

Lecture October 21

The Balance of Relationship: The Bilateral IR

Chih-yu Shih and Chiung-chiu Huang

The two newly inaugurated leaders, Chinese President Xi Jinping and US President Barack Obama met in spring 2013. While Obama raised a number of global governance issues on human rights, climate changes, internet security and so on, Xi enthusiastically promoted the notion of “the new type of great power relations.” Obama’s move could be based on idealism since he pushed for universal criteria to guide each governance issue. He could alternatively come from realism, motivated to impose pressure on his rising competitor. In contrast, Xi was uninterested in negotiating universal principles of governance and even insensitive to the relevance of different values to the bilateral relationship. Rather, he reiterates that the two great powers could establish an amiable relationship independent of their differences and away from confrontation expected of a bi-polar system (Calmes and Myers, 2013). What is Xi’s new type of relationship if not the familiar balance of power?

A similar, if not sharper, contrast between universal principle and relational concern exists in China-EU relationship where arms embargo is a chronic issue. (MOFA, 2013) In face of China’s unsatisfactory human rights conditions, embargo is to actualize EU’s self-image of being a “normative power”. (EU Official, 2003) For China, bilateral relationship can never be normal under the circumstance of embargo. EU’s quest for a rule-based international society incurs suspicion that China has never been an equal to EU. (Kavalski, 2013) Perhaps China would not have cared about this normative pressure if it abided by realist balance of power. Is China’s alienation from universal rules or realistic politics out of some subjective volition that cannot be explained by a general theory of international relations?

In fact, in addition to China’s lack of counter-principle to cope with US and EU pressure, China likewise seems refrained from unilateral control over smaller neighbors expected either of a global bi-polar power or a hierarchical regional power. For example, China has refused to intervene in North Korea facing the provocation of nuclear proliferation. One popular realist explanation suggests that China needs NK to balance South Korea and the US. (Bajoria, 2010) This fails to explain why China is far from being effective or even active in revoking NK’s recalcitrance. Rather, China begins to work with the US closely. Alternative realist wisdom suggests that this is because of China’s desire for NK’s natural resources, but China actually supplies to NK. (Lin 2009, 38) In its South, China encounters maritime dispute with Vietnam, but the dispute coincides with a bilateral agreement of strategic partnership between the

two governments and a joint drill of maritime rescue between the two navies (Ma 2012). China's relations with Myanmar, for another example, have survived the ideological incongruence, contrast in size, oppositional membership of alliance, border and ethnic disputes, global intervention, and internal upheavals on both sides, to the extent that Myanmar has not resorted to either balancing or bandwagoning. (Roy 2005) Their bilateral relations call for an unconventional explanation.

In short, US pressure has not pushed China to entertain the idea of establishing a sphere of influence to defend, despite China's rising power. Instead, China's pursuit of stable relationships with smaller neighbors is consistent with its stress on relationship with the US and the EU, regardless of the power status of the other side, although the issue area and the style of the relationship sought in each case apparently vary.

In the case of a remote relation, China has refused interventionism to the effect that it has lost vital sources of energy as in the case of Libya. (Piao 2011) Against all realist analyses that Chinese foreign policy as well as foreign policy of any other nation is driven by energy security, (Collins et al., 2008; Lampton, 2008: 246; Ziegler, 2006: 19; Copeland, 1996: 10) China's lukewarm attitude toward the new Libyan regime in 2011 cost its energy supply dearly. In Africa, however, China gave its consent to UN intervention in Sudan and Liberia in 2007 and 2003 in spite that they were China's major suppliers of oil and timber respectively. As elsewhere, though, China's consent was given only after securing the approval of regional organizations (African Union and Economic Community of West African States). The regional organization that fares marginal in international relations theory appears critical in China's settling between the UN and the local authorities.

A theory to explain rising China's consistent good-neighbor attempts, successful or not, and continuous disinterest in global-governance principles is called for. Explanations from China include the notions of peaceful coexistence, harmonious world and peaceful rise, but they are incorrect as China has not hesitated to resort to limited sanctions or show of muscle. Neither Vietnam nor Philippines or Taiwan would ever characterize China's maritime policy as harmonious. Nevertheless, China refrains from taking territories where it has an upper hand as in the case of NK and Myanmar while resolutely showing military determination where it has no capacity or even intention for immediate take over, as in South China Sea, East China Sea or the Taiwan Straits.

Our task in this paper is to explain theoretically the relational concerns in Chinese foreign policy and their implications for understanding international relations (IR) in general. We argue that Chinese foreign policy abides by the doctrines of balance of relationships (BoR). The BoR reflects a systemic force on all countries to avoid uncertainty under anarchy by seeking long-term reciprocal international

relations regardless of difference in value, institution, and power status. This is a contrast with balance of power (BoP) whereby self-help typically characterizes foreign policy. In comparison, self-restraint is what informs foreign policy under BoR. The state relies on self-restraint to acquire all kinds of relationships or revoking self-restraint to rectify a wrong relationship. The relational constitution of the state transcends anarchy between separate states. We thus join the recent “relational turn” in international studies (Hafner-Burton, Kahler, Montgomery 2009; Slaughter 2009; Anderson and Neumann 2012) and draw on Chinese cultural resources, especially Confucianism, to map the Chinese route to the discovery of a general theory of balance of relationships.

We use Confucianism for three reasons: First, Confucianism contains clear doctrines that illustrate the rationale of BoR. However, we intend that cultural and ideological routes to reach the BoR are various and multiple. Second, we reject the stereotype of Confucian pacifism or negligence over rationality for the sake of morality. We argue that BoR is a rational system of international politics, but definitely not about pacifism. Third, assessing Confucianism could be useful in surmising the impact of China rising on international politics. We believe that the much discussed Chinese school of international relations in recent years would be misleading if China’s claimed quest for relational security is mistaken as an exclusively Chinese phenomenon. We will demonstrate that the BoR transcends Chinese conditions. We suspect that China is merely a follower of the BoR as is anyone else, not its inventor.

Finally, the paper will propose an international relations theory (IRT) as a parallel to the more familiar narratives of the BoP, balance of interests, or balance of threat. Most other theories conceive of international relations as structures independent of the maneuvering of individual nations. Specifically, these theories always consider power as a property, never as a relation. (Baldwin, 2004: 182) Alternatively, the BoR considers the state as the agent of relationships. We echo Anthony Giddens’ structuration theory (1984) and also conceive of the BoR as structural mechanism that recognizes the relevance of strategic choices of the state in reproducing or revising international relation to constantly redefine the state each via their multiple and changing dimensions of relationality. The notion of relationality treats the phenomenon of double standard in all countries’ foreign policy as systemic necessity. It provides a universal frame to explain inconsistency in foreign policy, which other IRTs easily throw into the theoretically irrelevant category of idiosyncrasy.

The BoR theory thus goes beyond all civilizational divides and the epistemological gap between rationality and culture by always looking to localized or

even individualized routes to access the BoR. We believe that the state tries to stabilize relationships, especially bilateral relationships, in order to avoid uncertainties. Current IR theories are biased toward estranging relationships, overlooking both relational security as well as nations' possessing the agency to achieve it.¹

Theoretical Propositions of Chinese BoR

International relations can be more conveniently dealt with where the states share a collective identity, conform to same rules or principles of conduct or observe universal structures of power. Contemporary IRTs discover these identities, rules and structures. However, at times, the states defy a presumably shared identity, the agreed rules or the structure of power. Instead of reducing these incidents to idiosyncratic reasons, the theory of BoR is aimed at providing an explanation of how these numerous cases of defiance or double standard likewise follow a plausible logic which is equally, if not more, convincing and attractive to the states in face of the unwanted uncertainties in the condition of anarchy. Imperfect politics of identity, rule-making, and structuration together compose a systemic incentive for the state to resort to the strategy of BoR. By opening the state to relationality, the IRT informed by the BoR presents the rationale of those acting in the name of the state to violate those established patterns registered in other strings of IRT.

The recent turn to relational analysis in IR attends to the relational constitution of the state as process of becoming rather than closed substance of being (Katzenstein, 2013; Jackson and Nexon, 1999) Confucianism similarly believes that relationships constitute beings. According to Confucianism, the virtue of Jen (reciprocal beneficial relationship) is the essence of humanism while self-restraint is the vehicle to Jen. It is allegedly this stress of self-restraint that makes the survival of the society and its members possible and lasting. We will show how the BoR that is rationalized by Confucianism in China is both a system that defines and constrains China as state in the world and a strategy that maintains balanced relationships for China. We will then argue that the BoR is a major processual mechanism to reify the agency of state in making international relations an inalienable part of the state.

One perspective applied in the analysis of Chinese foreign policy suggests that since China values stable relationships, it will not support the type of intervention that is designed to plant a specific ideology or nurture certain types of regimes. (Wang and Rosenau, 2009) The principle of "seeking common ground while reserving differences" (*qiu tong cun yi*), a major theme of Confucianism, remains the principal discourse for China in managing disputes with other nations. Practically, this means

¹ BoP typically conceives of structures as ultimate constraints that render the human choice at best a spurious process. For exception, see Yan Xuetong's (2011) argument for the importance of leadership and Victoria Hui's (2005) assertion for the relevance of strategic choice in IR theorization.

that all states should exert self-restraint in order to avoid disrupting mutual respect between them. Neither will China initiate intervention in order to enforce a rational value or accumulate power. Such point of view assumes that harmony and the self-restraint “kingly way” (*wangdao*) are the ultimate goals in China’s foreign relations.

The instruments that China used to maintain its higher position and expand its influence in the region were cultural attraction and “rule by virtue.” (Zhang, 2009; Tan, 1978) The philosophy of *tianxia* and the harmonious world has produced a unique interventionary policy, which may be termed *harmonious intervention*. (Shih & Huang, 2013: 364-5) Accordingly, intervention should not be aimed at transforming the values or institutions of the target country. The intervening force should always allow the target country to determine what is appropriate for itself regardless of whether its internal situation meets the standards of justice by which any potential intervention force abides. Both Confucianism and Taoism advise against “involuntary learning.” As long as the situation is not out of control, Confucianism in particular stresses the virtue of self-restraint and holds that a true gentleman or prince (*junzi*) should rely only on self-restraint or self-discipline to win spontaneous respect and voluntary followers. People will learn by righteous example.

The implication for contemporary leaders, in theory, is that they should always refrain from opting to synchronize circumstances where there exists an operating authority or where there is another means of resolving differences. This seemingly passive attitude reproduces the existing relationship between China and the potential target country without which nothing can be perceived as certain in the future and no respect can be mutually established. If a reciprocal relationship is in jeopardy, China’s own integrity is subject to interference. In sum, pluralism, in the sense of allowing different systems to coexist harmoniously within a certain territory, along with the characteristic of being a relational state, makes China adopt a thinking that corresponds to the ideal of *tianxia* (more later) and helps explain China’s attitude toward other states with diverse political systems, as well as its aversion to synchronization of institution or intervention to correct the perceived wrongdoing.

China’s pragmatic appeal to and reliance on stable relationships as a way of coping with the pressure of global governance has dragged China into a peculiar version of the realist BoP. The level of intervention on each occasion attests to this balance between the force encouraging intervention and the force discouraging it. That said, China’s quest for security does not involve an expansion of its influence or an increase in its capacity for control. Immediate and concrete gains are considered less useful than stable relationships, which are sometimes achieved even at the expense of such immediate and concrete gains. To that extent, the kingly way can be

legitimately renounced if the purpose is to restore a relationship. Throughout modern history, the Legalist wisdom, which has coincided Confucianism, is to rely on severe punishment in the time of chaos (luan shi yong zhong dian).

Based upon the need for stable relationships, we propose the following three principles of BoR as guidelines for China coping with disruptive conditions in which the entire or part of its foreign policy orientation owes to reciprocal mutuality as opposed to sovereign estrangement between nations:

1. When a condition is perceived as potentially threatening, resort to compromise to repair it. This is to balance the breach of relationships with enhanced self-restraint in order to restore the relationship as if the relationship were never under challenge. Self-restraint is aimed at enabling the other side to similarly exert self-restraint.
2. When a condition is perceived as already directly threatening, resort to breakup to start anew. This is to balance the breach of relationship by revoking China's self-restraint. China's revoking of self-restraint is aimed at destroying a corrupt relationship so that follow-up interactions could only move toward an improved relationship.
3. When a condition is perceived as indirectly threatening, resort to a mix of punishment and repair to rectify it. This is to balance the breach of relationship with enhanced self-restraint in one area and revoking of self-restraint in another area. China's act of balance is aimed at preserving flexibility in order to prepare for the situation to improve or exacerbate.

Balance of relationships is a concept that explains the limited relevance in Chinese thinking of differences in ideas, institutions, identities, and material forces as variables that matter in international relations, since they can readily be disregarded for the sake of long-term stability. However, the BoR acknowledges that all these elements still have mundane implications in daily policy making. The BoR is in direct contrast with the pursuit of a synchronized world or regional order. *Synchronization* is the derivative of rationalism and universalism. It informs most general theories in international relations. It refers to the simultaneously executed or promoted diffusion of a pattern of rational thinking embedded in an idea, an institution, a collective identity, or a perceived arrangement of material force. Synchronization is presumably a process whereby unrelated national actors conjunctionally fulfill their systemically assigned functions in order to interact rationally. However, the BoR is a system exempt from such synchronized rationality. It values varieties each embedded in its relational history. The BoR prescribes for China ontological tolerance and epistemological sensibility in international relations.

Accordingly, the BoR predicts that national actors will not consistently stick to

any specific synchronic ways of rational thinking in the long run. Rather, they will always try to achieve stabilized reciprocal relationships no matter how deterministic or opportunistic they might appear in the short run in their pursuit of security, prosperity, global governance, peace, and so on. As a result, Chinese foreign policy makes multilateral relations volatile since a multilateral frame usually depends on certain universal rules in order to function. The BoR is mainly a system of bilateral relations that relies on reciprocal tolerance and self-restraint instead of shared values, implying inconsistency in enforcing one's own values facing different countries at different times. The BoR is a system parallel to the BoP, just as all nations have the social system parallel to the political system. In the following discussion, we begin with Chinese Confucianism for heuristic purposes and then proceed with analyzing how Confucianism actually leads to the discovery of a generalized thesis on the balance of relationships.

Chinese BoR as Systemic Principle

Long-Term Rationality of Nonapparent Interests

Because of its proclivity for long-term and relational thinking, the Confucian lessons for foreign policy contradict mainstream international relations theory, such as realism, liberalism, and constructivism. These approaches share the same epistemological individualism that focuses on the state. Each of these schools of thought conceives of foreign policy of all states as in pursuit of a synchronized set of national interests, which includes structurally determined security and power for realism on the one hand, (Waltz, 1979) and welfare and institution for liberalism on the other hand (Keohane and Nye 1987). The synchronic kind of national interests also includes non-structured, mutually negotiated, and nonetheless collectively applicable goods for constructivism, such as Wendt's (2003) Kantian culture of anarchy. To some extent, the English School adopts the societal thinking and pays more attention to the impacts of diverse civilizations and cultures, (Buzan, 2004; Bull, 1977) but concerns for common rules and systemic stability continue to echo the synchronic style of theorization. Nevertheless, its definition of international system allows more room for the state to manipulate relationships. (Bull, 1977: 9-11)

In comparison, Confucianism is concerned with the preparation of foreign policy for relationality, mutuality, embeddedness, and contextuality, unfailingly making sinification, historical as well as contemporary, an all-directional movement void of destiny. (Katzenstein, 2012)² Consequently, China is hardly a distinctive analytical entity. (Callahan, 2004) These cultural processes either introduce or rejuvenate

² For Confucian legacy in China's dealings with the world, see Fairbank, 1968.

Chinese worldviews as defined by the values of harmony, group orientation, and *guanxi* culture. (Qin, 2009a) *Guanxi* is particularly pertinent to the BoR. It refers to the cultural belief, as in the tradition of sociological literature on network theory (Archer, 1996; Eliasoph and Lichterman, 2003; Vaisey and Lizardo 2010), that nations cannot survive without coupling their existence to one another's in certain mutually agreed and practiced relationships. The quest for *guanxi* makes self-restraint an intrinsic component in any rational, bilateral exchange. In the subsequent discussion, however, we do not aim to assert China's distinctiveness but to transcend it in an attempt to arrive at a general thesis that one can discover via a Confucian route.

To make sense of Chinese strategic calculus, which sometimes contradicts apparent national interests understood in accordance with IRT, we follow the constructivist call to establish the link between ideas and rationality (Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998) and study the Chinese foreign policy that serves "nonapparent national interests." Nonapparent national interests are interests that presumably secure apparent rational/national interests in the long run. One such nonapparent interest refers to control over uncertainty in relationships to stabilize apparent national interests. We critically assess the cliché that Confucian culture is used for the values of stability and certainty in reciprocal relationships. This belief requires China to cope with perceived incongruence between China and parties that it encounters, that is, by either assimilating or co-existing. Chinese foreign policy leaders have to assess the essence of the world and the nature of the other parties facing China in each specific situation. Therefore, whether or not a perceived incongruence is stabilizing or destabilizing in the long run is an immediate concern. The purpose of Chinese foreign policy embedded in stabilizing relationships yields a disposition not for any synchronic arrangement but for compromise or confrontation at the expense of apparent, current national interests.

Stabilized relationships presumably exempt China from uncertainties, compelling Chinese leaders to constantly test the intention of others. It should be noted that the archetypal interest of IR liberalism in institutionalization likewise lowers the transaction cost of negotiation in the longer run. (Keohane, 1987; 1984) The Confucian emphasis on stability is therefore methodologically in line with IR liberal rationality. Even realist IR has a similar emphasis, because one of its pedagogical models, the prisoner's dilemma, prefers cooperation over betrayal, even though by betrayal one loses less in the short run. (Axelrod, 1984) This kind of longer-run calculation is consistent with the notion of hedging, which does not produce any immediate gain other than risk-averting utility. In a similar vein, the Confucian value of stability aims at greater national interests in the longer run.

However, while all are capable of long-term calculation, the major difference between the Chinese BoR and the others lies in the former's readiness to avoid specific standards of calculation. The logic of apparent national interest under liberalism and realism requires a clear and universally applied base of calculation. Chinese leaders may at times believe that no calculation is long-term or long-lasting enough, making the act of calculation and its base trivial. Patience, instead of justice or order, is called for the situation where there is no obvious solution to an embarrassing setting of incongruence. In short, reliance on stabilized relationship, compared with calculation of interest for any length of time ahead, is always a culturally preferred approach of Chinese foreign policy. In addition, relational security in the extreme long run thus reproduces the cultural belief that the states cannot survive without coupling their welfare, leadership, and security to one another. Self-restraint is rational and relational at the same time.

There is no denying that Chinese strategic calculus can be at the same time realist. Alastair Iain Johnston (1995) formulated a strategic culture argument based on his investigation of China's *Seven Military Classics*. He found empirical support for his argument in the warfare of the Ming dynasty. He concluded that although the Confucian-Mencian paradigm is still present in China today, it is applied more as a symbolic discourse in Chinese official language by the strategists. The parabellum paradigm may be seen in both the Chinese classics and Ming dynasty practice. Yuan-kang Wang, (2010) along with Johnston, further demonstrated that pedagogical nurturing is not required for Chinese literati to adopt realpolitik thought and practice and advocated that realism is an inescapable imperative, independent of cultural construction. Hui (2012) concludes that Chinese culture is more than just Confucianism, which makes pacifism far from dominant in Chinese foreign policy making.

Nevertheless, the parabellum paradigm is not a culturally preferable solution to Confucianism's quest for security, probably because it only addresses an immediate or emergent need. If the Confucian long-term calculation relies on the conviction that, in the extreme long run, stable relationships should always pay off, we should expect to see a style of foreign policy in frequent violation of mundane calculation. Moreover, whether or not the totality of national interests in the long run is calculable is not a question of rationality in itself but rather a matter of conventional belief, which breeds a different attitude towards time. In the case of Chinese foreign policy, a stabilized relationship is taken as a convenient and reassuring indicator of long-term national interests. The nonapparent national interests that guide China's rational thinking are primarily long-term conditions in which all countries' apparent national interests will have a stable, i.e. relational, foundation to build on, and therefore they are not

immediately subject to estimation.

Since the national interest calculus is centered on the preservation of stable relationships in order to minimize future uncertainty, how to convince the other states of one's sincerity toward stability becomes critical. After all, peaceful harmony is achieved only if both sides apply self-restraint in a mutually compatible way. Self-restraint that is unilaterally practiced and imposed by China can be ironically threatening or confusing to the other party. To lend credibility to China's pursuit of stable relationships, China should be ready to compromise on such apparent national interests as territory, power, energy supplies, or economic gains. For the sake of credibility, China should be prepared to resort to confrontation, including violence, from time to time when necessary, even from a weak position, in order to demonstrate its determination to restore what it perceives to be a proper relationship. Neither of these clues appear rational from the viewpoint of apparent national interest.

The care Confucianism takes of more remote relationships can involve a degree of investment that is not apparently rational, because the BoR necessarily commits a state to protecting an extant, but doubtfully useful, relationship, especially during a perceived condition of isolation, just for the sake of having the relationship itself. As this faith in relational security takes root in the Chinese mindset, it may persist regardless of whether or not it appears rational in the immediate run. China, with its culture of *guanxi* or relational security, is unambiguously inclined to stress nonapparent national interests rather than apparent ones, thus transcending purely individualist (i.e., estranging) rationality. To study this tendency to sacrifice short-term interests for the sake of long-term interests, observers should pay special attention to those compromises that China makes to its weaker opponents or acts of resistance to those stronger opponents. We call this theoretically unfamiliar mode of strategy "balance of relationships."

Non-Interventionism

A Confucian leader should consider intervention to produce global synchronicity unintelligent. Zhao Tingyang, a Daoist, enlisted the classic epistemology of *tianxia* to focus international relations on *guanxi*, which is composed of reciprocal relationships. Confucian philosophy defines everything in terms of *guanxi*. Zhao Tingyang made the epistemological point that reciprocal relationships decide how one views one's relations with the outside world: "We find somebody friendly when we treat him in a friendly manner; in other circumstances, we might have the opposite idea of him if we treat him wrongly." (Zhao, 2009:10) This might provide a relational explanation for China's cautious attitude toward alleged pariah regimes. China tends to oppose the imposition of military intervention and economic sanctions on any other state, because

this would disrupt existing *guanxi* and deprive the future regime of a perspective.

Zhao Tingyang tried to promote *tianxia* as a solution for problems that could be misconstrued by Western IRT. (Zhao, 2009:12) The ideal of *tianxia* is the construction of a world where nothing is left out and no one is treated as an outsider. It does not involve the pursuit of sameness or synchronized values and procedures; on the contrary, it involves the pursuit of a harmonious world, 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, 2009:14) This obsession with harmony provides justification for a policy that seeks and enacts stabilized relationships rather than synchronic arrangements.

David Kang believed that China does not use intervention in neighboring countries for the purpose of conquest or the achievement of hegemony. The main question of his research is why there is no obvious fear and antagonism toward China’s rise among East Asian countries, and why these countries have not tried to form a coalition or attempted to bring any other great power into the region in an effort to balance China. Kang traced this back to the East Asian international system of the early modern period (1300-1900) and argues that the reason why China’s rise has not been a cause of instability in the region can be found in the tributary system, power relations, cost-benefit equation, shared culture and ideas, and China’s long institutional reach. Kang (2007) concluded that when China was strong, the East Asian international system remained stable and peace was preserved; in contrast, when China was weak, chaos and conflict was rife in East Asia. According to Kang’s analysis, China has maintained the hierarchical system by spreading its cultural values. China has rarely used force to intervene in other countries. (Jacque, 2009) In the rare cases where force was used, China’s main purpose was to restore the hierarchical relationship that had been disrupted by the target state.³ We argue that this sort of aversion to intervention that Kang identified simultaneously reflects China’s alienation from synchronic arrangements.

The Chinese use of force is by no means interventionist. In practice however, Chinese harmony is rarely harmonious. (Hui, 2012; Adelman & Shih, 1993) Nevertheless, the Chinese apply force in dealing with international crises primarily for its symbolic meaning rather than in pursuit of material interests. Empirical evidence can be found for this in the military conflicts that have broken out between China and its neighbors. Whenever China, either the People’s Republic of China (PRC) or the imperial dynasties of the past, has resorted to military force, it has hardly ever reaped

³ Kang (2007: 37) mentioned the example of the Qing dynasty’s war against the Korean Choson regime in the early seventeenth century. The purpose of this war was to consolidate and demarcate the border between the two states.

substantial gains. Instead, force may be seen as an effort on China's part to restore a relationship that is consistent with a proper role for China. Chih-yu Shih (1990:188) argued that several meanings may be attributed to China's use of force, including eliminating a challenge to China's national self-image, signifying China's disapproval of certain environmental events that disrupt existing relationships, signaling the emergence of a new image that calls for a different relationship, managing the disruptive event by targeting an indirect target, and searching for a national self-identity that ameliorates a problematic relationship. Violence against a foreign country has always had to be conceived of as a form of self-discipline. In other words, violence is conceived of as self-discipline or self-rectification and that means that China and its targets must have first composed a greater self in the Chinese worldview before violence can be justified in China's own eyes. (Shih, 2010)

From this perspective, China's application of counter-force in dealing with its foreign relations is closely related to how China perceives its civilizational image and role in the international system, and how it wishes its image to be perceived internally and externally. The interventionary use of force in the name of global governance that is aimed at transformation threatens China's faith in reciprocal relational security. The Chinese national interest calculus is based on the certainty and stability provided by such intangible relationships rather than apparent gains. John Garver (2006) took a similar view in his investigation of the causes of China's war with India in 1962. He concluded that the Chinese decided to attack India 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's argument is applicable to China's involvement in other wars since the late nineteenth century, which was often the result of China's dismay at violations of the often nominal hierarchical relationships in the Chinese worldview.

Pragmatism and Bilateralism

The BoR directs one's attention to conflicts of relationships or roles. In the age of global governance, the pragmatic purpose of BoR is to find a plausible solution to the dilemma between (1) the quest for stable borders, which intervention would undermine, and (2) the quest for recognition by the global powers, which resistance to intervention would undermine. No state can avoid the synchronizing demand of global governance led by the major powers, whether it is perceived to be hypocritical or not. China has to learn how to care exclusively for its own relational interests in the face of interventionist global forces by supporting them only partially. Simultaneously, China is trying to change the style of global intervention in order to reduce the potential

impact of intervention on China's relationships with either the global powers or the target state.

Chinese pragmatism is at the same time relational. China continues to have faith in its ability to protect its national interests by cultivating long-term stability. A stable relationship that ensures certainty and reciprocity is believed to benefit both China and its partners. Chinese pragmatism defines China's style of soft power, which supposedly builds on its reputation for never deliberately standing in the way of any other state's goals. This means that China is reluctant to attempt any synchronic arrangement in accordance with China's own cultural rationality. In this way, its leaders hope that China is never a threat to others even though they may dislike Chinese values or institutions. Chinese soft power stands in dramatic contrast to American soft power that prevails in IRT. American soft power emphasizes the capacity of the United States to synchronize ways of rational thinking of other nations into following American values and institutions voluntarily, even though they may dislike the United States itself.

In addition, the BoR privileges bilateral relationships over multilateral ones, although the theory does not preclude the multilateral BoR. It is a system composed of multi-bilateral relationships. To lead or even participate in multilateral relations requires one to take an intervening attitude regarding how to synchronize domestic practices of all the countries, (Carlson, 2005) unless all relevant parties are applying the BoR at the same time, as illustrated by the ASEAN.⁴ Any notion of the right values or procedures positions countries against one another by dividing them into followers and revisionists. Whenever there is a perceived revisionist, there is perceived confrontation. To enhance one's relational security, one minimal strategy is to avoid treating anyone else as a revisionist. The quest for justice undermines relational security, so overly zealous involvement in regulating multilateral relations or confronting revisionism is always dangerous unless the purpose is to destroy a wrong relationship. In the same vein, the reproduction of hierarchy in international relations is usually bilateral. (Lake 2009)

To engage in bilateral relations is at the same time to neutralize multilateral synchronization so that the scenario of global interference with domestic or bilateral relationships can generate little threat. China, for example, does not have to resist the hegemonic order imposed by a superpower, such as the United States, if all countries bordering China do not have to take sides between China and the United States. Therefore, even though a neighboring country seemingly complies with the hegemonic request for cooperation, it will not seek a change in its reciprocal relationship with

⁴ 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" The ASEAN Charter could be downloaded here: <http://www.asean.org/archive/publications/ASEAN-Charter.pdf>

China. All-round stabilized bilateral relations along the borders not only resolve the threat of containment by the United States; China's own bilateral relationship with the United States remains minimally non-confrontational. This is in sharp contrast with the strategy of BoP, which recommends seeking allies in the face of a rising power or alerts of new strategic alliances between others. Establishing a bilateral relationship is instrumental to balancing potential threats via alliance formation under the BoP system, but it is a goal in itself under the BoR system. A bilateral relationship benefits both sides if it does not fluctuate in accordance with the perceived power shift or emerging alliance reformation in a multilateral setting.

One incident that shows salience of bilateral relationships is when Beijing commented on arms sales by Russia to India. According to a Chinese diplomatic spokesman, "Both India and Russia are China's friendly neighbors...China welcomes the growing friendly relationship between India and Russia and believes that the growing of their bilateral relationship is conducive to the world's peace and stability." (EWS, 2012) This means that a nation can rationally consider a stable bilateral relationship between its potential enemies conducive to its interests. International order is maintained under the BoR through stable bilateral relationships so that the national security of one country is not threatened by the good relationship between others. Investment in BoP would be redundant in the long run. Nevertheless, investment in hard power is always wise at any given moment. This is because bilateral relationships can still break down or hegemonic power can still coerce neighbors on the borders. This combination of pragmatic preparation for confrontation and pragmatic renouncement of benefits for the sake of any particular relationship is the same reason that once led the late Lucian Pye (1990) to misperceive a China that perplexingly tolerates cognitive dissonance and younger generations of strategic culture to debate whether or not the Chinese have a peaceful strategic culture. (Johnston, 1995; Mearsheimer, 2006; Hui, 2008; Wang, 2010; Buzan, 2010)

A stable bilateral relationship necessarily follows patterns and rituals, their emergence as well as reproduction involves coincidence, volition, and consensus. Each stable bilateral relationship has its own history and distinct features. That is why the salience of bilateral relationships inevitably causes inconsistency between the bilateral relationships with different countries and characterizes even US foreign policy. The US foreign policy often suffers the charge of hypocrisy due its apparent use of double standards. It would be misleading to simply conclude that the US does not really care principles because the BoR rationality certainly allows more room for an ally and less room for a defector. For countries deliberately subscribing to the BoR, there is no need to choose sides when coping with two different countries in two different patterns, that

is, a multi-bilateral system.⁵ This is particularly relevant to both the United States and China today. As a rising power experiencing expansive interactions, China cannot practically enforce any value consistently. The United States' rebalancing in Asia likewise has to avoid promoting a single value in order to negotiate support from a whole range of partners. Wherever there is a will to retrieve the loose reciprocal relationship, there is regression toward the BoR. The implications for understanding IRT in general is that BoR, instead of BoP, is an ultimate resort for a nation under threat to avoid dreaded anarchy.

The theory of BoR contributes to constructivism where ideas and identities that are agreeable to nations to govern their interactions for various reasons run into a limit. This is where nations that share a confrontational collective identity can still maintain friendship or nations which share an alliance identity can still enter a difficult pattern of interaction. During the Cold War, for two noticeable examples, communist China and anti-communist Myanmar remained friendly while China and the former USSR clashed. While the materialization of shared idea constrains the state in a multilateral framework, the BoR acknowledges the practices of constructivism at the bilateral level which compromises, but not necessarily substitutes for, collectively constructed ideas at the multilateral level. The BoR provides such a systemic incentive for the state to rely on bilateral constructivism for the sake of long-term stability. Bilateral constructivism answers to the specific concerns between the two states and makes their relationship an alienable part of each of their national beings. To that extent, the BoR is by no means Chinese.

Implications for IRT in General

The idea of a balance of relationships, originally derived from Confucian lessons, is able to extend the horizon of BoP. The BoP prescribes for the state facing the rise of another power to either engage in balancing or a deviant strategy of bandwagoning. Balancing is aimed at defending against the potential aggression exerted by the rising power to maintain one's own security. Bandwagoning is aimed at joining the side of the rising power to avoid becoming its target. The goals of the BoR, like the BoP and bandwagoning, also include the preservation of the security of state. More importantly, however, the BoR aims to create the sense of peaceful and constructive relationships between the states. Although both strategies focus on national interests, such as survival, security, and economic benefits, among other things, the BoR does not take such interests as priorities or immediate ends. The belief that ultimately, rational states

⁵ A veteran Indian China watcher concludes that China supported intervention when the intervening party was defined as its friend and the target regime was identified as its enemy. When the intervening state was viewed by China as the enemy, on the other hand, it would severely criticize the intervention action as immoral and unjust. (Gupta, 1971: 15-22)

should strive to establish harmonious relations is the distinctive feature of the BoR.

A state applies the strategy of BoR to remain connected and avoid anarchy. Anarchy is a system of independent states seeking self-help but suffering uncertainty, the most extreme form of which is outbreak of war. The state wants to avoid anarchy so that it does not have to assume enmity of other states. How to achieve the better BoR is a skill, which practically enables parties of a relationship to transcend their differences in power, value, institution, and so on. Each BoR is thus a model of practice in itself. It may lay down apparent and immediate national interests for the preservation of relationships. On the other hand, the strategy of BoP or bandwagoning is often triggered by fear—the fear that external powers deprive a state’s survival. Such rationale is similar to what Thucydides (1996, 351-6) described thousands of years ago—the same idea the classical realist assumption in IR theory has unremittingly followed: “The strong do what they can and the weak suffer what they must.” However, the motivation that applies to the BoR is completely different.

When a state adopts the strategy of BoP and bandwagoning, the strategy always targets a specific other. The state either attempts to weaken a specific other’s capability or influence, or aspires to the release of pressure resulting from being threatened by a stronger external power. By contrast, the rationale for applying the BoR is to achieve reciprocation and harmony. Such rationale could only appear when the state’s need for survival and development can be met by an enhanced sense of relational security. When the state is denied a reciprocal relationship, it senses the threat of survival because of the loss of mutuality, then the sense of isolation, and finally the threat of uncertainty. Balancing and bandwagoning are strategies adopted when the international system remains in the Hobbesian state of nature. In reality, rarely do states continue to hold survival as the primary national interest at stake, because they usually possess relational security of various kinds and to a certain degree.

If anarchy is a system of no central authorities, in which the state in solitude is compelled to adopt a self-help strategy, harmony should likewise be a system in which the state protected by reciprocal self-restraint is inclined to avoid the disruption of relationships. (Qin, 2009a; 2009b; 2011) Under anarchy, the foundation of strategic calculation is about the capability and relative weakness in physical power resources as indicators of danger. If realists believe that states must live in anarchy and thus states cannot help but resort to the BoP for survival, they could alternatively seek to avoid anarchy by acknowledging and then reproducing reciprocal relationships so that self-help actually means mutual help. The same fear toward potentially unrestrained violence of anarchy therefore leads to the system of BoR upon which they could rely to stay away from the challenge of survival. The BoP is a systemic aptitude for realists

to live with anarchy as nature; the BoR is a systemic resource for the realist state to avoid or suppress anarchy as an undesirable, but not inevitable condition. They are parallel to each other. Abortion or failure of either leads to strategic thinking leaning towards the opposite.

If a state subscribes to a specific idea (e.g., liberalism) or institution (e.g., capitalism) and acts with determination to synchronize ways of rational thinking of all other nations in order to operate international relations accordingly, the BoR will predict that its determined pursuit will not continue in the long run. Under the system of BoR, nations that seek to diffuse a distinctive value or institution always need to coordinate with other nations and therefore inevitably act inconsistently when coping differently with complying and revisionist actors that coexist. All the inconsistencies are harbingers for the undergirded force of BoR, which pushes one to compromise on deviant behavior of a perceived ally. The BoR is a peculiar system that pushes all the other systems to face their limit. There can be higher moments in which states stick with a particular way of rational thinking at the expense of bilateral reciprocity. However, they are always capable of retrieving reciprocity through self-restraint in the aftermath of—or during an interval in between—high moments. The BoR enables the states to recover from fatigue or uncertainty caused by overcommitment. Those other systems of rationality based on power, institutions, or identity always have to retrieve specific bilateral relationships when systemic constraints fail to provide guidance.

Compromises and confrontations that deviate from synchronizing forces attest to the system of BoR. Compromise is a widespread practice anywhere and anytime. This is because compromise with a complying state could secure its continued support; compromise with a revisionist state could warm up feelings conducive to future synchronization. The latter is usually called peaceful evolution or engagement. The fact that whether or not and how much to compromise necessarily involves human judgment compels one to think in the longer term and in relational terms. The deepest danger during systemic failure is the loss of relationship or the possibility to stay related. The quest for relationships is too strong to allow synchronization to continue consistently, indiscriminately, or teleologically, alluding to relational security as a systemic incentive and the aforementioned phenomenon of double standard and hypocrisy as systemic necessity. Being an indicator of failure of the state to comply with the theory of BoP, inconsistency in enforcing a value or a rule is actually intrinsic to the BoR, because judgment and its undecidable consequences are systemic parameters of the BoR. Even though the idealistic destiny in harmony is hardly attainable or fixable in the IR dynamics, relational security remains a plausible solution to uncertainty in practice.

Under the imagination of harmony, the relationship is the foundation, and the loss of self-restraint of the other members of the group is the danger. Between the two imagined extremes of anarchy and harmony, the state typically strives to dismiss uncertainty through negotiated or assimilated convention as well as institutions on the one hand and guard against two potential threats on the other. These threats are the breach in an extant reciprocal relationship and the emergence of those not yet assimilated. The latter threat, which is caused by undefined relationship, is also a source of opportunity. In the system of BoR, even the national leaders who subscribe to the BoP tactics will find it rational to act with self-restraint. To renounce a claim, concede a right, or compromise on a dispute is an investment or a cost-efficient way of the stronger party to preserve a long-term, reciprocal relationship. The United States, for example, at times adopts a cautious BoR policy to avoid containing China even though it has superior military power. According to Joseph Nye, (2013: A19) such a policy ought to “ensure that China doesn’t feel encircled or endangered... [S]ometimes America’s power is greater when we act with others rather than merely over others.” Nye seems confident that even a superpower is capable of self-restraint for an unspecified benefit to accrue in the future.

Thus, in theory, the balance of relationships could be a strategy that is universally adopted by the state. Yet, empirically, the BoR becomes the main theme of foreign policy more easily in those states whose domestic culture (politically as well as socially) provides strong support for the application of such a relationship-oriented strategy. The BoR emphasizes the importance of reciprocal interaction and self-restraint in one’s effort to build network. The goal of harmony does not signify the ethical and virtuous aspects of the state’s acts. On the contrary, achieving harmony is a comprehensively realistic consideration with the hope for better future gains or fewer future losses by preserving positive relations with all concerned parties. Once the systemic necessity of BoR is consciously acknowledged, , the BoR can compose of a strategy with a genuinely pragmatic logic that seriously takes national interests into account. Such logic treats the sequence of interests differently.

Under the BoR, every option should be pragmatically possible as long as balanced arrangements are made. Pragmatism is thus translated into adapting to both international conditions and the conditions of others in order to ease their worries about one’s own intentions. This means that one should not advocate specific principles of justice or orders for global governance, which seeks to synchronize values or procedures between nations to create one rational global society. Pragmatism of this kind is ill fit with multilateral relations whereby a universal type of norm is called for to synchronize internal conditions of all parties in a multilateral relationship.

Clues of BoR as a General System

Quest for relational security is not merely China's or Confucian societies' style, granting that Confucianism is the Chinese way of practicing the BoR. Moreover, it is neither necessarily peaceful nor necessarily violent. The balances of relationship are widespread all over the world and throughout history. Nevertheless, scholars have not yet acknowledged them as systemic behavior. The reason why they are hard to acknowledge is two-fold: the BoR predicts inconsistency rather than synchronic ways of rational thinking, and the BoR guarantees no systemic consequence. In addition, the multilateral meanings of bilateral relationships are often not direct or immediate. Both compromise in a stronger position and confrontation in a weaker position provide political statements about what should be the proper relationship in the long run and bilaterally. Political statements need to be enacted every once in a while to reproduce the proper relationship. However, the view on what exactly constitutes the proper relationship evolves over time and varies by parties involved. That is probably the reason why even though states resort to the BoR all the time, students of IRT have not yet been ready to consider it as a system, albeit a system of inconsistency.

Now, the notion of relationship can be universally defined. It is a practically governable pattern of mutually agreed reciprocal tolerance. The BoR is not new, nor is it restricted to a few Confucian cultural areas, but the IRT has failed to acknowledge its ubiquity and longevity. Yet, to discuss how universally applicable the BoR can be in international relations misses the point of studying balances of relationships. This is because a balance of relationships is mainly bilateral and contextual. Whether or not a stable bilateral relationship can emerge is the result of both coincidence and volition. The Confucian culture which cherishes long-term reciprocal relationships prepares Confucian leaders to think and desire balances of relationships in substitution for a BoP or a balance of interest. Each other culture has its own route to such realization. This is why the BoR is different from repeated prisoners' dilemmas or transaction-cost institutionalism, both of which advocate a synchronic measure of rationality.

Through the lens of BoR, contending explanations and meanings alternative to contemporary IRT can be derived from familiar events. The Christian tradition that stresses ontological integrity rather than a relational self can still incorporate the BoR as long as the nation judges that the pursuit of BoP does not yield any apparent result. In 2005, for example, the United States gave Democratic People's Republic of Korea, designated by the United States as a terrorist state, the promise not to attack it with either nuclear or traditional weapons. (Cha, 2009:119) Although the balance of power between the United States and the NK is asymmetric, such a rigid pledge nonetheless

contradicts the realist calculus of balance of threat. Neither was the US good will with NK a move to balance a rival China as China strongly encouraged such a show of good will. On this particular move, the US appeared to be applying the BoR rather than the BoP. Just two years before this, the United States invaded Afghanistan and then Iraq on the grounds that these countries trained terrorists and possessed weapons of massive destruction (on conspiringly forfeited evidence), while neither country was capable or intentional of a war with the United States. Again, such behavior was incompatible with either realism or idealism. The BoR is called for in like cases where the BoP does not provide sufficient explanation.

Apparently, realism has not been an exclusionary principle of international relations for the United States facing the rise of China. Since 2011, for example, the United States has adopted the strategy of rebalancing toward Asia. Practically, it has included both partnership building with Myanmar, Malaysia, China, and so on, on the one hand, and realist balancing against China via cooperation with Japan, the Philippines, and Vietnam on their maritime disputes with China, on the other hand. Accordingly, the BoP and the BoR together characterize the U.S. endeavor to remain influential in spite of relative power decline. The Falklands War of 1982 between the United Kingdom and Argentina is another example. The US made possible the victory of the United Kingdom even at the expense of the long-held national interest of refusing any European force to interfere with American affairs. Rather, via a long-term BoR with the UK, the US had its “main overseas partner in the Cold War sustained and strengthened for the long struggle ahead.” (Osullivan, 2012) Note that “the long struggle ahead” involves primarily the non-apparent national interest.

For a nation practicing the BoR, determining how threatening a condition is requires judgment on the possibility of recovering from lost reciprocity. This judgment should be based on both the strength of extant reciprocal relationships and the resources available for carrying out punishment as well as compromise. Different leaderships may arrive at different judgments under similar conditions. Therefore, once consciously acknowledge, the balance of relationships, aside from being a system, is also a skill, an attitude, and a decision. All nations practice the BoR to some extent when a crisis is judged in presence. Judgment on the nature of the threat to the existing reciprocal relationship is critical in the play of BoR. By contrast, the BoP theory is presumably an analytical tool used by scholars to explain the occurrence of a specific policy. Unlike the BoP theory in which policy options are considered structurally constrained, the policy under the balance of relationships involves judgment. Policy makers need to rationalize whether a particular situation is a total threat that requires total breakup of a relationship or a minor threat that requires only pampering to repair. What prepares a policy choice is not the power change, but the

judgment on the specific relationship.

Neither is Confucianism required at all to exercise BoR on a global governance issue. A major power may refrain from intervention when it judges that a challenge to its desired order can be improved if a relationship can be established. This is how China was able to contrive the framework of the Six-Party Talks to bring the United States together with North Korea to the same table. The United States went along, despite the prevailing criticism or the lack of any result.⁶ The rationale to support the Talks could not be that it did not have the capacity to impose sanctions on the North. It had to be because the BoP provided no pragmatic solution. At the limit of BoP, a relationship with North Korea and/or China, once emerging, could bring a longer-term solution. The North, in comparison, has never hesitated to threaten the much more powerful United States in order to demonstrate its disapproval of a perceived act of betrayal on the United States' side.

For another example of dissolving a multilateral crisis via enhancing a bilateral relationship, the United Kingdom rushed to recognize the People's Republic of China in 1950 at its birth, despite the fact that communism was the major threat of the time. The early bird effect successfully dissolved the potential crisis of the PRC's taking over the British colony of Hong Kong. Preventing the loss of Hong Kong at the time exempted the United Kingdom from the image of decline and also the domino effect on its multilateral empire of African colonies and elsewhere. The British were not subscribing to the BoP in the emerging bipolar system that should have required disciplinary following of the US or taking China's advantage at its vulnerable moment. Rather, the hope for a long-term relationship took the priority. By contrast, even if the capacity of a major power to intervene is insufficient, intervention will nonetheless proceed if the violation of its order is judged as direct. After all, an apparently bad relationship has to be made anew by destroying it completely. U.S. intervention in Iraq, neither a major power nor an owner of energy, exemplifies the BoR thinking of restoring via destruction and yet incurred noticeable criticism from leading realists (Waltz, et al, 2002).

For a nation deciding which side to take, the policy of BoR is to avoid enforcing synchronization. The BoR leads a nation to cherish bilateral relationships with both the intervening major power and its target states. Relationships with the target states encourage mutual respect, for any third nation's internal preferences as well as for those of the target state. Relationships with interventionist countries encourage mutual

⁶ Christopher Hill, former Assistant Secretary of State to the Bush Administration and US chief representative to the Talks was quoted by Zhu (2011: 192) as having said that "the North Koreans lied to the United States" and to all Six-Party participants. Hill said there is "absolutely no value" in restarting Six-Party Talks so that "the North Koreans can go and lie to us again".

concessions. All foreign policy debates over intervention demonstrate the negotiable nature of interventionist policies. Each round of negotiation provides hints about how stable a relationship is or can be. Interventionist practices in accordance with BoR have to be highly individualized and contextualized.

Conclusion

China's grievance toward the EU's arms Embargo and its passion for promoting a new type of great power relationship with the US are not China-specific attitudes. Both are attempts to explore a longer-term relationship by asserting the importance of transcending universal rules. Much of the same relationship more easily exists between personalities in the US or the EU, or between political parties in the former Soviet Bloc. The US and the EU could achieve a better relationship with China, accordingly, by restraining in China's favor the application of rules, and China would presumably respond with self-restraint by improving China's record with the EU and the US. In the same vein, China reacts to the recalcitrant smaller neighbors differently each with a specific mix and sequence of compromise and sanction with one common purpose of showing a related partner's self-restraint and determination at the same time. China's concerns for reputation and credit can be found anywhere else in the world and to an extent that no longer serves apparent national interests. Finally, China reliance on regional organization in Africa to legitimize its own participation in UN's intervention is to balance relationships between the interventionary force and the target state. The same practice of avoiding choosing sides, which usually involves no immediate goal, has been the everyday task of the US diplomats all over the world.

That BoR and BoP are parallel systems in international politics resembles what the political system and social system are in domestic politics. Such a situation is not rare, because the quest for stability and certainty answers directly to the desire to avoid the potentially unrestrained violence of anarchy. In actuality, on the one hand, the BoP only needs to take place when a reciprocal bilateral relationship is not foreseeable. On the other hand, the reciprocal bilateral relationship is the solution to cases whereby the BoP fails to coordinate international relations. In reverse, a failed BoR practice could likewise lead to BoP or bandwagoning. The decision to enter a particular system depends on judgment, but the decision in itself is inescapable. The BoP and the BoR together complete the theory of international system.

In conclusion, we can summarize the foreign policy principles of BoR in two motifs: first, the value of all-round reciprocal bilateral relationships should always exceed that of multilateral synchronization; and second, compromise and confrontation should always contribute to the restoration of bilateral relationships in the long run rather than reflecting relative power in the immediate run. Regarding the

second motif, we propose: (1) When a condition is perceived as not threatening, resort to compromise to repair it; (2) When a condition is perceived as directly threatening, resort to breakup to start anew; and (3) When a condition is perceived as indirectly threatening, resort to a mix of punishment and repair to rectify it. The BoR is a skill that all can possess, a decision that reflects one's judgment, and a system that explains the necessity of inconsistency, double standard, and defiance of rules. The BoR as a theory is not necessarily universally present or cognized; but as a practice, it is inevitable, pragmatic and therefore universally possible. In this sense, the BoR is a theory that is readily retrievable anywhere and any time.

Reference

- Adelman, Jonathan and Chih-yu Shih. 1993. *Symbolic War: The Chinese Use of Force, 1840-1980*. Taipei, Taiwan: Institute of International Relations.
- Archer, Margaret S. 1996. *Culture and Agency: the Place of Culture in Social Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Andersen, Morten Skumsrud and Neumann, Iver B. 2012 “Practices as Models: A Methodology with an Illustration Concerning Wampum Diplomacy,” *Millennium* 40(3): 457-481.
- Axelrod, Robert. 1984. *The Evolution of Cooperation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bajoria, Jayshree. 2010. “The China-North Korea Relationship,” Council on Foreign Relations, October 7.
<<http://www.cfr.org/china/china-north-korea-relationship/p11097>>. Accessed June 2013.
- Baldwin, David A. 2004, ‘Power and International Relations,’ in Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth A. Simmons, eds., *Handbook of International Relations*, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Lt., pp. 273-297.
- Bull, Hedley. 1977. *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. London: Macmillan.
- Buzan, Barry. 2010. “China in International Society: Is “Peaceful Rise” Possible?” *The Chinese Journal of International Politics* 3: 5-36.
- Buzan, Barry. 2004. *From International to World Society? English School Theory and the Social Structure of Globalisation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Callahan, William. 2004. *Contingent States: Greater China and Transnational Relations*. Minneapolis, M.N.: University of Minnesota Press.
- Calmes, Jackie and Steven Lee Myers. 2013. “Obama and Xi Tackle Cybersecurity as Talks Begin in California.” *The New York Times*. June 7: A5.
- Carlson, Allen. 2005. *Unifying China: Integrating with the World*. Stanford, C.A.: Stanford University Press.
- Cha, Victor D. 2009. “What Do They Really Want?: Obama's North Korea Conundrum.” *The Washington Quarterly* 32 no. 4: 119-138.
- Collins, Gabriel B. et al. 2008. *China's Energy Security: The Impact on Beijing's Maritime Policies* (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press).
- Copeland, Dale. 1996. “Economic Interdependence and War.” *International Security* 20: 5-41.
- Eliasoph, Nina and Paul Lichterman. 2003. “Culture in Interaction.” *American Journal of Sociology* 108: 735-794.
- EU Official: Commission Policy Paper for Transmission to the Council and the European Parliament: A maturing partnership – shared interests and challenges

- in EU-China relations (2003),
http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/external_relations/relations_with_third_countries/asia/r14207_en.htm, 10 July 2013
- EWS. 2012. "China hopes Russia-India ties conducive to Asian stability." 2012.12.26,
http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/china/2012-12/26/c_132065055.htm,
 accessed January 8, 2013.
- Fairbank, John King, eds. 1968. *The Chinese World Order: Traditional China's Foreign Relations*. Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press.
- Finnemore, Martha and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change." *International Organization* 52, 4: 887-917.
- Garver, John W. 2006. "China's Decision for War with India in 1962." In Alastair Iain Johnston and Robert S. Ross, eds., *New Directions in the Study of China's Foreign Policy*. Stanford, C.A.: Stanford University Press.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gupta, Krishna Prakash. 1971. "China's Theory and Practice of Intervention." *China Report* 7, no. 12: 12-27. <http://chr.sagepub.com/>, accessed January 16, 2013.
- Hafner-Burton, Emilie M., Kahler, Miles, and Montgomery, Alexander H. 2009 "Network Analysis for International Relations," *International Organization* 63 (Summer): 559-592.
- Hui, Victoria Tin-bor. 2008. "How China Was Ruled?" *American Interest* 3, no. 4 (March/April 2008): 44-52.
- 2012. "Confucianism and Peacemaking in Chinese History." In S. A. Nan, Z. C. Mampilly and N. Partoli, eds., *Peacemaking: From Practice to Theory*. Santa Barbara, C.A.: Praeger, pp. 211-27
- Jacque, Martin. 2009. *When China Rules the World: The End of the Western World and the Birth of a New Global Order*. New York, N.Y.: The Penguin Press.
- Johnston, Alastair Iain. 1995. *Cultural Realism: Strategic Culture and Grand Strategy in Chinese History*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- 2008. *Social States: China in International Institutions, 1980-2000*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Kang, David C. 2007. *China Rising: Peace, Power, and Order in East Asia*. New York, N.Y.: Columbia University Press.
- Katzenstein, Peter, eds. 2012. *Sinicization and the Rise of China: Civilizational Processes beyond East and West*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Kavalski, Emilian. 2013. "The Struggle for recognition of normative powers: Normative power Europe and normative Power China in context." *Cooperation and Conflict* 48: 247-267.

- Keohane, Robert and Joseph Nye. 1987. "Power and Interdependence Revisited." *International Organization* 41, no.4: 725-753.
- Keohane, Robert. 1984. *After Hegemony*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Lake, David. 2009. *Hierarchy in International Relations*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Lampton, David M. 2008. *The Three Faces of Chinese Power: Might, Money, and Mind*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Lin, Jin-shu. 2009. "The Status quo of Sino-North Korean Trade and the Countermeasures." *Journal of Yanbian University (Social Science)* 1: 37-43.
- Ma, Lin. 2012. "Zhong Yue Shouci Kuajie Haishang Soujiu Yanxi (The First Sino-Vietnam Interstate Rescue Drill Has Been Held)." *Wenweipo*. August 30. <http://paper.wenweipo.com/2012/08/30/CH1208300012.htm>, accessed July 23 2013.
- Mearsheimer, John J. 2006. "China's Unpeaceful Rise." *Current History* 105, no. 690: 160-162.
- MOFA (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the PRC). 2003. *China's EU Policy Paper*, <http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/eng/topics/ceupp/t27708.htm>, 12 July
- Nye, Joseph Jr. 2013. "Work with China, Don't Contain it." *The New York Times*. January 26: A19. http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/26/opinion/work-with-china-dont-contain-it.html?_r=0, accessed January 28th, 2013.
- O'Sullivan, John. 2012. "How the U.S. Almost Betrayed Britain." *The Wall Street Journal*. April 2: 11.
- Piao, Shenghe. 2011. "Dezui Libiya Fankangjun Zhanho Chongjian Zhong E Meifen? (Displeasing the Libyan Rebel China and Russia Out of the Postwar Reconstruction)." *cn. Chosun.com*, August 25th. Accessed September 2011. <http://bbs.aboluowang.com/viewthread.php?tid=47807>
- Pye, Lucian W. 1990. "China: Erratic State, Frustrated Society." *Foreign Affairs* 69: 56-75.
- Qin, Yaqing. 2009a. "Relationality and Processual Construction: Bring Chinese Ideas into IRT (Guanxi Benwei yu Guocheng Jianguo: Jiang Zhongguo Linian Zhiru Guoji Guuanxi Lilun)." *Social Sciences in China*, no. 3: 69-86.
- 2009b. "Development of International Relations Theory in China." *International Studies* 46, nos. 1-2: 185-201.
- 2011. "Rule, Rules, and Relations: Towards a Synthetic Approach to Governance." *Chinese Journal of International Politics* 4, no. 2: 117-145.
- Ren, Min. 2006. "Musang Tiekuan Kaifa Zhongguo Dongbei Dongbian Dao Tielu Jianshe (The Exploitation of Musang Iron Ore in North Korea and the

- Construction of East Border Railways in China).” *Tiedao Yunshu Yu Jingji (Railway Transport and Economy)* 28: 11-12.
- Roy, Denny. 2005. ‘Southeast Asia and China: Balancing or Bandwagoning?’, *Contemporary Southeast Asia* 2, no. 2: 305–22.
- Shih, Chih-yu. 1990. *The Spirit of Chinese Foreign Policy: A Psychocultural View*. New York, N.Y.: St. Martin’s Press.
- . 2010. “The West That Is Not in the West: Identifying Self in Oriental Modernity.” *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 23: 537-560.
- Shih, Chih-yu and Chiung-chiu Huang. 2013. “Preaching Self-Responsibility: The Chinese Style of Global Governance.” *Journal of Contemporary China* 22, no. 80: 351-365.
- Slaughter, Anne-Marie 2009 “America’s Edge: Power in the Networked Century,” *Foreign Affairs* 88 (January-February): 94-113.
- Tan, Chung. 1978. *China and the Brave New World: A Study of the Origins of The Opium War (1840-42)*. Bombay, India: Allied Publishers Private.
- Thucydides. 1996. *The Landmark Thucydides: A Comprehensive Guide to the Peloponnesian War*. Originally written between 424 and 400 BCE. Trans. Richard Crawley, 1874. Eds. Robert B. Strassler. New York, N.Y.: Free Press.
- Vaisey, Stephen and Omar Lizardo. 2010. “Can Cultural Worldviews Influence Network Composition?” *Social Forces* 88, 4: 1595-1618.
- Waltz, Kenneth. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.
- Waltz, Kenneth, et al. 2002. “War with Iraq Is Not in America’s National Interest.” *The New York Times*. September 26: op-ed.
<http://mearsheimer.uchicago.edu/pdfs/P0012.pdf>, accessed July 24 2013.
- Wang, Hongying and James N. Rosenau. 2009. “China and Global Governance.” *Asian Perspective* 33, no. 3: 5-39.
- Wang, Yuan-kang. 2010. *Harmony and War: Confucian Culture and Chinese Power Politics*. New York, N.Y.: Columbia University Press.
- Wendt, Alexander. 2003. “Why a World State Is Inevitable?” *European Journal of International Relations* 9, no. 4: 491-542.
- Wendt, Alexander. 1999. *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yan, Xuotong. 2011. *Ancient Chinese Thought, Modern Chinese Power*. Eds. D. Bell and Z. Sun. Trans. E. Ryden. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University.
- Ziegler, Charles E. 2006. “Energy Factor in China’s Foreign Policy.” *Journal of Contemporary China* 11, 1: 1-23.
- Zhang, Feng. 2009. “Rethinking the ‘Tribute System’: Broadening the Conceptual

Horizon of Historical East Asian Politics.” *Chinese Journal of International Politics* 2: 545-574.

Zhao, Tingyang. 2009. “A Political World Philosophy in terms of All-Under-Heaven (Tian-xia).” *Diogenes (English edition)* 56: 5-18.

Zhu, Feng. 2011. “Flawed Mediation and a Compelling Mission: Chinese Diplomacy in the Six-Party Talks to Denuclearise North Korea.” *East Asia* 28: 191–218