

# **China's Perception of and Strategy for the Middle Powers**

---

Dong Ryul Lee  
Dongduk Women's University

**December 2014**

## Knowledge-Net for a Better World

---

East Asia Institute(EAI) is a nonprofit and independent research organization in Korea, founded in May 2002. EAI strives to transform East Asia into a society of nations based on liberal democracy, market economy, open society, and peace.

EAI takes no institutional position on policy issues and has no affiliation with the Korean government. All statements of fact and expressions of opinion contained in its publications are the sole responsibility of the author or authors.

 **EAI** is a registered trademark.

© Copyright 2014 EAI

This electronic publication of EAI intellectual property is provided for non-commercial use only, as long as it is unaltered and complete. Copies may not be duplicated for commercial purposes. Unauthorized posting of EAI documents to a non-EAI website is prohibited. EAI documents are protected under copyright law.

ISBN 979-11-86226-00-1 95340

**East Asia Institute**  
#909 Sampoong B/D, Eulji-ro 158  
Jung-gu, Seoul 100-786  
Republic of Korea  
Tel 82 2 2277 1683  
Fax 82 2 2277 1684



## China's Perception of and Strategy for the Middle Powers

Dong Ryul Lee  
Dongduk Women's University

December 2014

### I. Introduction

After the 2008 global financial crisis, Chinese diplomacy became more active and assertive, but it retained abstract and normative characteristics. China's recent assertive diplomacy however, is evolving into a new level: China has begun to provide and propose concrete agenda and alternatives. This change is posing a significant and realistic challenge to South Korea's diplomacy. With China's unexpectedly rapid rise and the United States implementing a rebalancing strategy in Asia, South Korea has recently had to grapple with the growing possibility of having to choose between the two powers in the midst of competitive and conflictual relations. However, now that China has begun to propose concrete agenda and alternatives, what has been a possibility for the future is now looming as reality. For example, China has recently taken aim at the U.S.-led Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) by pursuing a Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP). At the Conference on Interaction and Confidence-Building Measures in Asia, China stated that "Asian security must be protected by Asian people"; and China is also requesting South Korea's participation in the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB), an initiative where the U.S. has not been invited.

With the increased competition between the U.S. and China placing real pressure on South Korean diplomacy, South Korea's realization of "middle power diplomacy" has become more of an imminent task. The necessity for South Korea to expand its independent role and prestige as a middle power while avoiding the dilemma of choosing between the U.S. and China has enlarged. The problem is how to induce China to support and cooperate with South Korea's role and prestige as a middle power while keeping South Korea's alliance with the U.S. unaffected.



Therefore, based on the aforementioned issues, this paper first tries to observe the direction of China's diplomacy toward middle powers by examining how China recognizes the emergence of the middle powers and where the middle powers are positioned in relation to China's diplomatic strategy. This paper further analyzes China's perception of South Korea and its diplomatic policies vis-à-vis South Korea; based on the findings, it traces China's perception and stance with regards to South Korea's middle power diplomacy.

## II. China's Perception of the Middle Powers

### 1. Characteristics of China's Rise and its Multiple Self-identities

Accelerated by the relative decline of the United States since the global economic crisis in 2008, China's rise is still burdened with various tasks such as socio-political reform, development, and integration. China's rise also displays multiple identities. China is not a developed country from the West; rather it is a socialist developing country. China is a major power in terms of national strength, possessing by far the strongest overall national strength among all developing countries. However, there still exists a considerable gap between China and other countries such as the U.S., those in Europe, and even Japan in terms of soft power including science technology, education, and culture. Regionally, China is a major power in Asia, whose national interests and influence are spread around the world, but even in Asia, it is not yet a dominant, leading country. Domestically, China maintains a socialist styled unique political system and values while still undergoing reforms, and suffers from problems of national and territorial integration as well as ethnic separation. Lastly, in terms of the international system, China is a participant and beneficiary of the existing international political and economic order, while being subject to international regulations set by the Western powers and seeks reforms to the existing system.<sup>1</sup>

China, on one hand, is in its transition from a regional power to global power in the international community; on the other hand, it still has characteristics of a developing country with tasks such as reform and development ahead of it. Due to this dichotomy, China's behavior in the international community has displayed propensities toward a status quo power and revisionist power. Among the four categories in Chinese diplomacy, China's attitude towards the major countries is relatively status quo-oriented, pursuing a stable relationship through mutual respect of each other's core interests. China's attitude towards the peripheral



countries is both status quo-oriented and revisionist-oriented, pursuing a stable peripheral environment favorable to its rise, while at the same time strongly expressing willingness to secure its recently expanding core interests. China's attitude towards developing countries has traditionally also been revisionist-oriented, calling for reform of the international political and economic order led by the existing major powers. However, compared to the emerging importance of China's diplomacy with major and peripheral countries, diplomacy with developing countries is relatively contracted, tending to amount to mere diplomatic rhetoric. China's attitude towards multilateral diplomacy is mainly status quo-oriented in that China is perceived as a participant in the current international political order. Yet, China also suggests revisionist-oriented arguments that the "irrational" aspects of the current system have to be revised through active participation in the existing international organizations and regime.

China has shown traits of both status quo power and revisionist power depending on the differing categories of its diplomacy. This complexity in China's evaluation of its own status and role affects its perception of middle power. China is not only a participant and a beneficiary of the existing international order but also a country under restriction by the international norm led by western powers. In order for China to overcome such restrictions, reforms of the existing international order is necessary; China looks toward emerging middle powers as new partners in pursuit of such change to the international order. This means that China does not foresee the appearance of middle powers within the context of maintaining the status-quo; rather, it expects the middle powers to play the role of catalysts in revising the status-quo, or of partners in the China-led transformation of the status-quo. In the regional sphere as well, China needs to induce cooperation and support from the middle powers on the periphery in order to become a de facto leading country in Asia.

On the other hand, because China still possesses unresolved tasks as a developing country in many areas including soft power, China is wary of the fact that in certain areas, the middle powers may have interests contradictory to those of China and pose as competitors to China's growth. Because China possesses domestically unresolved tasks of internal reform and development, induced by the vulnerability of the regime, it considers a stable peripheral environment crucial while at the same time taking a firm stance on sovereignty and territorial issues, which in turn brings about conflicts with peripheral middle powers.<sup>2</sup>

## 2. China's Perception of the Middle Powers

It has not been long since China started to take notice of the emergence of middle powers and their role in the international community. Since the 2008 global financial crisis, however, China, starting from academic circles, began to give more attention to and lead discussion on



middle power (中等强国). That is, China has been keenly focusing on the rise of the emerging market and the emerging countries since the beginning of the 21st century, especially after 2008, that marked the advent of the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa) and G20.

China's interest in emerging countries centers around the ongoing shift in existing global economic order, triggered by the Western economic powers faltering in the aftermath of the global economic crisis of 2008 and the contrasting rise of some developing countries. Discussion on middle power in China fundamentally started from the growth of this emerging market, and implies China's expectation for the transformation of the existing Western economic order and system. Among the emerging countries, China has been especially interested in the rise of non-Western emerging countries, the so-called "emerging middle powers." What has been noticed of these key players in the emerging market is that they appear collectively rather than independently. While emerging market countries do not have the power to give an impetus to change the existing system individually, the impact of their collective efforts is not negligible.

As mentioned earlier, at the dawn of the 21st century, China has begun to perceive the emergence of the middle powers as a new phenomenon in the same vein with the rise of emerging countries. China sees that emerging countries are growing to form a group of middle powers, thus enhancing their overall power, strengthening its voice to participate in global governance, and expanding their ability to change the global, as well as regional, architecture. All these factors lead China to believe that emerging countries will rise as a new major force in creating a multi-polar world.

China's attitude toward the emergence of middle powers is derived from the context of its own rise. Firstly, China expects that the emergence of the middle powers can help contribute to the multi-polarization of the international community, which has been China's consistent aim since the end of the Cold War. As mentioned earlier, China has paid attention to the fact that the emergence of the middle powers has been brought about by the relative decline of the U.S. and Western powers after the global economic crisis. This implies China's expectation of the emerging middle powers is that they will become a partnering force in checking the existing international order led by the U.S.

China has been emphasizing in its relationship with the "emerging economies" that an individual country's path of development should be a self-determined one and individual decisions have to be respected, a fact that has been previously emphasized throughout its diplomacy with developing countries. Chinese President Xi Jinping has articulated the importance of this through the so-called "shoe theory." When referring to China and Arab states, he has called on each side to respect each other's choice of development pathway. The follow-





ing remarks were made at the opening ceremony of the sixth ministerial conference of the China-Arab States Cooperation Forum (CASCF) in Beijing in 2014. “A person’s shoes don’t have to be identical to those of others but must fit the person’s feet; a country’s way of governance doesn’t have to be the same with that of others but must benefit its own people,” said Xi. Only the people of a country can tell whether the country’s path of development suits them or not.”<sup>3</sup>

Recently, prior to President Xi’s attendance at the sixth BRICS Summit, Chinese Foreign Minister Wang Yi also reiterated the same argument in a press interview. Wang Yi said that emerging markets and numerous developing countries including Latin American countries are exploring the approaches to reform, and looking for development paths suitable for their national conditions.<sup>4</sup>

China’s decision to take sides with developing countries in emphasizing state sovereignty on choosing a development path is in the same context with its emphasis of “mutual respect” in its “new model of major-country relationship” with the U.S. In other words, China’s emphasis on mutual respect is intended to shield itself from potential criticism on internal matters such as China’s political system and the human rights issue. In doing so, China hopes to secure support from the middle powers on China’s stance.

In short, China perceives the emergence of middle powers within the context of China’s rise and its diplomacy with the U.S. China’s perception of middle powers can also be identified in the way that China relates the emergence of middle powers to international organizations and regimes. It can be said that China hopes for change in the existing framework established by the U.S. and Western powers, and furthermore, it anticipates the change in the international order and system.

For example, China focuses on the emergence of new international organizations and regimes in which middle powers are participating. China views the launching of the G20 as representative of the elevated status of the middle powers in the international community. So far, the international order has been set up and led by Western powers; however, China believes that after the global financial crisis, the G20 has become a strong candidate to replace the G8 as a major organization for multilateral cooperation. Unlike the G8, mainly comprised of Western powers, the G20 includes not only the existing major powers but also emerging countries and eight middle powers—Australia, Turkey, Indonesia, Mexico, Argentina, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, and South Korea. With the middle powers participating in the G20, China looks forward to effecting change on the tradition in which the existing Western powers have initiated the construction of international regime.

China anticipates that the international system will change and develop through mutual interaction between the Western powers and the emerging countries. China also thinks, after



the global financial crisis, the middle powers are rapidly rising from their former positions as peripheral or semi-peripheral countries to the new position of central rule-setters. It is expected that as middle power countries in non-Western regions grow, the center of the global system of authority, in the post-economic crisis world, is being diffused from the West to the non-Western world. The argument is that these non-Western middle powers are imposing significant changes on the existing international system by actively organizing themselves through cooperation. In the process, China emphasizes cooperation between the emerging major powers and middle powers. As an emerging major power, China emphasizes this in order to give a new direction to the existing international system.

China, in fact, still possesses a dual perception of middle power. In that middle powers signify an emergence of a new force that can effect change in the existing international order, China expects that middle powers will become cooperative partners in forming a new international order. For China, since the 2008 global financial crisis, the role and importance of middle powers in the international community has increased. Such change will become a main factor in checking the U.S.-centered power structure and developing a multi-polar system as led by China.

In terms of bilateral relationships however, as China's national strength and interests enlarge due to its rapid growth, China is expressing concerns about potential competition and conflict, rather than complementary cooperation with middle power countries. Especially since there remain characteristics of developing countries in certain sectors within China due to the uniqueness of its rise. There is concern that some middle power countries might be embroiled in competition with China. Subsequently there is a view in China that it should be wary of the possibility that there might be certain groups that would utilize conflicting interests between China and middle powers to counter China's rise.

Consequently, China's perception of and attention to middle powers are guided by China's national and strategic interests such as its rise, check-and-balance vis-à-vis established major powers like the U.S., and the reform of the existing international system and order.

### **III. China's Evaluation of Middle Power Diplomacy**

China shows a generally positive expectation towards the emergence of middle powers as a key variable capable of bringing about change in the existing international system and order. In this sense, China thinks that middle powers can exert influence in sectors where the influence of





established major powers is relatively weak such as foreign aid, the environment, and human rights; it is also expected that cooperation with China will be possible in these issue areas.<sup>5</sup>

China has given a positive evaluation on middle powers' role as a mediator. For example, the Libyan crisis induced China to renew its perception of Turkey's diplomacy and role in the international community as a middle power. Taking advantage of its unique dual identity as both a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and as a Muslim country, Turkey, led by its Prime Minister and Foreign Minister, is considered to have created a venue for a peace treaty by actively mediating between the Middle East and Western countries. China focuses on the fact that the Libyan case has not been resolved in the traditional way of dealing with Middle Eastern problems, in which resolution of these regional problems depended completely on the wills of major Western powers.

Concerning Southeast Asia, China is expecting Indonesia to play a considerable role. According to China's categorization of its object of diplomacy, Indonesia is a peripheral country. However, Indonesia has the fourth largest population in the world, is a G20 member, and is a "motor power" for the development of ASEAN; Indonesia is evaluated to have played an important role in both international and regional communities. However, behind China's focus on Indonesia's role lies the fact that in the recent South China Sea dispute, Indonesia supported China's position. In drafting the 2011 Chair's Statement of the ASEAN Summit, Indonesia as chair included not only a negotiation agenda for Code of Conduct for South China Sea (COC) demanded by the Philippines and Vietnam, countries directly involved in conflict with China, but also a bilateral negotiation agenda requested by China. Regarding this move, China believes that Indonesia as a chair has played a discreet and balanced mediator role. Based on this new understanding of Indonesia's role and importance as more than a mere peripheral country, it was suggested that China should adjust its middle power diplomacy as well.<sup>6</sup>

China focuses on the formation of small-scale organizations among middle powers within the existing international organization and regime. China evaluates that it is a new phenomenon arising after the global financial crisis where emerging countries and middle powers formulate organizations for cooperation on practical problems and issue areas. For instance, India, Brazil, and South Africa co-founded the IBSA Dialogue Forum (India, Brazil, South Africa) in 2003, with the intention to enhance South-South cooperation. Within the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), China, India, Brazil, and South Africa co-founded BASIC in 2007 to enhance cooperation and share a common position on issues amongst the four countries.

China focuses on the fact that after the global financial crisis, middle power countries have played a leading role in establishing and developing regional organizations. For example,



Saudi Arabia is leading cooperation among countries in the Gulf region as the head nation of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC); Indonesia is serving its role as a “motor power in the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN)”; Mexico and Argentina are leading regional economic cooperation in South America; Egypt plays a significant role in leading cooperation in the Arab region, as does South Africa and Nigeria in Africa as core members of the African Union (AU). Now that middle powers are intensifying their participation in discussing regional problems and increasing their capacity to establish new regional regimes and systems, China believes that the trend is beginning to occur in which a handful of major powers no longer lead regional order as predominantly as they did before.

In the same sense, China is positively interested in the role of regional organizations such as the AU and the Arab League, especially since the Middle East upheaval in 2011. Although existing major countries such as the U.S. are still in control of the conditions in the Middle East, China’s view is that regional middle powers and regional organizations played a crucial role during the 2011 Middle East upheaval. China stresses that the United Nations (UN) humanitarian intervention in Libya was made possible by active requests from the AU and the Arab League.

However, China does not necessarily have high regard for middle power diplomacy all the time. As for Australia—a representative middle power to which China pays close attention and also a country positioned in a similar setting to that of South Korea, an American ally—China expresses both positive expectation and concern.

China has expressed criticism of the “Creative Middle Power” theory proposed by a former Australian Prime Minister Kevin Rudd. China pointed out that because Rudd’s middle power diplomacy relies on China for economic relations but relies on the U.S. for political and security cooperation, it attempts to alleviate the danger of dependency on China through alliance with the U.S. and Japan.<sup>7</sup> Against a backdrop of China’s criticism of Australia’s middle power diplomacy lies Australia’s defense white paper published in May 2009 that commented, “the pace, scope and structure of China’s military modernization have the potential to give its neighbors cause for concern if not carefully explained,” which hinted at China threat theory. Australia was deeming it necessary that it strengthen its alliance with the U.S. in order to deal with the uncertainty of China’s rise. At the time, responding to the Australian defense white paper, a Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman stated that “[We hope] neighboring countries will view China’s military buildup objectively, without bias.”<sup>8</sup> Recognizing this official response from China, Australia indicated in its 2013 defense white paper that it does not see China as an enemy.<sup>9</sup>

China looks to the U.S.-China relationship for Australia’s change of attitude. It is China’s evaluation that whereas Australia recognized China as a threat when U.S.-China relations



deteriorated after 2009, as the bilateral relations between the U.S. and China began to thaw, Australia's perception of China also changed for the better.

The focus of China's interest in middle powers is concentrated on what choices the middle powers will make from a realist perspective during the process of power transition. In other words, China is deeply interested in whether, during the power transition process triggered by China's rise and U.S.'s relative decline, the middle powers would check China's rise while relying on the existing hegemon, the U.S., or recognize China's rise as an opportunity and ride the new tide.

China especially focuses on the reality that since 2008, many countries are faced with a dilemma of strategic choice under the rapidly changing regional political architecture, with China's rise and the U.S.'s Pivot to Asia strategy. China evaluates that most East Asian countries are relying on the U.S. or strengthening their military power out of concern for their security. At the same time, China sees that these countries are not attempting to practice a hostile security strategy against China by siding with the U.S. Instead, China recognizes that the middle powers in the region are likely to try to maintain the most national security interests possible between the U.S. and China, rather than choosing either side.<sup>10</sup>

Also, China sees that middle powers are not voicing calls for reforms of the existing international system and order, or pushing for the fundamental revamping of them; therefore, China's view is that despite the growth of middle powers, the current international system led by the Western powers may not change significantly. Still, it is considered that the appearance of middle powers is a natural consequence of historical progress, and the international system is expected to become more democratic and multi-polar.

In short, China is paying attention to the roles of middle powers in the following context. First, the emergence of middle powers suggests it is the key to the change in the existing international system and order currently led by the U.S. and other Western powers. Second, with the middle powers emerging mostly in non-Western regions, the significance and role of non-Western region, formerly neglected by the West-led regional order, are increasing. Third, as middle powers, both as individuals and groups, actively participated in the discussion of major global problems in 2008, their sphere of influence in international affairs is increasing; middle powers have appeared as a new variable to the existing decision-making process led by the U.S. and Western powers.



## IV. China's Diplomacy toward Middle Powers

### 1. The Position of Middle Powers in China's Diplomatic Strategy

In China, there has been yet no official usage of the term “middle power” from either its political leaders or official government documents. China classifies the major objects of its diplomacy into four categories: the major countries, the peripheral, the developing, and multilateral diplomacy. Specifically, it can be said that the developed countries are of crucial concern for China, the peripheral the most important, and developing countries the basis of Chinese diplomacy. Additionally, multilateral diplomacy is defined as an important stage for China's diplomatic strategy (“大国是关键、周边是首要、发展中国家是基础、多边外交是重要舞台”).<sup>11</sup> This arrangement of priorities and the major objects in Chinese diplomacy was established at the 16th National Congress of the Communist Party of China in 2002 and has been maintained intact through the 17th and 18th National Congresses held respectively in 2007 and 2012.

As mentioned earlier, the countries with which China is concerned in practicing its diplomatic strategy are classified into major countries, developing countries, and peripheral countries—there is no separate classification for middle powers. China's diplomacy once again carried out structural adjustment and level correction, and China clearly continued to improve and develop relations with developed countries, strengthen good-neighborhood friendships with peripheral countries, enhance solidarity and cooperation with the Third World developing countries, and actively participated in multilateral diplomatic exercises, thus forming the current foreign policy layout, which is widely known. According to this classification standard, middle power countries are not separately targeted as part of China's consideration in foreign policies.

As China has begun to rise rapidly since 2008 and changes in international power relations have occurred, it has been suggested that Chinese foreign policy, which specifies the existing four realms as major targets of its diplomatic practices, is not effectively responding to the new changes caused by the rise of middle powers and thus needs correction.<sup>12</sup> Nevertheless, China still does not officially mention middle power countries in its foreign policies; the four realms specified back in 2002 continue to be the official classification standard against which its diplomatic policies are practiced. This means that since China does not yet classify middle powers as a separate category in its arrangement of foreign strategy, China's middle power diplomacy is currently being constructed and implemented under its existing diplomatic framework—“a new model of major country relationship,” peripheral diplomacy, developing country diplomacy, and multilateral diplomacy. Among these, it has to be examined how China's middle power diplomacy is being reflected in peripheral diplomacy and



economic diplomacy including multilateral economic diplomacy, the two areas to which middle power diplomacy, under active expansion by President Xi is closely connected.

## 2. China's Diplomacy toward Middle Powers as a Part of Its Peripheral Diplomacy

China shares land borders with fourteen countries. Therefore, it traditionally has put more weight on peripheral diplomacy and especially more so since “stable peripheral international environment” has been set as the most important diplomatic goal after China implemented economic reforms.

As a result, China's diplomacy toward middle powers is being framed as a part of its peripheral diplomacy, focusing on the roles and strategic importance of countries classified as neither developed nor developing. For instance, China categorizes South Korea, Indonesia, and Pakistan as peripheral middle powers, and focuses on their strategic roles and significance.

However, in tandem with China's rise, there has been a recent transition in China's peripheral diplomacy from that of aiming at economic development to that of aiming at its rise in the region. This is a change from passive diplomacy attempting to construct a stable peripheral security environment through active diplomacy, attempting to enhance its influence and status on the international stage. Accordingly, China's will to actively project its influence on peripheral middle powers and incorporate them into China's clout is increasing. However, as the U.S. has begun to aggressively execute its Pivot to Asia strategy since 2010, peripheral countries are facing a dilemma of having to choose between the U.S. and China.

China recognizes that these peripheral middle powers wish to extricate themselves from this dilemma and maintain friendly relations with both the U.S. and China. In the end, China's maximum objective in its peripheral middle power diplomacy is to incorporate them into the influence of rising China, and its minimum objective is to prevent them from participating in the U.S.-led containment of China. China recognizes that in order to actualize this goal, it needs to let peripheral middle powers perceive China's rise as neither threatening nor unstable while obtaining from them support—or tacit agreement at the least—for China's rise.

In order to prevent the middle powers from facing this dilemma of having to take sides, China seeks to establish a stable U.S.-China relationship under the “new model of major country relations.” At the same time, China seeks to enhance economic, social and cultural ties with middle powers so that they can formulate a common interest-based community. Specifically, China is promoting establishment of multilateral economic cooperation mechanisms such as bilateral free trade agreements (FTA) and Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP), a formation of a common market through internationalization of the Yuan, and advocacy for the unity of humanities and society through epistemic communities. For



example, the former Hu Jintao administration proposed the “Harmonious World” concept, while the current Xi administration proposes the “Community of Common Destiny” concept. The “Harmonious World” concept accepted bilateral axis alliances with the U.S. from a practical point of view, although China may disagree with the U.S. in many areas in constructing regional and global order.<sup>13</sup> The “Community of Common Destiny” concept emphasizes that China’s rise will benefit, not threaten, its peripheral countries by highlighting the fact that they are bound by close, mutually-dependent economic and social relationships.

Considering China’s geopolitical characteristics, it is contiguous with major middle powers in the eastern, western, and southern side of its border. Korea in the east, Indonesia in the south, and Pakistan in the west are all placed in strategically significant locations in China’s peripheral diplomacy. Because these countries take up important strategic positions in the U.S.’ U-shaped containment strategy against China, relationships with these countries are considered to have more strategic importance than those with other peripheral countries.<sup>14</sup>

Also, as maritime conflicts have increased due to China’s attempt to advance towards the Asia-Pacific, China is proposing a “westward advance” strategy towards Eurasia to offset its conflicts in the Asia-Pacific. The so-called “High-speed rail link strategy” and “Silk Road Initiative” are suggested to promote economic integration with the Eurasian continent. Against this background, China has recently put considerable effort into the construction of high-speed railroad, oil pipeline, and gas pipeline.<sup>15</sup> China hopes to not only reaffirm its traditional and geological identity as a continent-ocean country, but also secure a position as a hub connecting the Eurasian continent and the Asia-Pacific. Also implied in the strategy is China’s attempt to alleviate conflicts caused by its recent efforts to become a “maritime power” and secure diversified routes for an expansion out into the ocean.

Regarding this move by China, it is also notable that President Xi himself proposed the “Silk Road Initiative” as a symbol of China’s westward policy. In September 2013, in his speech at Nazarbayev University in Kazakhstan, he proposed the initiative for the construction of a ‘Silk Road Economic Belt’ with Central Asian countries. This proposal intends to stabilize China’s western border, secure energy resources, and eventually secure land routes to advance to the Middle East and Europe by enhancing engagement with Central Asian countries.

Last October, in his speech to the Indonesian Parliament, President Xi proposed the concept of a “21st Century Maritime Silk Road.” In this speech, he emphasized the common destiny of China and the ASEAN countries. Especially, President Xi stressed that China is ready and willing to open up its market to ASEAN in order for ASEAN countries to benefit from China’s rise.<sup>16</sup> China made concrete propositions that it would increase its amount of trade with ASEAN up to a trillion dollars by 2020, establish the Asia Infrastructure Invest-





ment Bank, and construct the 21st Century Maritime Silk Road.<sup>17</sup> As for the expansion of China's investment in ASEAN countries, China focuses on countries traditionally friendly to China—Cambodia and Laos—and on neutral countries such as Thailand and Indonesia. As illustrated so far, China's westward advance has significant implications: China attempts to circumvent continuous territorial disputes in the Asia-Pacific and conflict with the U.S. and pioneer an alternative route for China's rise.

### 3. China's Diplomacy to Middle Powers as Its Economic Diplomacy

China now led by the Xi government attempts to fully utilize its economic power in strengthening its relationship with other countries and expanding its international influence. Foreign Minister Wang Yi clarified China's such intention in a recent speech: "Today China is the biggest trading partner for 128 countries, a major export market with the fastest growth, the most popular investment destination and a major importer of energy and resource products." In particular, China has become the largest trading partner for Japan, Korea and Australia, all of which are major allies of the U.S. in the Asia-Pacific region. China already surpassed the U.S. in 2012 to become the largest trading country in the world, and is also the first in car manufacturing and sales. Utilizing this economic power and prestige, China is expanding its economic network with various countries in the world and eventually enhancing its status and influence on the international stage. China's active economic diplomacy has been induced by its strategic consideration, in which it attempts to increase its international influence while circumventing conflicts with the U.S. In other words, China pursues a gradual rise starting from the economic realm where China has relative advantage, rather than provoke conflict or direct competition with the U.S. in the sphere of military or national security where the U.S. has relative advantage.

Under the Xi government, China's strategy focused on economic diplomacy is unfolding vigorously and in a more diversified way. Firstly, China tries to construct a system for Asian integration by establishing Asia's infrastructure and network. For instance, it plans to expand various forms of investment projects with neighboring countries via highway construction, high-speed railroad construction, fiber-optical cables installation, river development, and ecological environment construction. Representative examples include construction of oil and gas pipelines with Central Asian countries and the development project for the Mekong River area. Secondly, China tries to utilize FTA mechanisms such as 10+1 and 10+3 to promote economic integration between Chinese and Asian markets. Recently, China has been active in not only bilateral FTAs, but also multilateral economic cooperation mechanisms such as RCEP. It can also be sensed that China is pushing ahead with RECP while making a



negative assessment of the U.S.-led Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) as part of its plan to rise through economic diplomacy. China believes that the TPP is a way for the U.S. to execute its rebalancing strategy in Asia-Pacific and to construct a new U.S.-centered political-economic order in the region, with an aim to weaken China's influence in East Asia.<sup>18</sup>

Thirdly, China plans to integrate capital markets with Japan, South Korea, Singapore, Hong Kong, and Taiwan through internalization of the Renminbi. President Xi's agreement with opening direct market for Yuan-Won convertibility and his request for South Korea's participation in AIIB during his recent visit to South Korea are all an extension of China's such attempts. China also intends to increase its capacity of providing aid to under-developed countries in Asia such as Laos, Myanmar, Afghanistan, Central Asian countries, and North Korea. Fourth, China tries to link its Northeast China Revitalization and China Western Development with the development of peripheral countries. Utilizing the longest border regions in the world, China plans to construct the hub of economic development.<sup>19</sup>

China is currently working on materializing its plan to develop BRICS into a significant economic network, as originally it was merely a representation of the first letter of each member countries' name. Since 2009, BRICS—composed of China, Russia, Brazil, India and South Africa—have held annual summits every year and thereby made their common areas of interest concrete. Especially, in the sixth BRICS summit held in Brazil in 2014, the establishment of a New Development Bank (NDB) in Shanghai and the installation of a hundred-billion dollar crisis-response-fund were officially announced. By partly playing the roles formerly reserved for the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, the two institutions that have led global financial order so far, prospects for a possibility of change to the U.S.-led global financial order are raised. During the sixth BRICS summit, President Xi stressed that “the establishment of NDB can contribute to an enhanced influence of BRICS countries in the field of international finance, and BRICS countries should strengthen the unity and cooperation to further democratize international relations.”<sup>20</sup> Chinese Ambassador to Brazil, Li Jinzhang also said, “BRICS must enlarge its scope of cooperation to political issues. It will help enhance common interest of BRICS countries and democratization of international organizations,” implying what China intends to attain through BRICS.<sup>21</sup>

China considers Australia as a representative case of economic diplomacy's success. Emphasizing that despite Australia's alliance with the U.S., Australia bases its international relations on 'national interests,' China is active in its relations with Australia. China is already Australia's largest trading partner, the largest export market, and a country from which Australia imports most goods. For Australia, a main exporter of ores and metals, China is a desirable and high priority market. The Chinese market was also a significant factor in helping Australia maintain economic stability during the global economic crisis in 2008. China is



strengthening cooperation with Australia in such areas as economy, trade, and investment; the two countries are processing negotiations on a bilateral FTA, RCEP, and cooperation regarding payment in Renminbi in trade and investment.<sup>22</sup> China believes that Australia can become an important model for middle powers in the Asia-Pacific. China's view is that the way Australia approaches its dilemma of choosing a side between the U.S. and China can provide important implications for other countries suffering from a similar dilemma.<sup>23</sup>

## V. China's Perception of and Strategy for "South Korea as a Middle Power"

China perceives that middle powers normally have the diplomatic aim of securing their national interests within the existing international system and their international prestige within their middle power status. There are two concrete strategies for realizing that diplomatic goal. The first strategy is to become an important participant or stakeholder within the existing international system by actively partaking in international affairs. For example, one would position itself as an active global player, like EU countries, by participating in various international institutions and inter-governmental organizations, enhancing economic interdependence, and establishing cooperative institutions in the area of diplomacy, security, and national defense. Another strategy is to consolidate its international status as a middle power by allying with a super power under the existing international system. One representative example of the latter strategy is former Australian Prime Minister John Howard's proposition that Australia would position itself as a "Deputy Sheriff" for the U.S. in Asia.<sup>24</sup>

China thinks that although South Korea is an OECD member and a middle power in terms of its economic size, South Korea has not been able to secure prestige and a role commensurate with its national strength because of its geopolitical environment surrounded by major powers. Especially, China thinks that South Korea is suffering from a dilemma of strategic choice; already plagued with the North Korean nuclear issue, South Korea is additionally faced by the overlapping of China's rapid rise and the U.S.' rebalancing strategy that caused the East Asian regional order to be in flux. Furthermore, South Korean diplomacy is perceived to be in an even deeper dilemma due to the internal disagreement regarding what role the country should take in the international community and which strategy to follow.<sup>25</sup>

Although China includes South Korea within the category of middle powers, it still has not released any notable response to or evaluation on South Korea's middle power diplomacy. It can be said that this is because South Korea still has not earnestly initiated diplomatic ac-



tivities as a middle power that China deems noteworthy; it is sensible to say that China is currently at a stage where it is merely observing. Or, as mentioned earlier, it is also possible to argue that China thinks South Korea is bound by certain limitations and dilemmas to properly practice middle power diplomacy. Another possibility is that although conceptually China includes South Korea within the category of middle power, but because of South Korea's uniqueness as a divided country that shares borders with China, South Korea has been strongly imprinted in the Chinese mindset as a peripheral country.

China is still deferring evaluation on MIKTA (Mexico, Indonesia, South Korea, Turkey, and Australia). China pays close attention to all the participants of MIKTA as middle powers possessing important strategic values in respective regions and it is highly interested in solidarity among middle powers. China is still not open about its position on MIKTA partly because MIKTA is still in its nascent stage and has not yet executed any noteworthy activities; however, another reason may be that all five participants are in either alliance or friendly relations with the U.S., the condition of which makes it difficult for China to form a positive perception.

With China's stance on South Korea's middle power diplomacy remaining unclear, examining China's evaluation of and response to Australian middle power diplomacy provides an important, albeit indirect insight. China focuses on Australia as a representative country that practices middle power diplomacy. Australia, like South Korea, is an ally of the U.S., and at the same time, an important partner of economic cooperation with China. While Australia has to maintain friendly relations with both the U.S. and China, it began to actively advocate middle power diplomacy. China evaluates that Australia's middle power diplomacy has been under pressure ever since the U.S. initiated its rebalancing strategy and would not be able to properly function. In other words, as Australia positively responds to the U.S.' rebalancing strategy, it is argued that Australia's prestige and role as a "balanced and constructive middle power" would weaken. This evaluation of Australia, in essence, reflects China's concern and criticism that Australia is actively participating in the U.S.' checking of China's rise via its rebalancing strategy in East Asia.

China under the Hu Jintao government once expressed a certain level of expectation regarding Australia's middle power diplomacy and was eager to improve relations with it. However, as President Obama in 2011 officially announced the Pivot to Asia strategy at the Australian Parliament and Australia positively responded to it, China began to harbor suspicion that Australia's middle power diplomacy, in the end, aims to check China's rise through alliance with the U.S. China also has expressed complaints to South Korea, during the Lee Myung-bak administration that attempts to strengthen the alliance with the U.S. would signify South Korea's participation in checking China's rise.



For China, South Korea is different from Australia in some major aspects: South Korea shares a maritime border with China, stations U.S. military troops, and is a divided country. China accepts that being contiguous with North Korea, which develops nuclear weapons, leaves South Korea with no choice but to maintain an alliance with the U.S. Even so, China keenly pays heed to the possibility of South Korea's participation in the U.S.' checking of China or of the U.S. military's continued presence on the Korean peninsula after reunification.

Recently, as the uncertainty of the East Asian political situation heightened along with the initiation of the Xi Jinping government in China, South Korea's strategic value to rising China is being newly highlighted. Especially, the recently ongoing series of events—the U.S.' rebalancing strategy, strengthening of U.S.-Japan alliance, and power competition between China and Japan—has shed new light on the Korean peninsula's importance as the object of China's expansion of influence. Within this context, the importance of China's strategic relationship with not only North Korea but also South Korea is being newly recognized.

China is wary of South Korea's participation in the U.S.' checking of China via its rebalancing strategy and U.S.-Japan alliance; under this context, China's active diplomatic gesture towards South Korea is being played out. It is likely that the underlying reason for China's recent aggressive efforts to improve relations with South Korea and new understanding of South Korea's strategic value as a “middle power” is due to a change in the international system and environment, rather than the result of South Korea's middle power diplomacy. There is a high possibility that this trend will continue in the future.

China's recognition and judgment of South Korea's middle power diplomacy will depend largely on its recognition and judgment of its own relationship with the U.S. China wants a stable atmosphere in the periphery and avoids direct conflict against the U.S. in East Asia. China also aims to keep the U.S. neutral in the Diaoyu/Senkaku Islands conflict with Japan.<sup>26</sup> To that aim, China emphasizes that it would not infringe upon the U.S.' core interest in the Asia-Pacific region by establishing a “new model of major-country relationship.” China is stressing it will not infringe upon the U.S.' established status as a hegemon in the region and will not threaten the safety of U.S. allies, which is the basis of the current U.S.' hegemon status. It can be said that China is stressing a “new model of major-country relationship” with the U.S. because of its strategic consideration in preventing peripheral countries allied with the U.S., such as South Korea, from participating in checking China's rise.

Regarding South Korea's role as a middle power, China has more concern than expectation. As mentioned earlier, the background reason for China's focus on the emergence of middle powers is related to its diplomatic goal of actualizing China's rise and creating an international environment conducive to it. Firstly, as for China that is currently preparing for its rise as an emergent major power, the emergence of middle powers is a positive turn of



events in that they can contribute to effecting change in the existing international system and norms being led by established powers. However, because in China's perspective South Korea supports the U.S.-led order within the framework of its alliance with the U.S. and the two countries carry out close policy cooperation, China's view of South Korea's role and prestige as an independent middle power is limited. Even in terms of economics, South Korea is too limited to take a leading role in the region as a middle power because it directly faces competition with the region's economic major powers such as China and Japan.

China in some aspects is wary of South Korea's increasing role as a middle power. It is staying alert whether South Korea's role and prestige as a middle power might limit China's influence or hinder its national interests. China's strategic focus in its relations with South Korea is whether South Korea will partake in checking China's rise via its alliance with the U.S. and what can be done to prevent South Korea from doing so. China also pays close attention to South Korea's diplomacy in Southeast Asia. This is also because China recognizes South Korea as its competitor in terms of the economic realm in Southeast Asia and therefore, is wary of the possible effect South Korea's Southeast Asian diplomacy has on China's national interests.

## **VI. Conclusion: South Korea's Dilemma**

With the initiation of the Xi Jinping government in China, China has become more active in improving its relations with South Korea, and South Korea-China relations seems to have improved outwardly. However, with South Korea-China relations recently weakened by international political affairs, there also has been no notable improvement in the international environment and structure surrounding the Korean peninsula. In fact, some of their aspects seem to have deteriorated. For example, the North Korean nuclear crisis and relationship between South and North Korea is at a standstill; conflicts between China-Japan and South Korea-Japan also see no prospect of a resolution; and the competitive elements of U.S.-China relations are also continuing.

In short, although South Korea and China possess common motivation for mutual cooperation, such motivation, when examined closely, is of a differing kind. On the surface, both South Korea and China support peace and stability on the Korean peninsula. China, however, is newly recognizing the necessity of cooperation with South Korea as a means of checking the U.S. rebalancing strategy in Asia and the rightist turn of Japan. Particularly, as





China unlike before begins to propose concrete alternative agenda to take initiative in the process of reshuffling the East Asian regional order, it is actively seeking South Korea's participation or support. For instance, China expects South Korea to support its claim promulgated at the Conference on Interaction and Confidence Building Measures in Asia that "Asian security must be protected by Asian people" and requests South Korea to participate in the AIIB where the U.S. is not invited.

Considering its alliance with the U.S., South Korea still finds it difficult to readily respond positively to these concrete demands, but on the other hand, it focuses on its expectation of economic cooperation with China and "China's role" in resolving the North Korean nuclear crisis. South Korea and China, therefore, can be likened to two partners on a journey who believe they are on the same path, meanwhile, inwardly, they are aiming at different destinations. Unless there is sufficient understanding of each other's differing expectations, the journey can always lead to conflict and friction. It has to be noted that China is focusing more on making progress with plans for its rise rather than on understanding and consideration of its peripheral countries, as it rapidly evolves into an independent major power.

Considering the developmental trajectory of South Korea-China relations over the past 22 years, China to a certain extent endowed strategic value to South Korea, a major U.S. ally. However, if South Korea places emphasis on its alliance with the U.S. as a way of securing prestige as a middle power, Australia's case shows that receiving support from China for South Korea's role as a middle power can become difficult. Furthermore, it is highly likely that China will continue to harbor suspicion of South Korea's intention. China will acknowledge the strategic value of South Korea allied with the U.S., not necessarily based on its respect for South Korea's middle power status, but more likely on its perception of South Korea as the U.S.' junior partner. China will view South Korea as an obstacle to China when it plays its role in important international affairs; it is possible that China will continuously practice a limited approach to South Korea as a dependent variable in U.S.-China relations. Also, if South Korea attempts to check China through its alliance with the U.S., doing so in the long run may result in the negative ramification of bringing U.S.-China competition onto the Korean peninsula. Also, as a rising China gets involved while harboring negative perceptions of South Korea, China in the long run would harbor distrust of South Korea's strategic intention, and forming trust between South Korea and China could become difficult. Therefore, as South Korea becomes permanently understood by China as an object of caution and check, the possibility of chronic tension in South Korea-China relations, North Korea's increased dependence on China, and expansion of China's negative influence on Korean peninsula increases. Furthermore, the possibility of China supporting and cooperating with the reunification of Korean peninsula is likely to decrease.<sup>27</sup> There is concern that in case a reunified Ko-



rea retains an alliance with the U.S. and continues to station U.S. troops within the country, China would end up practically sharing borders with the U.S.

In order for South Korea to secure prestige and a role as a middle power vis-à-vis China, it is necessary that South Korea make efforts to expand its independent diplomatic space and arena beyond its existing identity as an American ally. Additionally, another important task is to jointly seek cooperation mechanisms with other middle powers to induce stability in U.S.-China relations.

China also is creating an environment favorable to its rise by circumventing competition in areas where the U.S. has relative strategic edge.<sup>28</sup> By expanding its influence in the areas of trade, investment, finance, environmental issues, and energy, China is building various networks, targeting middle powers and emerging major powers. As for South Korea, participation in China-led economic and non-traditional security networks could be an alternative to securing its prestige as a middle power all the while alleviating China's concern and wariness generated from Korea's alliance with the U.S. ■



## Endnotes

- <sup>1</sup> 王缉思, 思中国的国际定位问题与“韬光养晦、有所作为”的战略思想, 载『国际问题研究』第 5 期. 2009. pp. 4-6.
- <sup>2</sup> Pew Research Center's Global Attitudes Project conducted public opinion polls in several regional nations in 2013 to assess the extent of these concerns. In response to the question "How big a problem are territorial disputes between China and your country?" the proportion that said the disputes are a "very big" or "big" problem was 82 percent in Japan, 90 percent in the Philippines, 62 percent in Indonesia, 36 percent in Malaysia, and 77 percent in South Korea. Richard Wike and Bruce Stokes, "Who Is Up, Who Is Down: Global Views of China and the U.S.," Pew Research Center, Global Attitudes Project, July 2013, <http://www.slideshare.net/PewResearchCenter/who-is-up-who-is-down-global-views-of-china-the-us-71813>.
- <sup>3</sup> "Xi: Development Paths Should Be Respected," *Xinhua*, June 5, 2014  
[http://www.china.org.cn/world/2014-06/05/content\\_32583619.htm](http://www.china.org.cn/world/2014-06/05/content_32583619.htm).
- <sup>4</sup> Seize New Opportunities, Embark on New Path and Write New Chapter - Foreign Minister Wang Yi Talks about President Xi Jinping's Attendance at BRICS Summit and China-Latin America and the Caribbean Summit, and Visits to Four Latin American Countries 2014/07/25  
[http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/mfa\\_eng/wjdt\\_665385/zyjh\\_665391/t1178527.shtml](http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/mfa_eng/wjdt_665385/zyjh_665391/t1178527.shtml).
- <sup>5</sup> 钱皓: “中等强国参与国际事务的路径研究——以加拿大为例,” 《世界经济与政治》, 2007 年第 6 期.
- <sup>6</sup> 丁工, 0 中等强国崛起及其对中国外交布局的影响, 载『现代国际关系』2011 年第 10 期.
- <sup>7</sup> 杨小辉, “中等强国” 澳大利亚的海军政策与实力及其对中国的影响, 载『上海交通大学学报 (哲学社会科学版)』第 4 期, 第 21 卷. 2013. pp. 43-44.
- <sup>8</sup> "China's Military Modernization Poses No Threat to Other Countries," *China Daily* 5 May 2009.
- <sup>9</sup> Australian Government, Department of Defence, *Defence White Paper 2013*  
[http://www.defence.gov.au/WhitePaper2013/docs/WP\\_2013\\_web.pdf](http://www.defence.gov.au/WhitePaper2013/docs/WP_2013_web.pdf).
- <sup>10</sup> 王敏, “权力变迁冲击下的东亚安全新态势,” 『世界经济与政治』, 第 10 期. 2012. pp. 132-148.
- <sup>11</sup> “新中国外交60年：务实成熟全方位外交布局的形成,” 『中国网』2009/9/10  
[http://www.china.com.cn/international/txt/2009-09/10/content\\_18501595\\_2.htm](http://www.china.com.cn/international/txt/2009-09/10/content_18501595_2.htm).
- <sup>12</sup> 金灿荣, 中国外交须给予中等强国恰当定位, 载『國際展望』第 5 期. 2010. pp. 20-21.
- <sup>13</sup> Yuan Peng, "Sino-American Relations: New Changes and New Challenges," *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 61, No. 1 (2007), p. 107.



- <sup>14</sup> 丁工, “中等强国崛起及其对中国外交布局的影响,” 『现代国际关系』 2011 年第 10 期, p. 53.
- <sup>15</sup> 杨小辉, “中等强国”澳大利亚的军事政策与实力及其对中国的影响,” 『上海交通大学学报 (哲学社会科学版)』 第 4 期, 第 21 卷 (2013 年), p. 45.
- <sup>16</sup> “Xi in Call for Building of New ‘Maritime Silk Road,’” *China Daily* October 4, 2013.
- <sup>17</sup> “外交部长王毅谈习近平主席出访：开创周边外交新局，推进亚太区域合作,” 『人民日报』 2013/10/9.
- <sup>18</sup> 왕쉐핑, “평중국의 관점에서 본 TPP 와 RCEP,” 『성균차이나브리프』 제 2 권 제 2 호 (2014.1), pp. 108-111.
- <sup>19</sup> 黄仁伟, “美国亚洲战略的再平衡与中国战略优势再评估,” 『现代国际关系』 第 8 期(2012 年), pp. 35-36.
- <sup>20</sup> 习近平, 平新起点新愿景新动力—在金砖国家领导人第六次会晤上的讲话 (2014 年 7 月 15 日) [http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/mfa\\_chn/zyxw\\_602251/t1174958.shtml](http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/mfa_chn/zyxw_602251/t1174958.shtml).
- <sup>21</sup> *Yonhap News* (2014/07/16).
- <sup>22</sup> 于镭, 萨姆苏尔·康, “中等强国”在全球体系中生存策略的理论分析—兼论中澳战略伙伴关系,” 『太平洋学报』 第 22 卷第 1 期 (2014 年 1 月), pp. 49-59.
- <sup>23</sup> 肖洋, “一个“中等强国”的战略空间拓展—“印—太战略弧”视阈下的澳大利亚安全重构,” 『太平洋学报』 22 卷第 1 期 (2014 年 1 月), pp. 47-48.
- <sup>24</sup> William T. Tow, “Deputy Sheriff or Independent Ally? Evolving Australian-American Ties in Ambiguous World Order,” *Pacific Review* 17.2 (2004): 271-90.
- <sup>25</sup> 韩献栋, 韩国的外交困境: 一个概括性框架的解读, 概括 『东北亚论坛』 第 3 期 (2012 年), pp. 68-70.
- <sup>26</sup> 胡德坤, 坤中立美国, 构建中国海洋周边的睦邻关系, 立美 『现代国际关系』 第 8 期(2012 年), pp. 31-33.
- <sup>27</sup> 이동률. 동중국의 초강대국화와 한반도의 미래. 래도이동률 편. 『중국의 미래를 말하다』 (서울: 동아시아연구원, 2011), p. 282.
- <sup>28</sup> 黄仁伟, 美国亚洲战略的再平衡与中国战略优势再评估, 亚洲 『现代国际关系』 第 8 期(2012 年), pp. 35-36.



## References

---

- 왕쉐핑, “평중국의 관점에서 본 TPP 와 RCEP” 『성균차이나브리프』제 2 권 제 2 호 (2014.1), pp. 108-111.
- 이동률. 동중국의 초강대국화와 한반도의 미래. 래도이동률 편. 『중국의 미래를 말하다』 (서울: 동아시아연구원, 2011), p. 282.
- Australian Government, Department of Defence, *Defence White Paper 2013* available at <[http://www.defence.gov.au/WhitePaper2013/docs/WP\\_2013\\_web.pdf](http://www.defence.gov.au/WhitePaper2013/docs/WP_2013_web.pdf)>
- China Daily*, “China’s Military Modernization Poses No Threat to Other Countries,” May 5, 2009.
- China Daily*, “Xi in Call for Building of New ‘Maritime Silk Road,’” October 4, 2013.
- Peng, Yuan, “Sino-American Relations: New Changes and New Challenges,” *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 61, 1: (2007): 107.
- Tow, William T., “Deputy Sheriff or Independent Ally? Evolving Australian-American Ties in Ambiguous World Order,” *Pacific Review* 17,2: (2004): 271-90.
- Wike, Richard and Bruce Stokes, “Who Is Up, Who Is Down: Global Views of China and the U.S.,” Pew Research Center, Global Attitudes Project, July 2013, available at <<http://www.slideshare.net/PewResearchCenter/who-is-up-who-is-downglobal-views-of-china-the-us-71813>>.
- Xinhua*, “Xi: Development Paths Should Be Respected,” (June 5, 2014) available at <[http://www.china.org.cn/world/2014-06/05/content\\_32583619.htm](http://www.china.org.cn/world/2014-06/05/content_32583619.htm)>.
- 丁工, 0 中等强国崛起及其对中国外交布局的影响, 的影『现代国际关系』2011 年第 10 期.
- 丁工, “中等强国崛起及其对中国外交布局的影响,” 『现代国际关系』2011 年第 10 期, p. 53.
- 韩献栋, 栋韩国的外交困境: 一个概括性框架的解读, 概括『东北亚论坛』第 3 期 (2012 年), pp. 68-70.
- 胡德坤, 坤中立美国, 构建中国海洋周边的睦邻关系, 立美『现代国际关系』第 8 期(2012 年), pp. 31-33.
- 黄仁伟, “美国亚洲战略的再平衡与中国战略优势再评估,” 『现代国际关系』第 8 期(2012 年), pp. 35-36.
- 黄仁伟, 伟美国亚洲战略的再平衡与中国战略优势再评估, 亚洲『现代国际关系』第 8 期(2012 年), pp. 35-36.
- 金灿荣, 中国外交须给予中等强国恰当定位, 外交『國際展望』第 5 期. 2010. pp. 20-21.
- 钱皓, “中等强国参与国际事务的路径研究——以加拿大为例,” 『世界经济与政治』, 2007 年第 6 期.
- “外交部长王毅谈习近平主席出访: 开创周边外交新局, 推进亚太区域合作,” 『人民日报』2013/10/9.



- 王敏,“权力变迁冲击下的东亚安全新态势,”『世界经济与政治』,第 10 期. 2012. pp. 132-148.
- 王缉思, 思中国的国际定位问题与“韬光养晦、有所作为”的战略思想,战『国际问题研究』第 5 期. 2009. pp. 4-6.
- 习近平, 平新起点新愿景新动力—在金砖国家领导人第六次会晤上的讲话 (2014 年 7 月 15 日). [http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/mfa\\_chn/zyxw\\_602251/t1174958.shtml](http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/mfa_chn/zyxw_602251/t1174958.shtml)
- 肖洋,“一个“中等强国”的战略空间拓“印—太战略弧”视阈下的澳大利亚安全重构,”『太平洋学报』22 卷第 1 期 (2014 年 1 月), pp. 47-48.
- “新中国外交60年：务实成熟全方位外交布局的形成,”：『中国网』2009/9/10.  
[http://www.china.com.cn/international/txt/2009-09/10/content\\_18501595\\_2.htm](http://www.china.com.cn/international/txt/2009-09/10/content_18501595_2.htm).
- 杨小辉,“中等强国”澳大利亚的海军政策与实力及其对中国的影响,  
的海『上海交通大学学报(哲学社会科学版)』第 4 期,第 21 卷. 2013. pp. 43-44.
- 杨小辉,“中等强国澳大利亚的海军政策与实力及其对中国的影响,”  
『上海交通大学学报(哲学社会科学版)』第 4 期,第 21 卷 (2013 年), p. 45.
- 于镭, 萨姆苏尔·康,“中等强国”在全球体系中生存策略的理论分析—  
兼论中澳战略伙伴关系,”『太平洋学报』第 22 卷第 1 期 (2014 年 1 月), pp. 49-59.





*Author's Biography*

**Dong Ryul Lee**

Dongduk Women's University

Dong Ryul Lee is a professor at the Department of Chinese Studies of the Dongduk Women's University since 1997. He is now a chair at China Research Panel of East Asia Institute (EAI). Previously, he served as a policy advisor to the Republic of Korea Ministry of Unification and an executive committee member in the Joint Committee of Experts for Korea-China Strategic Cooperative Partnership. He was also an editor of *The Journal of Contemporary China Studies in Korea* (2010-2011). He was a visiting scholar in the Weatherhead East Asian Institute, Columbia University from August 2005 to August 2006. He received his Ph.D. in the Department of International Politics, Peking University in 1996. He has published many scholarly articles, monographs, and edited books, including *Global Superpower? Prospects for China's Future* (2011), "China's Policy and Influence on the North Korea Nuclear Issue: Denuclearization and/or Stabilization of the Korean Peninsula?" in *The Korean Journal of Defense Analysis* (2010), *China's Territorial Dispute* (2008), and "Chinese Diplomatic Behavior in the United Nations" (2007). His research area includes Chinese foreign policy, international relations in East Asia, Chinese nationalism and minority.

## Knowledge-Net for a Better World

---

- This article is the result of East Asia Institute's research activity of the Asia Security Initiative Research Center.
- Any citation or quotation is prohibited without prior permission of the author.
- The contents of this article do not necessarily reflect the views of EAI.
- East Asia Institute acknowledges the MacArthur Foundation for its support to the Middle Power Diplomacy Initiative.

