

China's Contribution to the Breakdown of Transnational Security
Andrea Yarosh
Professor David Martin-McCormick
School of International Service
University Honors in International Studies
Spring 2013

Abstract

The People's Republic of China does not play the part of a concerned international leader, but undermines international order and creates instability by refusing to adhere to rules and norms set by the international community. This report aims to demonstrate China's contribution to global insecurity in three areas: China's compliance with the World Trade Organization (WTO), its investment in Africa, and its dealings with rogue states. Throughout the report, China's actions in each of these areas are analyzed by content analysis of various primary and secondary sources to provide evidence as to the country's contribution in creating transnational security challenges. The results indicate that if the United States wishes for a peaceful resolution of these problems, it must craft a cooperative solution that will not only include the Chinese but be sensitive to their cultural norms and standards. In this way, China will no longer be an antagonist in global affairs but a partner in generating solutions to pressing world issues.

Executive Summary

The People's Republic of China that the United States faces today is a very different country from the one the United States faced in the last century. China's power is growing exponentially, and with this growth in power comes new status within the world. It is now a major player in international affairs, where before it was just a bystander. However, with this new position comes considerable responsibility—responsibility which China has not taken seriously in its interactions with other states. Rather than acting the part of a concerned international leader, it continues to undermine the international order and create instability in an already unstable world by refusing to adhere to rules and norms set by the international community.

This report aims to demonstrate China's contribution to global insecurity in three areas: China's compliance with the World Trade Organization (WTO), its investment in Africa, and its dealings with rogue states. Each of these scenarios presents repeatedly choosing to undermine the foundations of global security. It also provides recommendations on how the United States and other Western powers should work together to ensure that this behavior comes to an end.

China in the WTO shows clearly the country's unwillingness to adhere to international rules and norms with its dealings in International Property Rights (IPR). While the majority of the world wishes to protect these rights and ensure fair competition, China refuses to enforce these measures in their own country, leading to considerable backlash from the Western world. While this might seem a purely economic issue, the refusal to adhere to IPR stirs up enough controversy in the West that it could easily lead to a trade war, thus unbalancing the global economic system.

China's investment in Africa reveals that China is primarily interested in economically exploiting the region, a stark contrast to Western superpowers. China continues to invest considerable amounts into Africa, but it does not take into consideration the utter chaos to which it contributes by supporting dictators and genocidal regimes. Due to its desire to pursue its own interests, China not only creates chaos in Africa, but manufactures conflict that could potentially spill over into Europe or the Middle East.

Finally, China's irresponsibility can be measured in how it treats rogue states such as North Korea and Iran. These two states' nuclear ambitions cause considerable stress for the rest of the world, and while the West continues to keep these states at arm's length, China embraces them. North Korea is beneficial as a buffer zone between China and the powerful American ally South Korea, and Iran is beneficial as an easy access to oil. However, these material gains encourage Chinese endorsement of rogue regimes, and China protects these same regimes from action in the United Nations (UN) Security Council.

The solution to these problems is not an easy one. America, as a world leader and a regional hegemon, must step up to the plate and tackle these issues with China. However, the United States cannot continue to call out the Chinese and refuse to cooperate. The United States must craft an innovative solution that will not only include the Chinese but be sensitive to their cultural norms and standards. In this way, China will no longer be an antagonist in global affairs but a partner in generating solutions to pressing world issues. The emerging partnership might not be an immediate, Western solution, but the only way to solve transnational problems is to create a transnational solution. Excluding China will only serve to further undermine Western interests.

Introduction

Over the past decade, China has truly solidified its place as a rising power in the world, often a position of concern to entrenched Western governments. The reasons for this fear are demonstrated best by China's behaviors in major intergovernmental organizations such as UN and the WTO. Each of these organizations holds a set of rules and norms that major powers adhere to in order to ensure the stability of the international system. Without them, there would be no standard to which to hold members of the international community, which is increasingly important in this transnational world. As a rising power, China is expected to comply with the rules and norms that should help it become a responsible stakeholder in these organizations, but as many governments have seen time and again, China refuses to adhere to them. In fact, beyond just a refusal to adhere to the rules and norms of the international system, it often rejects and challenges them outright.

While the United States would like to ensure Chinese compliance with the system, there is no easy way to do so. US policymakers must first understand the reasons why China does not comply with international rules and norms. China's focus on its own interests and sovereignty lead it to refuse to comply with international standards the West holds so dear. This is detrimental to the international system, and a cause for the United States to take some action within these intergovernmental organizations. After all, if one major power acts solely towards its own interest, then security for the rest of the world diminishes due to a refusal to work with other governments to solve transnational problems. China's lack of adherence to international rules and norms decreases the overall security of the international system as evidenced by China's noncompliance with IPR laws, support of African governments that the UN finds a threat, and support of rogue states that the UN attempts to contain.

The WTO and Intellectual Property Rights

In 2001, China acceded to the WTO, and by doing so was instructed to change many of its policies to comply with the norms and standards implemented by the WTO. In fact, if one were to analyze China's conduct in the WTO, one would discover that China keeps closer to the tenets of trade liberalization than protectionism, which is critical to ensuring a stable global economy.¹ While China has done much of what has been asked of it, it has failed in other respects. Most notably, China has failed to enforce The Intellectual Property Rights laws that much of the world considers the critical foundation for innovation.

Many members of the international community do not perceive China to be compliant, which leads to many dispute settlement cases in the WTO. The United States, in fact, is leading the suspicion against China, particularly in regards to Intellectual Property Rights; China's blatant disregard for IPR makes the West consider its compliance "decidedly mixed" and keeps China on edge to pursue dispute resolution if a bilateral agreement cannot be reached.² This, in turn, keeps other Western powers suspicious of China, thus leading to China's reputation as a cheater in the international system. There is good reason for this reputation, however. China is a large violator of IPR, and as they become more and more important to the international economy, IPR must be respected.

The WTO understands this need for IPR protection, which falls in line with the Western respect of IPR that has been ingrained in these societies since it came into existence. The Agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS Agreement) is the WTO's answer to IPR protection, and is a binding agreement to all members of the WTO that

¹ T.P. Baht. "Assessing China's Compliance with WTO Commitments." *India Quarterly: A Journal of International Affairs* 65 (2009), 230.

² Tracy M. Owens. *It's a Numbers Game: Financial Data Restrictions in China Don't Add up to WTO Compliance*: University of the Pacific, 2007, 1.

could be brought up in the dispute settlement system. TRIPS ensures protection for all forms of intellectual property and defines precisely what subject matter is protected, the rights given to the states, and what exceptions to those rights exist.³ Most of the Western world finds these agreements to be binding; it is in their very nature as legalist societies. However, countries like China and other developing nations do not see the TRIPS Agreement in the same light. While being a member of the WTO necessarily means that China has agreed to it, the domestic enforcement of IPR laws is not one of its high priorities as a nation.

It is not that China does not handle some sort of enforcement over IPR laws; the enforcement is inadequate by Western standards. The court system in China saw only 566 IPR related cases in 2006, but local administrations resolved 10,000 copyright infringement cases, 65,000 trademark violations, and 11,000 patent infringement cases.⁴ The court system is woefully inadequate in providing deterrent for these cases due to the low penalties on IPR infringement, thus leading to violations in the tens of thousands dealt with by government bureaucrats.⁵ With such low penalties for violating these laws, Chinese citizens will continue infringement of IPR laws, thus breaking the TRIPS Agreement by which China agreed to abide. This causes an antagonistic relationship with the West, which values intellectual property as the source of innovation and growth, thus making these Western states protective over this material that is constantly stolen. This leads to growing tension with the West, and calls for more protectionism as jobs are outsourced and ideas are stolen. These demands bring the world economy into far shakier territory; protectionist trade wars would bring harm to every country.

China does not do this because of a desire to blatantly disregard the rules; the issue is far more complicated than that. The Chinese view of IPR is based upon a strategy of “one base, two

³ Bishnoi and Goyal, “Intellectual Property Rights and the WTO,” 44.

⁴ Baht, “Assessing China's Compliance with WTO Commitments,” 230.

⁵ Baht, “Assessing China's Compliance with WTO Commitments,” 230.

goals, and three principles” that focuses on transmitting information and sharing knowledge.⁶ Thus, their intent is not necessarily malicious (though it does indeed skirt the creative process and bring in more money), but the cultural view of IPR is merely different. In a communal society, people are expected to share things with one another, whether it be ideas or material wealth. Intellectual property is farther down on the list of important assets that should be protected. In the individualist Western world, IPR is incredibly important, thus causing a clash of ideologies with China.

Unfortunately, the problem is too large to ignore and too large to consider to be a mere cultural misunderstanding. In 2010, the U.S. Trade Representative 301 Special Report claimed that 79% of Chinese products that were seized at the border infringed upon IPR laws.⁷ The Western world will continue to lose valuable money and ideas to this sort of piracy, while the Chinese will continue to partake in it unless something is done. However, this is a transnational issue that demands a transnational solution; it cannot be solved on a bilateral basis, for the world is now far too small for such a simple solution.

Recommendations for the IPR Problem

If there is no resolution with China, then many companies all over the world might call for greater protectionism in the Western states, especially fledgling patent owners who need to ensure the money stays with the product. Of course, in the globalized world of the present, protectionism might sound appealing to some business owners who want to fight off competition, but it would only serve to wreak havoc on both national and global economies. China can only grow because it has the Western world as customers, and the United States can

⁶ Dexin Tian and Chin-Chung Chao. "Intellectual Property Rights Disputes in Cyberspace: U.S. Hegemony and Chinese Resistance." *Journal of Politics and Law* 5, no. 2 (April 25, 2012), 6.

⁷ Dexin and Chao, "Intellectual Property Rights Disputes in Cyberspace: U.S. Hegemony and Chinese Resistance," 2.

only acquire certain goods so cheaply because it imports from China. To disrupt that balance with protectionism would do far more harm than good to the world.

Therefore, the members of the Western world have to ask themselves whether or not it must take an all-or-nothing stance with China. Is a potential trade war worth the integrity of IPR, or is it more valuable to keep trade stable with China? When an entire country's policy could undermine the current economic system, it is best not to rush headlong into the idea of fighting the battles on one small issue. In fact, if WTO members (particularly Western members) focus only on one area of China's noncompliance, China could even use that diversion to introduce protectionist laws in other areas that the Western world might not even notice. IPR laws could simply blind the rest of the world to this fact.⁸ Therefore, the solution has to be broader than fighting policymaker-to-policymaker on the issue of IPR laws. Not only will a coherent solution include top leaders, but also the multinational corporations that have so much sway not only in the Western world, but in China as well.

The United States does, however, have a considerable role to play in this resolution process. It leads the charge against China in terms of IPR laws, so the US must make the first move and lessen the degree to which it pursues China in WTO dispute settlements for these IPR infringement cases. A loss in revenue is nothing compared to the global catastrophe that could result with a protectionist China. Furthermore, the United States must use its talent at the State Department to understand that China is not a legalist society, and that negotiations with China about IPR cannot happen on a purely legalist basis. The United States must incorporate an understanding of their sense of communalism when attempting to resolve the intellectual property crisis. Top leaders must devise a way to compromise the United States' desire to secure revenue from IPR infringements, while the Chinese must feel that their traditions and their

⁸ Owens, *It's a Numbers Game: Financial Data Restrictions in China Don't Add up to WTO Compliance*, 9.

worldview can be respected as they continue to rework their legal system to adhere to international standards. In fact, since the Western world (especially the United States) is so legalist, this is the perfect opportunity to assist China in creating a system of laws compliant with WTO standards.

To do this would require more than just a multilateral discussion between countries. It would require the involvement of multinational corporations (MNCs) in negotiations as well, especially because the MNCs are the victims of the IPR infringements. While the countries might be losing taxable revenue, the MNCs are the entities being targeted. Therefore, these are the entities that would best be able to define the problem and define solutions by which to solve them. Since most of them also adhere to Western standards (as most of them started in Western countries), this would be beneficial to the Western powers disgruntled by IPR infringement.

One of the biggest problems in China involves copyright infringement in regards to downloading movies and television shows illegally. This also occurs in the United States, but the problem has been alleviated somewhat by the introduction of pay-to-stream services such as Netflix and Hulu. Unfortunately, both of these websites are blocked in China by the Great Firewall, and the Chinese still have a desire to watch Western shows. Therefore, they upload them on Youku (the Chinese equivalent of Youtube) or download them using torrents. While the Chinese government does not often prosecute for this sort of copyright infringement, the fact that it happens to such a degree in China is unsettling to copyright holders in the West.

Therefore, a partnership should be formed to stop the problem of Chinese IPR violation. Netflix and Hulu should, with the help of the American government, start to negotiate with China to get a presence in the country. Perhaps it would be a Chinese version of the domain that

was more regulated, but even if that were the case, it would start to offer the citizens another way of getting the entertainment they desired that is both free and convenient.

There are many more ways with which to handle the problem of copyright infringement in China. However, these ways will need to be negotiated in order to come to fruition. By doing so, the West can assist China in understanding that although it is a communal society, not everything can be shared so easily between people. This could also help ease tensions between East and West and set up for better cooperation in the future, thus ensuring the continued stability of the economy and putting off another potential trade war.

Case 2: China and Africa

In the international community, the United Nations often sets the standards for how other countries should act toward their fellow nations. Many decisions made in the United Nations are followed throughout the world. The UN Security Council, therefore, is where some of the largest decisions are made. However, the voices that make up the Permanent Five Members of the Security Council (P5) vary considerably due to the membership of China and Russia.

These differing voices make decision making on critical issues increasingly difficult, and thus splits international opinion, making it next to impossible at times to deal with pressing security issues in the world. China often stands alone in its conviction to support some of the most dangerous regimes in the world in its own self-interest or its desire not to infringe upon a sovereign nation. However, this often makes it seem like an antagonist in the eyes of the West. When problems arise and people desire swift action, China can sometimes be that veto that prevents another nation from protecting its own security, or the one veto that prevents the whole globe from ensuring its own security.

This is, however, ingrained in China's cultural framework. While many Western countries believe in giving sovereignty over to intergovernmental organizations IGOs for the betterment of mankind, China reveres state sovereignty and will not part with it. Its concern with sovereignty overrides its concern with other foreign policy issues such as human rights and the environment.⁹ Because of this, China becomes a considerable challenge to Western powers when dealing with sensitive issues that might impinge on the sovereignty of others, making the decision process extremely slow and labored.

This makes itself most evident in China's investment in Africa. China does not work in the interest of global security as a whole; therefore, it allows travesties to occur in Africa that could and should be prevented. The UN cannot act against human rights violations in particular because China continues to block resolutions that would enact punishments on violating countries. To China, this is irrelevant as long as the Chinese are obtaining what they need from the country, and that the country's sovereignty is being respected. For instance, in Sudan, China insisted that the Sudanese government had a right to govern its own affairs despite the blatant, ongoing genocide.¹⁰

This stance by China cannot continue, however. As it has grown in power, China has become a larger and larger investor in Africa's natural resources. It is so large an investor, in fact, that it is outstripping the investments of many of its Western counterparts. In 2007, China committed to provide African countries another \$20 billion in loans, while another \$5 billion in investments and aid packages were given to Katanga. Furthermore, China purchased a 20% stake

⁹ Maria Don Harpaz. "Sense and Sensibilities of China and WTO Dispute Settlement." *Journal of World Trade* 44, no. 6 (2010), 1166.

¹⁰ Philippe D. Rogers. "China and United Nations Peacekeeping Operations in Africa." *Naval War College Review* 60, no. 2 (Spring 2007), 75.

in a leading South African bank later on in 2007.¹¹ These are not the only countries that have received aid from China; Zimbabwe, Namibia, Liberia, and others have received investment from the rising power. The Chinese have become even more numerous than Britons in former colonial possessions such as Nigeria, with 100,000 Chinese nationals living and working on the continent as a whole.¹² While many fear that this is becoming a new colonization of Africa by the Chinese, there is an even greater problem with this rapid pace of Chinese influence: gross human rights violations and Chinese protection of dictators.

With such a large stake in Africa, it is impossible for China to be considered unimportant in its affairs any longer. However, this also presents an immediate problem: China wants to be a major power, but being a major power requires being a responsible global citizen. It faces new challenges that every global power must, including upholding international standards throughout the rest of the world and ensuring peace for other nations in which it is involved.¹³ The United States, for instance, has been tasked with this very same charge since the end of World War II, often finding nothing but criticism for its interventions in other countries. That intervention, however, has ensured the ongoing peace in many regions of the world that could have been destabilized by Western involvement. Now, China faces the same problem with Africa.

Unfortunately, this does not seem to be a priority for China in the least. It does not feel that the world is one in which it must give back to the community from which it takes. It has refused to take upon itself the responsibilities incumbent upon a global power, thus destabilizing the international community by upholding dictators and corrupt regimes.¹⁴ Nothing demonstrates

¹¹ Chris Alden. "China and Africa: A New Development Partnership." *Strategic Analysis* 32, no. 2 (2008), 298.

¹² Howard W. French "Commentary China and Africa." *African Affairs* 106 (2006), 127.

¹³ Michael Fullilove "Angel or Dragon? China and the United Nations." *The National Interest* 85 (September/October 2006), 67.

¹⁴ Michael Fullilove. "China and the United Nations: The Stakeholder Spectrum." *The Washington Quarterly* 34, no. 3 (June 21, 2011), 67.

this better than the situation in Africa, in which China allows its own self-interests to dictate its policy toward the continent, thus creating international instability, human rights violations, and misery among the millions who live on the African continent.

When China is faced with a threat against its self-interests, it has proven that it will always allow the interests to win out against the atrocities that have happened and will continue to happen on the African continent. For instance, despite the genocide in Darfur, China led the opposition to UN sanctions against Khartoum.¹⁵ While this is neither new nor surprising behavior from China, it proves that it is an irresponsible stakeholder in the international system; it would let the lives of hundreds of thousands be lost only because it did not want to encroach on the sovereignty of another nation. Not only this, but it has been concluded that China provides political protection to Khartoum in order to continue to receive easy access to oil, a resource which the booming nation needs.¹⁶ While resources are important and are becoming scarcer and scarcer, an unstable Africa will have repercussions on the Middle East and even Europe if the conflicts are allowed to expand and the refugee population continues to grow.

In addition, the Chinese are heavily increasing military presence in Africa. They are selling small arms and fighter aircrafts to African nations, building small-arms factories in Sudan, and are even increasing military advisers in the region.¹⁷ They are also contributing ammunition, anti-aircraft guns, anti-personnel mines, anti-tank mines, tanks, helicopters, and fighter aircrafts.¹⁸ This increase in presence not only provides African nations with the money and weapons to continue to enact genocides and other human rights violations, but it also gives

¹⁵ Fullilove, "Angel or Dragon? China and the United Nations," 68.

¹⁶ Fullilove, "Angel or Dragon? China and the United Nations," 70.

¹⁷ Rogers, "China and United Nations Peacekeeping Operations in Africa," 74.

¹⁸ Piet Konings. "China and Africa: Building a Strategic Partnership." *Journal of Developing Societies* 23, no. 3 (2007), 353.

China even more incentive to keep ushering people into Africa and demanding oil be taken from the region.

This also shows something about the Chinese method of foreign policy. They offer “cash, soft loans, investments, bribes, technology, the construction of infrastructure and prestige objects, arms sales” and “political protection from international pressures,” all so that they can have access to oil resources.¹⁹ This emboldens dictators and spreads the message globally that dictatorship and oppression of human rights is a tolerable method of governance, thus putting people everywhere in harm’s way. As dictators are rewarded for this kind of behavior with increasing investments, the practice will only spread to other regions that want both money and a strong arm against the people.

China also fails to even work with the Western world in terms of creating a solution for peace on the African continent. The West has tried embargoes in order to prevent further violence from spreading, but China will do no such thing. In fact, China sold arms to Zimbabwe and Sudan while under Western arms embargoes, not even caring about the fact that it completely undermined the Western attempts to prevent violence in the region.²⁰ As a global power, China cannot do this and hope to maintain its legitimacy within the international community. The world needs strong leaders, and China’s undercutting the authority of the Western powers at every turn for its own selfish gain only leads to more turmoil around the globe. Sanctions cannot be effective unless they are multilateral, and China prevents such a possibility due to its desire to maintain good relationships with dictators who will give them easy access to oil.

¹⁹ Piet Konings, “China and Africa: Building a Strategic Partnership,” 352.

²⁰ Piet Konings, “China and Africa: Building a Strategic Partnership,” 353.

There is, however, another side to China's presence in Africa. The country helps staff peace missions in Africa and deploys more military and civilian personnel to UN Peacekeeping operations than any of the other P5.²¹ Unfortunately, these many troops in the region do not stop the wars from happening, and certainly do not stop the genocides. China's military presence may serve one of two reasons: it placates the West as these powers clamor for more Chinese action, and it serves to protect Chinese investment. Perhaps the country does not care what happens to the people, but if Chinese access to natural resources are threatened, that might be worth protecting.

This peacekeeping presence in Africa cannot negate the harm that has been done by the Chinese. It cannot erase the fact that China will allow dictators to stand and many to be killed in unjust regimes. Certainly, the Western powers should not take this as a cue that China is somehow changing and can be dealt with rationally on these issues. The fact of the matter is, simply, that China is only invested in its own interests in Africa and does not care if it brings down global security with it.

Unfortunately, China does not feel any desire to do anything but act in its own self-interest. While it is considered an incredibly powerful state by Western standards, it is not considered as a government that can stand. Therefore, China continues to try and garner legitimacy in the international community; if it cannot do so through the Western world than it stands to reason that it would try to gain legitimacy through its dominance in the African continent. The Western powers garnered their own legitimacy from assisting in global conflicts, many times unilaterally; why would China feel incentivized to do differently?

This does, however, demonstrate that China does not have a stake in the UN rules and norms that govern a situation such as China's dealings in Africa. First and foremost, the

²¹ Fullilove, "Angel or Dragon? China and the United Nations," 68.

Responsibility to Protect (R2P) is invoked to protect nations to which stronger nations are linked through the use of force if necessary. It would stand to reason that China should be using R2P doctrine in Africa, not promoting the violence through arms sales and investments. It does deploy peacekeepers, but these peacekeepers do little to nothing to stop the widespread violence and genocide that occurs without ceasing. This becomes an increasingly large problem due to the fact that while China funds these conflicts, the conflicts will only grow more intense. With more violent capabilities, factionalized violence has no reason to remain confined to low-tech fighting, not when anti-personnel weapons and anti-aircraft weapons are available. Furthermore, this could become a transnational problem very quickly. An entire continent embroiled in bloody conflict could spill over into Europe, which already has a significant number of North African immigrants. This could also re-ignite many tensions in the Middle East, thus sparking more interest from the United States due to this region being crucial to national security. Therefore, China's inability to adhere to rules and norms of the UN only creates more problems not only for Africa, but for the world as a whole.

Recommendations for the Africa Problem

Clearly, the end goal for any recommendation about the problem with Africa is ending the funding of military conflict by China. However, the problem will only continue to persist if China holds to its cultural norm of resisting the use of sanctions against sovereign nations. Therefore, any solution must incorporate sensitive negotiations that take into account China's cultural stance against sanctions. While the United States cannot cave to Chinese pressure just because it is culturally founded, there must be a compromise that will ensure stability in the region and keep transnational peace.

The United States must work together with the Chinese government to negotiate strategies that will work in Africa to help build peace, not continue fund war. Therefore, rather than institute peacekeeping operations or continue to hurl sanctions at unjust regimes, global powers should institute *peace-building* operations. The foundation can then be laid for institutions to be built in a peaceful way rather than one which will continue to fund violent regimes and violent practices. These institutions could ensure that peace will persist in Africa rather than trying to clean up the mess once it is over. Institutions that could assist in the peace building process include transparent, democratic governments, a stable market economy, and simple infrastructure to allow easy access to jobs and resources to help the lower classes grow and find stability, thus preventing the need to turn to war.

A solution also ties into the rise of China as a major power. While the United States continues to fear the Chinese rise, it must understand that there is ability for the Chinese to rise peacefully, with the help of the United States. At the moment, China continues to rise in an irresponsible fashion because it still considers itself a third world nation and acts in that manner. A major power that is a developed, first world nation, necessarily has to consider the ramifications of its actions throughout the rest of the world. However, if China is to be a responsible leader, it must be taught to be so. The United States has learned the hard and painful lessons of being a responsible hegemon in a global society and therefore understands the intricacies better than any other country. Instead of fearing China, the United States could help it grow into a responsible world leader, thereby helping prevent incidents such as the ravaging of Africa only because China is interested in its own desires. This could also ensure that China begins to adhere to rules and norms of the international community with the guidance of the

United States, thus protecting interests of the West while still enabling China to pursue its own interests in a responsible way.

The final key to a solution in Africa is to ensure that this becomes less of a colonization of Africa and more of a partnership between China and Africa. Africa certainly needs the infrastructure and the jobs that come with China's involvement, but these need to be *African* jobs for *African* people, not Chinese jobs for Chinese workers who are imported into the country. While China does have the workforce to do such a thing, this does not help the continent stand on its own, and in fact becomes a detriment to the people. The United States should work with both China and Africa to help the building of sustainable infrastructure, including building sustainable institutions to preserve the infrastructure. In this way, African resources will not just be available to other, larger powers, but also to the Africans who might have more need of them than anybody.

Case 3: China and Rogue States

The United States and much of the Western world feels the threat of rogue nations, in particular Iran and North Korea. These states are the largest violators of cultural rules and norms and threaten not only national security but transnational security on a daily basis. Both Iran and North Korea have been testing nuclear weapons in an attempt to compete with the major powers of the world. The West is not only is uncomfortable with this development of these nuclear programs, but considers these unstable actors who may expand nuclear proliferation into the hands of non-state actors who would then use them against states. Therefore, there have been many attempts to prevent nuclear weapon proliferation, none of which have succeeded.

The main tactic the West attempts to employ against these states is the use of sanctions. However, despite North Korea experiencing intense famine and the Iranian population suffering due to the recently-implemented economic sanctions, they have not stopped the nuclear development program. Much of this lack of success is believed to be due to China. China, after all, is typically seen as a promoter of the two countries, the only ally when none others rise. This does not sit well with the major powers of the West, which causes considerable conflict between the two regions.

China and North Korea, for instance, have a relationship that is strong enough to throw a wrench into Western plans. However, it is not a partnership that will endure through the end of time. China's primary interest in North Korea is due to the fact that a collapsed state on the Korean Peninsula would cause refugees to flow into China and cause security problems. On the other hand, if North and South Korea reunified, China would have to deal with American military on their border, a position China does not favor.²² Therefore, North Korea acts as leverage for China to deal with the United States, South Korea, and Japan; the perception that it has some kind of sway over North Korean policy forces Western powers and their allies to adhere to the Chinese opinion on how to treat the situation.²³ While this might mean security in negotiations for China, this hardly comforts the West. If anything, it creates tension in the West when deciding how to deal with China; it is the only one out of the major powers to have a diplomatic link to this rogue state, yet it refuses sanctions and punitive measures for the creation of nuclear missiles.

China hardly seems to care whether or not North Korea is working on nuclear weapons. In the eyes of the Chinese, it will take far too long for North Korea to create nuclear missiles

²² Fullilove, "China and the United Nations: The Stakeholder Spectrum," 76.

²³ You Ji. "China and North Korea: A Fragile Relationship of Strategic Convenience." *Journal of Contemporary China* 10, no. 28 (2001), 391.

ready for the battlefield; therefore, they are not a threat and can merely be used as a playing chip.²⁴ Furthermore, although China sits in on the Six Party talks, it does not seem to mind that there is a desired resolution to this conflict on the part of the Americans, Japanese, Russians, and South Koreans. An isolated North Korea is in the interest of China, while China's support in the settlement of the conflict between North Korea and the Western powers can assist North Korea in reaching a settlement that will benefit it to the fullest.²⁵ However, China has used this power for considerable good in the Six Party talks. It has persuaded North Korea not only to agree to the format of the talks, but China was also responsible for getting North Korea to show up at the talks in the first place.²⁶ This allows China to help the West come to a conclusion on what to do that remains in its best interest, while it adheres to both its own interests and its view on how to treat state sovereignty. Therefore, although this might seem more amenable to the West, China is playing a dangerous game with global security. If it is wrong on its assessment of North Korean weapon production, it could lead to enhanced nuclear proliferation from a state that might not be a completely rational actor. Its interests and the interests of the West would cease to matter, especially if chances for nuclear conflict were raised by the North Koreans acquisition of usable nuclear weapons.

Dealing with Iran is a similar situation to dealing with North Korea. However, this time China is motivated by its trade in oil with Iran, thereby wanting it to keep its sovereignty. However, the West views Iran as a considerable national security threat, thus creating backlash and conflict with the Chinese who desperately want to keep Iran not only an ally, but a protected ally.

²⁴ You Ji, "China and North Korea: A Fragile Relationship of Strategic Convenience," 395.

²⁵ You Ji, "China and North Korea: A Fragile Relationship of Strategic Convenience," 392.

²⁶ Andrew Scobell. "China and North Korea: The Limits of Influence." *Current History* 102 (2003), 275

Much as it has done in Africa, China has worked its magic on the Security Council to ensure that the blows to Iran are not as severe as they could be. China has shielded Iran from scrutiny in international forums, while also attempting to render resolutions proposed by the United States, Britain, and France utterly useless in the UN Security Council, thus leading to long, prolonged debates about sanctions and other preventive measures.²⁷ This is the same story as in Africa, but the problem is magnified in Iran. The United States, Britain, and France all have a much greater stake in Iran than they do in Africa. Furthermore, the issue comes down to a threat to national security, meaning considerably more conflict with China, as the Western world cannot simply let the nation have its way.

Unfortunately, the West cannot merely take a hard stance against China's involvement with Iran. The sanctions against Iran passed in the United Nations needed China's support to continue. They could not afford a continuous blockage by China due to its veto power, yet China also was faced with a predicament: as a major power, it had to begin to take a stance against Iran with the rest of the Security Council, yet it also needed to stand up for its own ideology in conjunction with sovereignty and sanctions. Therefore, the Security Council found itself in a precarious situation, with Russia backing China and China not willing to back down.

However, China's need for legitimacy on the world stage forced it, at the very least, to agree to some sanctions. Thanks to Western pressure, China supported three resolutions from 2006 to 2008 that imposed sanctions on Iran, but only on the condition that the sanctions were diluted with the help of Russia, thus preventing the sanctions from causing any real effect on Iranian policy.²⁸ Sanctions are only effective when they are done on a multilateral basis, and with China neutering the sanctions of their intended effect, they continued to give Iran the green light

²⁷ Fullilove, "Angel or Dragon? China and the United Nations," 70.

²⁸ Fullilove, "China and the United Nations: The Stakeholder Spectrum," 74.

to continue expanding its nuclear program. While this might look like cooperation with the West, China only used a new tactic to prevent a major partner from going under. It would rather have easy access to energy sources than to prevent the world from a potentially overwhelming security threat in the form of Iranian nuclear technology.

Of course, the public Chinese stance on the issue is very different, thus making negotiation hard for the West. The Chinese Ambassador to the UN claimed that China does not want nuclear weapons, but due to the country's belief that sanctions are counterproductive, the Chinese would not support them. Furthermore, he claimed that sanctions only cause ordinary people to suffer, not the ones in charge.²⁹ While this might seem to be the humanitarian argument, it only continues to delay any real, effective measure against Iran. In fact, despite the fact that China did eventually give in to UN sanctions against Iran, it can continue to fight the sanctions battle; arguing over sanctions is a much simpler way to delay more aggressive action against Iran than arguing over what to do about Iran. If anything, this only buys the Iranian government more time to develop its own weapons while the West fails to address the greater issue.

Recommendations for the Rogue State Problem

While the United States and the West considers these rogue states to be a global problem, the solution is often left in the sole hands of the Western world. Any solution must include China, otherwise China will continue to act as an antagonist to the problem. Since China is part of most of the intergovernmental organizations that deal with these issues, it will continue to counter the West if a solution is not proposed that satisfies it. Already, with its acceptance of

²⁹ Voice of America News. "China: Iran Sanctions 'Counterproductive.'" News release. March 17, 2010.

Iranian sanctions, it has been shown that China is willing to take action against rogue states. The problem is simply that the Western world does not engage China enough in these solutions, and does not want to cater what seems to be an easy, Western solution to the needs of the Chinese people and ideology.

To remedy this, the rest of the P5 on the Security Council should consult China on what it thinks should be done in dealing with these states, not merely propose resolutions and hope that China does not veto them. The finger-pointing at China for helping these states helps nothing; it only increases the tensions between the Western world and this emerging power. Furthermore, nothing will be accomplished by China's abstaining from votes or vetoing resolutions; this only gives the rogue states more time to do what they are doing without consequence, without reaction from the largest powers in the world.

Thus, there should be a cooperative solution in regards to what must be done with North Korea and Iran. It might involve denuclearizing them, and it might involve allowing them to retain their weapons. The end result is not necessarily the most important piece of the puzzle; Chinese cooperation is the most crucial part. After all, if China cannot agree to the solutions of the West, it will continue to undermine all efforts of action against these states, thus creating further instability for the world and delaying what could be a time of peace.

Conclusion

China, while a rising world power, has not yet found its place as a leader in the international system. It does not consider the effects that its actions have upon the international system, and continues to act in a self-interested fashion that favors sovereignty and material gains over transnational security. Thus, it is a problem not only to the Western world, but to the entire world that seeks peace.

The concept of sovereignty has changed, and China cannot merely act in its own interests any longer. Unfortunately, the country fails to see that for a combination of cultural and material reasons. It continues to act as a weak, developing nation that can escape the consequences of a rapidly changing world, but it can no longer be such. China must step up and become a leader, for without such an action it will cause nothing but international grief.

The United States, however, must not demonize China and its efforts to act in its own self-interests. While this harms the international system, such finger-pointing only creates antagonism between the two countries, and this cannot be afforded with the significant transnational security challenges that face the world. These problems need transnational solutions and, more importantly, they require strong states who are willing to work together. Thus, the only way to ensure this is to cooperate rather than push away potential allies. The United States must work together with the other Western powers to bring China to willingly comply with rules and norms of the international system, but these older powers must bring China into the solution if they ever hope to see progress. Only by inclusion and strategic thinking can any progress be reached.

Bibliography

- Alden, Chris. "China and Africa: A New Development Partnership." *Strategic Analysis* 32, no. 2 (2008): 297-304.
- Baht, T. P. "Assessing China's Compliance with WTO Commitments." *India Quarterly: A Journal of International Affairs* 65 (2009): 215-35.
- Bishnoi, B. R., and Parul Goyal. "Intellectual Property Rights and the WTO." *International Refereed Research Journal* 11, no. 2 (April 2011): 37-50.
- French, Howard W. "Commentary China and Africa." *African Affairs* 106 (2006): 127-32.
- Fullilove, Michael. "Angel or Dragon? China and the United Nations." *The National Interest* 85 (September/October 2006): 67-71.
- . "China and the United Nations: The Stakeholder Spectrum." *The Washington Quarterly* 34, no. 3 (June 21, 2011): 63-85.
- Harpaz, Marcia Don. "China's WTO Compliance-Plus Anti-dumping Policy." *Journal of World Trade* 45, no. 4 (2011): 727-66.
- . "Sense and Sensibilities of China and WTO Dispute Settlement." *Journal of World Trade* 44, no. 6 (2010): 1155-86.
- Ji, You. "China and North Korea: A Fragile Relationship of Strategic Convenience." *Journal of Contemporary China* 10, no. 28 (2001): 387-98.
- Konings, Piet. "China and Africa: Building a Strategic Partnership." *Journal of Developing Societies* 23, no. 3 (2007): 341-67.
- Owens, Tracy M. *It's a Numbers Game: Financial Data Restrictions in China Don't Add up to WTO Compliance*. N.p.: University of the Pacific, 2007.
- Prah, Kwesi Kwaa. "China and Africa: Defining a Relationship." *Development* 50, no. 3 (2007): 69-75.
- Rogers, Philippe D. "China and United Nations Peacekeeping Operations in Africa." *Naval War College Review* 60, no. 2 (Spring 2007): 73-93.
- Scobell, Andrew. "China and North Korea: The Limits of Influence." *Current History* 102 (2003): 274-78.
- Tian, Dexin, and Chin-Chung Chao. "Intellectual Property Rights Disputes in Cyberspace: U.S. Hegemony and Chinese Resistance." *Journal of Politics and Law* 5, no. 2 (April 25, 2012): 1-9.

Voice of America News. "China: Iran Sanctions 'Counterproductive.'" News release. March 17, 2010.