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Abstract

There is little agreement in the debate on structure theories, as to the question of anarchy versus hierarchy in international relations. According to neorealist, anarchy plays a central role in international politics. This paper provides a view of international politics as a realm of variegated hierarchy, globally as well as in East Asia. In steep hierarchy, secondary states tend to bandwagon rather than balancing against the extant dominant power. After establishing the two concepts of hierarchy and bandwagonism, I argue that it makes sense why China, instead of being a threatening power, demonstrates a more cooperative foreign policy behavior, as a bandwagoning regional secondary state. Maintaining a cooperative statues-quo posture in East Asia is the most appropriate strategy from China’s perspective and it is important for East Asian development.
1 Introduction

When applying theoretical arguments to regional studies, it is necessary to question whether the existing theories explicating international structures are relevant across all regions, and not just limited to Western history of international relations. Kang counsels “Getting Asia Wrong” that knowledge of European relations is no longer sufficient for well-trained international relations scholars (Kang 2003). Theories derived from the experience of European relations can not be applied to East Asia readily. Neorealists define the international system as being more anarchical than hierarchical. Their analysis about the international system based on past western experience does not seem to have the body of experience or the East Asian nations in mind. Hence, my question: “Is the international system truly an anarchy or is it in reality more of a hierarchy?” In addition to this, I am also skeptical about neorealists’ dichotomy between domestic and international politics and their assertion that it’s more hierarchical in domestic politics while it is anarchical in international politics. This view has been similarly challenged and criticized by numerous scholars in previous decades. Thus I do not take such a theory to be a perpetual and fundamental theoretical foundation. However, I will try to extend the view that hierarchy is a well-developed element in international relations theory by utilizing existing empirical or experimental tests in this paper. From a theoretical perspective, David Lake believes "it is a fallacy of division to assume that because the system is anarchic all relationships within that system are anarchic as well." This is a world composed of a hierarchical structure and the relations between states can be and often are authoritative.

Scholars have long questioned the importance of hierarchy. In Lake’s (2002) research on the “anarchy or hierarchy” debate, he provides a more advanced systemic analysis of the international structure, noting that,

International relations is a variegated system composed of a range of institutions, some anarchic, some hierarchic. Identifying the elements of hierarchy at the core of both the Cold War and Gulf War reveals how taking anarchy as the defining characteristic of international politics actually distorts our vision.

Given the increased support from international relations scholars who also criticized that the global system today is not simply unipolar, we can realize firmly that it is an increasingly globalized hegemonic system, in which the basic concepts of realism provides little guidance or understanding in explaining state behavior (Van Ness 2002). In this paper, I demonstrate that
the study of hierarchy is a well-developed branch of international relations theory, and the “dead horses” plaguing the study and practice of international politics should be recovered and acknowledged. We cannot realize the phenomenon such as the United Stated Congress exists in the domestic arena if we define the domestic politics is more hierarchical, or authoritative relationships like that between the United States and Germany or the United States and Japan exist in the international realm by the only concept neorealist provided, the international anarchy system. This could also be observed by the security hierarchy, in which country A exercises authority over B’s security actions. Some countries tend to surrender its security ability to a much stronger hegemon, such as the Persian Gulf and South Asia, the Federated States of Micronesia and Republic of Marshall Islands today.

Under the assumption of hierarchic international society, some international relations scholars have increasingly begun to challenge the balancing hypothesis. Bandwagoning, not balancing, predominates in political realms whose structure is best described as a hierarchy. Schweller (1994) has criticized some political scientists who have adopted a too narrow and bias selection of cases to explain the world filled with balance of power. He believes that “the goal of bandwagoning is usually self-extension: to obtain values coveted.” (Schweller 1994) Balancing is an extremely costly activity that most states would rather not engage in, while bandwagoning rarely involves costs and is typically done in the expectation of gains. In a steep hierarchy, the international order through a combination of benefits and sanctions that the central power provides to the lesser powers could easily maintain a regular international status. The best strategy for a group of weaker states is to join the dominant power instead of trying to balance against it. Moreover, other scholars’ criticisms center on the balance of power theory.

Research has shown that the theory is “incorrect in its claim for the repetitiveness of strategy and the prevalence of balancing in international politics.” (Powell 1991) Bandwagoning is more common than balance of power in history. Kang (2003) has also mentioned the rising debate in his article, if twenty years ago the conventional wisdom was that balancing was universal law of international relations, there is now considerable evidence from outside the European context-including ancient Assyria, medieval Asia, India, and Latin America-that in systems consisting of one major power, the secondary status often do not balance against it (Kang 2003).

The statements mentioned above can lead one to conclude that after scruti-
nizing the international relations in East Asia, it is demonstrated that in a system of steep hierarchy, bandwagoning replaces the balance of power as the main strategy of secondary states. The use of bandwagoning predominates in hierarchically ordered political realms where functional differentiation is low and influential resources are tightly concentrated in the hands of the dominant power.

I extend the argument into an analysis of Chinese foreign policy that in the structure of hierarchy marked by U.S. hegemony, China clearly prefers to bandwagon instead of balancing against the hegemon. My main argument in this paper is that China will not play the “hegemon” in the future; the U.S.-led alliance system will still occupy its position of influence in the Asian region.

Under U.S. dominance in East Asia, China intends to be a stable regional power, rather than a revisionist one that will challenge American influence. China’s rise does not have to result in the eclipse of the United States as the region’s dominant power. It would be preferable if the U.S. maintains its dominant strategy in East Asia, which will in turn help maintain stability and peace in the region. In particular, it pays for the U.S. to strengthen the U.S.-Japan alliance. It is in the U.S.’s national interest, however, to actively integrate China into the world system, treating China as a cooperative partner rather than a strategic competitor.

At the conclusion of this paper, the debate over the “China Threat” issue will be addressed and China’s official and academic explanation will be analyzed. I will discuss the reform of Chinese foreign policy and its participation in international institutions. I will conclude that China prefers to play a more stable and cooperative role internationally, as evidenced by the increasing introduction of multilateralism into Chinese foreign policy. I will use the examples of ASEAN, APEC, and WTO as my case studies. My conclusion will be that bandwagoning strategy is more suitable than balance of power if China’s rising is to set up its eventual target as a regional power instead of being a global hegemon. The empirical and historical evidence have revealed that it is better for China to pursue a more flexible and status-quo foreign policy, instead of being an aggressive revisionist. If this were so, it is possible that the escalation of U.S.-China rivalry will cease, as will the U.S. view of China as a challenger.
2 The Change at the Systematic Level in Asia

According to Waltz (1979), structure is the principal determinant of outcomes at the systems level: structure encourages certain actions and discourages others. He criticized traditional realists’ (Morgenthau’s and Kissinger’s) arguments, asserting that they only care about the unit behavior, and also ignore the influences from structure. Waltz thinks states’ small decisions do not matter while structure will evolve in some ways that will determine international order. The state-as-actor model needs no defense among neorealists, as they also embrace the state-centric assumption. Waltz emphasizes on his own theory, systemic model, arguing that it is not possible to understand world politics by just looking inside states. In the history of international relations, results achieved seldom correspond to the intentions of actors. His answer to this phenomenon shows that states’ decisions are apparently shaped by the very presence of other states as well as by interactions with them (Waltz 1979).

The rule of anarchy has been accorded a central role in international politics, Waltz having explained that “among states, the state of nature is state of war (Waltz 1979;102).” There is no central authority capable of imposing order on the individual states-countries have to rely on self-help, and thus cooperation is rare and at best temporary. Because of the conflict and competition between nation states, the main schools of thought in neorealism strongly believe that balance of power offers an irreducible explanation of states’ behavior. Self-help is the only important dictum for survival when actors are in an anarchic order.

Waltz also separates political structures between domestic and international ones. He believes that there is a dichotomy method dividing domestic and international structures, which consists of domestic politics with hierarchical order and international politics with anarchical order. And because of anarchy in international system, there are some methods used simply because the system forces you to act that way. Therefore, balance of power is no longer a mechanism to explain but is the only channel. As balance of power applies to the anarchic model, he assumes that units have to worry about their survival and self-help is necessarily focused on international anarchy issues.

Indicating and defining the importance of international structure nowadays are extremely essential when we initiate our discussion on regional politics. Discovering the disadvantages and lack of sufficient argument of the implications of anarchy can also let us follow from the assumption. Many debates and academic discussions have demonstrated that hierarchy clearly
exists in the international arena, and it is such a fallacy if we ignore this important phenomenon when we discuss the international structure. David Lake states in his article “Hierarchy is one of the dead horses plaguing the study and practice of international politics (Lake 2003).” I wish to follow up the same point and ask “Is the international system truly an anarchic one or is it in reality more of a hierarchic one?” Or could we just define this world in the same manner as Waltz: “it is anarchical in the international system while hierarchical in the domestic ones?” I will discuss in this chapter about the structure issue, and also provide my own argument that neorealists have led us down the wrong path.

2.1 Hierarchy Does Exist

Waltz claims that anarchic and hierarchic orders are two different ends and that the international structure is anarchic (Waltz 1979; 79-101). If we neglect the existence of hierarchy in the international society, how could we explain behavior of states within, for example, the Soviet bloc established in Eastern Europe following World War II (subsequently embodied in the Warsaw Pact) or within the U.S. dominated unipolar system after the collapse of the Soviet Union? They were both hierarchical structures. Institutions in security affairs are considerably broader than the alliances and collective security organizations. If we accept that the world is merely composed of anarchic order, how could we explain the institutional forms of formal empires, informal empires, and protectorates (Lake 2001)? They all have different levels of right of residual control. It is quite obvious that most neorealists and neoliberal institutionalists are blinkered by their common assertion that all important relationships within the international system are anarchic. Hierarchic institutions can coexist with some anarchic institutions under the international system with different formations of security relationship and residual rights of control owned by each state. It is also necessary to discuss the security relations varying along the continuum defined by the degree of hierarchy between the two different ends.

Lake (1996) asserts that “In anarchy, each party to the relationship possesses full residual rights of control...in hierarchy, one party—the dominant member—possess the right to make residual decisions...the subordinate member lacks this right.” In his definition, hierarchy represents the political formation of hegemony or empire, and anarchy occupies the different end of the spectrum with the form of alliance (Lake 1996). ¹He believes that in

¹Also see David Kang’s argument “hierarchy is not the opposite of anarchy; rather,
alliance, states pool resources in pursuit of some common objective while retaining complete right. The famous cases are the Australia-New Zealand-United States pacts formed after WWII and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). The United States has maintained a “triangular security framework in the Asia Pacific region” by the U.S.-Australia alliance, and, under the pure alliance formation, the nation state possesses full authority to make its own decision. Australia and New Zealand make their own decisions with regards to the foreign policy making process and their military power. Under the assumption of anarchic order, alliance is the necessary formation of security relations in the international community. Under the alliance formation, hierarchy was both relatively unnecessary and more expensive for the United States, and an anarchic security institution was an efficient and logical response to the Soviet Union’s informal empire.2

Between anarchy and hierarchy exists one special intermediate relationship, the protectorate, where one state cedes control to another over important areas of national policy, most notably foreign affairs. The United States has transformed parts of its Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands into its protectorates. The most famous cases are the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands, over which the U.S. has recognized their sovereignty but still retains responsibility for their defense. However, both countries have their own decision making capability on their foreign policy while the United States tends to influence their voting behavior. For example, during the United Nations 61st General Assembly, the Permanent Mission of the United States sent out one memorandum calling for concern on several draft resolutions which RMI voted in favor of in the 60th session while the U.S. voted for against. The Permanent Mission of Republic of Marshall Islands did not follow up the concerns from the United States; on the contrary, it supported several draft resolutions relative to the disarmament, conventional arms control or nuclear proliferation, which the United States voted against as usual.3

My observations on this issue have helped me to develop an argument that anarchy and hierarchy could coexist in this world with the formation of alliances and empires, which also corresponds to Lake’s research on the equality is the opposite of hierarchy, in “Hierarchy and Stability in Asia International Relations,” International Relations Theory and the Asia Pacific, Columbia University Press, 2003 p.166.

2 The reason why hierarchy costs more, please see Professor Lake’s article, “Beyond Anarchy,” p.133 148

3 About the voting results of the 61st UNGA, please take a reference on the website: http://www.un.org/ga/61/first/documentation.shtml
security formation. Neorealists assume that the international system as a whole is anarchic, or lacking in a single authority. But it is fallacy of division to assume that because the system is anarchic all relationships within that system are anarchic as well. Relations between states can be and often are hierarchic after the discussions on different security formation.

2.2 Hierarchy in the Modern Asia

It is obviously true that the global system lacks a world government. But it is a mistake to infer from the assumption that state actors inevitably perceive the world as an anarchical system; to do this is to misunderstand the nature of contemporary interstate relations. The debate about how best to understand the international structure after the collapse of the Soviet Union continues with no resolution in sight. However, the U.S. predominant power is the consensus among most of the international scholars, and terms like 'unipolar power' have become common parlance. Unipolarity is the structure in which one state’s capabilities are too great to be counterbalanced. Any unipolarity contains only one super power state with several strong powers in the system, and the dominant state can have beneficial impact on less powerful states.

It is so clear and obvious that after the collapse of the Soviet Union, there is no major candidate to balance against the United States. The United States has the quantitatively and qualitatively preponderant capabilities of the British during the 1960-70 Pax Britannica and the Soviet Union in the 1945-1955 Cold War era.4 The United States possess exceptionally rich natural and human resources, strong military capabilities, and a unique geopolitical position. It is also the only state with global power projection abilities on the three aspects, including land-power, blue-water navy, and air. Besides, the U.S. not only possesses preponderance in hard power, it also holds the ultimate "soft power", as shown in its wide-spreading culture, information technology, and education system.5

Hierarchy can be global as well as regional, and the United States is clearly the dominant state both in the global order and in Asia. I agree

with Van Ness and Kang’s arguments about hierarchy and bandwagoning in Asia (Kang 2003). The empirical evidence has proved that modern Asia has a stable hierarchical system with no powers to balance against the United State or the rising China. The relative discussions will be processed in the next chapters. Kang (2003) even points out that “The structure of anarchy and balance of power theory were designed to explain the Cold War, however, it may not explain why Asian states are not balancing China in the same way that the United States balanced the Soviet Union.” A general theory of international politics can not only be based on the great powers, but we also need to pay attention to the behavior of small nations since the nation-state is the unit of analysis adopted by Waltz himself. Therefore, the theory of international politics written according to the European history is no longer sufficient for a significantly different region under study. A Europe’s past could not necessarily be Asia’s future.

I would leave the question “Will China replace the U.S. hegemony in Asia in the future?” to next two sections. What I will provide in this section are two reasons why it is a hierarchical international structure and the dominant power that have maintained a stabilized international community in Asia. First, under the assumption of the China’s hegemony in the future, I tend to argue that the concern of a strong China may be misplaced. Historically, it has been Chinese weakness that has led to chaos in Asia. When China has been strong and stable, order has been preserved. Regional relations in Asia have historically been hierarchic, more peaceful than those in the West. Form a historical perspective, a rich and strong China could again cement regional stability. Hsiung (2002) has shown evidence that China is not a first-time “upstart.” During the fourteenth through the mid-seventeenth centuries, China occupied 28-30 percent of total GNP of the world’s total output (Hsiung 2002). Due to China’s national influence there were numerous tribute states to the Chinese’s established Empires, including neighboring countries such as the Japanese, Korean, Mongolian, and Vietnamese dynasties. The traditional Chinese tribute system demonstrates a hierarchical international structure, and either China or the subordinate states had no intentions to overthrow this structure. Even from a realist perspective, the two countries that should be most fearful of China, Vietnam and Korea, still accept China’s central position and adjust their foreign policy so as not to go against China, as Kang so eloquently argues. The political structure of Asia reveals a comparably stable status under China’s leading position, and the political structure will be more hierarchical.

Second, if the United States continues to maintain a very particular type of hegemonic system in East Asia, I believe it will still be a hierarchical in-
ternational society in the future. States in Asia are economically encouraged to become more deeply integrated into the capitalist world market system and to open their markets to the world economy. Once the nations in Asia become more economically integrated with the U.S., the U.S. may maintain its sole and dominant superpower status over all other nations. From the strategic point of view, all of the states in East Asia are in varying degrees dependents of the United States. Professor Peter Van Ness provides several examples to support this assumption, including the U.S. guarantor role of interventions in 1994 in an attempt to stop North Korea’s development of nuclear weapons, in the Taiwan Straits in 1996 to counter the PRC’s missile test, and in East Timor to broker the Indonesian acceptance of an Australian-led intervention in 1999 (Van Ness 2002). Under the U.S. hegemony, the Asian political structure reveals a more hierarchical than anarchical status, and it also tells us that instead of balancing against the U.S. hegemony in the region, Asian states prefer a more stable social order, such as is guaranteed only under hegemonic stability.

3 Bandwagoning or Balancing

Under the neorealist assumption, states worry about their security issue and self-help is the only dictum of survival in an anarchic order (Waltz 1979). States will choose to balance against threats to their security for two reasons. First, states will join with those who cannot dominate their allies, in order to avoid being dominated by those who have the threat power. Second, as Waltz argues in his book “Secondary states, if they are free to choose, flock to the weaker side, because the threat comes invariably from the stranger side (Waltz 1979).” However, do nation states always balance against each other? Why have some scholars begun to argue that bandwagoning is the dominant tendency away secondary states in international politics? Can bandwagoning, like hierarchy, exist globally as well as regionally? This section will focus on an analysis of the bandwagoning strategy, and I will try to argue that instead of balance of power, states prefer bandwagoning in a steep hierarchic structure.

During the past fifty years, most of the international relations scholars paid more attention to the balance of power theory, claiming that under most conditions balancing is far more common than bandwagoning. Some point to numerous historical examples of bandwagoning and claim that bandwagoning is the exception, not the rule. The balance of power, according to
neorealist Stephen Walt, means that states will join alliances in order to avoid domination by stronger powers (Walt 1987). However, bandwagoning means states will align with stronger power to split the benefit and share the advantages with the stronger power. He even goes one step further to elaborate that both balancing and bandwagoning are more accurately viewed as a response to threats, and there are four other factors that will affect the level of threat: aggregate power, geographic proximity, offensive power, and aggressive intentions. Walt believes balance of power and bandwagoning are two different kinds of concept and opposite behaviors motivated by the same goal, to achieve greater security. And balance of threat can be viewed as an improvement of traditional balance of the power theory.

Walt himself agrees that bandwagoning may appeal under some circumstances, such as facing a threat (Walt 1987). But what I want to ask here is “Do states only bandwagon in reaction to a threat? Or do states have other motivations in assuming a bandwagon strategy, such as bandwagoning for profit.” Besides, Walt only discusses the strategy of bandwagon and balance of power inside an alliance formation. How about if the political structure is a hierarchic order? Will states more likely bandwagon under such a circumstance? We should focus more on the changes of the evolving intellectual and political climate in recent international relations, and realize that paying attention solely to the balance of power theory without discussing the issue of bandwagoning by secondary states would result an inadequate explanation of regional politics and international relations. Balance of power theory seems to be losing its empirical relevance if we examine the international politics carefully in recent years.

3.1 Not Bandwagon against Threat, but Bandwagon for Benefit

Schweller (1994) points out that Walt has conflated the various forms of bandwagoning into one category: giving every factor into threats. Walt asserts that countries react only to threats instead of other reasons or influences. Schweller believes Walt has even made a contradiction on the definition of bandwagoning at the beginning of his work. Walt has stated that bandwagoning is to share the spoils of victory, which is not consistent with his claim that ”balancing and bandwagoning are more accurately viewed as a response to threats” rather than power imbalance. If Walt believes bandwagoning comes only from reaction to potential threats, why do states have the intentions to free ride on unearned victory? For a most famous example,
Japan’s decision to bandwagon with the Axis and Stalin’s eagerness to fight Japan in 1945 was driven more by the prospect of gaining unearned spoils than the imminent security issues from the United States or Japan. Hence, it appears that it is not the sense of threat that force states to bandwagon, but the opportunistic aspect of bandwagoning that is especially important for assessing the alliance choices of revisionist states.

Schweller also offers his criticisms of Walt’s balance of threat theory. He points out “To determine whether balancing or bandwagoning is the dominant tendency, Walt considers only cases involving a significant external threat (Schweller 1994:93).” Walt only discusses his theory cases with tests for balancing and appeasement-type bandwagoning among threatened states, while it ignores the behavior of unthreatened states that align for reasons other than security consideration. Therefore, how could we explain those countries that focus more on obtaining gains relative to the negative feedback? Schweller provides two types of bandwagoning to explain why states nowadays prefer bandwagoning to the balance of power strategy (Schweller, p.93). He explains that balancing is an extremely costly activity that most states would rather not engage in, while bandwagoning rarely involves costs and is typically done in the expectation of gains. Since realists have paid more attention to the gains rather than cost, bandwagoning should become more common than balance of power.

In a steep hierarchy system, the international order, through a combination of benefits and sanctions that the central power provides to the lesser powers, could easily maintain a regular international status. The central power will be able to allocate values within the community. Therefore, a good relationship with the central power will be treasured by the lesser powers because if the lesser powers reject the hierarchical system, it will bring about conflicts as the central power intervenes to reestablish the hierarchical order.

Under this explanation, we can deduce that hierarchy develops over time and can become a formal or informal pattern of relations among nation-states. Order is restored and conflicts resolved through the central state’s use of force to impose order on lesser states. These states in turn realize that to challenge the hierarchy would be against their own interests. The best strategy for a group of weaker states is to join the dominant power instead of trying to balance against it. Like what I have discussed before, balance of power will result in national costs. In contrast to realist predictions that secondary states will be fearful of and balance against the central power, in hierarchy the secondary states flock to its side with a view toward gaining benefit. Kang (2003) elaborates that “The theory designed to explain the
Cold War, however, may not explain why Asian states are not necessarily balancing China in the same way that the United States balanced the Soviet Union.” Without a doubt, it is no longer a world made up of two superpowers, and I strongly believe the era of balance of power has already passed. Small states or the secondary states prefer accommodating to the stronger states. I will list the examples of Asian countries bandwagoning with China in the next section.

Methodological and theoretical disagreements aside, student of international relations have found it difficult to identify many examples of genuine bandwagoning in their domain of inquiry. This is not surprising given the consistently anarchic structure of the international state system since Westphalia; a structure that most acknowledge has proven conducive to balance of power, not bandwagon politics. Goldstein (1995) believes that under the hierarchic order, the actors have the same expectations that political issues will be resolved in some sense and that a “winner” will be produced. Different from the anarchic order, an organized community in hierarchical society will decide the procedures for selecting among alternative actions and policies, and put them into action.

Moreover, the most reasonable explanation for the bandwagoning behavior in the hierarchy system is that the hierarchy established some of the conditions conducive to bandwagoning. Hierarchic order has a very obvious influence on the structure dimension, the distribution of capabilities. The greater power controlled by those in leadership positions or central power, the greater the incentive for actors to ensure that they are belonging to the winning coalition. Under the hierarchic order, the expectations from the following or secondary states that the central power will wield substantial power generally increase the incentives for potential actors to become members of any winning coalition immediately. Besides, a central power at the top of the hierarchy could maintain the order and minimizes conflicts between the lesser powers, and a hierarchic order is regarded as a stable political structure. Therefore, a trustful and valuable commitment from the central power and tight concentration of power in positions of leadership encourages the strategy of bandwagoning.

3.2 Bandwagoning in Asia after the Cold War

The balance of power theory designed for the explanation of the Cold War may not explain regional politics suitably in the post-cold war era due to the particular characteristics of the post-cold war order derived from U.S.
foreign policy and its impact on other countries’ perceptions of the rising power of China. According to my previous discussions, the international political structure reveals a more hierarchic than anarchic order; and secondary states, if they could choose, will choose to bandwagon instead of balancing against the dominant power. The hierarchic order nowadays reveals a U.S. dominated international structure, and the secondary states tend to accommodate to U.S. power in this region. Moreover, I found that contrary to the expectations of standard formulations of realism, Asian states do not appear to be balancing against a rising power such as China. They do not worry about the threat caused by the regional rising power. Ross (2006) makes an interesting comparison, using the case of Great Britain and Wilhelm Germany to explain that even when Germany was a rising power, its global presence was very limited and the resulting balancing of power politics merely occurred in the European theater rather than globally. Balancing is a regional process, not a global process. China as a rising power today does not necessarily mean it could cause a global threat. We could not conclude that nations in Asia must follow the steps of the European countries to balance against each other. On the contrary, Asian states nowadays tend to bandwagon with the rising China, to maximize their national benefit. I would like to provide several cases to explain my argument in this section.

Realist theories predict that both South Korea and Vietnam should welcome the United States and fear China. Those are two typical countries with stubborn nationalism, gritty determination, and proud history as countries independent from China (Kang 2003;79). However, Kang points out that “both South Korea and Vietnam, while wary of China, are not obviously balancing against China (Kang 2003;79).” The most notable impact of the rise of China on South Korea has been Seoul’s response to the North Korean threat. South Korea publicly and dramatically distanced itself from U.S. policies that threatened war with North Korea (Ross 2006;380). The main incentive that forces South Korea to accommodate China is to prevent a possible second war with North Korea ignited by the United States because of the nuclear tests which have been done by North Korea since 1994. Seoul’s changing alignment predates the 2003 nuclear crisis; it reflects Beijing’s emerging influence over the entire Korean peninsula. The Six Party Talks, which is organized and hosted by China, also creates another form of diplomatic pressure to South Korea to accommodate to China. Even the election of the Secretary General of the United Nations, the senior South Korean diplomat Ban Ki-Moon, also reflects a complicated diplomatic wrestling within Asian politics. Some observers believe it is because of China that Ban Ki-Moon needs to accept this burden he has not even
fully been prepared for. Ban has even teased himself saying that “I am more Secretary than General in the United Nations.” Moreover, we can’t forget the influence of soft power while discussing international politics. The rise of China has led to socioeconomic changes in South Korea’s relationship with China. There are now direct flights between seven South Korean cities and twenty-four Chinese cities, and more than 200,000 South Koreans have residencies in China. There are more than 30,000 South Korean students studying in China now, the largest group of foreign students in China. Not only hard power, but soft power also does work between Seoul and Beijing.

Vietnam is another notable case for countries accommodating China. Although there were several military conflicts caused by border incidents between the two countries during the past three decades, Vietnam and China have managed to cease this border conflicts in the 1980’s and to start unofficial trade. Historically, Vietnam has not shown any direct signs of being worried about a rising China. Vietnam has stood in the shadows of China with a “love-hate, dependent-independent relationship” which forms a fundamental factor in the Vietnamese conception of security. Today, Vietnam is neither arming nor actively defending its border against China. With regard to the issue of the Spratly Islands, a potentially oil-rich group of islands in the South China Sea, Chinese and Vietnamese leaders have met annually since the normalization of relations between their countries in 1991, and relations have improved steadily over time (Kang 2003:81). China and Vietnam have even started trade and other forms of economic cooperation since 1991, and the bilateral relationships have been stabilized.

Taiwan’s accommodation to mainland Chinese power is the most interesting case in this discussion. Although the trend of Taiwanese identity keeps rising recently, some scholars have observed Taiwanese people increasingly accept the “One-China Principle,” the principle that the island of Taiwan is part of Chinese sovereignty, regardless of the government of China. Ross (2006) mentions in his article “…less than 10 percent of the population support an immediate declaration of independence. Eighty percent of the people oppose changing the name of the island from Republic of China.” It is obvious that Ross pays more attention to the anti-independent voice within this Island. Taiwanese people demonstrated their attitudes against Chen Shui-bian’s March 2004 initiative for a “defensive referendum” regarding Taiwan’s mainland policy. Numerous public opinion polls at that time revealed that a majority of the people believed the referendum was at best unnecessary, and at worst provocative. Ross believes the referendum

---
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initiative had reduced voter support for Chen's candidacy although Chen eventually got his ultimate electoral victory. Even though a majority voted for Chen Shui-bian in the March 2004 presidential election, it was not a vote for independence.

Besides domestic politics, Ross also discusses Taiwan's defense policy, which demonstrates the trend of decreasing interest in purchasing U.S. advanced weapons in the face of the island's increasing vulnerability to mainland Chinese power. The opposition party, KMT, successfully played the main actor in accommodating to China and voted against increasing the national defense budget for the sale or purchases of U.S. advanced weapons. Taiwan's public opinion also shows reluctance to purchase U.S. weapons and believes the purchase would only paradoxically result in more insecurity.

The economic dependence on the mainland is also an important factor for Taiwan accommodate to China. Even the hard-core Taiwanese independent factions have faced the irresistible pressures from business circles. The latter wants the government to open direct air and sea transportation links in order to expand trade with the mainland. More than one million Taiwanese now have residencies on the mainland, where they have established separate Taiwan communities in Shanhai. The broad and comprehensive communications between Taiwan and the mainland have formed a main stream, forcing the government to face the stronger economic and political power from China.

South Korea, Vietnam and Taiwan are the three main model societies in Asia which tend to accommodate to China's power. In this section, I firstly followed the same track as Schweller's argument that countries, instead of balancing against the dominant power, prefer bandwagoning for profits. I listed three secondary countries that do not adopt balance-of-power politics, but try to accommodate the rising power of China to cooperate in this region. In the next chapter, I will elaborate that not only the secondary states tend to accommodate to the dominant power, but also a rising power such as China, has demonstrated more cooperative and accommodating posture towards regional integration and multilateral incorporation. I will extend this argument into an analysis of Chinese foreign policy, asserting that in a structure of steep hierarchy, as created under U.S. hegemony, China prefers to bandwagon instead of balancing against the leadership of the United States.
4 China as a Status-Quo Regime

There are two types of arguments, including several reasons whether to view China as a threat or not. The first type of argument views China as a threat because of its rising military buildup, communism values, and increasing power, even China’s hunting for energy. The opposite side viewing China as not a threat argues that China’s self-constraint on assertive behavior, internal problems, China’s benign track record, and the anti-China prejudice.\textsuperscript{7}

Despite China’s rapidly growing economic and political influences in East Asia, Beijing still tends to behave reactively rather than pursue distinctive goals beyond China’s borders. Unlike the United States, China does seem to keep its intentions under wraps, which often perplexes other powers in the world. However, if we check the speeches of President Hu Jintao, who is also Communist Party chief and the head of the military, or Zheng Bijian’s (2005) article, we could easily find that China tries to behave in a friendlier manner and to ease nervousness between nation states. China needs a more stable economic environment for development. China embodies an enigma: economic success under a communist regime. What China wants for its foreign policy are listed in five broad targets—the internal stability in politics and economics to sustain China’s economic growth, to maintain a peaceful environment in China’s complicated geographic situation, to enhance its reputation in the aftermath of the 1997-98 Asian financial crisis, and to meet the United States on equal terms (Terrill 2005). Chinese leaders not only mentioned their country’s lack of ambitious foreign policy, but showed their concern about internal problems at home, as mentioned in the last chapter: a middle-class push for property rights, rural discontent, the internet, the 150 million unemployed wandering between village and city, and energy problems.

Meanwhile, there is also powerful evidence to support that China behaves in a friendly manner towards its neighbors. The most notable change is the marked decline in the Chinese assertion of confrontational territorial claims and threats, starting in the early 1980’s and continuing through the last decade. The territorial practices from 1980 to 1988 of easing tensions,

\textsuperscript{7}Some discussions of China’s Threat seen in Xinhua news agency say “It seems that it’s only the U.S. that has the right to develop, while China does not. China has to remain permanently poor and backward and bow to the subjugation and exploitation of big Western powers.” The quotation is from Li Wenzheng, “Writing to Economist, Chinese Ambassador Britain Refuted the Argument of ‘China’s Threat,’” People’s Daily, Aug 19, 1995, p.A3
bolstering claims of the marked decline in the Chinese use of confrontational territorial claims and threats, shows three main examples of the reform in Chinese foreign policy: (A). Sino-Soviet boundary, the 1987 announcement by Gobachev. (B). Sino-Indian boundary, the dispute for the McMahon line. C. Sino-Vietnamese boundary, the dispute changed from land to maritime areas (Carlson 2003).

We can also look at Chinese Confucianism which proclaims the following principles: first to cultivate one’s moral character, to govern the family, and then to rule the state. Not until the Chinese equip itself thoroughly will they be in a position to set up any future visions of goals. In fact, if we use historical study in as part of our research, we can see that the Chinese seldom spreads its ambition out to the world.

Hsiung (2002) has discussed the issue of China’s rise in one of his articles. He put forward the thesis that China is not a first-time upstarter. Before 1800, China dominated the world economy for at least one thousand years before the West’s rise after 1500. China’s GNP during the fourteen through the mid-seventeenth centuries accounted for 28-30 percent of the world’s total output. Even during China’s first rise as a strong regional power, its behavior was completely different from that of the European rising hegemon’s, from Britain (after the Industrial Revolution), Frances (under Napoleon), Germany (under Wilhelm II and Hitler), to Russia (under Stalin), not to mention Japan (after the Meiji Restoration). China’s behavior at that time demonstrated that the Chinese were not in a habit of colonizing others’ territories. It is also true that the Chinese did not occupy any others countries’ territories or even tried to dominate this world. Besides, the Chinese noncolonizing tendencies have come from the economic and culture aspects. Professor Hsiung has made an extremely important argument that the Chinese people were taught to win people’s hearts without violence, which come from Confucius teachings called Wang-Dao. This influenced the Chinese people deeply for centuries.

4.1 Reviewing Chinese Foreign Policy

The intensive debate concerning China as a possible threat has been followed by some China specialists in other discussions. Johnston (1994) noted some skeptics believe that China would not be engaged in the international community for long because of their different political regime (for some, China is still Red China) and its dissatisfaction with the United State’s domination in East Asia. He also claimed that the status quo nations would
obey the rule of the game instead of rebuilding a new one like the revisionists do. When discussing whether China adopts a more status-quo role on the international stage, he uses several indicators to evaluate China’s overall performance, such as China’s participation rate in international norms, degree of compliance with international norms, and its behavior towards the rules of the game in international relations. Chinese participation rate in international norms show a rapid increase after 1966, which reached epic proportions in 1997. Shambaugh (2003) agrees with China’s new regional posture resting on the four pillars of its foreign policy, and one of them is multilateralism. ASEAN is the best example for an illustration of Chinese multilateralism after both sides signed four main agreements to improve relationships.

Besides economic integration into the international system, China also improved its nonproliferation and arms control records, and even made strides in the controversial issue of human rights. After China agreed to abide by the 1987 version of the MTCR (Missile Technology Control Regime) and signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in 1996, the U.S. government officially pronounced its performance as improved. Nathan (1994) paid more attention to China’s human rights records, arguing that China remains outside the trend of democratization and human rights promotion, and human rights are likely to remain a structural weakness for China’s diplomacy. However, when the United Nations Commission on Human Rights examined the key international forums of human rights practices, it found that China’s government managed to put together a winning coalition of states to vote in favor of quashing every resolution critical of the PRC from 1992 to 2001.

Another possible indicator that proves China as a status-quo regime is its obedience to the rules of the game. The Chinese tended to meet the regulations of the international institutions at the time it engaged in (WTO and IMF). China entered most of the institutions after their creation, not only the economic ones but the security institutions as well. According to Johnston, it’s not easy for China to change the rules of the game even though China would like to, because changing the rules would mean changing the ideology. Besides, it is not simple for any dissatisfied actor to change any rules of the institutions or overcome the veto of a single player without a super coalition.

Therefore, there are several issues that need to be discussed when arguing whether or not China prefers the status-quo, and one of the most interesting will be this: Is China satisfied with U.S. hegemony in this world? In Mao’s era, he argued that in responding to the two superpowers (Cold War), there should be a third power, which lead to the Chinese foreign policy of
multipolarity. At first, multipolarity plays an ambiguous role in China’s foreign policy process; however, as leaders in Beijing switched, China’s policy making process shifted towards taking an active role in regional and international institutions.\(^8\) Will China challenge U.S. interests in the world? Some mentioned that China has to be cautious in the short run in challenging U.S. power, but that the long-run goal should be to develop the strategic and diplomatic alliances necessary to do so. Moreover, even though the U.S. is the sole superpower, China can benefit from economic relations with the U.S. and from the relative global stability provided by the U.S. hegemony. That’s why Zheng Bijian and David Shambaugh also supports the view that China will not exclude the U.S. hegemony in East Asia. Perhaps China could share in it.

I provide some of my own observations about the reform of Chinese foreign policy and the embrace of multilateralism to prove that China prefers a more status-quo supporting and cooperative international strategy, which tends to attract the accommodation from the secondary states in East Asia.

### 4.2 The Multilateral Approach in Chinese Foreign Policy

Since the end of the cold war and collapse of the Soviet Union, multilateralism has regained the spotlight in the international realm. The bipolar system vanished after the collapse of Soviet Union which explained the cancellation of “two camps.” Following the collapse of the Soviet Union and Communism in east Europe, multilateralism substituted the bipolar system in the international politics arena. However, most analysts have concluded that despite an overall reorientation towards more active participation in global regimes, China has remained ambivalent on global governance (Economy 2001). In addition to Christensen (1995), Harding (2001) and Shambaugh (2003) also support the view that China was suspicious and ambivalent toward multilateralism, and that this attitude would influence its participation on the world stage. Other studies show that, in order to maintain their national sovereignty, Chinese leaders remain vigilant against unwanted foreign interferences, including those representing human rights, environmental concerns, and telecommunications. Those influences would cause harm to China’s internal political stability even though they would

\(^8\)Christensen supported this in his article saying that China’s elites were suspicious of many multilateral organizations, including those devoted to economic, environmental, nonproliferation, and regional security issues. At first China just joined those institutions to avoid losing face. Thomas F. Christensen, "Chinese Realpolitik," Foreign Affairs, Vol.75, No.5, p.38
increase the opportunities for international involvement. Michael Swaine and Alastair Johnston have concluded that China’s growing involvement in arms control negotiations has “primarily taught it to use the arms control arena more effectively for its state-centric purposes rather than promoting a reconsideration of how best to attain security.” (Economy 2001) China would rather use unilateral power to promote national security than cooperate with other nations to control arms.

Elizabeth Economy (2001) attempts to explain that international influences and collective power could silently transform the domestic policymaking process. She points out one essential element,

International regimes and process of establishing international regimes may influence the manner in which a participant formulates policy. The transmission of new ideas and knowledge from the international community can contribute to the learning process and to changes in behavioral norms by domestic actors.

International actors have several linkages with domestic fields; such as environment, economics, and arms control, thus international regimes could intervene domestic policy making with an influx technology. International experts have proven that they have the ability to influence domestic policy makers, as in the arena of trade. Jacobson and Oksenburg (1990), for example, have used the Work Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) as two cases in point. These two organizations not only expanded the expertise of Chinese trade, but also helped to reconfigure the balance of power among various Chinese economic experts. After all, China’s government established one leading group, including several experts and representatives that interact with international regimes and nongovernmental organizations to form domestic policy.

4.3 Multilateralism in China’s Behavior-Case Studies on APEC, ASEAN, and WTO Participation

The People’s Republic of China was founded in the Cold War era, which scored two camps in contention, with China aligned initially with the Soviet Union against the United States. International politics changed drastically during the next 40 years, and China transformed its foreign policy. In 1960, the “opposition to imperialism, revisionism and reactionaries” became the principal guideline for Chinese foreign policy (Wang 2000). China opposed the Soviet Union’s revisionism as well as American imperialism. In 1970,
Beijing started to gather a great deal of power, and tried to divide international politics into three worlds. Different from the super powers and often developed countries, China defined itself as a developing country, and tried to play the leading role among the so called “third world.” In the 1950’s and 1960’s, China rejected nominal multilateralism because of national security concerns and fear of imperialism. However, in 1970 the third world theory allowed for China’s involvement in international organizations. The substitution of the PRC for ROC in the UN was the main reason for the PRC to take part in international organizations. But it was only in nominal, not quantitative, multilateralism.

Before 1994, China and the rest of Asia did not have close relationships in multilateral organization. China was very suspicious of these international organizations, especially regional ones; China worried about being blamed by other countries as the sole Communist in the region. For the past decade, China has shifted from the periphery to become an active organizer in the multilateral arenas. As the organizer of the northeast Asia Cooperation Dialogue, China has successfully played an important role in the Six Party Talks, and its diplomats now have the opportunity to practice diplomacy on the world political stage. I will use three main examples to support these observations.

4.3.1 APEC-The Multilateral Economic Institution

Compared to the EU, the economic cooperation in Asia is not as organized. The goals of the two institutions differ; EU tends to integrate the economies of its member countries, while APEC has limited cooperation. The structures and procedures are also different. EU has strong entities and internal organizations, such as the European Court of Justice and European Commission. But APEC, only recently founded in 1989, has 21 countries participating. China has been the active role in the regional multilateral arrangement. It became a participant of APEC in 1990 and joined in 1991. The Chinese government committed itself to opposing protectionism and supporting free trade. China also reduced its tariffs by 15% and promoted the protection of intellectual property rights (Wang 2000). Partly due to its participation in APEC, China was able to get into the World Trade Organization in 2000. Taiwan, Hong-Kong, and Mainland China, the primary economic entities, took part in the APEC together without conflict, which unveiled a new cross-strait relationship and cooperation between different political and economical entities. The APEC summit, hosted by Shanghai in
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2000, was also an outstanding economic success for the Chinese government.

4.3.2 ASEAN-Chinese Concession and Soft Foreign Policy

Security by means of multilateralism around the Asia-Pacific region is a new concept that lacks institutionalization. During the cold war, the only alliance in South East Asia was the ASEAN, which was the bilateral alliance between US and several countries in South East Asia. In 1994, ASEAN initiated a loose forum of dialogue—the Asian Regional Forum (ARF). The ARF is the only region-wide security organization in the Asia-Pacific region (Shirk 2004). China has not been cavalier in its attitude toward multilateral organizations; however, Chinese analysis initially seemed wary of the ASEAN and its new security forum, the ARF. Civilian and military experts were concerned that after Vietnam’s acceptance into ASEAN, the organization might become a more anti-Chinese alliance with growing links to the United States. However, China has participated fully in ARF activities since 1994, and its attitudes toward the organization have clearly softened on a range of issues. As the ASEAN specialist Kuik Cheng-Chwee (2005) states, the ACFTA (ASEAN-China Free Trade Area) accumulates China’s enthusiasm in sharp contrast to its cautious attitude towards the implementation of preventive diplomacy in the ARF. China shows different patterns of participation in different types of multilateral institutions. This may be explained by the notion that different institutions bear different degrees of “diffuse reciprocity.” According to Kuik’s (2005) argument, China might suffer from short term loss but get the benefit in the long term, and this is the reason why Beijing has not only agreed to give ASEAN states earlier access to Chinese markets than other WTO members, but it has also granted special treatment to Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, and Myanmar. Beijing believes that the short term generosity could lead to favorable geopolitical and economic outcomes.

After having actively engaged with ASEAN and the Southeast Asian nations, China adopts a policy of readiness to use its growing soft power— notably economic leverage and national image—as a persuasive means to translate its influence into concrete policy interests. China’s ASEAN watchers feel that the improvement of Sino-ASEAN economic relations is likely to alleviate the China Threat theory both in the economic and security arenas. China demonstrated a willingness to play the role of a more responsible power during the 1997 Asian financial crisis, when China contributed to the IMF rescue package for Thailand and Indonesia. Beijing’s growing appreci-
ation of soft power diplomacy is also expanding China’s efforts to popularize Chinese culture throughout the region. There are more and more students studying abroad in China and receiving Chinese culture. The best way to eliminate hostility and mistrust is to open up and embrace the world, and I think that China has also thought about this concept.

Besides cooperation with ASEAN, it is also interesting to discuss about the influences toward of economic interdependence toward China’s foreign policies. I also agree that economic interdependence plays a leverage able role for China as participating the world. From the global logic view (means the domestic economic and political changes could be understood by the regional political economy view), the globalization has increased the incentives and disincentives for states’ political economy, which stimulated the China’s development strategies to openness and reform. Being a developing country, China has strong incentive to adapt to whatever economic opportunity present. Moreover, the policy making process in the China government is more pluralized from the top leaders to other traditional power centers. Unlike the former policy making process, now is more institutionalized than before. There are substantial give and take between Beijing and local government interest. In the Asia Financial Crisis, as the central leaders thought about preventing devaluation, the local governors preferred the devaluation of RMB to promote the export.

4.3.3 WTO-The Major Case for China’s Multilateralism

Key to any analysis of China’s behavior in WTO is an understanding of the WTO as an organization, and of China’s place in it. If we need to observe the PRC’s multilateral cooperative strategies, the WTO case would be the necessary one. The PRC government used the occasion of its first major speech as a WTO member to declare it would serve as a “bridge” between the developed and developing worlds. China’s verbal commitment to support developing countries’ concerns and its actual behavior in building coalitions highlight important questions about China’s goals in the WTO and its self-definition.

Pearson (2006) has done several research on the China’s joint of WTO. She discusses in one of her articles that China has tried to cooperate with the dominant rules and regulations in the first beginning of joining WTO. According to Pearson, there is no substantial evidence that the Chinese reject the dominant rules and operative norms of WTO. Chinese government officials, who have spent time in Geneva, are busying learning all the regula-
tions of WTO. Pearson admires Chinese members of the mission and trade officials have demonstrated the personal qualification and profession even though the scale of China Mission was so limited at the beginning of joining the WTO.

China has demonstrated its cooperative strategy on the three agreed-upon areas for Agreement on Agriculture negotiations. On the Agriculture import tariff liberalization, China agreed at the time of its WTO accession to reduce average tariffs on agriculture imports to 15 percent by January 2004, far lower than Japan and Korea’s 50-60 percent. Besides, China also called for the eventual elimination of trade-distorting domestic subsidies, which are viewed as the main method to terminate the distort trade. Finally, China committed to reduce export subsidies to zero upon WTO entry, a liberalization substantially beyond the current U.S. and EU levels. Those three policies could be viewed as the main symbols that China does not advocate a harsh attitude on trade.

Unlike agriculture, textile is likely to be a major source of conflict with the United States. However, being the world’s dominant export power in textiles and apparel, China accepts the restrictions provided by the Agreement on Textiles and Clothing (ATC) on the growth of China’s textile market share by the end of 2004. China even did not fight back to the United States when the United States launched safeguard actions against China in May 2005 due to the tremendous surge of Chinese textile exports to the U.S. In the early stages of the dispute over surging Chinese textile and apparel exports, China has attempted to avoid throwing oil onto the fire, apparently wishing to preserve the international cooperation.

5 Conclusion

With the more advanced discussions of the changes on the systematic level, the old-fashion anarchic order has been challenged by the rising focus on the hierarchic international order. Besides, under the comprehensive realization of the dominance of U.S. unipolarity, people now switch their attention from the power balancing strategy to the bandwagoning strategy between nation states. Great-power balancing could explain the Cold-War international relations, but the realist argument that perception of great-power intentions matters little in regional alignment decisions is corroborated in post-cold war East Asia. Secondary states in East Asia have very different understandings of Chinese intentions, yet they have adopted con-
vergent responses to the impact of Chinese power on their security. This probably results from geographic proximity or from common cultural roots shared with China in the region. Most important of all, it is also essential to notice that as Asian secondary states are found bandwagoning to a rising China, Beijing likewise manifests a similar accommodative posture toward the U.S. unipolarity.

Being an economically developing country, China certainly needs a more stable investment environment. Official statements about the regime’s acceptance of interdependence and lack of interest in establishing a post-Cold War hegemony should be considered quite credible. Besides, the PRC has become more integrated into and cooperative within international institutions than like never, and the alleged evidence of China’s leaders trying to balance against U.S. power is not convincingly supported by empirical facts.

China’s effort to engage the international community is an obvious phenomenon after domestic economical and political reform. Chinese behavior in relation to ASEAN, APEC and other multilateral institutions provide an undeniable proof for China’s "Open Up" policy, acting like a status quo power to an increasing extant. True, Beijing’s resistance to democracy, or we can say, its sin of communism, may be troublesome for Western countries. It’s increasing military clout, plus its opaque military budget, may nevertheless present a security dilemma problem in East Asia. For the reason, the U.S. my find it necessary to maintain a military presence in the region. However, if Chinese history is a guide, it remains true that only under the Mongolia Dynasty (1260-1368) could we link China to any acts of external invasion and expansion. But China is not under alien rule today, as it was then. China prefers to follow the Confucian Wang-Dao, which translates into a more peaceful foreign policy orientation in modern language.