---

89 The US began to sanction Myanmar in September 1988, after the military junta suppressed the peaceful protest, the so-called 8888 Uprising, by force. In the following years, the US sharpened it sanctions on Myanmar/Burma after the events on the further violation of human rights and democracy conducted by the military regime in Myanmar (Martin 2011, 4).

The first sanctions imposed by the EU on Myanmar were made in 1996. Before 1996, EU had an indefinite attitude toward the Myanmar military junta, although it would cooperate with the US in imposing an embargo during the early 1990s. The cause of change in the attitude of EU occurred when the military junta accused and arrested James Leander Nichols, the Danish consul who also represented Norway, Finland, Sweden, and Switzerland. Nichols was arrested for illegally possessing two facsimile machines and a telephone switchboard. Two months after his imprisonment, Nichols died in jail. The military junta rejected the request of an independent autopsy made by Demark. In October 2006, EU made the first Common Position on Myanmar/Burma and imposed soft sanctions on the Myanmar military junta (Tamen 2003, 28).

In April 2012, EU has decided to suspend the sanctions against Myanmar for one year (Pawlak and Moffett 2012).

90 Aung San Suu Kyi was released from house arrest in November 2010. Before being released, she had been under house arrest for 15 of the past 21 years (McVeigh 2010).
abandoning norms and morality for its national interests (Haacke 2010, 121; Maddox, 2009).

Persuasion and criticism are the major pressures China faces regarding the human rights violations of the Myanmar military junta. The accusation of persuasion mainly came from the officials representing the Western states and criticism from the mass media, which represents public opinion in the international community. Persuasion exercised to give pressure, as discussed in Chapter 2, means to change the mind of the target without the implication of material coercion. Persuasion should bring the effect of creating mental power that makes the target act against his/her conscious wishes. Western mass media often criticizes China for protecting the military regime in Myanmar. Facing such pressure, China has maintained the policy of nonintervention and continued to support and protect the Myanmar military junta. However, to say that Beijing remained unresponsive to the social pressure coming from both the Western states and the international community is not true. Beijing acted under the logic that is obscure to Western observers, as China did respond to the social pressure. PRC has adopted the measure of obliquely involving itself in the dealings of the military junta with the issues in question.

Dealings with the crises that occurred in Myanmar also relate to China’s concern about its relations with the Southeast Asian states, that is, the ASEAN members. The most famous and most controversial principle in the ASEAN Charter is Article 2.2 (e), which states that all ASEAN members should obey the principle of “non-interference in the internal affairs of ASEAN Member States” (Association of Southeast Asian Nations,
China has been trying to avoid being labeled as a rising hegemon in East Asia. Respecting the ASEAN Charter regarding the principle of noninterference is important for Beijing to maintain its image of a peace-oriented, rising great power in the neighboring region. Although ASEAN has gradually lost its standing of shielding authoritarian regimes, such as Myanmar, since the Asian economic crisis occurred in 1997, the responses and behavior of China on the matter remain the focal point. If Beijing decides to intervene or to support the proposal of the Western powers, it may agitate ASEAN states, generate the suspicion on China as pursuing hegemony, and threaten regional security again.

China’s Response to Western Criticism

The reason why the Myanmar military junta was targeted in the Western great powers’ list of intervention is related to its notorious record of human rights violations. China is also targeted by its Western counterparts because Beijing has been shielding the military junta from the UN Security Council. Beijing has received serious criticisms for its nonintervention policy on Myanmar. However, a worse issue was uncovered by the mass media. Some of the former PLA personnel were selling weapons to the Myanmar troops and ethnic minority armed groups (Luard 2006; Haacke 2010, 127). This issue has further damaged the reputation and image that Beijing endeavors to build. The selling of weapons of China to Myanmar has worsened the violation of human rights of the Burmese people. According to BBC News, many experts of Sino-Myanmar relations

---

91 After the Asian economic crisis in 1997, most of the ASEAN member-states were in desperate situations and needed support from the Western world. This phenomenon gave Western institutions the authority to intervene in the politics of the Southeast Asia. For example, concern about EU stopping its economic cooperation with ASEAN states made some ASEAN members (i.e., Thailand and Philippines) try to reject the ASEAN membership of Myanmar (Acharya 1998, 13-14).
believe that “Without Chinese arms supplies, the Burmese army would find it impossible
to operate (the mission of suppressing civilians)” (Luard 2006).

Western counterparts of China have urged it to stop supporting the military
regime in Myanmar. The international pressure reached its climax when the “Saffron
Revolution” occurred in September 2007. The “Saffron Revolution” was a nonviolent
mass protest led by Burmese monks. The Myanmar military junta responded to this mass
movement by suppressing the protesters with machine guns. The bloody suppression
ordered by the Myanmar military regime trapped China into receiving extreme criticism
from the international community. The US, EU, Australia, and some Asian states such as
Indonesia made formal announcements to urge China and India, the two regional powers
considered the closest allies of Myanmar, to pressure the military junta to stop the
atrocities (Bagchi 2007; Indo-Burma News 2007). The vice president of the EU
Parliament Edward McMillan-Scott even suggested that EU should boycott the 2008
Beijing Olympic unless China intervened in Myanmar (Ennis 2007).

However, it seemed that the increasing international pressure caused by the
“Saffron Revolution” in 2007 failed to press China to take responsibility as expected by
the international community. Before the September crisis occurred, China and Russia
jointly vetoed a resolution designed to criticize the poor human rights records of
Myanmar in the UN Security Council (Lynch 2007). In late September 2007, China again
blocked the proposal of condemning Myanmar in the UN Security Council (Lague 2007).
Another barrage of criticisms on the nonintervention policy of China occurred when

---

92 The media also reported that the Bush administration pressured Chinese officials on the Burma issue
during a private conversation (Abramowitz 2007).
cyclone Nargis hit Myanmar and greatly damaged Burmese lives and properties. In May 2008, Nargis hit the Irrawaddy Delta and created a catastrophe in Myanmar. The Burmese civilians were in desperate need of foreign rescue and humanitarian aid. However, the Myanmar military junta rejected the foreign relief materials, denied the visa of international aid workers, and blocked foreign ships from unloading cargos with aid materials in the nearby ports during the first three weeks after being hit by the cyclone. This conduct almost turned a natural disaster into a manmade catastrophe (Paik 2011, 454).

At that time, China was one of the very few states that did not encounter difficulty in getting its aid materials into Myanmar. However, soon after Beijing sent out the first batch of humanitarian aid materials and workers to Myanmar, a serious natural catastrophe happened in its own domain. An earthquake that measured 8.0 on the Richter scale struck Sichuan Province in Southwestern China (Paik 2011, 451). The earthquake made Beijing focus on its own problem and turned China into another humanitarian aid receiver. The Western states urged PRC to push the Myanmar military junta to release the restrictions on receiving humanitarian aid and workers. However, Beijing rejected such request in public. According to the Wall Street Journal, the Human Rights Watch also called on China, India, and the ASEAN to pressure Myanmar to lift the restrictions on accepting the crisis relief materials and personnel. China responded that it would respect “the Myanmar government's decision on whether to open up its borders.” China even blocked the proposal of having the UN humanitarian chief brief the Security Council on
Myanmar, as the Chinese representative explained that the decision of China was meant to avoid over-politicizing the natural disaster issue in Myanmar (Leow 2008).

Although the responses of China to international pressure frustrated Western countries and other East Asian states, which are concerned about the human rights record of and democratic development in Myanmar, experts of East Asian international affairs agree that working and communicating with China is crucial for the international community (Indo-Burma News 2007). The conduct of China regarding the Myanmar issues in the UN Security Council seems to stand firm on its policy of nonintervention. However, social pressure has wielded a certain influence on the behavior of China, but even the effect is not as apparent as expected by the Western states. One piece of evidence showing the effect of international pressure is the mediation of Beijing with the Myanmar military junta. Before the September 2007 demonstration, Myanmar Foreign Minister U Nyan Win met with the PRC State Councilor Tang Jiaxuan. Tang expressed China’s desire for Myanmar to restore its domestic stability right away. The military junta remaining calm at the beginning of the Saffron Revolution is attributed to its fear of PRC (Li and Zheng 2009, 635). In addition, although China blocked the proposal of imposing multilateral sanctions on Myanmar, it supported the UN Security Council statement of strong opposition against the Myanmar military junta suppressing the nonviolent protest. Other than that, China acquiesced in the passing of a condemnatory resolution made in the UN Human Rights Council (Kleine-Ahlbrandt and Small 2008, 44).
The other crucial evidence showing the influence of social pressure on the policy of China toward Myanmar is China mediating in favor of the Myanmar military junta accepting the visit of UN special envoy Ibrahim Gambari. In November 2007, China sent its special envoy Wang Yi to visit Myanmar. Wang’s mission was to encourage the military junta to accept the visit of Gambari. According to Wang:

China, meanwhile, will continue to support the mediation efforts of the UN secretary general and his special adviser, Mr. Gambari. It is China’s sincere hope that political stability, economic development and tranquility would be achieved in Myanmar (Kyodo Yangon 2007).

China successfully made the junta grant Gambari access to meet with the senior generals and the leader of the opposition party Aung San Suu Kyi. After the trip to Myanmar, Gambari praised the role of China in the process of negotiation and the conduct of Beijing regarding the crisis management on the Myanmar issue (He and Li 2009; Kleine-Ahlbrandt and Small 2008, 44). The sending of Wang Yi to pressure the Myanmar military junta also gained positive comments from the UK (Li and Zheng 2009, 635).

In sum, China successfully played the role of mediator between UN and the Myanmar military junta in the aftermath of the Saffron Revolution. Although Beijing stood firm on its opposition to the proposal of intervention and sanctions imposed on Myanmar, China still responded to the international pressure by adopting the mild form of interference (or involvement as per the Chinese official terminology) in the dispute between Myanmar and the outside world. This response may not be sufficient in the eyes of the West. However, it still proves that social pressure, which was imposed on China
through persuasion and criticism, did have some impact. Clearly, international pressure does not weigh enough to force PRC to change its nonintervention attitude.

Another Source of Social Pressure: ASEAN and the Principle of Nonintervention

Although some ASEAN member states have announced that ASEAN will not shield Myanmar from condemnation and sanctions imposed by the UN, there has never been consent made by all ASEAN members to support the Security Council’s action of targeting Myanmar. As Tonkin observed, the case of Myanmar is not like other pariah states, for example, Sierra Leone, Afghanistan, Yemen, Haiti, Rwanda, Liberia, and Cambodia, whose neighboring states and regional organizations made a collective representation and entrusted the UN Security Council to take action. The ASEAN and its member states never made any representation on the case of Myanmar, and it did not define the thorny Myanmar regime as a “threat to peace” of the region (Tokin 2007). Facing the Myanmar issue, the ASEAN seems to agree that the principle of noninterference is still the priority guideline.

The collective attitude of the ASEAN is consistent with the policy of China toward Myanmar. The principle of noninterference in the internal affairs of the ASEAN Charters has formed the counter force against the appeal made by the Western countries. This counter force supports the PRC nonintervention policy toward Myanmar. Nevertheless, the wariness of the Southeast Asian states regarding the rise of China to the position of the regional great power has pressured Beijing to deal with the Myanmar issue. The conduct of the Myanmar military junta contradicted the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR), which took effect in July
2009 (Arendshorst 2009, 102). Nevertheless, the Southeast Asian states would not be willing to have intervention in Myanmar through the use of force of any great power. As China has been concerned about its image in the region, supporting the intervention would only worsen its exertion of image building. Beijing has been sensitive to its image in front of its Southeast Asian neighbors. Evidence has been shown indirectly in the public announcement of China regarding its Myanmar policy. For example, in one of its explanatory statements on why PRC utilized its veto power in the UN Security Council, Chinese representative Wang Guangya reaffirmed that Myanmar has not posed a threat to regional peace and security. He also stressed that China would always support the ASEAN policy and its status as the leading international organization on the Myanmar issue. In other words, the collective attitude and policy of the ASEAN member states on the Myanmar crises influenced the response of China to the international appeal for intervention. If the ASEAN changes its attitude toward the guiding principle of noninterference on the ASEAN Charter, then the possibility of China being forced to readjust its policy of nonintervention toward Myanmar will increase.

Dilemma of the Chinese “Guanxi” with Myanmar and the Chinese Nonintervention Policy

_Hypothesis 4: If the relationship between PRC and the regimes in the target states is not weakened, China will neither initiate nor support intervention._

Myanmar (Burma) is the first non-socialist state that recognized the PRC in 1949. Myanmar is also the first state in its neighboring area with which China had peacefully

---

93 The full copy of Wang’s statement is available in the website of the Permanent Mission of the People’s Republic of China to the UN: http://www.china-un.org/eng/xw/t288676.htm.
solved the border disputes. This historical fact has made Myanmar a special neighbor of
the PRC. Myanmar has named China and the Chinese people “baobo” or “paukphaw,”
which means brothers or cousins, respectively (Wang 1979, 71; Haacke 2006, 28); these
Burmese terms show the close relationship between the two nations. However, the
relationship between Myanmar and China is not always as smooth as the terminology
represents. In fact, when the two states established diplomatic relations in 1950\(^\text{94}\), the
atmosphere between Beijing and Yangon was lukewarm. Change did not come until
1954. The remote atmosphere between China and Burma started to warm up when the
leaders of the two states began their frequent exchange visits (Fan 2008b, 38).

According to historical records, the relation of China with the two recent regimes
(the elected government led by Thein Sein and the former military junta led by Than
Shwe) is not based on the personal connection between the leaders. The relationship is
built on long-term historical ties and the accumulated interactions between China and
Myanmar. If China subscribed to realism, the factor of guanxi would not have shaped the
policy of China toward Myanmar. In addition, if PRC considered the gain of material
interests more than did the others, Beijing would not have supported Myanmar at the
expense of its relations with the Western great powers, which almost led to its ban from
the 2008 Beijing Olympics. However, when facing the inquiry on China’s insistence on

\(^{94}\) Burma had sent its foreign minister to inform PRC that Burma had officially recognized the new regime
of China in December 1949. However, Beijing replied that, to establish diplomatic relationship, Burma
must send representatives to Beijing and undergo a negotiation process. The response of PRC was viewed
as cold and unfriendly. However, the conduct of Beijing at that time was due to the special historical
context. PRC presumed that a state should promise that it would cut off relationships with ROC (Republic
of China, led by KMT) and recognize PRC as the only legal regime representing China. Only then would a
formal relationship with PRC could be established. This reason is why CCP insisted that a negotiation was
necessary between China and Burma. The formal relationship between them was not established until June
1950 (Fan 2008a, 136–137).
its nonintervention toward Myanmar, the Chinese official statement and the Chinese scholars always addressed the long-term relationship between the two states and the special position of Myanmar as the first non-socialist regime, which recognized PRC in the early years after its establishment (Wang 1979; He and Li 2009; Tian 2009).

Rise and Fall of the Sino-Burmese Relations: From the 1950s to the Early 1980s

Several reasons contributed to the lukewarm interaction between PRC and Myanmar. First, there were strong suspicions between the two regimes. Neighboring with such a vast and strong communist state, the Burmese leaders always had doubts about the intention and behavior of China. Second, from the perspective of Beijing, the democratic regime in Burma made befriended Western imperialists. PRC was concerned that Burma might become a spy supported by the US. Moreover, there had been issues on the dual-nationality of the Chinese diaspora in Burma. The Burmese suspected that PRC might utilize the Chinese diaspora to get involved and intervene in the domestic politics of Burma. Third, the unsolved border disputes also made Burma anxious about the intention of China. In addition, since the early 1950s, KMT troops were still in place in Burma. These troops provoked armed conflicts in the border shared by Burma and China. The remaining KMT troops caused a rift between the two states in the early stage of their relationship, as Burma was concerned that PRC might use it as an excuse for invasion (Fan 2007, 60).

The concern of Myanmar (Burma) about being invaded by China was not groundless. In Burmese history, imperial China invaded Burma twice. The first time was in the 12th century. Burma was invaded and occupied by the Mongolian army, and it later
became part of the Mongol Empire, also known as the Yuan dynasty in China. The second invasion occurred in 1765. The army of the Qing dynasty attacked but failed to conquer Burma. As a result of the war, both sides signed a peace agreement and restored their relationship. Since then, Burma had been exchanging ambassadors with China and paying tributes to Beijing until the British colonized it in the early 19th century. Although the past invasions from China were led by non-Han regimes, the history of imperial China could not be erased, and its shadow remained in the minds of the Burmese leaders (Fan 2008a, 139).

The Chinese diaspora and the remaining KMT troops contributed to the complexity of Sino-Burmese relations. There have been a great number of Chinese immigrants all over the Southeast Asia since the end of the Ming dynasty. Chinese immigrants left their home country for diverse reasons. Economic reasons are the most common impetus for emigration from China (Xiao 1985). During the Cold War era, host states suspected Chinese migrants to be spies and reporters for Communist China to infiltrate and expand its influence on Southeast Asia. Rumors proliferated that the Chinese diaspora was the “fifth column” of PRC or those who maintained dual-nationalities to maintain their loyalty to Beijing. Burma was also under such suspicion, and the distrust toward the Chinese immigrants deepened the rift in Sino-Burmese relations. In addition, thousands of KMT soldiers fled to Northern Burma after the CCP won the civil war in 1949. Burmese president U Nu worried about PRC using the remaining KMT troops as an excuse to invade Burma (Tian 2009). Suspicions as such kept the Sino-Burmese relations remote in the early 1950s.
The icebreaker of the cold relations between China and Burma was the visit of Zhou Enlai to Yangon in 1956 (Fan 2007, 62). Since the first visit of Zhou Enlai, frequent exchange visits had occurred between the leaders of the two regimes. Zhou Enlai visited Burma eight times, and Burmese leaders U Nu and Ne Win visited China more than five times. The frequent exchange visits contributed to a more profound mutual understanding and the improvement of the confidence-building relationship between China and Burma. During the period when Sino-Burmese relations remained ardent, Burma showed loyalty to PRC. For instance, after the Korean War broke out and the UN decided to sanction PRC in the 1950s, Burma opposed the UN proposal, which defined China as an “aggressor.” Burma even abstained from the voting process for imposing sanctions on PRC (Fan 2008a, 139).

Moreover, when the Western league, led by the US, was materializing the strategy of containment on China, Yangon agreed to open a new international air route for PRC to connect with the outside world (Kunming was the departure location on the Chinese side). Thus, Burma made itself breach the containment policy. Yangon even exported rubber, which was one of the UN embargo items, to China, regardless of the opposition from the Western community. The increasing confidence between the two regimes finally led to Burma’s acceptance of the PLA in its territory for fighting the remaining KMT troops. The cooperation between China and Burma led the PLA to force the remaining KMT troops to retreat from Burma successfully (Fan 2008b, 38-39).

China repaid the friendship with Burma by giving up most of the disputed territory. In addition, PRC supported the regimes in Burma (and later Myanmar) and
shielded Burma from being imposed an intervention. To convince Burmese leaders that China had no intention of interfering in its internal affairs, Zhou Enlai encouraged Chinese immigrants to abandon their Chinese nationality and apply for Burmese citizenship when he visited Yangon in 1956 (Fan 2007, 60-61; 2008a, 38-39). Although the Chinese leaders maintained a good personal relationship with U Nu, Beijing immediately sent its recognition when Ne Win overturned the U Nu regime in 1962. After taking over the office, Ne Win carried out the “Burmese Road to Socialism” project, which was a combined policy of nationalizing private property and ensuring the independence of Burma. The nationalization project prioritized the promotion of Burmese nationalism and deepened the already existing xenophobia. PRC dissented from the ambition of Ne Win, but it did not express its opposition publicly. The nationalization policy of Ne Win also focused on nationalizing privately owned banks, including those owned by PRC. China not only gave up the compensation provided by Burma but also voluntarily transferred two more Chinese banks to Burma. Moreover, in the 1950s and early 1960s, Beijing imported rice produced by Burma, as Yangon had requested China to do, regardless of the fact that China itself was a major exporter of rice in that era (Fan 2008b).

However, since the mid-1960s, the relationship between China and Burma started to degenerate. The major causes of this change, as Fan analyzed, were attributed to the following historical events: the Cultural Revolution and left-leaning policy on the Chinese side and the extreme nationalization policy and exclusionism in Burma. The left-leaning policy led Beijing to increase its support to the Burmese Communist Party, which
was the main rival in both the democratic and the military regimes in Yangon. The crucial event that hastened the degeneration of the Sino-Burmese relationship was the 15th National Day celebration of PRC in 1964. Beijing published the felicitations sent by the Burmese Communists to *the People’s Daily*, translated the content into English and Burmese, and made it known to the public. Such conduct infuriated Yangon. Immediately Burma shut down China’s consulates in Mandalay and Lashio. PRC was frustrated by Burma regarding its Vietnam policy. Beijing was working on gaining support from Burma on the Chinese position in the Vietnam War. Nevertheless, Burma did not join the anti-US camp with PRC, and Yangon did not agree with condemning the US in waging war against Vietnam. The cold response of Burma upset China and worsened their already shaky relations (Fan 2008b, 42–43).

When the Cultural Revolution began in 1966, the Sino-Burmese relationship became worse. There were reports that Burmese soldiers and aircrafts intruded into Yunnan Province and provoked armed conflicts with Chinese civilians. The Ne Win regime recognized the intrusion and responded to the complaint by ordering the troops to retreat (Fan 2008b, 43). The Sino-Burmese relations reached the bottom point during the Cultural Revolution. China used the mass media to spread the propaganda of Maoism in Burma. This propaganda tried to incite a revolution, which stepped on the Burmese regime that emphasized exclusionism and anti-foreignism. An incident occurred that proved the tension between the two sides in that era. Influenced by the Maoist propaganda, a group of young ethnic Chinese students started to pin badges representing Maoism on their shirts and wore them to the schools in Burma. The Ne Win regime raged
about the spreading propaganda of Beijing and the supportive behavior of the ethnic Chinese students. This incident resulted in intensifying the anti-Chinese movement in Burma. Inevitably, it deepened the rift between China and Burma (Van Ness 1970, 225-226; Fan 2008b, 42-43). The worst event occurred in 1969 when Yangon delivered the note terminating the mutual non-aggression pact with PRC. However, the termination of the pact did not last, as it was revived in the early 1970s when the Sino-Burmese relations increasingly recovered (Liu 2001, 326).

Elaborate Guanxi Process: Sino-Burmese Relations After the 1980s

Among all the Chinese leaders, Zhou Enlai could be the only figure who maintained a good personal relationship with the Burmese heads of state, including U Nu and Ne Win. However, the personal ties were never the concern of China in its relationship with Myanmar. China always sent recognition to the succeeding regimes regardless of the regime types and the process of power transference. The end of the Cultural Revolution and the readjustment of the Chinese foreign policy improved the Sino-Burmese relations. After the two states signed a cross-border trade agreement in 1988, their relationship greatly progressed (Haacke 2006, 26).

Although the Sino-Burmese relation had gradually improved since the 1970s, this improvement did not mean that Sino-phobia had dissolved in Myanmar. Egreteau (2008, 63-68) pointed out that xenophobia and the nationalization policy kept the Burmese

---

95 According to Chinese ambassador Ruisheng Cheng, the personal relationship between Zhou Enlai and Ne Win was even better. When Zhou Enlai passed away, Ne Win not only sent his condolences but also requested to attend the funeral. At that time, Beijing did not allow foreign representatives to participate in the funeral of national leaders, and thus Ne Win’s request was turned down. In the end of the same year (1976), the widow of Zhou, Deng Yingchao, visited Burma. Ne Win treated her with the highest custom given to a head of state; this conduct was done to show how Ne Win cherished his friendship with Zhou Enlai (People’s Daily 2009).
political figures and the whole society alert to external influence, and the relationship with China was of no exception. Accordingly, the turning of Myanmar into an ally of China was for strategic reasons. PRC clearly caught on this. Since the Burmese military junta took over the leadership, the bloody suppressions of the civilians and the violation of human rights resulted in severe international condemnation. The 1988 turmoil even led the US to sanction Myanmar and the EU a few years later. The Western states had been trying to target the Myanmar military junta in the UN Security Council agenda. Such reality had made maintaining a good relationship with China necessary for the junta, as China was the most powerful figure that could provide the shield for Myanmar in the UN Security Council.

China became an important source for the regime in Myanmar to gain both political and economic support. Nevertheless, assuming that Myanmar became a client state of China is incorrect. A significant reality must be realized: Myanmar has been balancing its relationships with China, India, and other Southeast Asian countries. Since the early 1990s, India has gradually readjusted its policy toward Myanmar. Although the Myanmar policy of Beijing does not include much concern about India, New Delhi views China as a crucial competitor as regards its relationship with Myanmar (Egreteau 2008). The Burmese military junta caught the vigilance of India, which skillfully utilized the tension to prevent too much influence from the Chinese side (ibid.).

---

96 In 2008, the vice chairman of the SLORC (the regime of the military junta) was sent to New Delhi to persuade India to oppose the proposal of imposing international sanctions on Myanmar. Myanmar also has a good relationship with Japan. Japan has been one of the crucial aid providers that help Myanmar improve its domestic infrastructure (Lee, Chan, and Chan 2009, 108-109). China is not the only provider of weapons to Myanmar. Myanmar also purchases weapons from India, Pakistan, and North Korea (Li and Lye 2009, 267).
From the Chinese point of view, Myanmar’s relation with India is not the major concern for its policy making. The weight-bearing point is still the relation of China with Myanmar. For PRC, Myanmar/Burma has been a nation located in its periphery for centuries. Traditionally the two states interacted (under the tribute system) more frequently than did other states. Moreover, China and Burma struggled together to fight the imperialists in the colonial period and in the Second World War (against the invasion of Japan). China should have been the major character that shares the closest relationship with Myanmar. However, apparently, Myanmar does not share a similar perspective. For such reasons, PRC has been elaborating the guanxi with Myanmar. The goal is to make the relationship more advanced by giving more effort. Except in the era when the Chinese foreign policy was extremely left-leaning, Beijing did not adopt a hostile attitude toward Myanmar. As a matter of course, China did not easily deflect the “Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence” announced by both China and Burma in 1954.

As regards the influence of the US on Southeast Asia, PRC has been elaborating on its guanxi with the ASEAN nations not only for its strategic needs but also for its face and status as a regional power. Compared with the US, China should have closer ties with the Southeast Asian states. To prevent the possibility of the US executing the containment policy on China again, Beijing needs to maintain good relationships with the Southeast Asian states. The relationship with Myanmar is especially important. Not only did Burma stand on the Chinese side when the US imposed a containment policy on China in the 1950s, Burma was also the first non-socialist regime among the Southeast Asian states that recognized PRC in 1950. If the guanxi with Myanmar degenerates again
and Nay Pyi Taw becomes friendly with the West, then it should be disadvantageous to
the position of Beijing in the region. Thus, insisting on the nonintervention policy and
maintaining good relations with the regime in Nay Pyi Taw will remain the main theme
in China’s policy toward Myanmar in the future.

Evaluation of the Regime Ability and China’s Nonintervention Policy toward
Myanmar

*Hypothesis 5: If the regime of the target states remains in strong control of
domestic affairs, China will neither initiate nor support intervention.*

The complicated ethnic minority problem has made Myanmar a state with a high
potential for upheaval. The central government in Nay Pyi Taw faces the challenge of
ruling the type of state composed by roughly 10 different ethnicities. Ten different
ethnicities mean 10 different dialects used and 10 diverse customs practiced in one
nation. Thus, disparity and misunderstanding are difficult to prevent. Among these
different ethnicities, the Bamar people comprise the major population and rule seven
provinces in Myanmar. Different ethnic minority groups with their own armed forces and
administrations rule the rest of the territory. The Burmese military junta had adopted the
policy of reconciliation to pacify the armed ethnic minorities since 1989. Nevertheless,
the Kokang event in 2009 indicates that the policy of pacification may have already
terminated. Facing the intricate ethnic minority problem in Myanmar, China has been
more cautious in evaluating the trend of events. Supporting the military junta and the
current regime has been the consistent policy of the Chinese leaders. The ability of the
Myanmar central regime to handle the disputes and maintain internal stability contributes to the main criteria used by PRC to judge if nonintervention is workable.

The other crucial factor that confirms the decision of China to support the military regime in Myanmar is the attitude of the ASEAN and its member states. Owing to the different political ideologies and various regime types among the ASEAN members, critiques have been made by individual member states (e.g., Thailand and Philippine) on the conduct of the Burmese military junta in violating human rights and obstructing the development of democracy. However, the collective body of the ASEAN has never labeled the human rights issue in Myanmar as a threat to regional security and stability. In contrast, in 2003, the Secretary-General of ASEAN, Ong Keng Yong, warned the Western great powers and called upon them to be more cautious about the Myanmar issue. Ong stressed that Myanmar is the state facing extremely complicated ethnic minority conflicts; Myanmar could easily become another Yugoslavia with worse conditions if hasty decisions were made and premature actions were taken. He emphasized that Myanmar, other ASEAN members, and neighboring countries could not afford the price of reckless policy (Long 2003). Moreover, China shared the same view as that of ASEAN. The newly elected Myanmar regime supported by the formal military junta gained tacit recognition from ASEAN. The recognition of the regime indicates that ASEAN agrees that the new regime is capable of handling the internal balance and stability. Thus, China supporting the proposal of intervention imposed on Myanmar is less possible in the future.
Capability of the Regime: Domestic Upheavals in Myanmar

For China, the problem of the armed ethnic minorities in Myanmar is not simply the confrontation with the central government and the resulting effect on the stability in the border area with China. The complication entangled with the ethnic minority issues includes drug smuggling, spread of the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV; the cause of AIDS), and human trafficking. These issues belong to the category of nonconventional security, which China has increasingly paid attention to and tried to find solutions since the late 80s. To date, cooperation with the central regime of Myanmar has been the major approach of PRC to control the abovementioned problems. China has supported the action of the Myanmar military regime in eliminating drug trafficking. Since 1990, Chinese soldiers have been ordered to fight Burmese drug dealers. Moreover, to control the drug issues effectively and to convince the Myanmar central government to cooperate with them, PRC has promised that it would never give official recognition to any armed ethnic minority group in Myanmar, regardless of their blood ties with the Chinese people (Li and Lye 2009, 263).

The root of the drug-smuggling problem in Myanmar is the extreme economic inequality between the Barma people, who reside in fertile lands, and the ethnic minorities, who live in the barren periphery. The limitation on the living environment and the estrangement from the central regime have led the ethnic minorities to develop a specific economy for sustained living, which consists of growing the opium poppies and running a drug industry. A great portion of the ethnic minority troops is supported and led

---

97 China issued the “Regulations on Specific Policies towards Myanmar’s Armed Ethnic Minority Groups” in 1990 and assured that it would give no “political recognition, military support or economic assistance” to the armed ethnic minority groups (Li and Lye 2009, 263).
by the armed drug clans. Many of the famous ethnic minority leaders were, in fact, drug
kingpins who were on the criminal list and targeted by the Myanmar central
government.\footnote{For instance, the leader of the United Force of Shan, Kun Sha, and the leader of Kokang, Jiaxin Peng, are famous drug kingpins; the former was even put in jail by the central regime (Liu 1997, 19; Lin 1992, 40).} In 1973, the central government of Myanmar adopted the strategy of
cooperating with foreign aids to wage war against these drug dealers and eliminate the
ethnic minority armed forces at the same time. Countries that assisted Yangon on purging
drug trafficking included the US, Japan, Singapore, and Hong Kong (Mu 1995, 46).
However, the result was not positive. Owing to the extreme nationalization policy and the
spreading xenophobia in Myanmar, the central regime was not willing to rely much on
foreign forces to fight the drug war. In addition, the central regime fought the drug war
for political purposes. They cared more about eliminating the armed ethnic minority
groups than solving the problem of drug smuggling. The economic inequality in the
Burmese society did not gain solution and the effort to control the drug smuggling

In 1988, Western states sanctioned Myanmar, which resulted in the discontinuing
of the aid provided to Yangon for the fight against drug dealers. Losing foreign aid to
support efforts against drug trafficking almost negated previous efforts. What worsened
the already bad situation was the pacification policy the central government of Myanmar
adopted to recruit the armed ethnic minorities. In 1989, to pacify the armed minority
forces and to build the autonomous states, the Myanmar military junta agreed to
legitimize all types of economic activities in the ethnic minority residences, including
planting opium poppies and producing drugs (Mu 1995, 45).
China suffered from the spread of drug smuggling in Yunnan Province and the increasing number of Chinese population infected with AIDS.\(^{99}\) Although China made the assurance that it would not recognize the ethnic minority groups, it allowed exceptions and permitted both the Chinese officials and enterprises to cooperate with the “local authorities” in certain projects (Li and Lye 2009, 263). China utilized such exception to support the economic reform adopted by the Myanmar ethnic minorities residing in the bordering areas. Since 1992, with the aid provided by Yunnan Province, the state of Shan has successfully transformed from a drug producer into a rice exporter. This achievement gained China and Myanmar praises from the international community and the UN (Shi 1999, 16–17). China planned to expand the experience of the Shan state to other ethnic minority residences in Myanmar, and the central government agreed to support the plan (Reuters 2008).

The previous account reveals the attitude of China in dealing with critical issues in Myanmar. Whereas the US government adopted sanctions as solutions to push the central regime of Myanmar to work harder on the drug war,\(^{100}\) PRC applied a different strategy to make Myanmar cooperate on the issue. Based on experience, China cooperated with the central regime in Myanmar and provided them sufficient support so both countries could eliminate drug trafficking. From the Chinese perspective, the US way of sanctioning Myanmar is not only futile but also disturbs the existing programs and damages the already gained improvement. Based on China’s evaluation, the central

---

\(^{99}\) Around 80% of the cases of AIDS and HIV in China could be traced back to drug trafficking in Myanmar (Arendshorst 2009, 106).

\(^{100}\) In September 2011, the Obama Administration announced the possibility of imposing further sanction on Myanmar for its lack of substantial effort on fighting the spread of drug trafficking in the past year (Voice of America 2011).
government in Nay Pyi Taw is the only regime relatively capable of handling the ethnic minority disputes and other related problems, including drug trafficking and spreading of HIV. According to the viewpoints of Chinese scholars on Sino-Burmese relations, the measurement adopted by the Myanmar military junta to solve the abovementioned issues can be labeled as a specific type of social and economic reform probably suited to Myanmar only (He and Li 2009; Fan 2008a & 2008b; Shih 1999). This measurement was designed to transform Myanmar into a modern state based on very pendulous and complicated conditions characterized by long-term political confrontations and economic entanglements. Moreover, the failure of the U Nu administration in the 1960s and the following social turmoil proved that the Western style of democracy might not be a good choice for a state with multiple ethnic minority issues like Myanmar. China caught on this fact and confirmed the nonintervention policy toward Myanmar.

Attitude of Other States in the Region: ASEAN’s Concern

The principle of noninterference in the ASEAN Charter has been criticized to neglect the value of human rights. In 2009, ASEAN states eventually made the joint declaration of AICHR. This commission did not reject the participation of Myanmar; thus, Nay Pyi Taw had a representative in the AICHR. The ASEAN decision of allowing Myanmar to take part in the AICHR is consistent with its policy of “constructive engagement” with Myanmar. Note the announcement made by the Chair of the AICHR: “the mission of the AICHR in current stage is to ‘promote’ human rights, not ‘protect’ human rights” (Arendshorst 2009, 113–114). This announcement indicates great

---

101 The content of the press release by the AICHR can be found on the ASEAN official website: http://www.asean.org/22769.htm
flexibility for the ASEAN to include Myanmar into the AICHR, regardless of the severe criticism and disdain coming from the international community.

The goal of ASEAN’s “constructive engagement” with Myanmar is to transform gradually the central regime in Myanmar into a more liberal and open state. ASEAN disagrees with the Western approach of isolating Myanmar and applying coercive means. The former president of the Philippines, Gloria Arroyo, described “constructive engagement” as the Asian Way of improving Myanmar. The ASEAN policy of “constructive engagement” is based on the principle of noninterference in the ASEAN Charter. The dealings of ASEAN with Myanmar encountered great pressure from the West. Considering the political culture and historical background of Southeast Asia, ASEAN has been insisting on the “constructive engagement” policy. More importantly, ASEAN has held great concern about the intricate ethnic minority problems in Myanmar. The stability of the Burmese domestic situation has formed the prior condition for ensuring regional security.

PRC has consented to the policy of “constructive engagement” with Myanmar. As ASEAN has recognized the legitimacy and ability of the regimes in Nay Pyi Taw, China would certainly give its full support. The current situation in Myanmar shows that there is no reason for China to support the proposal of intervention or sanctions. The possibility of counter behavior from China might occur only if there was chaos from the vacancy of authority in Myanmar. The following humanitarian crises caused by the collapse of the central regime in Nay Pyi Taw, such as the unmanageable number of refugees, spread of diseases, and intensified ethnic minority conflicts, will force China to adopt a different

102 See the news release on the ASEAN official website: http://www.asean.org/afp/78.htm
approach. However, such phenomena will be too difficult for any of the neighboring
countries of Myanmar to handle and solve.

**Chinese Perception on the Myanmar Issue**

*Hypothesis 6: If PRC perceives that the non-coercive means are still functional for dealing with the target states, China will neither initiate nor support intervention.*

From the point of view of China, the conduct of the Myanmar military junta is not
a threat to international security; hence, the imposition of intervention will not be
legitimate. The 2007 crisis made China act as a mediator between Myanmar and the UN.
If China had subscribed to realism, it would have taken a more active role in the
Myanmar issue and expanded its influence in the process. Clearly, Beijing would not
adopt an active response unless there was turmoil happening and the outcome might spill
over the Burmese boundaries, and its relationship with Myanmar was turning toward the
direction against its expectation. With the exception of these two circumstances, Beijing
remains in the position that transformations on national reconciliation, democratization,
and economic development should be decided and completed by the Burmese people, not
by the imposition of foreign forces.\(^\text{103}\)

While insisting on the nonintervention policy, PRC maintained its provision of
humanitarian aid and economic investment to assist Myanmar to maintain stability and
undergo domestic reforms. Hak Yin Li and Yongnian Zheng described such acts as a soft
manner action applied by China to wield its influence on the domestic politics of
Myanmar. The soft manner action is an alternative to Western intervention. This action

\(^{103}\) Beijing let its representative to the UN Wang Guangya express such stance once in 2007. The Chinese premier Wen Jiabao reemphasized the same position when he visited Singapore at the end of the same year (Du 2007).
includes cross-border cooperation focusing on eliminating drug trafficking, purging gambling in the bordering area, and diplomatic intervention, such as encouraging Myanmar to break international isolation, pushing it to accept the deal of exporting rice to North Korea, persuading the military junta to remain calm in the 2007 demonstration, and pressuring Myanmar to agree to the visit of the UN special envoy Gambari (Li and Zheng 2009, 633–635).

In describing China’s “softer manner” action as an alternative of intervention, Li and Zheng may have adopted a broad definition of intervention. However, the term “intervention” cannot be accepted according to the Chinese official attitude. As the Chinese scholar Wang Yizhou indicated, “intervention (ganshe)” is still a politically incorrect term in China. He used “involvement” to describe the policy of China in target states of international intervention. Involvement can better describe how China defines its dealing with the social pressure coming from the international society while taking care of the Sino-Burmese relationship at the time when the appeal for intervention in Myanmar was at its height. For PRC, to be involved in the Myanmar issue is to take a non-coercive measure to solve the dispute. Thus, sending a special envoy and playing the mediator role are the consistent themes in its nonintervention attitude toward Myanmar.

104 Wang’s book published in 2011 was entitled “Creative Involvement: A New Direction in China’s Diplomacy.” When asked about the difference between “creative involvement” and the Western style of intervention, Wang explained that the Chinese creative involvement in the crises that occurred in the domains of other states emphasizes the necessity of UN authorization and recognition. Moreover, creative involvement insists respecting the dignity and sovereign rights of the target states. Wang Yizhou argued that the creative involvement in international crisis should focus on autonomous actions and the consistent engagement of China with the target regimes. This definition is how he differentiates the Chinese style of intervention from the Western way of coercive intervention (Wang 2011). The details of Wang’s interview on the concept of “creative involvement” can be found here: http://big5.xinhuanet.com/gate/big5/news.xinhuanet.com/herald/2011-12/20/c_131308349.htm.
Factors Benefiting the Choice of Non-Coercive Means

Based on the record of the responses of China to the crises in Myanmar, pragmatic thinking led PRC to insist on the policy of noninterference. Considering the security and stability in the bordering areas and the construction of a pipeline for transporting oil through Myanmar, it is reasonable for PRC to oppose the application of coercive means against Myanmar. However, the decisive factors shaping the decision making of China more are the Chinese perspective of the matter and China’s relationship with the target regime. Stability and peace in the bordering area are not always prioritized in the Chinese foreign policy; otherwise, the PRC would have adopted a more forbearing attitude on the disputes in the region. Take the examples of the South China Sea and the Senkaku Islands (Diaoyutai) disputes. China took a strong position on these two disputes, causing the emergence of the “China Threat” again. The Sino-Burmese relations in the second half of the 1960s also illustrate the argument. In short, whether China takes an active action on issues related to other domains is less shaped by material conditions than by Chinese perception and interpretation.

As regards the armed conflicts between the military junta and the Kokang troops, China only expressed its concern with a frown when the military clashes caused a huge number of refugees to flee across the Sino-Burmese borders in 2009. PRC has avoided becoming involved in the ethnic minority affairs in Myanmar. China did not intervene in the grand-scale anti-Chinese movement consciously mobilized by the Burmese central regime in the late 1960s, even though the Sino-Burmese relationship before the late 1970s had greatly degenerated, and intervention under the excuse of rescuing the Chinese
diaspora would have been valid. Unless China perceived the seriousness of the event that could probably exacerbate the occurrence and spread of chaos, Beijing would not support the use of coercion on a state that shares a warm and long-term relationship with PRC.

The violent repression of the military junta on the demonstration in 2007 did not cause a spillover effect on China. However, the aftermath led to enormous international pressure pushing China to respond actively. Under this great international pressure, China still provided support to the military regime and negated the proposal of intervention.

The capability of the central regime in the target state remains a crucial standard for the PRC to determine its attitude toward international intervention. As the military junta and the current elected regime are capable of maintaining internal stability, weakening the power of the central regime with humanitarian excuses is not reasonable. In the Chinese political thought, the change in regime should be processed by the people who rule and are ruled. In the event that the central regime remains powerful in dominating the domestic unrest, and at a time when international pressure is so strong that China must respond, China could provide suggestions to all parties involved in the disputes and make connections for future negotiations. This action is the specific management action of China to negate the call for intervention. It is also the important design in the policy of “involvement.” In short, China playing the role of mediator and host of the negotiation process (by persuading and luring the target states) is the other core section of its nonintervention policy.
Definition of Being a Mediator and the Unpredictable Future of the Sino-Burmese Relation

The policy of “involvement” as an alternative to the Western style of intervention has three purposes: to establish or maintain good relationship with the target state, to pacify the dispute or prevent the potential exacerbation of the conflict, and to keep the domestic society and politics of the target state integrated and functional. In achieving these goals, China decided to persuade the Myanmar military junta to remain calm during the 2007 crisis and agree to the visit of the UN envoy. In so doing, PRC eased the international pressure and prevented the intervention on Myanmar. However, the involvement policy of China did not impose certain ideologies or regime change in the target state. Moreover, China did not expect results such as the release of prisoners, holding of elections, or handing over of power, which is often the case in the Western intervention policy.

The insistence of PRC on the nonintervention incurred criticism from the international community. In addition, the internal voice from the Chinese academia also urged its government to reflect on the inactive policy. The current development in the Sino-Burmese relations has made observers question the effectiveness of the “involvement” policy of China and its focus on the role of mediator.

The newly elected regime in Myanmar seems to maintain a lukewarm relationship with PRC. In the fall of 2011, Myanmar president Thein Sein announced the halting of the hydroelectric project in the Irrawaddy River (also known as the Myitsone dam project) financed and led by a state-owned Chinese company (Fuller 2011). The suspension of the
dam project was a huge loss to the PRC; anger and criticism ruled among the Chinese
businesses involved in the project (Guardian 2011). Although it is still early to forecast if
there will be great changes in the Sino-Burmese relations, some argue that the sudden
termination of the dam project shows the awkwardness of the inactive attitude of China in
supporting nonintervention toward Myanmar; this event may expose the long-term
contradiction in the Sino-Burmese relations again (Yuan 2011). This event also cast
doubt on the meaning of China’s role as mediator in the Myanmar issue. If Nay Pyi Taw
changes the orientation of its foreign policy and mends its relation with the West, it will
make the Chinese effort of maintaining guanxi with Myanmar in vain, and the meaning
of China’s mediator role between Myanmar and the West will be nullified.
CHAPTER FOUR: CONSTRUCTING THE CHINESE PATTERN OF INTERVENTION

The negative attitude of China toward the appeal for intervention in North Korea and Myanmar has brought about the question that has been the staple of scholarly and policy debate since PRC has risen and become the most competitive great power: Is China adjusting itself to the status quo? Alternatively, is it bringing challenges and even threats to the current international order? This study focuses on the controversial issue of international intervention. Intervention through the use of coercion has caused arguments in the conventional understanding of the fundamental principle of international society: sovereignty of state. As Finnemore (2009, 7) argued, the application of military intervention provides a good analytical point for examining the flow of ideas regarding sovereignty and war, meaning of peace, and genealogy of legitimate use of force in the international system. The undeniable reality is that whether international intervention for “justice” can override the principle of sovereignty is still debatable. Understanding the root of the debate must start from how states define “justice,” how they evaluate the conflicting institutions, and, more importantly, how states further legitimize and prioritize certain principles or norms. The answers to these questions signify the views of the states of the international and world orders.

In the previous two chapters, the Chinese nonintervention policies toward North Korea and Myanmar were examined by testing and analyzing six hypotheses designed in
Chapter 1. In each case, the positivist approach was adopted, and whether realism, constructivism, and the Chinese perspective provide persuasive explanations to the responsive or irresponsive attitude of China toward international interventions was examined. Conclusions were not made in the previous chapters. A truly persuasive conclusion should be presented only by carefully comparing the action and reaction of China in both cases. Thus, the first major aim of this chapter is to provide a comprehensive comparison between both cases. Moreover, to strengthen the arguments, brief case studies are provided on the participation and reaction of China in the international interventions imposed on states in Africa and the Middle East.

The second aim of this chapter is to find theoretical support for understanding the Chinese pattern of intervention. Here, the root of the logic that determines the attitude of China toward international intervention is traced back to its view of the world order. According to Bull (1977), order is a specific pattern and arrangement of social life leading to a particular result and promoting certain goals and values. Thus, world order signifies a pattern adopted and shared by actors at all levels (i.e., individual state, community of states, and non-state actor) to promote the specific values and goals in the world. Hence, actors living under this pattern anticipate specific outcomes. Different IR theories possess various views of world order. However, when discussing IR, as Cox (1981, 138) pointed out, world order is “the particular configuration of forces which successively defines the problematic of war or peace for the ensemble of states.” Investigating China’s view of world order is to understand how PRC perceives the prevailing norms and institutions that legitimatize certain values and goals, and how the
Chinese leaders evaluate the regulations on war and peace. Only by analyzing how China views world order can we comprehend how China defines the legitimacy of the use of force, which deeply shapes its attitude toward intervention through coercion.

**Response of China to the Appeal of International Intervention in East Asia: One Picture Depicted by the Six Hypotheses**

Both North Korea and Myanmar have been targeted as regimes needing to be intervened to force them to stop the atrocity of human rights violation or abandon the plans threatening international security. The case of North Korea is even more controversial. The DPRK is developing a nuclear program and testing multiple ballistic missiles. These actions have caused great concern in the international community. Myanmar and North Korea share similarities. Other than being targets of international intervention, the most obvious one is sharing borders with China. Both states have built formal relations with PRC since its establishment. Moreover, the ties between China and these two nations can be traced back to the imperial period when China was the center of the East Asian international system. The case studies based on the relations of PRC with these two states provide distinct empirical evidence for depicting the pattern of the intervention policy of China.

To complement the analytical structure of this research design, the relation among the six hypotheses should be examined. In fact, the shared borders between China and its neighboring states have provided basis for the other factors adopted in this analysis. In addition, these factors correlate with each other. Although in each case study six separate sections focus on different factors that shape the intervention policy of China, these
factors are not independent from each other. For example, the pursuit of raw materials is always about reducing the cost of production. Certainly, the cost of transportation is considered in the Chinese rationale. This situation makes the bordering nations that possess crucial resources important to PRC. Therefore, the relationship with the bordering states has been given extra attention for the sake of security and stability. The concerns about the means applied to adjust the decisions of target states or reverse the current development of undesirable events certainly relate to the geopolitics and the international pressure on the issue in question. These concerns have been indirectly discussed in the previous chapters. In the following sections, these issues are mentioned again to make a more comprehensive comparison between the two cases.

Shared Borders and the Rationale of Nonintervention

For PRC, both North Korea and Myanmar are neighboring states that share its borders. These two nations were vassal states during the imperial period of the Chinese history. In the past, neither the concept of “nation-state” nor the idea of “boundary” was introduced into the traditional East Asian international system. Therefore, the delimitation of territory became problematic when China and its neighboring countries proceeded to the modern state system in the 20th century. The border disputes between PRC and its neighboring states emerged. China successfully solved the border disputes with Myanmar (Burma) in the early 1950s. However, there remains the incomplete delimitation between China and North Korea. In fact, the status of the Sino-North Korean border dispute on the sovereignty over the Chouduan Dao (Pidan Island) in the outfall of the Yalu River can hardly be called a “dispute,” as PRC seems to consciously avert the
issue from being highlighted. Based on the atlases published in Beijing, China either marks the Chouduan Dao as part of the Sino-North Korean borderline (in so doing the ownership of the island remains vague) or further defines it as part of DPRK. In both cases, PRC settled the border disputes peacefully by making concessions and ceding great portions of the territory to its neighbors. This decision negates the realist assumption in terms of the offensive actions that a stronger state should have adopted when confronting weaker states. Nevertheless, assuming that China has applied similar criteria to all border disputes with its neighbors, then explaining the conflict of China with India in 1962 and its recent strong attitude as regards the South China Sea will be difficult.

Shared borders are the issues related to the consideration of security and stability. However, if PRC subscribed to the realist thinking, then it would clearly be tolerant to North Korea and Myanmar, as the border dispute is not rational at all. If PRC followed the arguments of offensive realism, proposing intervention on these two pariah states and using aggressive action, then it would have benefited by gaining control of the disputed territories and further expanding its influence. Contrary to the offensive realist hypothesis, China has taken a relatively cautious position and valued stability as the priority in its policies toward these two states. The proposal to impose intervention on states sharing borders with China did not gain support from Beijing. Other factors weigh more than the desire to gain disputed territories back for PRC. If China opted not to argue

105 As a visiting scholar in the Chinese Academia of Social Science (CASS), I checked four different atlases in its library. Except for the World National Geographic Atlas published by Geology Publisher in Beijing, which marks the Chouduan Dao as North Korean territory, the other atlases vaguely label the island as part of the borderline.
for the disputed territories with North Korea and Myanmar for the preservation of regional stability, having Beijing support intervention would be unreasonable, as intervention with coercive means always accompanies the risk of breaking stability and causing more insecurity.

Another factor that shaped the Chinese logic of intervention in the cases of North Korea and Myanmar is the issue on ethnic minorities. How the ethnic issue shaped the policy of China of nonintervention in these two cases is different. In the case of North Korea, the Chinese leaders considered the relationship with the Chao Xian Zu, the ethnic minority with Korean heritage living in Northeast China. A great portion of Chao Xian Zu businessmen invested and traded in North Korea. If the PRC collided with DPRK, it would definitely damage the interests of the Chao Xian Zu businessmen. Although Beijing propagandized the ideal of building a “harmonious society,” it did not want to have any disturbance in its relationship with the ethnic minority groups. Thus, the Chinese central government would not support the proposal of intervention imposed on the DPRK, which would threaten its relationship with the Chao Xian Zu. China relied on the Chao Xian Zu in the negotiation process with Pyongyang for the rights to rent the Lupjin harbor, which would give PRC access to the Sea of Japan. Having the rights to use the Lupjin harbor greatly increased the maritime influence of China on Northeast Asia.

The factor of ethnic minority in the case of Myanmar is a different story. The lack of harmony between the Myanmese central government and the armed ethnic minority groups made the Chinese decision makers more cautious about their policy toward Myanmar. Although there was a domestic voice claiming that the Chinese government
should have supported some ethnic minorities with Chinese heritage in Myanmar, the official attitude of the PRC remained the same: never be involved in the domestic issues of Nay Pyi Taw. Except for providing humanitarian aid to the cross-border refugees and sending troops to maintain order and security in the bordering area (but the PLA was ordered to stay within the Chinese territory), China did not involve itself in the conflicts between the Myanmar government and the armed ethnic minorities. Such restrained attitude is also related to China’s concern about its image in East Asia. Had Beijing intervened in the Myanmar government war with the ethnic minorities, it would have complicated the situation and entangled itself in the long-term thorny swamp. It would have revived the “China Threat” narrative and made other East Asian states fear the potential of China becoming a hegemon.

The doubt about China’s intention and the concern about China becoming a hegemon in the region linger in the minds of not just the Burmese leaders but also of the heads of other neighboring states of China. The experience of solving border disputes with Myanmar was defined by Beijing as the example of how China should deal with the disputes with its neighbors. Solving disputes through a peaceful discussion and bilateral cooperation accompanying the discourse of “building a harmonious world” emerged in 2005. These doctrines have become the guidelines for Beijing in dealing with disputes with the neighboring states. However, note that it is largely just wishful thinking on the Chinese side. The Myanmar and North Korea experiences are meant to maintain harmonious relations by ceding a great portion of the Chinese territory. Both Myanmar and North Korea did not adopt a belligerent attitude against PRC, as formal relations had
been built. Thus, once the criterion of “peaceful and bilateral conversation” was satisfied, the concession from the Chinese side could be expected.\textsuperscript{106}

In sum, for PRC, the effect of shared borders with North Korea and Myanmar on the Chinese nonintervention policy was entangled with the border disputes in the past and the issues of ethnic minorities in the present. China has adopted a more cautious attitude toward the bordering states. Its yielding to the requests of weaker neighbors and the concerns about relations with both the ethnic minorities and the central regimes of the neighboring states have revealed the logic of China in its decision-making process. The concern about image and the pursuit of harmonious relations have greatly restrained the actions of PRC toward states that have expressed willingness to cooperate and negotiate.

After the economic reform era, maintaining good relations with others in the international society was treated as the priority of the Chinese foreign policy. Therefore, PRC will not accept intervention wielded through coercive means, as applying military force or imposing sanctions will hurt the development of the target states and possibly their relations with China.

Pursuit of Raw Materials and Nonintervention Policy of China

North Korea and Myanmar owning rich deposits of raw materials is a great blessing to PRC. The deposit of iron ore in North Korea is the richest in Asia, and Myanmar owns many unexploited fields of oil and gas. As China is the closest ally with both nations, China could have had more opportunities to gain a supply of natural resources from these two countries. With the advantage of shared borders, China could

\textsuperscript{106} Of course, such criterion is only suitable for negotiating with states or actors who are not defined by the PRC as part of China. Certainly, Tibet, Xinjiang, and Taiwan do not belong to this category.
save on the cost of transportation, which is a great benefit almost every great power would pursue. However, based on the analysis conducted in the previous chapters, China has gained very limited supplies from these two countries, and Beijing even provides them with energy from time to time. The reasons have also been presented. Poor management of the natural resources, the terrible political and economic environments, and the long-term international sanctions have made the exploitation and development of raw materials in these countries far from being useful and sufficient to China. Moreover, these states could not even satisfy the domestic needs through their own production, and PRC even had to support them for civilian-use energy. For such reason, Hypothesis 2 fails to explain why China opposes the intervention imposed on these two states in its pursuit of raw materials.

Another way of thinking suggests that, if China subscribed to realism, the rational choice would be to initiate interventions on these states and take the leadership in the collective action. The unwillingness of the PRC to intervene in North Korea and Myanmar negates the realist argument that great powers apply military force to gain or maintain the sources of raw materials. Raw materials are essential for states to construct military and economic power, and preserving the stability of sources of raw materials is crucial to the national security of the states. Copeland (1996, 10) cited both Waltz and Mearsheimer and argued the following: “in anarchical international politics, states worry about their vulnerability so that they are forced to control what they depend on or reduce the degree of dependence” or “states will try to extend political control to sources of critical economic supplies for the fear of cutoff or blackmail, so the conflict with the
source or with its other customers is highly possible.” Copeland (1996, 26–39) also applied the case of Germany before the two World Wars to support his theory on how interdependency and trade expectations would easily lead states to wage war.

The more extreme argument, which also finds supporting evidence from world history, is Lenin’s (1939, Ch. IV & X) *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*. This book was written based on historical facts that Western great powers exploited the Third World in the era when colonialism prevailed. European great powers occupied nations with rich deposits of raw materials through military force to support their need for resources and expand markets for their domestic industries. In the current international community, colonialism and invasion of other countries to secure the sources of raw materials are no longer legitimate. However, great powers imposing military intervention on countries with deposits of raw materials are still capable of the conspiracy of exploitation. North Korea and Myanmar could have been the major suppliers of natural resources for China. With their rich deposits of iron mine, reserves of oil, and advantageous geographical location, North Korea and Myanmar could have greatly increased the economy and national power of China.

Moreover, China could easily find legitimate excuses to support the international interventions of these two states. If China waged unilateral intervention, justifying the cause would be easy, as there have been voices urging China to restrain DPRK in disturbing regional peace. Moreover, during the crises in Myanmar, China was also expected by its Western counterparts to stop the atrocities of the Myanmar military junta.

---

107 Similar to those on the US intervention in Venezuela and Iraq, analyses and critiques on the decision making of these policies often include the calculation of interests in gaining the most critical raw material: oil (Polychroniou 1995; D’Amato 2000; Cole 2007).
On the other hand, if China supported the multilateral intervention waged by the UN Security Council or other international institutions, it could still have benefited by negotiating with other great powers and winning the trusteeship over North Korea and Myanmar. Furthermore, in the case of North Korea, the disturbances caused by DPRK’s nuclear weapon testing, frequent provocation, and conflicts with South Korea have not only threatened regional security but obstructed Chinese business with both Koreas. Applying coercive means to intervene in the DPRK could more efficiently force Pyongyang to have an economic reform and open policy. This action could provide an ultimate solution to the current impasse in the North Korean economy.

In sum, the supply of raw materials provided by these two states does not constitute the conclusive reason that China keeps opposing the intervention imposed on them. A more influential factor relating to the supply of raw materials is the strategic meaning of the geographic locations of these two states. Myanmar has provided China the opportunity to build the pipeline, which can help PRC reduce the cost and risk of transporting fuel from the Middle East. North Korea has granted China the access to a business route through the Sea of Japan and the chance to expand its marine power in Northeast Asia. In other words, the deposits of natural resources owned by these two states seem inconsequential to China. Maintaining a good relationship and maintaining the access to the core strategic spots mean more to Beijing. Such factors weigh more in the nonintervention thinking of China rather than the oversimplified explanation of the pursuit of raw materials.
International Pressure and China’s Response to the Call of Intervention

China has been facing severe international pressure due to the crises in its two neighboring countries: the development of a nuclear program in North Korea and the bloody oppression of the revolutions in Myanmar. International pressure normally came in the form of criticism and persuasion. PRC has been criticized as behaving passively and hesitantly when the crises occurred. International pressure was presented through condemnation when Beijing refused to join the collective action proposed by its Western counterparts. Persuasion often came with criticism made by the Western states or international organizations through official visits to Beijing. Proposing appeals during public events was often adopted as a way to impose pressure on China as well. The degree of pressure is not like a concrete object, which can be measured by a scale or any appropriate material. The most common and reasonable way to determine if the international pressure is strong enough is to examine whether the criticism, persuasion, and other related events threaten the state national interests defined as crucial by the state itself. In the case of China, such threats include damage to its economic interests and violation of its relations with others.

In the case of North Korea, international pressure on its development of a nuclear program and testing of missiles caused severe condemnation and criticism on the inaction of China. Moreover, the hostile attitude of DPRK even triggered the potential military intervention led by the US. The Western media reported that an anti-China bloc could be created by the US, Japan, and South Korea in response to Beijing’s shielding of the

108 In 2005, the Bush administration sent 15 F-117A stealth fighter-bombers to South Korea to target North Korea. This decision shows that the option of applying military intervention is still on the table of the US policy toward North Korea (Symonds 2005; Sounders 2003).
North Korean nuclear program (Pmfret 2009). In the case of Myanmar, international pressure caused by the bloody oppression of peaceful protests stirred the appeal of blocking the 2008 Beijing Olympics. If such appeal had materialized, it would not have only harmed the economic interests China would gain through the Olympic Games, but it would also have greatly hurt the pursuit of status and dignity of China as a respectable nation in the international community. These examples show that international pressure caused threats and potential damage to the national interests of China. International pressure on the crises occurring in the neighboring areas of China is strong, but China remains reluctant and even opposes the appeal of intervention in North Korea and Myanmar.

Nonetheless, international pressure still plays a role in pushing China to respond to calls for intervention. As discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, although PRC did not respond as the Western countries expected, Beijing did answer the call for China to take more responsibility in dealing with the crises. In both cases, China mediated between the target regimes and the international community. Beijing sent out special emissaries to both countries to encourage them to communicate with the outside world. Only when the target regime rejected China’s mediation or undermined its credibility as a mediator did PRC adopt harsher means. This pattern can be observed in the case of North Korea. China publicly condemned North Korean nuclear tests in 2006 and 2009, adopting a harsh attitude for two reasons. First, China had promoted the Six-Party Talks for several years, which was viewed as an important achievement by both Chinese officials and the academia. However, North Korea withdrew from these talks a month before the 2006
nuclear test, an act Beijing took as a slap in the face. The second nuclear test was then considered a declaration of China’s failure to mediate between North Korea and the US-led Western camp. According to Chinese logic, these acts violated the Sino-North Korean relationship and made an embarrassment of China’s principle of dealing with international order in East Asia. The second reason has to do with China’s view of world order and its evaluation of the current international institutions. Of all international endeavors in which China has actively participated, nuclear nonproliferation is one of the most crucial.\textsuperscript{109} Supporting nuclear nonproliferation is consistent with the national interests of PRC as a major nuclear power. Moreover, Beijing considers the institution of nonproliferation an inviolable and legitimate goal for the security and stability of not only China but of the whole of international community.\textsuperscript{110}

The case of Myanmar reveals another possible explanation for why strong international pressure has no effect on China’s nonintervention policy. Beijing’s policy of nonintervention toward Myanmar is consistent with ASEAN’s “constructive engagement.” At the same time, China’s concern about its image and relations with ASEAN states seems to weigh more in its decisions than appeals from Western powers, resulting in a concessive attitude toward weaker Southeast Asian states. While the PRC possesses a strong attitude toward both Japan and the US and pays little attention to the

\textsuperscript{109} Ian Johnston analyzed China’s participation in the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty using the social learning process (Johnston 2008, 99-117).

\textsuperscript{110} According to my interview with a Chinese scholar, the development of the PRC’s nuclear capability has never been viewed as an achievement in China. He indicated that the pursuit of nuclear weapons has its historical background; actually, no one in China sees owning nuclear power as a good thing. However, it has long been suspected that the PRC has continued developing nuclear capability in secret. A recent report by the Washington Post reveals the long-term suspicion on China’s increasingly sophisticated missile and nuclear arsenal (Wan 2011).
Indian influence on Myanmar,\textsuperscript{111} it emphasizes the ASEAN position on matters involving Myanmar. In interviews conducted by the International Crisis Group, Chinese officials claimed that China could not apply a strong attitude and coercive means against Myanmar because of the prevailing “China Threat” discourse in Southeast Asia, and thus China needed to reassure ASEAN states by insisting on a nonintervention policy. The Chinese officials also indicated that PRC did not want to usurp ASEAN’s leadership in managing the Myanmar issue. Furthermore, empirical evidence shows that China only voted in favor of the resolutions condemning Myanmar’s military junta when ASEAN publicly expressed its outrage over the crises occurring in Myanmar, namely, the junta’s blockage of foreign humanitarian aid after Cyclone Nargis struck in 2008 and the trial of Aung San Suu Kyi in 2009 (International Crisis Group 2009b, 25-26).\textsuperscript{112} Thus, ASEAN’s passive attitude toward international intervention strengthened China’s nonintervention policy toward Myanmar, regardless of international pressure.

Importance of Guanxi in China’s Nonintervention Policy

The meaning of guanxi was developed under a Chinese social and historical context. It is a kind of social connection based not only on personal relationships but also

\textsuperscript{111} The best way to describe the mutual perspectives of China and India’s role in Southeast Asia, including their policies toward Myanmar, is “India distrusts China, and China dislikes India.” The Washington Post released a report describing how distrust between the two states in Asia might hinder their peaceful rise (Denyer 2011). On the Myanmar issue, China recognizes that India is gaining more benefits at China’s cost, but the Chinese academia and media have focused more on the US intention of balancing power in Myanmar than on India’s conduct. In contrast to China’s lack of attention, India has been greatly upset by China’s influence on Nay Pyi Taw. Talk of the “China Threat” is often featured in Indian media and in academic reports (Egreteau 2008, 42-43).

\textsuperscript{112} Aung San Suu Kyi has been under repeated house arrest by the military junta. In March 2009, an American named John Yettaw swam across a lake to Aung San Suu Kyi’s home. This event caused Aung San Suu Kyi to be charged with breaching the terms of her house arrest. The military junta began the trial on Aung San Suu Kyi on May 18, 2009. The majority of the international society and the global mass media have denounced Myanmar military junta’s brutality and condemned the trial of Aung San Suu Kyi (Mydans 2009).
on mutual responsibilities and an awareness of one’s role in the community. More importantly, the concept of guanxi enables a strong community-centered orientation that treasures the consolidation of relationships above institutions and written regulations. In Chinese society, guanxi can be seen as a warm accelerant used to smoothen the performance of cold institutions. The ultimate destination of managing guanxi is to reach and maintain harmony. To be in the status of harmony also means that all types and levels of guanxi have been properly settled and balanced; conflicts and contradictions are peacefully resolved without shaking the foundations of guanxi.

Guanxi is a cultural concept, yet its influence extends to all aspects of Chinese daily life. It shapes the logic of Chinese policymaking, worked by policymakers into the core of Chinese national interests. This fact is explicit in China’s official statements regarding North Korea and Myanmar. As often stated in public announcements by the spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs or leading figures in the PRC, fighting the Korean War in the 1950s is an unforgettable memory that binds the PRC and the DPRK together. Similarly, when asked about China’s relations with Myanmar, the term “baobo” would be repeatedly emphasized, demonstrating the unchangeable guanxi between Beijing and Na Pyi Taw.113

In the previous chapters, I discussed guanxi as one of the independent variables shaping China’s attitude toward international intervention. However, in the process of

113 For example, since the end of 2011, when Myanmar started showing signs of political reform and president Thein Sein suspended a hydroelectric project that China had greatly invested in, PRC has encountered questions and suspicion about its relations with Myanmar. Responding to such suspicions, Chinese state media repeatedly stressed the long-term relationship between China and Myanmar as “baobo” (Liu 2011). Even in official statements given by the PRC Ministry of Foreign Affairs regarding US Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton’s visit to Myanmar, the term “baobo” has been adopted to emphasize the unchangeability of Sino-Burmese relations (Xinhua Net 2011; Yan 2011).
investigating other variables, I found that China’s concern for guanxi also shapes the functions of other core concepts in this research design’s hypotheses. For example, in the border disputes with both North Korea and Myanmar, Beijing took into account its guanxi with the two regimes. Material interests were never the major concern for the Chinese leaders; rather, the maintenance of guanxi dictated China’s logic. In the name of guanxi, Beijing could yield to its weaker neighbors and cede most of the disputed territories to them. Even as they faced severe international pressure, decision-makers put China’s guanxi with all related parties at the core of Chinese national interests and decided on a mediatorial role. In so doing, China kept the balance of its guanxi with both the target states and the states exerting social pressure. If China did not value guanxi to such an extent, it would have supported the calls for intervention to secure its reputation and reduce suspicion on the “China Threat.”

However, note that China’s interventions in behalf of North Korea and Myanmar are different in approach. Their differing historical and political backgrounds required Beijing to adopt different strategies to consolidate its guanxi with the two states.

The Kim family in North Korea has relatively solid personal ties with CCP. Although Pyongyang has tried to develop its own path toward socialism, and Kim Jong-Il has sought Russian support from time to time, Pyongyang’s long-term comradeship and status as China’s closest ally remain solid. However, some Western academic experts on North Korean issues admit that China’s influence on Pyongyang is in fact more limited than conventional thinking suggests. Moreover, the guanxi between China and

---

114 For example, You Ji, a senior lecturer in the University of New South Wales, argued that the relationship between PRC and North Korea is actually fragile, and it has been gradually eroding. His article analyzes
North Korea is strong enough that Beijing remains the state with the most access to, and communication with, Pyongyang. For China, while peacefully convincing North Korea to negotiate remains a possibility, the support for or initiation of coercive means can only violate its guanxi with Pyongyang, something that goes against China’s national interest.

The personal guanxi between the CCP and the military-led Myanmarese government can hardly compete with that of the Kim family. The following is a more accurate way to describe the Chinese leaders’ relationship with the Thein Sein administration and the former Than Shwe regime: despite some discrepancies, China has consistently, and as a matter of policy, elaborated on its relationship with Myanmar since the 1950s to maintain China’s advanced position among states that Myanmar has official relations with. However, note that that China’s desire to maintain this “advanced position” is a vague and self-convincing goal rather than a precise aim with a clear operational strategy. Indeed, Beijing is aware of its strategic interests and the complexity of Southeast Asian geopolitics. However, unlike other major states (e.g., India) competing with China for influence in Myanmar, Beijing hardly stressed its concerns about other states’ influence on its Myanmar policy or held a harsh attitude toward Nay Pyi Taw and made strong requests after the Obama administration clearly declared US intentions of restoring its sphere of influence in the Asia Pacific. Official reports released through Chinese mainstream mass media show that Beijing maintains a cautious and

the historical background and the reasons causing the degeneration of the Sino-North Korean quanxi (You 2001).

However, since Kim Jong-Il died of a heart attack in December 2011, possible changes in Sino-North Korean relations have been a matter of concern in the international community, especially when successor Kim Jong-Un thanked foreign leaders for sending messages of condolence but did not include China in the list. This dismissal of China caused great suspicion that the relationship between China and the Kim regime might be deteriorating (China Review News 2012).
positive attitude toward the future of Sino-Myanmarese relations, even as the US has revealed its ambitions.\footnote{116}

In both cases, China’s policy-making seems to focus more on maintaining the existent guanxi, patching differences, strengthening the relationship when it turns weak (la guanxi), and responding to obstructions and threats to the existing guanxi.

This study focuses on China’s relations with North Korea and Myanmar. However, historically, China has valued its guanxi with neighboring nations much more than did states in other regions. In September 2011, Beijing published a White Paper entitled “China’s Peaceful Development.” In this White Paper, Beijing once again emphasized building positive and amiable relations with its neighboring countries as one of the main goals of its foreign policy, envisioning a harmonious world (Xinhua Net 2011). The major troublemakers in East Asia, North Korea and Myanmar, have been part of the East Asian international system since the imperial era of Chinese history, and both North Korea and Myanmar have maintained good relations with China through most this time. Such guanxi has become a strong kinship that China would hardly abandon for the sake of material interests. At the same time, however, China also believes that its responsibility as a great power includes not just regional security but also maintaining harmony in its relations with neighboring states, as stated in the aforementioned 2011 White Paper. The breaking of harmony would be a slap in China’s face and a challenge to

\footnote{116 In most reports written by Chinese scholars and reported by mass media in China, the common opinion tends to believe that the US policy of restoring relations with Myanmar will not change China’s position regarding Na Pyi Taw’s foreign policy. In contrast, most English mass media analyses of the Obama administration’s policies in the Asia Pacific view the re-engagement with Myanmar as a form of competition with PRC (Weiss 2010).}
its claim of building a harmonious world. For such reasons, supporting the proposals of coercive interventions, which could lead to a breach of guanxi, is difficult for PRC.

Evaluation of Regime Ability and China’s Nonintervention Policy

In cases in which PRC supported international intervention, one crucial criterion is the consent of the target regime. This consent is only given when the target regime admits that it is no longer capable of controlling the development of the crisis. China’s insistence on a regime’s ability and treating it as a major criterion for imposing intervention should be considered a reemphasis of the prior status of the institution of sovereignty. In the cases of North Korea and Myanmar, the target regimes’ ability to maintain internal stability and manage crises is unquestioned. The military junta in Myanmar and the Kim regime in North Korea remain so vigorous that Beijing cannot support the proposals of intervention against them. In Chapter 2, China’s attitudes and responses to interventions imposed on East Timor and Sudan were briefly examined. Two cases were used to predict Beijing’s possible response if the Kim regime fails in North Korea. The case of Myanmar is especially useful for verifying Hypothesis 5. As discussed in Chapter 3, the military regime in Myanmar is relatively stronger than other antagonist forces, such as the armed ethnic minority groups. Beijing’s major concern about intervening in Myanmar is the possibility of the military regime losing control over its domestic affairs, causing strong secessionism and turning Myanmar into another Yugoslavia in Asia. ASEAN, the regional communal body, also shares this concern and opposes harsh measures against Myanmar. For these reasons, it is difficult to see PRC give up its nonintervention policy toward Myanmar.
Clearly, Beijing’s responses to appeals for intervention focus much more on the maximization of regional stability and security than on eliminating the target regimes behind the crises. China has claimed that imposing intervention (especially military intervention) would only worsen an already complicated situation.

First, intervention violates the institution of sovereignty and equality among states, and intervention imposed on weaker states arouses suspicion of renewed imperialism. China, being a victim of Western imperialism, shares a historical memory with other Third World nations; this memory has strengthened the discourse of “National Humiliation” that remains popular among Chinese civil society and its netizens.117 Bearing such historical memory, the Chinese have a strong antagonism toward Western imperialism, which in turn presents itself as the Chinese nationalism that causes the international community to worry about China’s rise and intentions. Such historical and political conditions contribute to China’s opposition to intervention in states that remain vigorous and in control of their domestic conditions. Should PRC do otherwise and support the violation of sovereignty and equality among states, it would stir the suspicion of Chinese expansionism and imperialism, especially among Third World countries.

Second, the past examples prove that military intervention and economic sanctions rarely work.118 In particular, US unilateral actions taken in the name of war only alerted China to the dangers of military intervention. Many other cases in history

---

117 On the discourse of how “National Humiliation (Guo Chi Lun)” has developed and prevailed in China, see the profound analysis made by Zhao Suisheng in A Nation-State by Construction: Dynamics of Modern Chinese Nationalism (Zhao 2004), and William Callahan in The Pessoptimist Nation (Callahan 2010).
118 As Frank(2006, 7) pointed out, sanctions rarely succeed: “Even the conservative Heritage Foundation cautions against the excessive utilization of sanctions as a tool of foreign policy and points to the adverse effects they can have on all involved parties.”
prove that violating the sovereign rights of other states only helps plant more roots of insecurity.¹¹⁹

China’s consideration of regime ability is the result of pragmatic thinking combined with the belief that only by adopting soft means (i.e., conversation and negotiation through Beijing’s mediation) can the preservation of stability be guaranteed. For Beijing to vote in favor of intervention, there must be no conflict between action (supporting intervention) and principle (prioritizing sovereignty and equality among states). In the two cases investigated in this book, this condition was not met because of the target regimes’ ability.

The concern for guanxi plus the insistence on regime ability kept China from intervening in North Korea. Analyzing China’s policy toward North Korea without taking guanxi and regime ability into account, one would conclude that it is totally irrational that the PRC tolerates DPRK’s nuclear program. China’s reaction to the developing nuclear capability of a neighboring state negates realist arguments of power politics and preconceptions of the behavior of great powers.

The case of Myanmar provides additional evidence that guanxi and regime ability are crucial to explaining China’s nonintervention policy. If China did not value regime ability, it would have intervened in Myanmar during the late 1960s, when anti-Chinese

---

¹¹⁹The current case of international intervention, the UN-authorized intervention on Libya, provides an obvious example. After Gaddafi was toppled, a strong voice in the Transitional National Council urged Libya to become an Islamic state following Islamic law. International human rights organizations were concerned about Libya’s pro-conservative tendencies leading to the further violation of Libyan citizens’ rights, especially women (Sheridan 2011a). Nevertheless, there remains a great portion of militiamen who did not submit to the Transitional National Council. In fact, rival militias waged several armed confrontations in Tripoli, posing a serious threat to the security and stability of not only Libya but also those of its neighbors. The possibility of a civil war between rival militias has never been eliminated (Sheridan 2011b).
movements swept across Southeast Asia. During this period, the Chinese diaspora in Burma encountered severe antagonism: on June 26, 1967, the most serious anti-Chinese movement, later called the “6.26 event,” occurred in Yangon. According to Fan’s (2006) analysis, both Beijing and the military regime were responsible for stirring hostility between the Burmese Chinese and the Barma people. Beijing tacitly supported the spread of Maoist propaganda in Burma, thereby irritating the Burmese military junta. The military regime, faced with a serious economic crisis and a potential coup-de-tat, decided to divert domestic attention by supporting the anti-Chinese movement, sending soldiers disguised as civilians to join the slaughter of the Burmese Chinese. However, aside from expressing serious objections and remonstrance, Beijing did nothing to stop the anti-Chinese movement in Burma (Fan 2006).

Several factors contribute to China’s inaction in Burma. First, China was undergoing the Cultural Revolution at the time, and it suspended almost all diplomacy. Foreign affairs were not a major concern, and the internal turmoil caused by the Cultural Revolution might have strangled China’s capability to intervene in anti-Chinese movements across Southeast Asia. Second, if China had sent troops to assist the Chinese in Yangon, it would have faced the danger of being entangled in internal conflicts between the military junta and multiple armed ethnic minority groups. China would have encountered greater threats to its national security than just a sour relationship with the Burmese military regime.

If China had any ambitions of expansion, it would have made use of the anti-Chinese movements and secretly instigated secessionism or supported regime change in
Yangon. As explored in Chapter 3, PRC once provided aid, including material resources and weapons, to the Burmese Communist Party. Aside from a shared communist ideology, most members of the Burmese Communist Party inherited consanguinity and culture from the Chinese. China could have used the anti-Chinese movement and the slaughter of Chinese immigrants as an excuse to initiate a call for intervention, and, if successful, China could have established a pro-Chinese communist regime in Burma. At a time when PRC was having a rift with the Soviet Union and facing a US-led containment, making Burma a dependency would have been conductive to national security. Nonetheless, China’s intentions at the time are out of the question. PRC did not use its ties with the Burmese Chinese to expand its sphere of influence even after it had gained a moral excuse. After China’s relations with the Myanmar central regime recovered, Beijing could not possibly support the proposal of intervention, considering the potential crisis that the Myanmarese military junta’s failure to rule could bring about.

Engagement Rather Than Intervention: China’s Insistence on Non-Coercive Means

Intervention is often utilized by great powers to expand their sphere of influence and to control weaker states; this was especially common during the Cold War era. If a great power subscribes to expansionism, even when alternative measures for settling disputes are present, it will always opt for intervention by military force and defend its decision as legitimate. Military intervention exists up to this day, but because of changes in moral norms and the increasing status of international institutions, states needs more lawful reasons to legitimize coercive intervention against other states. In addition, imposing intervention, whether by the use of military force or economic sanctions, has.
rarely proved effective (Gordon 1999; Frank 2006). For its part, intervention for humanitarian reasons has become accepted by international society, although weaker states remain uncertain and suspicious of the great powers’ intentions. These factors explain why international intervention is often a controversial issue: even if an action is taken collectively, it still foments severe debate in the international arena.

The PRC used to stand strongly against international intervention. To this day, the direct Chinese translation of intervention, “gan she,” is still a controversial and politically incorrect term in China. However, in its rise as a great power, China is expected to act as an international stakeholder and manage international crises and disputes. Thus, Beijing, never ignorant of such expectations, needs to find a way to conform to international expectations without violating its own principles. The two cases analyzed in the previous chapters provide examples of China’s efforts to create such a middle course. As the two cases prove, although PRC has opposed interventions against North Korea and Myanmar, Chinese leaders have never neglected the expectations of the international community. China responds by utilizing its connections (also guanxi) with the target regimes and by acting as mediator. PRC engages itself in crises and bridges the target states and the outside world through these methods. Thus, China maintains good relations with all parties involved in the dispute and prevents its engagement from being defined as interference in others’ domestic affairs.

As Gordon (1999) noted, economic sanctions rarely reach their goals. The successful case of South Africa is a unique one. South Africa was once the target of UN-favored economic sanctions for its apartheid policy. It successfully transitioned into a democratic society in the early 1990s, and the sanctions were lifted right after. Gordon pointed out that South Africa’s success could not be attributed to economic sanctions alone. The strong inner force led by the democratization movements in South African society played the key role (Gordon 1999).
There are several explanations for China’s hesitation to intervene in the North Korean nuclear crisis. First, Chinese foreign policy at the time was still under the influence of Deng Xiaoping’s principle of “tao guang yang hui” (to conceal one's ability and bide one's time). The main theme of this principle is meant to hind the offensive gesture and prevents taking the initiative position in international affairs. China considers itself still in the process of developing; Chinese officials and leaders emphasize that even if China eventually becomes a great power, it will never act as a hegemon or intend to expand its power over other nations. The same applies to China’s management of the Six-Party Talks: coordinating meetings between core states involved in the crisis and providing a platform for peaceful communication are China’s responsibilities. Being a host represents taking responsibility and letting others share the authority. However, being a leader implies a monopoly of authority and power, which is against Chinese officials’ claims of never acting in a hegemonic way. Thus, China can only become the host but never the leader. Second, interfering in North Korea’s nuclear program is not an action taken to satisfy any single state’s national interests; it is for the good of the global community. In Chinese leaders’ minds, the purpose of China’s involvement in the event and its management of the Six-Party Talks is not for China’s benefit alone. The point is to harmonize the dispute by coordinating the needs of all parties. China

---

121 Both Chinese President Hu Jintao and Premier Wen Jiabao claimed several times during public occasions that China would never “Cheng Ba” (seek hegemony). Chinese leaders insist that the “never seeking hegemony” strategy has long been the foundation of PRC’s foreign policy since the Mao era (Tian 2010).

122 Reviewing all the academic works on China’s position on international intervention in the post-Cold War era published in mainland China, one would find that the use of the verb “intervene” is rare when “China,” “Beijing,” “our country/state,” or “we” is the subject of the sentence. “Intervention” is still a politically incorrect term in Chinese academic writing. I did not sense this until I visited a famous Chinese scholar in Peking University in late spring of 2011.
recognizes the difficulty of achieving harmony and balancing the interests of all parties, and oppressing any side to benefit a specific party is against China’s beliefs. Thus, assembling the positions of all parties and pushing them to communicate is the proper approach to find the critical point of balance for mitigating the conflict.

The case of Myanmar leads to similar conclusions as those involving North Korea, albeit in a different format. At a time of large-scale anti-Chinese movements, PRC had a good opportunity to intervene and expand its political power in Southeast Asia. However, China opted to stand by its principle of nonintervention. This decision might have been due to the weakness of its material power at the time. However, China still fought a border war with India and a “punitive war” with Vietnam during the 1960s and 1970s. Had PRC wished, it would have waged war against Burma as well. The more crucial reason for China to choose a nonintervention policy was Beijing’s consideration of its guanxi with Yangon and the regime ability of the Burmese military junta. As revealed by the analysis in previous sections, Myanmar enjoys a special status with China being the first non-socialist state to recognize PRC as well as China’s primary connection with other Third World nations during its period of US-imposed containment. Moreover, the joint announcement of the “Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence” is of significant historical meaning to Beijing. It is viewed as a milestone through which China established a new international association representing the interests of all Third World countries. Myanmar is one of the members of the joint announcement, and it has

123 Protecting the security of overseas citizens and properties has been used by great powers as a favorite excuse for imposing intervention. Examples are Belgium’s intervention in Congo in 1960, the US military intervention in the Dominican Republic in 1965, and Belgium and France’s joint action against Shaba Province in 1978.
remained a close ally of PRC. China describes its relationship with Myanmar using the Burmese term “baobo” (brothers). Supporting the intervention against a brotherly neighboring country is against Chinese principles. Therefore, despite severe international pressure regarding the humanitarian crises in Myanmar, Beijing adopted a similar response: sending special emissaries to persuade the military junta to accept China’s mediation. Chinese officials describe this as a creative way to obtain engagement and involvement yet maintain noninterference in Burmese internal affairs.\(^{124}\)

China acts as a mediator not only to maintain relationships (guanxi) but also to prove the existence of the relationship. Acting as mediator demonstrates that China is in a good relationship with the target state and that Beijing is capable of managing the dispute through discussion and negotiation. Moreover, it is also China’s politics of “face.” The mediator occupies an important status in the dispute, and it must be seen as legitimate and responsible. For China, taking this role symbolizes the fulfillment of its responsibility as a great power in the Asia Pacific. More importantly, acceptance of China’s role as mediator (by target states, other great powers involved in the issue, and the international community as a whole) certifies the PRC’s status in global politics. Managing mediation and maintaining engagement seem to be what Beijing is willing to offer in settling international crises; supporting or initiating international intervention is still difficult for PRC. China’s attitude toward intervention stands firmly on the canon established in the “Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence.” Intervention through coercion would negate this canon and the logic behind Chinese policy making, which treats guanxi with other

\(^{124}\) More details about how the Chinese special emissary Wang Yi achieved his mission in Myanmar can be found in the Chinese scholar Wang Yizhou’s book *Creative Involvement: A New Direction in China’s Diplomacy* (Wang 2011).
nations as an important national interest. Thus, except for certain special circumstances, such as the US-led intervention in Somalia and UN-authorized actions in the East Timor independence movement, China will remain negative in its attitude toward international intervention imposed by force.

The last topic that needs to be stressed here is the other approach adopted by China to increase its involvement in multilateral actions related to international intervention: taking part in UN peacekeeping operations. Among the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, China contributes the most number of personnel to assist in UN peacekeeping operations, thus gaining the commendation of the international community. As reported by the International Crisis Group, China adopts a “case-by-case” approach in its participation in UN peacekeeping actions. This approach is intended to balance its responsibilities as a great power with its traditional principles of nonintervention. In short, only cases that satisfy three criteria (i.e., host country consent, impartiality and neutrality of peacekeepers, and use of force only in self-defense) receive PRC approval (International Crisis Group 2009a, 2). However, some flexibility remains. For example, in 1992, China voted in favor of peace operations in Somalia and insisted that the case of Somalia was an exception and needed unique management (Ibid., 23). The special circumstances in Somalia, that is, the lack of central authority, made it possible for the PRC to make an exception and display its strong pragmatism. Moreover, note that Chinese personnel sent to UN peacekeeping efforts are mainly civilian police, military observers, engineering battalions, and medical units (Ibid., i). China does not send combat troops possibly because of its principle of nonintervention and insistence on
non-coercive methods. The International Crisis Group report also agrees that China made valuable political contributions by manipulating its relations with tough host regimes, pushing them to accept UN peacekeeping (Ibid.) and thus succeeding where most Western nations failed. In sum, by actively participating in UN peacekeeping operations without sending combat troops, China can balance its principle of nonintervention with involvement in international crisis management. In so doing, it ensures that actions are taken with the consent of the target states and the under the authorization of the UN Security Council.

**International Interventions in Other Regions and China’s Responses**

To construct a comprehensive understanding of the Chinese interventionary pattern, an examination of more empirical cases is required. In this chapter, several additional brief examples are provided discussing China’s attitudes and reactions toward interventions imposed on pariah states in the Middle East and Africa, two regions that have seen the most number of international interventions since the end of the Cold War. These regions are also where the UN has invested the most humanitarian aid and sent the most peacekeepers. China’s active participation in UN peacekeeping missions demonstrates its deep involvement in the crisis management of both regions. At the same time, the Middle East and Africa are major providers of energy and raw materials to China. Economic ties with pariah states in both areas and China’s indifferent attitude toward intervention have earned PRC international reproach. Comparing China’s attitudes and behaviors toward international interventions in more geographic areas can
clarify whether the six hypotheses applied in the cases of North Korea and Myanmar truly support the construction of China’s interventionary pattern.

Humanitarian Crises in Africa and China’s Responses to the Call for Intervention

Africa occupied a crucial position in PRC’s foreign relations during the Cold War. Chinese leaders not only paid lip service to maintain intimate relations with African countries (so they could keep sending propaganda and remain allied with their “Third World brothers”) but also constantly invested in, and sent aid to, this continent. However, the 1980s saw the “lost decade” in Sino-African relations. During this time, Deng Xiaoping changed the focus of Chinese foreign policy: reconstruction of relations with the US and other Western countries began, and Africa was marginalized. The turning point did not come until 1989, when the events of Tiananmen Square brought PRC severe international condemnation, and the honeymoon between China and the West came to an abrupt end. Most African states, behaving as China’s “old friends,” kept official relations with PRC. Some, such as Angola, even showed public support for Beijing. To reciprocate the friendship and political support given by African countries since 1989, Chinese commitment of aid and investment in Africa grew dramatically (Taylor 1998, 443-450). China’s relationship with Africa has become crucial to its economic and foreign policy. Beijing even called 2006 the “the Year of Africa” when drafting its foreign policy guidelines for that year (He 2007, 23).

Raw materials and energy resources imported from Africa have solidified Africa’s strategic position in PRC’s foreign policy. China’s pursuit of raw materials in Africa has led the international community to suspect that China supports authoritarian regimes in
many African countries to strengthen its economic interests. Although China’s great investment in, and support of, current regimes in some African pariah states remains, contrary to conventional thinking, China does not always block calls for intervention against these pariah states. The most obvious example is Sudan.

The China National Petroleum Cooperation gained exploitation rights to the oil fields of Sudan in 1995. Over 60% of Sudan’s oil is exported to China, providing 5% of its oil needs (Rocha 2007, 21; Sautman and Yan 2007, 79-80). However, when the Darfur crisis occurred, Beijing supported UN-authorized intervention with conditions and did not veto resolutions to impose pressure on Khartoum. At most, China adopted a strategy of abstention in the UN Security Council, abstaining, for example, from the voting process of Resolution 1706, “which expanded the UN Mission in Sudan to include deployment of some 17,300 troops and 3,300 police to the war-torn region of Darfur, absorbing a previous African Union mission” (Wuthnow 2010, 70). The reasons for China’s abstention are clearly described in the above quote: the lack of the host state’s consent and the abridgement of the participation of the African Union. Instead, Beijing applied the same strategy it used in North Korea and Myanmar: it played the role of mediator between Khartoum and the UN. Beijing ordered its Chinese representative Wang Guangya to insist on the necessity of gaining consent from the Sudanese government. In addition, China provided USD11 million in aid to Darfur and USD1.8 million to the African Union in support of peacekeeping missions under the Union’s authorization (He 2007, 35). Furthermore, Chinese president Hu Jintao initiated discussions with Sudanese president Omar al-Bashir both in Beijing and during Hu’s visit
to Sudan in February 2007. Beijing also continued sending its special emissary Liu Guijin to Sudan and Darfur. After the South Sudan became an independent state in July 2011, Liu Guijin kept his position as special envoy representing China to Sudan and South Sudan (Higgins 2011).

In the end, China successfully persuaded Khartoum to accept the UN deployment of peacekeeping forces in 2007. In Chapter 2, a short analysis of PRC’s reasons for supporting UN intervention in Sudan was provided. International pressure on the possible boycotting of the 2008 Beijing Olympics, regional stability concerning the security of China’s economic interests in neighboring areas, and the inability of the al-Bashir administration to control humanitarian atrocities in Darfur all contributed to Beijing’s decision to act decisively and take the role of mediator.

However, Sudan is not the only case in which China supported UN-authorized intervention in Africa. In 2003, PRC also voted in favor of the deployment of UN peacekeeping forces in Liberia. Before reluctantly supporting the UN resolution to impose sanctions, China had been the largest buyer of Liberia’s wood products, especially timber. PRC’s economic interests in Liberia had helped former Liberian despot Charles Taylor stay in power (Tull 2006, 475; Chan-Fichel 2007, 147). However, investment in Liberia did not guarantee the stability of Sino-Liberian relations. Liberia repeatedly broke off diplomatic relations with PRC. For instance, in 1997, Liberia terminated relations with the PRC in favor of rebuilding diplomatic relations with Taiwan. Liberia went back to PRC in 2003 reportedly because it needed financial aid and China’s support in the Security Council (Yan 2003). China did support the UN Security
Council’s 2003 decision to send a multinational force to Liberia to end its 14-year civil war. To what extent the restoration of Sino-Liberian diplomatic relations influenced China’s decision is difficult to determine, as more powerful factors were involved.

The crucial reason behind China’s voting in favor of UN intervention was the consent of Liberian president Charles Taylor. Severe external pressure\(^{125}\) and long-term internal chaos caused Taylor to agree to step down and accept UN interference in July 2003; he even publicly announced an invitation for US intervention (China.com 2003; Hook 2003). Another factor shaping China’s supportive attitude was the proper involvement of the regional organization, the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). ECOWAS had been sending peacekeeping missions to Liberia since 1990 (Ero 1995). Chinese vice-representative to the United Nations Zhang Yishan praised the cooperation between the UN and the ECOWAS in a speech explaining China’s support for the Security Council Resolution.

In sum, the host state’s consent and the leading role of the regional organizations (the African Union and ECOWAS) were the key factors in China’s approval of UN-authorized intervention. The cases of both Sudan and Liberia support this finding. China’s economic interests in both states did not lead Beijing to oppose the proposal of intervention (i.e., use its veto power). Thus, both cases support the hypothesis that China supports intervention when the target regimes are unable to maintain stability.

On the other side of the coin, we have China’s response to Zimbabwe. Zimbabwean president Robert Mugabe and some of his subordinates were accused by the

\(^{125}\) The Bush administration publicly requested Charles Taylor to quit and accept its offer of asylum. US Secretary of State Collin Powell also discussed the Liberia issue with UN general secretary Kofi Annan for a resolution and crisis management (Semple and Sengupta 2003; Marquis and Shanker 2003).
International Criminal Court of crimes against humanity, including systematic rape, torture, murder, and other atrocities perpetrated against supporters of the opposition party (Economist 2008). As a result, the US and the EU have imposed targeted sanctions on Mugabe and several of his party members since 2002 (CNN 2011). In April 2008, the spokesman of the Zimbabwe opposition party, Movement for Democratic Change, told the international media that Robert Mugabe was about to order a crackdown to shape the results of his presidential run-off campaign and retain his status as the incumbent president. Thus, the opposition party called for a UN Security Council intervention to prevent potential violence against civilians in Zimbabwe (Chivers 2008). In July 2008, the US and the UK proposed a resolution to the UN Security Council calling for an arms embargo and financial and travel restrictions on Robert Mugabe and 13 other regime leaders. However, the resolution was later vetoed by China and Russia (Nasaw and Rice-Oxley 2008).

China expressed its position on the Zimbabwe issue through public talks given separately by the Chinese representative to the UN Wang Guanya and Chinese Ambassador Yuan Nansheng. According to them, China vetoed the resolution for two reasons. First, the African Union and the Southern African Development Community objected to intervention because they, like China, did not consider the internal turmoil in Zimbabwe a threat to world peace. Second, China did not agree with the sanction of issuing travel bans on Mugabe and his party members. Yuan Nansheng argued that if these leading figures in Zimbabwe could not travel to neighboring countries and engage in regional organizations, the development and democratization of Zimbabwe would only
worsen (Xinhua News 2009; Nasaw and Rice-Oxley 2008). Third, which is not spoken directly, is the lack of consent from the host regime. As the ruling party insisted that the election was a domestic affair, and it did not want the issue to be discussed in the UN Security Council, it was impossible for PRC to support UN intervention. However, although China vetoed the resolution to sanction Zimbabwe, it agreed to the release of a “presidential statement” issued by the Security Council in June 2008. The non-binding “presidential statement” used strong language in blaming the Zimbabwean government for the humanitarian and political crisis (Economist 2008).

Nuclear Threat and Civil War: Cases in the Middle East

In the Middle East, cases involving appeals for international intervention often involve the threat of nuclear proliferation and atrocities caused by civil wars. Aside from having a notorious human rights record condemned by many Western states and nongovernmental organizations, Iran’s development of nuclear weapons has made it the top target for international intervention. The case of Iran has much in common with the case of North Korea; however, as Iran does not share borders with China, it seems Beijing does not feel the need to take as much responsibility for it. Conventional thinking suggests that PRC should have more flexibility in terms of dealing with the nuclear crisis in Iran as well as better consideration of its economic interests. However, in practice, China’s response toward the Iranian nuclear crisis was little different from how it dealt with North Korea. While supporting UN sanctions against Iran, China did not give up on its diplomatic approach, encouraging multilateral talks involving the US, Britain, Germany, France, Russia, and China.
Beijing has many good reasons to oppose intervention against Tehran. Iran is one of China’s major oil suppliers, and it has often been suggested that China’s negative attitude toward intervention is a means of protecting a major source of energy. According to a recent report, trade between China and Iran increased 55.8% from 2010 to 2011. A large portion of this increase is attributed to oil exportation from Iran (Huanqiu Shibao 2012). Such important ties have a certain influence on China’s response to Western appeals to deepen sanctions against Tehran. Although Beijing has voted in favor of resolutions that “called upon Tehran to suspend all nuclear enrichment-related and reprocessing activities, including research and development” (Shichor 2006) since 2006, it has also rejected US and EU efforts to weaken Tehran by taking away its ability to refine gasoline as well as investment in its oil industry (Landler 2011). In early 2012, Washington sent Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner to Beijing to persuade China to support US sanctions against Iran, especially those that target investment in Iran’s petroleum industries. However, not only did China turn down Washington’s petition, but the Chinese media also publicly criticized the US decision to expand sanctions on Tehran as an act of overstepping UN authority (Hornby 2012).

From the Chinese view, the sanctions wielded by the US and some Western great powers are unilateral actions and therefore illegitimate and in violation of the authority of the UN Security Council. Despite Beijing’s support for the sanctions imposed by the UN Security Council, it has repeated that the diplomatic approach and negotiation among core parties should be the main method for solving problems. The Chinese spokesman also stressed that China’s emphasis on bilateral ties with Iran is not just for the good of
Beijing and Tehran but also for the good of the international community (Xinhua News 2010). China’s relationship with Iran should have some gains already. One example is the Iranian president’s public condemnation of the US in response to Washington’s bullying of China to join sanctions against Iran. The Iranian president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad even paid a visit to Shanghai two days after China had voted in favor of a fourth round of sanctions in the UN Security Council (Richburg 2010a). However, it is not yet clear to what extent China is capable of utilizing its gradually constructed guanxi with Tehran to deal with the nuclear crisis and to respond to the call for intervention. What is certain is that the PRC will not participate in any action unless it is authorized by the UN and done with Tehran’s consent.

Although PRC opposes any unilateral action against Iran taken without UN authorization, its attitude toward nuclear issues, especially nuclear nonproliferation, is not much different from that of its Western counterparts. Therefore, voting in this matter in favor of sanctions against Iran is not in conflict with China’s principles, as the major appeal is to cease the violation of nuclear nonproliferation.

PRC remains cautious and conservative when dealing with international interventions. The other case of intervention in the Middle East proves that even given UN authorization, if the criteria of “inability of the target state” and “consent of the target regime” are not met, China will still hold a negative attitude toward intervention. The intervention imposed on Libya in early 2011 provides an interesting example of the Chinese pattern of intervention.

Ian Johnston analyzed the process of China’s being socialized and supportive of the international institutions on nuclear nonproliferation in his book *Social States: China in International Institutions* (Johnston 2009).
Formal Libyan leader Muammar el-Qaddafi was one the most notorious dictators in the oil-rich Middle East. Since February 2011, the civil war between Libyan rebels and the Qaddafi regime has caused great concern in the international community. The Arab League approved the setting up of a no-fly zone on March 12, 2011. This decision provided an opportunity for the Western great powers to debate on imposing military intervention against Qaddafi. On March 17, 2011, the UN Security Council approved Resolution 1973 to establish a no-fly zone over Libya, authorizing all necessary measures to protect Libyan civilians. Two days later, a broad bombing campaign led by the US and France was carried out in Libya (Cody 2011; Richburg 2011). To the surprise of many observers, China abstained from the voting process (Tisdall 2011). After the passage of Resolution 1973, Beijing condemned the Western airstrikes against Libya. Officials also explained that China’s abstention (as opposed to a veto) was due to the fact that the Arab League and some African states had shown support for the UN intervention (Chin Review News 2011c).

Beijing could have vetoed Resolution 1973 but did not. More interestingly, despite suffering great economic loss caused by the civil war and military action executed by the multinational forces, PRC did not recognize the Libyan rebels immediately after the fighting had swung in their favor. Even after Qaddafi was defeated, China did not recognize the rebel-led National Transition Council (NTC) as the legitimate ruling body of Libya until September 12, 2011. According to reports, by being the last major power in the UN Security Council to recognize the legitimacy of the NTC, China lost a great opportunity to profit from Libya’s rich deposits of oil and participate in the
reconstruction business. In addition, the Libyan rebellion accused China of violating the UN embargo by shipping weapons to Qaddafi (McDonald 2011). The fact that Beijing had received representatives of both the Qaddafi regime the Libyan rebels while the war was ongoing created the impression that China was trying to keep its feet in both camps. Chinese mass media explained that Beijing’s intention was to show that China could accept a future Libyan government not under Qaddafi rule. The Chinese spokesman of foreign affairs expressed China’s intention of ending the warfare through peaceful negotiation (China Review News 2011b).

Although the Libyan civil war did not end the way China wanted, and Beijing did not gain much space to wield its influence on the event, China’s abstention from the voting process and its hesitation to recognize the legitimacy of the NTC make Libya a crucial case in the examination of this study’s hypotheses. The swinging of China’s attitude toward the intervention and regime change in Libya has left Beijing in an awkward position. The case of Libya also proves that without the consent of the host regime, Beijing cannot allow itself to support the imposition of intervention, even though the action is authorized by the UN Security Council and has the support of regional organizations. In addition, China’s concern about the attitude of the Arabic League also reveals the importance it places on maintaining relationships with core actors in the region, as dictated by the Chinese logic of policy making. The best contrast can be found in the case of Zimbabwe: China used its veto power. The appeal for intervention was clearly against China’s principle of noninterference, and, most importantly, the African Union and other regional states opposed coercive intervention. This opposition supported
Beijing’s strong reaction of vetoing the call for intervention against Zimbabwe. Thus, understanding why China abstained in the case of Libya is not difficult. Only in doing so could China show respect toward the regional institution and the Arabic states, thus maintaining its relations with them (the guanxi). Abstention also enabled China to practice its principle of nonintervention and its reluctance to apply force against functional sovereign states.

China’s responses toward proposals of intervention against pariah states in Africa and the Middle East provide comparison and contrast with the cases of North Korea and Myanmar. The fundamental difference among these cases is the shared borders with China. The physical distance between the target states and China makes the degree of social pressure different; clearly, the crises happening around China’s neighboring area would exert more international pressure on Beijing. The reason is that PRC is expected by the international community to take more action and be more responsible when dealing with crises happening in East Asia. The issues in Africa and the Middle East require China’s cooperation; however, China is less frequently asked to initiate actions dealing with turmoil in remote areas. For example, Beijing was asked by its Western counterparts to help stop the North Korean nuclear project, but in the Iranian nuclear crisis, PRC took a more passive action and attitude. Guanxi with the target regimes and regional international organizations is always foremost in China’s considerations of how to respond to the call for intervention. Thus, host state consent and the approval of regional organizations are always crucial in shaping PRC’s intervention policy. The use of non-coercive means remains the major point in China’s crisis management. This
insistence on the use of non-coercive means also depends on whether the target regime is capable of handling the crisis in question. Based on the case studies and comparison of China’s responses to different cases of international intervention, the criteria determining Beijing’s attitude and decision-making are clearly depicted. These criteria are never independent from each other. However, to understand why they are important to China’s logic of decision-making, an investigation on the Chinese political tradition and its philosophical thought is required.

**Harmonious Intervention: A Pattern in Process under a View of World Order**

Has China already formed a pattern of international intervention? If it indeed has one, what does such a pattern mean and how was it constructed? The answer remains complicated at first glance, but the clues have been clarified. By investigating multiple cases, as was done in the previous sections, the details can now be presented in the following analysis. The clues, if they can be defined as such, are the results of inductive inference based on the previous work. They include the following points: the criteria for China to support intervention, the measures China applies to balance international pressure calling for intervention, and the maintenance of its principle of nonintervention. The content of these points are directed to the “pragmatism” in China’s policy-making logic and its attitude toward international intervention. These points are the conditions for Beijing to accept or turn down the call for international intervention; they form the pattern, but they are not the root. The root of the Chinese pattern of intervention can be found in its political culture, particularly its view of world order. In other words, China’s attitude toward intervention and its insistence on the institution of sovereignty are shaped
by how PRC defines the world order. Such order is the apparatus driving the motion and
function of global politics, and it defines China’s role in global governance. This factor is
the ultimate one that leads PRC to engage in specific interventionary behavior, that is,
“intervention without confrontation.” Both the form and the root of this special pattern of
intervention will be explained and analyzed in the following sections.

Pragmatism in the Chinese Pattern of Intervention

Summarizing the previous cases regarding China’s responses to the calls for
international intervention, certain criteria are used to determine China’s attitude toward
intervention. These criteria were formed based not only on Chinese political tradition but
also on Beijing’s experiences in its international affairs. These criteria reflect the
orientation of pragmatism in Chinese foreign policy. Such pragmatism is intended to find
a balance between principle and reality while taking care of national interests and the
image China wants to present to the international community at the same time.

Pragmatism in China’s policy toward international intervention does not exclude the
consideration of national interests. However, how China evaluates and categorizes its
national interests should be the focus of inquiry. The way China ranks its national
interests is different from what most Western observers might expect. This method may
explain why, in the North Korea and Myanmar cases, China’s relationship with the target
countries seems to play a more crucial role in Beijing’s decision making than the matter
of raw materials. However, China’s current response to the nuclear crisis in Iran seems to
prioritize the pursuit of energy interests, which falls back to the predictions of the realist
argument.
At first glance, China seems to behave inconsistently in different cases of international intervention. The case studies presented in this research reveal the principles guiding China’s actions and reactions toward intervention. These principles, or criteria, include the following: UN authorization, host state consent, attitude of the regional community, and scope of the use of coercion. Among these criteria, the host state’s consent holds the foremost status, as it is the most crucial condition in China’s insistence on states’ sovereignty and equality. Only when there is agreement from the target state, regardless how it was achieved, can PRC positively respond to the proposal of intervention and treat it as a “request” from a target nation in need of external assistance.

One of the rare exceptions is the case of intervention imposed on Somalia. At that time, the internal situation of Somalia was anarchic, that is, none of the fighting forces could represent a legal government of Somalia and formally accept UN intervention. After China voted in favor of the UN taking action in Somalia, Chinese officials reiterated that China’s decision was based on Somalia’s unusual conditions and should be seen as an exception (Davis 2011, 231-232). Indeed, in other cases, China clearly did not attach great importance to the consent of the target state. The most obvious contrast lies between Liberia and Libya, with China supporting the UN’s decision to send forces in the former case but severely condemning it in the latter.

The other famous and noteworthy exception is the case of Sudan. China attempted to forcefully obtain host state consent by sending a special envoy to intercede and make Khartoum accept the UN intervention. However, Khartoum’s ability to handle the internal warfare and stabilize domestic politics should be noted. China’s evaluation of the
target regime’s ability should have driven Beijing to consider that criterion fulfilled. If China recognizes that the internal turmoil of the target state can still be controlled by the current regime, it will not compel the fulfillment of host state consent. In the case of Sudan, secessionism was so strong that Khartoum was unable to control the violence and atrocities (eventually leading to the independence of the Republic of South Sudan in 2011). Had the internal conflict not been so severe, it is doubtful that Beijing would have gotten involved in the mediation with Sudan and forced it to accept UN intervention.

The criterion of host state consent was not fulfilled in both North Korea and Myanmar cases. To some extent, the issues giving rise to calls for international intervention differentiate the two cases. China has yielded more to the Security Council resolutions on the imposition of sanctions on North Korea. This action is partly the result of the nature of the issue, that is, the nuclear crisis, which can easily foment tension and potential conflict in the region.

Another important factor shaping China’s decision making is the attitude of the regional community. In the case of North Korea, the major great powers and regional states in Northeast Asia all condemned Pyongyang’s violation of nuclear nonproliferation. In contrast, the major regional inter-governmental organization, ASEAN, remained opposed to the call for intervention against the military junta in Myanmar. Thus, the regional community placed social pressure on Beijing to respond in a manner ensuring the preservation of its guanxi with all parties involved in the issue.

One more relatively less crucial criterion is authorization given by the UN. If the other criteria have not been fulfilled, China would veto, or at least abstain from, any
decisions approving international intervention. However, in its official announcement on
the intervention imposed on pariah states, Beijing insists that the UN is the only
legitimate initiator of interference against sovereign states. Although an international
intervention is led by a single state, such action should still seek authorization from the
UN. This view further explains why China can support the sanctions issued by the
Security Council on Iran but severely condemn unilateral sanctions imposed by the US
and EU on the same. Of course, China’s insistence that UN should always take the major
role in international interventions is related to the fact that only when the UN is in charge
can the PRC wield some influence or at least control the scope of the use of force. Under
the principle of noninterference, China has opposed the imposition of intervention
through coercive means. China has tried to create a balance between such principles and
the trend of current international politics (which favors imposing intervention for
humanitarian reasons), and it remains very cautious and hesitant in cases of intervention
involving the use of military force. This hesitation is reflected in China’s refusal to send
out fighting troops but only police and professional personnel mainly in charge of
peacekeeping work and postwar construction. Refraining from the aggressive aspect of
intervention but contributing to the passive part of construction seems to be a special
characteristic of the Chinese pattern of intervention.

The last point regarding China’s interventionary pattern is the specific feature of
“institutionalized personal diplomacy.” If the previous criteria are the passive side of the
Chinese pattern of intervention, then institutionalized personal diplomacy should be
considered its active side. Personal diplomacy is not new in international politics, and it
was not invented by Chinese officials. This specific feature of the Chinese application of personal diplomacy is a product of the prioritization of guanxi. When managing international crises, China tends to send the same political figures to the same area to deal with similar issues. Thus, the term “institutionalized personal diplomacy” is coined in this study. This approach relies on personal capability and private connections to the issues in question, and it has been purposely maintained in the bureaucratic apparatus. These characteristics are well presented in Chinese scholar Wang Yizhou’s book *Creative Involvement: A New Direction in China's Diplomacy*. In Wang’s analysis, in almost all “successful” cases of China’s involvement in international intervention, that is, cases in which China received a positive response or even praise from the Western world, skillful and wise Chinese diplomats were always involved in the process of mediation. Through the outstanding performance of these Chinese diplomats and their personal ties with foreign political figures, PRC was able to lead the process smoothly and complete its role as mediator. Case studies analyzed in Wang’ work include Wang Yi’s mission in Myanmar, Liu Guijing’s status as special envoy to Sudan, and Fu Ying’s skillful and talented engagement with the global mass media.127 Wang also analyzed China’s performance in different international crises using the diverse theories or sayings currently prevailing in China (Wang 2011).

Institutionalized personal diplomacy demonstrates the importance of the maintenance of guanxi in China’s ranking of national interests. Chinese diplomats’

127 A similar technique was adopted in PRC’s dealings with Taiwan. Wang Daohan and Chen Yunlin are both representatives sent by Beijing to negotiate with Taipei. Both are famous for their people skills and good personal relationships with Taiwanese politicians. Wang is the most famous figure to advocate a pragmatic approach of peaceful engagement with Taipei.
personal skill and ties with the host states or organizations lead to better communication. Institutionalized personal diplomacy is a special type of track-two diplomacy designed specifically to strengthen track-one diplomatic work. Once such foundation has been built, it helps ease the friction of negotiation. It also proves that China treasures the relationship between nations. When China plays the role of mediator, institutionalized personal diplomacy frequently plays a key role in reducing tension and minimizing the possibility of further intervention through coercive means.

Philosophy Behind “Intervention Without Confrontation”

The development of institutionalized personal diplomacy in China’s response to international intervention demonstrates the importance of guanxi in Chinese diplomatic thinking. For the West, personal diplomacy is often a product of practice or coincidence, but for PRC, it is an intrinsic component of the Chinese style of diplomacy. Applying this to China’s response to international intervention, institutionalized personal diplomacy offers a private channel to reconcile the appeal for intervention and the political needs of the target regime. In so doing, either the call for intervention through coercion can be averted or the criterion of host state consent can be fulfilled. Thus, the ideal of “intervention without confrontation” can be achieved. This skill not only applies to China’s response to proposals of intervention against North Korea and Myanmar but also to its management of crises and negotiating with the two states.

The ideal of “intervention without confrontation” points toward the root of the Chinese pattern of intervention. This root has grown from China’s view of the world order and has shaped China’s understanding of the current international system. In
addition, the Chinese view of world order also determines how PRC defines the responsibilities of great powers. There has been much research, both philosophical and empirical, focusing on China’s view of the world order. This study does not intend to join the investigation on the origin and components of the Chinese view of world order, as this should be done by historians and philosophers. What this study plans to address relates only to the construction of China’s interventionary pattern and its response to international crises. This part of the Chinese view of the world order, simply put, is the special characteristic in the traditional Chinese political thought that can be summarized as **ontologically hierarchical and epistemologically relational.**

China’s motivation behind its response to international intervention is the assertion of a specific hierarchy of actions. This hierarchy has three aspects. First, if force is to be used at all, only the UN can authorize it. No single state or collective can replace the UN. Thus, only when an intervention is authorized by the UN can PRC support that intervention, **providing** that all other criteria are met. Second, the fundamental international institution should be prioritized: the sovereignty and equality of states. Thus, consent from the target regime is crucial to China’s support for international intervention. Third, this hierarchical thinking also shapes China’s relative attitude toward adjacent and distant neighbors. Neighboring states that are part of the China-centered East Asian international system carry more weight with PRC than those in the far distance. This ranking system can better understand the figure of concentric circles described in Confucianism. It is a derivative of typical Chinese family and social
relations. As kinship is defined by diverse ranks, the Chinese central authority also adopts policies and ways of thinking in which actors are classified into different ranks.

The third meaning of the traditional Chinese world view—hierarchical thinking—directs our attention once again to the importance of guanxi. The ultimate purpose of the Chinese pattern of “intervention without confrontation” is to manage relationships. Similar to the intervention theory in IR literature, the Chinese pattern of intervention aims to change the policy of target nations, preferably with the change done voluntarily. If this voluntary change is achieved, the guanxi between China and all parties involved in the issue is maintained. This strategy also aims to maintain regional and global order, with China setting the example as a fine role model for other nations to be attracted to and learn from. This special characteristic in the Chinese world view explains why China opposes intervention for the sake of regime change and democratization. The point here is that, if liberal democracy is a truly desirable form of government, then others will voluntarily come and learn it. In the same vein, if a political system is not voluntarily adopted by others, then that system must be flawed, or other limitations exist because of such conditions as environment and cultural background. From China’s perspective, imposing a political system through coercion it is neither legitimate nor only for an outside party.

Regime change is not only a negation of the institution of sovereignty; it also transforms untroubled relations into antagonism. Furthermore, regime change and value planting often introduce bias against different cultures and value systems. Avoiding potential conflicts caused by such biases is the main task of traditional Chinese political
thought, given China’s long history of integration of diverse ethnicities. Thus, preventing ethnic and cultural conflict is the main theme in Chinese political philosophy. This theme explains why harmony is always the most important virtue in Chinese political thought. Many Chinese political thinkers follow the common usage and call this specific political thought tianxia (or “all under heaven”).

Zhao Tingyang became the most well-known scholar of traditional Chinese political theories since publishing his book *Tianxia System* in 2005. In this book and in subsequent articles, Zhao claims that tianxia is an ideal rather than a political option or aim pursued by PRC. He defines the concept of tianxia by renewing and refining the political philosophy inherited from the Zhou dynasty. However, this philosophy portrays a utopia, and treating it as a goal for China as a rising great power to achieve is unrealistic. A better way to understand how the ideal of tianxia shapes China’s foreign policy is to consider it as a metaphysical method that affects the logic of Chinese leaders’ decision making.

---

128 In this chapter, the concept of tianxia adopted to explain the philosophical background of China’s interventionary pattern is mainly from Zhao Tingyang’s work. His definition of tianxia is a refined and renewed one, as it is a derivative of the political system of the Zhou dynasty in the Chinese history. He indicated that the concept of tianxia should not be treated as a “Chinese system” but as an ideal type of new world order newly designed for making a better world (Zhao 2005). Such claim forms the response to William Callahan’s critique of Zhao’s work. Callahan argued that Zhao’s theory of the tianxia system is the endorsement of the official propaganda, which represents a top-down ideological construction designed by Beijing (Callahan, 2008). However, many China experts have adopted the concept of tianxia as an analytical variable to investigate whether and how traditional Chinese political thought, which they call tianxia or the old usage “tribute system,” has affected PRC’s foreign policy and its relations with the current world politics. Such works can be found in Alan Carlson (2010), Jeremy Paltiel (2010), Zhang Feng (2009), David Kang (2007), Jonathan Adelman and Chih-yu Shih (1993), and Fei Xiaotong (1992).

129 As defined by Zhao Tingyang in his book, tianxia is the “dense concept of world” consisting of a trinity of meanings: (1) the earth under the sky, (2) the public choice made by all peoples in the world or the universal agreement of the “hearts” of all peoples, and (3) a universal system for the world, with a world institution responsible for universal order and peace (Zhao 2005 & 2011). More discussions and analyses of the concept of tianxia can be found in Zhao’s 2005 book *Tianxia System: A Political World Philosophy in terms of All-Under-Heaven.*
As Zhao explained, the revision of the theory of the tianxia system complements the defects of Kantian peace, which is frequently quoted in many IR theorists’ works (e.g., Alexander Wendt). According to Zhao, while Kantian peace requires all political existences to be similar (in international politics, the Kantian actor implies a republican state), the ideal of tianxia focuses on the achievement of universally compatible relations among all political existences. This idea is reflected in Chinese leaders’ emphasis on guanxi in matters of international affairs. To find such universal compatible relations, in practice, the consideration of policy making should focus on relationships. As Zhao points out, tianxia as a world view gives priority to relational security and reciprocal interests. By prioritizing relationships over individuals, conflicts will be easily settled and every individual’s self-interest can be ensured. Zhao called this rationale “methodological relationalism.” (Zhao 2011) Moreover, the fundamental characteristic of the Chinese way of communication is not to determine right from wrong but rather to reach a mutually beneficial outcome that both parties want or at least accept (Zhao 2003, 93). Beijing’s emphasis on multiple party talks and China’s role as mediator is the manifestation of this characteristic of Chinese political culture. Such strategies are designed to take care of China’s need to maintain guanxi.

The slogan of building a “harmonious world” is a derivative of the theory of all-under-heaven. Socialism also partly contributes to this discourse. Chinese socialism has practiced pragmatism since the Deng era, finding win–win solutions through cautious experimentation with the ultimate goal of preserving justice and equality and eventually
building a “harmonious society” within and outside of China. The slogan “building a harmonious society” formally became the principle behind China’s national development strategy in 2004. On September 15, 2005, Hu Jingtao used the term “harmonious world” in his speech at the 60th anniversary of the UN. Both “harmonious society” and “harmonious world” are legacies of traditional Confucian philosophy and are also embedded in the ideal of tianxia. The idea of harmony emphasizes both spiritual civilization and subjective virtue, which are utilized for the preservation of harmony. The process of reaching harmony is more an internal task than an external imposition. That is, harmony is not uniformity but rather seeking common ground while preserving differences (“qiu tong cun yi”). Focusing on consensus but not on the imposition of force is what Confucianism calls the difference between the selfless “ingly way” (“wangdao”) and self-centric hegemony (“ba dao”). This distinction forms the basis of the world order depicted in the ideal of tianxia.

To describe further the idea of harmony, Zhao Tingyang’s work once again provides a good definition: “In Chinese philosophy, harmony means the best of all

---

130 Despite socialist ideas, such as egalitarianism, collectivism, and revolution against exploitation, being compatible with Confucian order, there are still many contradictions between the Confucian ideal and the Chinese practice of socialism. Socialist ideology imbued with nationalism in opposition to capitalism/the West is one example of these contradictions; another is the one-party rule and the predominance of collective good over the good of partial interests (i.e., nation over clan, region, sector and so on). Yet another is that the Confucian ideal suggests that politics should be in the hands of virtuous elites, but the communist spirit dictates exactly the opposite. As China did not inherit the Western idea of transcendence, pragmatism and concession to the interests of the rank-and-file remain the themes for China to deal with, as well as the restoration of relationships broken by these contradictions due to the revolution against exploitation or imperialism. Historically, PRC once promoted the mass-line approach to mobilize popular support for gaining leadership. The mass line is actually a line adopted by the elite to discover the needs and expectations of the rank and file. Since Jiang Zemin took over the leadership, it seems that in the sphere of choosing successors and through Jiang’s successor Hu Jintao, PRC continues to hopes to tame elitism through the populist mass line to ensure that the Party remains selfless.

131 As Zhao Tingyang pointed out, the concept of tianxia is not equal to Confucianism. Tianxia is a political philosophy constructed by the combination of diverse Chinese political philosophies, with Confucianism and Daoism comprising the major part (Zhao 2005).
possible relations… The strategy of harmony aims at making the best relations that maximize the reciprocal interests for all players” (Zhao 2011). Traditional Chinese political philosophy does not reject the pursuit of interests and utility, but utility that is self-centric should not be valued more highly than the consideration of relationships. Confucian harmony is a process of concession and consultation first given by the higher party and then followed by the lower party; this has been the traditional way to deal with controversies and conflicts amid diverse self-interests. Therefore, “the best concept of the political is about the arts of harmonization instead of the arts of antagonism and domination” (Zhao 2011). This philosophical perspective provides a profound explanation to why China will never become a motivated practitioner of international intervention. It is flawed to the extent that it does not deal with violence caused by action and intent to restore relationship deemed drifting astray. China will not support the use of coercion unless its appropriate place in its view of world order and its definition of harmony are rejected. Chinese leaders evaluate China’s relations with other countries to determine if such a refusal has taken place. The goal of Chinese intervention is to restore either a relationship between China and other countries or a relationship among other countries in order to confirm China’s place in the hierarchical order. In short, the

---

132 Regarding the function of violence in the quest for harmony, see Shih (2009, 2012).
133 Violence or the use of force is an inevitable component in Chinese balance of relationships; yet it should always be the last resort. Whether or not applying coercion is the last resort is determined by the level of bearing which is attitudinal and subjective, not objective. Example has shown on the Chinese comment on the standoff between China and Philippine over the sovereign rights of the Scarborough Shoal. China accuses the Philippines of disrupting the Chinese fishermen. In an interview with the Chinese IR expert Xing Qu, he pointed out that in the Chinese philosophy, there is a saying called “give way to avoid conflict (tui bi san she);” yet it is never no limit of giving way. When the opposite side pushes over China’s bound of tolerance, retaliation is always the potential resort for China (Central News Agency 2012).
rationale in China’s view of world order is ontologically and epistemologically relation oriented. Methodologically, maintaining harmony and relationships is the main theme.\textsuperscript{134}

Emphasizing harmony, guanxi (relationship), interests based on the results of consultation, and the seeking of concession have deeply influenced China’s interpretation and practice of the application of power. After all, coercive intervention defeats the purpose of restoring relationship and harmony. In the cases investigated in previous sections, the Chinese involvement in international intervention was an application of soft means intended to demonstrate the attraction of maintaining relations with China. Even in cases in which PRC supported the use of economic sanctions or military force, it would insist that coercion could only be short term and punitive or constructive-oriented in nature. Thus, the target state would not lose authority over its territory and would still be capable of controlling its domestic politics. In the Chinese ideal, intervention best achieves its goal when the intervening parties can obtain victory without taking anything and without hurting the relations with the target regime. Noticeably, unilateral withdrawal has been a characteristic of Chinese military intervention since the early 1950s.\textsuperscript{135}

The Chinese political philosophy and PRC’s ideal version of international intervention have led China to develop a distinct understanding of the use of power when participating in intervention. The Chinese intent when applying power—whether hard or

\textsuperscript{134} Zhao Tingyang argued that tianxia, as a method, should be treated as “the methodology to make the world. The ultimate goal is to redefine and to justify universal values, and to make a world constitution, in terms of new universalism, that is relationalism.” Quoted from correspondence with Zhao Tingyang.

\textsuperscript{135} Famous examples include China’s wars with India and Vietnam. A more detailed analysis is provided by Jonathan Adelman and Chih-yu Shih in their book \textit{Symbolic war : the Chinese use of force, 1840-1980} (Adelman and Shih 2003).
soft—in international intervention is to pursue relational security and demonstrate that China would never be an enemy; this secures relationships and guarantees the peaceful solution of disputes. As a result, countries do not define China as a source of problems during times of controversy. These facts, as reflected in the Chinese foreign policy, support the previous arguments that the consideration of guanxi with target regimes and other involved actors shapes China’s attitude toward international intervention. However, judging from the global media’s lack of friendliness toward China, PRC clearly still has a long way to go to build a positive image in the Western world.136

The ideal of building a harmonious society and a harmonious world remains the ultimate goal of Chinese domestic and foreign policy in the foreseeable future. However, pragmatism developed through long experience in international politics has taught PRC to evaluate reality with great caution. China is aware that it is impossible not to encounter controversies caused by differences and disagreements, and the philosophy of tianxia may not be able to help solve disputes between states in real-world politics. Thus, tianxia remains a method at the metaphysical level; it shapes China’s view of the world order and leads China to focus on relational thought. Reflecting on China’s policy toward international intervention, the preservation of guanxi is considered the main goal of Beijing’s policy making. Furthermore, the Chinese way of solving disputes tends toward the model in which concessions are made by the higher party, and consultation should be done with the lower party. This method is the typical Confucian style of dealing with

136 On July 1, 2010, the Chinese official news media Xinhua News Agency launched a 24-hour English language global news channel called CNC world. This action is viewed as an important step in China’s international media strategy. For more details, related news is available at http://chinaelectionsblog.net/?p=9163.
controversies, and its great influence on Chinese foreign policy can still be seen in China’s management of the territorial disputes involving North Korea and Myanmar.

In sum, the Chinese style of intervention without confrontation aims to maintain and restore relations with others. This characteristic leads PRC to prefer an informal manner of dealing with disputes, that is, sending special envoys to the target state and communicating with all parties involved in the dispute. Concession and consultation are also better made through informal means. As a result, China does not agree with the use of coercion as the sole means of intervention. Coercive intervention is always confrontational and detrimental to world order in the Chinese evaluation. Moreover, its ontologically, epistemologically, and methodologically relational-oriented worldview rooted in Chinese political philosophy leads China to define its national interests differently from Western states. Emphasis on relationships with others enforces China’s belief that its highest national interest is to show that China will not pursue its own national interests at others’ expense. In this sense, material interests are far less important than the restoration of relations. Thus, we have seen PRC compromise on material interests in certain cases of international intervention (e.g., the crises in North Korea, Myanmar, Sudan, and Libya), turning hard intervention into a soft solution to gain long-term relational security.
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

This study was designed to answer the question: why does China hold a negative attitude toward international intervention imposed on pariah states in East Asia? The scope of the research is limited to East Asia, but the explanations and analysis provided in the previous chapters help depict the overall pattern of Chinese intervention behavior. PRC has a special style of responding to international intervention. This special style is different from what Western great powers expect and is the result of China’s gradual development of pragmatism and the influence of Chinese political culture. Chapters 2 and 3 provide a detailed analysis that supports the arguments made in Chapter 4. The case studies of North Korea and Myanmar were conducted by testing six hypotheses that also included the investigation of the following variables: shared borders and disputed territories, sources of raw material and economic interests, social pressure, relations with the target regimes and related parties, ability of the target regime, and feasibility of non-coercive means. In Chapter 4, more case studies were presented to compare and contrast with the two prior cases. However, the multiple cases provided in Chapter 4 were not investigated following the sequence shown in the previous two chapters. The main purpose of conducting these short case studies is to compare the results of China’s decision making on different issues occurring in different geographic areas. The comparison helped prove that PRC applies similar logic and engages in consistent behavior when facing appeals to impose international interventions in distant regions.
If the PRC’s decision-making logic does not appear much different across different regions, then the variable of shared borders seems to lose its weight. However, if the power of guanxi is added to the equation, then it becomes obvious that the effect of shared borders on China’s international intervention is crucial, albeit indirectly. The physical distance between the target state and China determines its importance in Beijing’s scale of foreign relations. Chinese foreign policy is built on the consideration of national interests and the maintenance of relations/guanxi. Western diplomatic history reveals a similar focus on national interests and the preservation of international relations, but the crucial distinction lies in guanxi/relations going beyond the methodological level. Western states place national interests before all else, deciding the manipulation of relations with other states depending on their own needs and interests. In Chinese political culture, although the manipulation of relations with others as a means to reach certain goals is not unusual, the extraordinary point is that Chinese culture also places relations/guanxi at the epistemological level. The evaluation of mutual relations and one’s role in such relations forms the core value system by which the Chinese make judgments and decide actions.

In daily practice, maintaining relations is done not only for gaining certain interests but also for the maintenance itself. This maintenance necessitates the understanding of the status of relations at an ontological level. Before one can construct one’s identity, one must know what kinds of relations one shares with others and acknowledge one’s own role in that network. Thus, the term guanxi interpreted in the Chinese context includes the meaning of responsibility. To a great extent, the
maintenance of guanxi is a realization of mutual responsibility. However, it does not mean that guanxi necessarily makes Chinese society more peaceful and stable. The harmony of guanxi has been an ideal throughout Chinese history. Whenever there was a breakdown of guanxi, either symbolically or in concrete terms, the Chinese would opt for violence and coercion. Realpolitik is not foreign to Chinese politics; it is rather a type of strategy than the essence of Chinese political culture.

Although the arguments in this study disagree with realist explanations of China’s behavior in response to international intervention, this study began by adopting realist assumptions and agreeing that China’s policy toward international intervention includes the pursuit of national interests, as suggested by the realist arguments. Security around its neighboring areas and its economic interests in the target states provide examples of these realist arguments. However, the realists fail to explain why China tolerates the great danger posed by North Korea’s nuclear weapons program and rejects interference using military force. Realism also fails to explain why Beijing seemed to act slowly in the Libyan crisis and allowed itself to miss great economic opportunities. The results of this research agree with the argument made by constructivism in the IR theory explaining China’s giving in to social pressure. Constructivism also provides a good analytical angle to understand the importance of maintaining guanxi in Chinese foreign policy. However, constructivism fails to provide a persuasive answer to why China keeps insisting on its principle of nonintervention, neglecting the threat brought by pressure imposed by other great powers and regional states. Furthermore, certain prevailing branches of

---

137 Ian Johnston proved that the strategic culture in the Chinese traditional political thought is not much different from the realist argument (Johnston 1995)
constructivism in the IR theory suggest a linear process of development in the states’ behaviors. For instance, Alexander Wendt’s social theory implies a final destination to the evolution of international society, which is the relatively more peaceful Kantian society based on the construction of communal identity. Alastair Johnston defines three processes of social learning in the book *Social States: China in International Institutions*. The final process of socialization, that is, persuasion, implies an implicit teleology that China will finally be socialized into global governance currently dominated by Western political culture and rules (Wendt 1999; Johnston 2008). The argument of this study does not have a similar teleological implication. It merely points out the insufficiency of realist arguments and refutes the assumption of any specific destination for China’s developing interventionary pattern.

The negation of the teleological development of China’s integration into the international community also points to the root of the difficulties in predicting PRC’s attitude toward international intervention, the same root that helped this study construct the arguments made in Chapter 4: the political culture represented in traditional Chinese politics and still reflected in Beijing’s current foreign policy. This political culture shapes the Chinese view of the world order and shows China’s distinctive pattern of behavior in its foreign affairs. There are clear distinctions between the Western and Chinese views of world order, which is partially why current IR literature cannot sufficiently explain China’s responses. Whereas the Western view of world order focuses more on individual and personal rights, Chinese political philosophy emphasizes the importance of community and the harmony inside it. In Western philosophy, individuals are prioritized
over the community; in the Chinese political and social order, individuals only find their 
roles and the meanings of their lives in the community, so that the community is always 
in a higher position than the individual. The basic assumption of the Western view of 
world order is that conflicts are caused by the clash of individuals’ self-interests; this is 
also what the IR theories seek answers for. However, in the Chinese view of world order, 
the ultimate objective of managing conflicts is the preservation of relations within the 
community.

In this study, applying the term “West” does not imply a universal standard 
representing all Western nations, cultures, and civilizations. The term was used simply to 
characterize the special features of Chinese political philosophy. The contrast between 
the generalized “Western” and Chinese political cultures makes understanding why China 
acts so differently from its Western counterparts under certain circumstances easier. 
Nevertheless, Chinese foreign policy is a mix of pragmatism and political culture. The 
pragmatic part of China’s intervention behavior is the result of accumulated experience of 
differences and controversies involving its Western counterparts. It can also been seen as 
a product of compromise between distinctive political cultures.

Despite the philosophical significance of the research results, this study departs 
from one of the most practical and controversial issues in current international politics. 
The legitimacy of imposing international intervention is still a matter of great debate; 
international society as a whole has not yet reached any agreement. International 
intervention remains a crucial international topic, as it remains the preferred approach to 
crisis management and a key aspect of global governance. Nevertheless, international
intervention is often doubted and challenged, especially by weak states in the developing world. Intervention has also been suspected as a means for great powers to exploit the resources and control the domestic politics of Third World countries. The pattern of Chinese intervention and nonintervention is vital to the future development of global governance not only because of PRC’s role as one of the five permanent members in the UN Security Council but also because of its self-identification as the representative of the Third World. Strong national power makes Beijing’s decisions important to the success of interventions. Moreover, its tight connection with developing states can help bridge the rift between the North and the South should an agreement on the legitimacy of international intervention be desired.

To date, the PRC has opposed more proposals of intervention than it has supported. The principle of noninterference remains in a foremost position in Chinese foreign policy. However, based on the investigations made in this dissertation, inaction is not China’s sole response to international intervention. China does act, although its manner is often interpreted as inactive and slow. The six hypotheses designed in this research are meant to explain not only China’s negative attitude toward intervention but also its specific manner of responding to proposals to impose interventions. These hypotheses are related to one another, especially the concept of “guanxi”, which is the key variable among the six (as discussed at the beginning of this chapter).

Therefore, the major finding of this study is the importance of guanxi in China’s decision-making logic when responding to calls for international intervention. All six hypotheses proposed in this research refer to the consideration of guanxi. The sharing of
orders and concession in territorial disputes proves Beijing’s special attitude toward two neighboring nations. Moreover, sources of raw materials and economic interests weigh less in Beijing’s consideration when facing calls for interventions against these two states. When pressured by calls for intervention, China opts for measures that demonstrate its willingness to act in front of its Western counterparts but at the same time allow it to preserve relations with the target regime. Thus, the evaluation of a regime’s ability to handle internal crises is so crucial to PRC. If the regime is still capable of managing the crisis in question, Beijing will not support intervention, but it may involve itself in crisis management by taking the role of mediator. The application of non-coercive means is always China’s priority when dealing with international intervention, as non-coercive means allow China to deal with crises and yet maintain good relations with the target regime and other parties involved.

However, note that the hypotheses and variables affecting Chinese intervention suggested in this research are ideal conditions, not the necessary ones. China’s decisions depend on diverse conditions and local situations. The consideration of guanxi is always at the core of the Chinese decision making, but the interpretation of China’s position when dealing with multiple levels of guanxi differs from case to case. What remains constant is Beijing’s intention to maintain balanced relations not only with the target states but also with those wanting to impose intervention and the neighboring states.

The recent crisis in Syria provides additional evidence for the arguments made in this research. The bloody government crackdown against civilian protesters has received severe condemnation from the international community. Syrian president Bashar al-
Assad has been charged with crimes against humanity, and many Arabic League states and Western great powers have called for al-Assad to stop the atrocities and hand over power. Proposals for international intervention were submitted to the UN Security Council in October 2011 and February 2012, but both resolutions were vetoed by Russia and China. This double veto by Russia and China is a rare occurrence in the history of the Security Council (Lynch 2011; BBC News 2012a). The second resolution submitted in February 2012 was backed by Arabic countries; therefore, China’s application of its veto power appears inconsistent with its response to Libya. Consequently, Beijing was widely criticized for it. However, later that month, China announced that it would send a special envoy, Deputy Foreign Minister Zhai Jun, to Damascus for mediation (Xinhua News 2012; BBC News 2012b). This behavior demonstrates that the variables of social pressure, guanxi, and regime ability do shape China’s decision making in response to appeals for international intervention. In this case, although China vetoed the resolutions and seemed to go against the will of the Arabic League, sending a special envoy shows Beijing’s intent to obtain the target regime’s consent and its willingness to participate in the management of this crisis. In so doing, China retains the respect of the Arabic League, preserves relations with both Damascus and the Western great powers, and stands by its principle of nonintervention.

Switching from coercive intervention to intervention without confrontation originates in Chinese political culture and its aim of constructing a world order in which China plays a positive role. This world-view order allows China to remain focused on guanxi and not only on material interests. The ideal of intervention without confrontation
is the appearance of harmonious intervention, the purpose of which is not to achieve any just state or a Chinese type of justice but rather to make sure every individual state's place is acceptable to all. The process can be private or public, and the aim is global, such as the materialization of tianxia (all under heaven). For harmonious intervention to manifest, there must first exist a danger of internal disintegration as well as a danger of external invasion. These two factors represent the breakdown of harmonious relations, necessitating intervention. However, if intervention is coercive, not only will harmony fail to recover, but the breakdown of relationships will only worsen. Inversely, harmonious intervention can also shield external dangers, as the maintenance of guanxi seriously limits the effects of intervention. In other words, prioritization of guanxi inhibits the solution of atrocities against humanity and threats to international society.

The Chinese pattern of intervention always seems awkward and slow, but note that, at the very least, China’s policies prevent the creation of failed states, which is a highly possible result of the use of force. The process of harmonious intervention copes with internal dangers by insisting that domestic politics should only be determined by the local people, not foreign powers.

Accordingly, the real danger for China is the breakdown of harmony. It is ironic then that harmonious intervention tends to lead to the further breakdown of harmony, as the slowness and mildness of China’s preferred means often results in new conflicts breaking out while the old ones are still unresolved. The constant conflict between Sudan and newly independent South Sudan provides the best example.
In sum, this dissertation provides different views to aid in the understanding of China’s attitude and behaviors toward international intervention. It has never suggested that the Chinese way can help create a better world where crises and conflicts are more easily solved. However, it does support the argument that the only way to make a better international environment is to improve mutual understanding between nations, cultures, and civilizations. As Lucian Pye famously states, “China is a civilization pretending to be a state” (Pye 1990; Zhang 2011). To grasp the Chinese pattern of intervention, one must go deep into the political culture that has shaped Chinese society and politics for thousands of years. Only by so doing can we expect to solve international crises using constructive measures that are created and accepted by all.
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