

China's policy towards South Korea: 1961-2017

by

Yin Xuan PENG

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment for the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Central Lancashire

October 2020

STUDENT DECLARATION FORM

Concurrent registration for two or more academic awards

I declare that while registered as a candidate for the research degree, I have not been a registered candidate or enrolled student for another award of the University or other academic or professional institution.

Material submitted for another award

I declare that no material contained in the thesis has been used in any other submission for an academic award and is solely my own work.

Collaboration

Where a candidate's research programme is part of a collaborative project, the thesis must indicate in addition clearly the candidate's individual contribution and the extent of the collaboration.

Please state below:

I declare that the research programme was not part of a collaborative project.

Signature of Candidate PENG Yin Xuan

Type of Award Doctor of Philosophy

School School of Humanities, Language & Global Studies

Abstract

In the realm of Chinese foreign policy, the majority of scholars and pundits analyze China's policy towards South Korea from the perspective of China's rational diplomatic thinking that caters to China's national interest maximization. However, I argue that China's diplomacy with South Korea from the late Mao Ze-dong era to the early Xi Jin-ping era should be considered as a combination of the influence of China's national interest calculation, the Chinese leadership's diplomatic thinking, the factional struggle among Chinese cadres. The thesis of mine, thereby, attempts to make a contribution to explanation of China's policy towards South Korea from aspects of Mao's pursuit of 'pure' communism and Deng's success in the campaign against the Chinese radicals, even though the Sino-South Korean relationship has been viewed as an interest-oriented bilateral diplomacy. China's new approach towards South Korea emerged from the year of 1961 as Park Chung-hee (1961-1979) became the *de facto* paramount political leader, as prepared to use developmental policies to promote its modernization programme – the “Miracle on the Han River”, which laid a foundation for a new economic relationship between China and South Korea. Deng Xiao-ping (1978-1992) did not put forward the “Four Modernization Programme” (“四个现代化” – *sige xiandaihua*) until the Chinese reformists returned to power, which enabled China to promote secret business dealings with South Korea in the 1980s. In the post-Cold War period, China's policy towards South Korea developed from a “friendly cooperative relationship” then into a “strategic cooperative partnership”. While there has been literature on China's “Two-Koreas Policy” since the Sino-South Korean relationship normalization, there is little on changes in China's “Non-Policy” towards South Korea in the Cold War era. In other words, many researchers explained China's relations with the two separated governments on the Korean peninsula in the context of China's “Independent Foreign Policy of Peace” (“独立自主和平外交”政策 – *dulizizhu de heping waijiao zhengce*) and “Opening and Reform Policy” (“改革开放”政策 – *gaigekaifang zhengce*), they paid little attention to China's hostile relations with South Korea in the background of China's “Leaning-to One Side Policy” (“一边倒”政策 – *yibiandao zhengce*), “Fighting-with Two Fists Strategy” (“两条线作战”策略 – *liangtiaoxian zhanlve*) and “One United Front Approach” (“一条线”策略 – *yitiaoxian zhanlve*). The dissertation questions why China did not shift the “Non-Policy” towards South Korea until the termination of the Cold War. To demonstrate my argument, China's changing policy towards South Korea from 1961 to 2017 will be explained through an analysis of primary and secondary literature. In brief, I utilize both Chinese and Western scholarship on China's diplomatic and economic policies towards South Korea to clarify their respective ideas of the geo-strategic relationship, including articles, books, essays, journals, and memoirs.

Table of Contents

<i>Abstract</i>	3
<i>Acknowledgement</i>	8
<i>Introduction</i>	9
Introduction	9
The literature on foreign policy approaches	20
Background	25
Foreign policy	27
Foreign policy analysis	30
The rational approach	33
The psychological approach	41
The bureaucratic approach.....	46
The rationalist approach in the study of China’s foreign policy (1949-1976)	52
The psychological approach under the presidency of Mao Ze-dong	55
The rationalist approach in the study of China’s foreign policy (1978-1992)	58
The bureaucratic approach under the presidency of Deng Xiao-ping.....	61
The rationalist approach in the study of China’s foreign policy (1992-2014)	65
The Literature on China’s relations with the Korean peninsula (1950s-2010s)	67
Research gap	73
Research question	75
Methodology	77
Chapter outline	82

<i>Chapter One: China's policy towards South Korea in the late Mao era (1961-1976)</i>	86
Introduction	86
Background	87
Literature on China's foreign policy to South Korea in the Mao era	90
The rational actor explanation of China's policy during the Korean War: the priority of supporting the national interest	115
The impact of the geographic link of the Korean peninsula on China.....	115
The Korean War and Chinese "Aiding North Korea" policy.....	119
The influence of the Korean War on China's "Non-Policy" toward South Korea	123
China's policies towards South Korea after the Korean War: the rational actor explanation	126
The "Leaning-to One Side Policy"	126
The "Non-Policy" towards South Korea.....	134
China's perspective on the South Korea decision to establish relation with Taiwan	138
The impact of China's national security priorities on China's post-Korean War international relations	144
China's security policies	144
China's confrontation with the United States	149
The Sino-Soviet Union split.....	152
The Vietnamese War	156
The Sino-United States rapprochement	160
China's policy towards South Korea after the Korean War: the psychological approach explanation	166
Mao's perception of the threat to China's security.....	166
Mao's perception of the threat from the capitalist powers	170
Mao's perception of the threat of the United States	174
Mao's perception of the Chinese Nationalist Party.....	177
Conclusion	180

<i>Chapter Two: China's policy towards South Korea in the Deng era</i>	181
Introduction	181
Background	183
Literature on China's foreign policy to South Korea in the Deng era	186
China's security policy towards South Korea in the Deng era: the rational actor explanation	201
China's security policies	201
The Sino-Soviet Union split.....	205
The establishment of Sino-United States diplomatic relations	209
China's perspective on the United States' relations with Taiwan.....	213
China's perspective on the United States military force on South Korea	216
China's diplomatic policy towards South Korea in the Deng era: the rational actor explanation	220
The "Independent foreign policy of peace"	220
The policy of "Separation the Officials from the People" towards South Korea.....	225
China's perspective on the South Korean government's "Northern Policy".....	229
China's perspective on Seoul's decision to remain relations with Taipei	233
China's economic policy towards South Korea in the Deng era: the rational actor explanation .	235
The "Opening and Reform Policy"	235
China's policy towards South Korea in the Deng era: the bureaucratic approach explanation ..	242
The factional struggle between the Chinese reformists and the Chinese radicals.....	242
Conclusion	252
<i>Chapter Three: China's policy towards South Korea in the post-Deng era</i>	253
Introduction	253
Background	255
Literature on China's policy to South Korea in the post-Deng era	259
China's security policy towards South Korea in the post-Deng era: the rational actor explanation	277

China's security policies	277
The dissolution of the Soviet Union	281
The development of the Sino-United States relations in the post-Cold War period.....	285
China's perspective on the United States' relations with Taiwan.....	289
China's perspective on the United States' force on South Korea.....	292
China's diplomatic policy towards South Korea in the post-Deng era: the rational actor explanation	296
The "Independent Foreign Policy of Peace"	296
China's "Two-Koreas Policy"	300
China's economic policy towards South Korea in the post-Deng era: the rational actor explanation	304
China's "Opening and Reform Policy" and "Going-global" strategy	304
Conclusion	312
<i>Conclusion</i>	<i>314</i>
Main findings	314
Recommendations	317
Limitations.....	320
Further research	321
<i>Bibliography</i>.....	<i>322</i>
Primary sources	322
Secondary sources	325

Acknowledgement

First and foremost, I here sincerely express my endless gratitude to my two main supervisors Professor. Hazel Smith of University of London and Professor. Niki Alsford for their consistent support for the whole process of my research. I could not have an opportunity to complete the thesis without their incredible encouragement, infinite patience and immense knowledge. Both respectful, responsible and resourceful teachers did not only help me to make substantial comments on the dissertation, but also provide me with high-level guidance of how to present controversial ideas in a precise way.

Secondly, I greatly appreciate Dr. Yu Tao of Univesity of Western Australia, Dr. Jia-yi Wang, Dr. Daniel Waller, and Dr. Petra Bagley for their constructive advices on my thesis, from where I received tremendous inspiration.

Thirdly, I am deeply grateful to my family, particularly my deceased grandmother Huang Ren-xiu. She always informed me of the significance of keeping learning and building independence, which has motivated me to strive for my dream. I would like to deliver my sepcial thanks to my father, Peng Shen-zhong. His spiritual as well as financial support has equally meant a secure shelter to me, which enables me to concentrate on my writing.

Introduction

Introduction

The People's Republic of China (hereafter, China) has considered the Korean peninsula as a significant part of China's overall policy considerations since its inception in 1949, which meant that China's policy towards the Korean peninsula resulted from the complex situation in northeast Asia. According to Oberdorfer, the Korean peninsula should be realized as the legacy of the Cold War – the place where the most drastic confrontation among great powers possibly appears.¹ The division of the Korean peninsula into two states with two different political systems should be viewed as a part of understanding of the Cold War, and it originated from the escalating tension between the Soviet Union and the United States in the wake of the Second World War, which laid a foundation for the pattern of the world in the Cold War period. Park argues that China did not enable to adopt a bolder policy towards the Korean peninsula until the Sino-Soviet Union rapprochement, which conversely suggested the diminishing role of North Korea.² In other words, China strove to strengthen the Sino-North Korean relations in order not to be fallen into the weakest party in the Northern Triangle that consisted of the Soviet Union, North Korea and China, which contributed to China's policy thinking on the Korean peninsula in the context of the Sino-Soviet split. On one hand, Snyder emphasizes that the influence of the dissolution of the Soviet Union on northeast Asia was not similar to the influence on east Europe.³ On the other hand, Seth insists that North Korea had caught an opportunity to develop its separate thinking on socialism in the context of the Sino-Soviet Union dispute.⁴ In contrast, the demise of the Soviet empire did not put an end to socialism in both China and North Korea, which conversely meant that the Soviet Union did have lower leverage on northeast Asia than east Europe.

China has been more determined to enhance diplomatic assurance and realize economic increase since the Tiananmen Square Incident, which meant that China pragmatically adopted two contrasting approaches to develop its commercial connection with South Korea and enhance its traditional alliance with North Korea.

¹ Oberdorfer, Don. (2001). The Two Koreas: a contemporary history. *Basic Books*, pxii.

² Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p379.

³ Snyder, Scott. (2009). China's rise and the Two Koreas: politics, economics, and security. London: *Boulder*, 30-31.

⁴ Seth, J. Michael. (2016). A concise history of modern Korea: from the late 19th century to the present. *Rowman & Litterfield*, p160.

Park argues the Tiananmen Square Incident immediately turned into a serious blow to China, and the United States and other industrial nations imposed strict restriction on China's economic development.⁵ Liu highlights that the United States did not enable to downplay China's role until the Gorbachev administration (1985-1991) declared the demise of the Soviet empire, which meant that the Chinese leadership saw how to re-calculate its strategy towards the United States as an urgency.⁶ In other words, the Tiananmen Square Incident and the implosion of the Soviet Union significantly changed the situation that China had faced, which suggested that China's relations with the two leading states came into a newly critical period. However, Jia and Zhuang argue that China's pursuit of material interests was one key factor that influenced China's policy towards the Korean peninsula, and the emerging industrial state – South Korea could provide China with cheaper technological products, which would help China to relieve from economic dependence on the United States and other advanced states.⁷ South Korea further grasped an opportunity to enhance political trust as well as expand economic inter-dependence with China, which contributed to China's "Two-Koreas Policy" in the post-Cold War period. Zhu additionally argues that China on one hand has aimed to protect itself from the detrimental influence of the North Korean crisis on China's strategic developmental programme, on the other hand, has striven to persuade North Korea to participate in the "Six-Party Talk".⁸ In contrast, China has realized the significance of attaining peace as well as stability in northeast Asia by playing a more profound role in the Korean peninsula, which conversely meant that China would be in jeopardy in the context of the complex geo-politics.

The thesis of mine aims to demonstrate factors that contributed to China's policy towards South Korea from a hostile "Non-Policy" to a flexible "Two-Koreas Policy". These factors could be viewed as a combination of key elements in Chinese foreign policy decision-making process, which includes China's multiple considerations on its survival interest, diplomatic concern and economic increase from the late Mao Ze-dong era to the early Xi Jin-ping era. Park argues that both the Chinese leadership's policy thinking and China's

⁵ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p382.

⁶ Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094, p1085.

⁷ Jia, Hao. & Zhuang, Qu-bing. (1992). China's policy towards the Korean peninsula. *Asian Survey*, 32(12), 1137-1156, p1148.

⁸ Zhu, Feng. (2003). "Liufanghuitan" hou de chaoheweiiji: wenti yu qianjing [The North Korean issue in the aftermath of the "Six-Party Talk": problems and prospects]. *Xiandai guojiguanxi (Contemporary International Relations)*, (9), 9-21, p9.

national interest calculation have been the two main factors that influenced China's diplomatic behaviour and economic activities.⁹ In addition to China's relations with leading states, Mao Ze-dong's (1949-1976) rhetoric of communism, Deng Xiao-ping's (1978-1992) success in the factional struggle against the "Gang of Four" and the Chinese radicals, China's pursuit of security protection and modernization programme have been recognized as key elements in China's foreign policy calculation. Viewed in this aspect, China's domestic changes from the 1960s to the 2010s should be also seen as an explanation of Mao's strategy of "Leaning-to the communist side", Deng Xiao-ping and other Chinese pragmatists' role in the reforming era, and the Chinese leadership's persistence in the interest-oriented principle in the post-Cold War era. Thereby, the thesis is not only an explanation of China's comprehensive policies towards South Korea through an analysis of China's pursuit of national interest maximization, but also an explanation of the influence of the paramount leader's personal perception – Mao's pursuit of 'pure' communism on China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea and a bureaucratic explanation of the influence of Deng's political struggle on China's changing relations with South Korea. In other words, China's policy thinking on South Korea should be considered as a part of the changes in China's policy thinking from the late Mao era (1961-1976), the Deng era (1978-1992) and the post-Deng era (1992-2017), which elaborates China's reactions to these changes at home and abroad. These changes will help to build understanding of a rising China's security strategies, foreign approaches and economic policies, which conversely means that South Korea can be presented as an example of how to interact with a rising political and economic power – China. In this chapter, I will first demonstrate the research gap in order to establish a possibility to do the research through some exiting literature analysis on the China-Korea relationship from the 1950s to the 2010s. In other words, I will analyze why I intend to explain factors that influenced China's changing attitudes towards South Korea. I will then present the research question and the research thesis. In the end, I will discuss the research method and describe the chapter outline.

Korea, adjacent to China, was profoundly influenced by China – a leading state that attracted tremendous attention in the ancient times, which suggested that Chinese culture was an inseparable element in Korea's development. According to Jun and Kim, the mutual China-Korea border enables Korea to become such a district that shares the greatest amount of cultural similarity and historical connection with China.¹⁰ On one hand, Kissinger argues that China played an outstanding role in the process of historical civilization, which meant that China was more remarkably capable of sustaining its dominant status than other nations.¹¹ Spence

⁹ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p6.

¹⁰ Jun, Byoung-kon. & Kim, Jang-ho. (2013). China's role and perception of a united Korea. *Korean Journal of Defense Analysis: Korea Institute for Defense Analyses*, 25(3), 369-383.

¹¹ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. *Penguin Press*, p8.

speaks highly of ancient China's fabulous cultural transmission and economic development, which helped to explain the popularity of Chinese attractive products in Europe.¹² On the other hand, Park argues that Chinese culture has been widely spread since the ancient times, and the long and porous border with which Korea shares was recognized as a culture corridor that enabled Korea to comprehend Chinese civilization, which meant that Chinese culture was a specially important part in the Sino-Korean relations.¹³ In other words, it was China's image as a giant power in the ancient times that gave a rise to the spread of the traditional Chinese doctrine through the border between China and Korea. Park emphasizes that China insisted on the philosophy of Confucianism, and China persisted that the way China treated Korea was similar to 'brotherhood', which conversely meant that Korea understood the essence of Confucian hierarchical culture and the tributary system.¹⁴ Viewed in this vein, the adoption of Confucianism within certain aspects of Korea culture and state apparatus witnessed an acceptance of Chinese 'hegemony'¹⁵ and a priority in Korea's foreign affairs.

In addition to the legacy of Confucian culture, the geographic linkage between China and Korea enabled Korea to play a critical role in the transition from the Ming empire (1368-1644) to the Qing empire (1644-1911), which indicated Korea's importance to China's security calculation. According to Park, China dispatched military forces to Korea and waged aggression wars on Korea in the ancient turbulent years, which significantly accelerated China's historical progress.¹⁶ On one hand, Olsen argues that Korea locates in the northeast of China, and Korea is separated from China by the Yalu River.¹⁷ On an account of the

¹² Spence, D. Johnathan. (1990). The search for modern China. Norton, p1.

¹³ Park, Il-keun. (1999). Chinese foreign policy and the Korean peninsula. *International Journal of Korean Studies*, III(1), 116-135, p116.

¹⁴ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p7.

¹⁵ Pratt, Keith. (2007). Everlasting flower: a history of Korea. Reaktion Books, p16. & Cotterell, Arthur. (1993). East Asia: from Chinese predominance to the rise of the pacific rim. New York: Oxford University Press, 46-47. & Cumings, Bruce. (2005). Korea's place in the sun: a modern history. New York & London: W. W. North, p19.

¹⁶ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p7.

¹⁷ Olsen, A. Edward. (2005). Korea, the divided nation. Praeger Security International, p4.

mutual border, the rulers of Korea attempted to consider themselves as ‘brothers’ of China in imperial times, which suggested that China should not be excluded from the analysis of Korea’s foreign affairs. On the other hand, Seth argues that the establishment of the Later Jin under the leadership of Nurhaci (1616-1626) placed Korea into a more serious situation, which helped to understand Korea’s later complex attitude towards the ruler of Ming.¹⁸ Hong Taiji (1616-1643), Nurhaci’s successor, insisted to dispatch troops to Korea from 1627 to 1637, which meant that the ruler of Later Jin aimed to replace the ruler of Ming as Korea’s ‘suzerain’.¹⁹ Korea formally promised to swift its recognition from the Ming government and to bolster the Hong Taiji regime in the year of 1638, which conversely quickened Hong Taiji’s plan to launch strikes against the Ming empire.²⁰ In contrast, Hong Taiji did not seize an opportunity to stabilize the border between Manchuria and Korea until Korea put an end to the “pro-Ming approach” and turned into an enemy to the Ming empire, which meant that Korea strategically promoted the later Jin’s ascent as the last feudal dynasty in Chinese history, the Qing dynasty.

The ruler of Qing did not have the capability to maintain its dominant presence in the international community, which conversely meant that the political pattern in northeast Asia came into a new stage in the context of a series of wars between China and imperialist powers – the collapse of the Sino-centric order.²¹ Kim argues that both geographic and historical factors have been combined to understand the importance of the Korean peninsula in China’s foreign policy decision-making process.²² Geographically, “China faces on

¹⁸ Seth, J. Michael. (2006). A concise history of Korea: from the neolithic period through the 19th century. Rowman & Litterfield, p142.

¹⁹ Lee, Chae-jin. (1996). China and Korea: dynamic relations. Stanford: Hoover Institutions, p2. & Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China’s policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) Durham University, Department of Politics, p7. & Seth, J. Michael. (2006). A concise history of Korea: from the neolithic period through the 19th century. Rowman & Litterfield, 142-143.

²⁰ Eckert, J. Carter. & Lee, Ki-baik. & Lew, Young-ick. & Robinson, Michael. & Wagner, W. Edward. (1990). Korea old and new: a history. Korea Institute: Harvard University, p150.

²¹ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China’s policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) Durham University, Department of Politics, p8.

²² Kim, S. Samuel. (1997). The future of China and Sino-ROK relations, the future of China and northeast Asia. Edited by Tae-Hwan Kwak and Melvin Gurtov, *The Institute for Far Eastern Studies*, Kyungnam University, p272.

its east the Tumen River and the Western Sea, located in the north and the west of Korea, respectively”.²³ Historically, Korea paid homage to China from 75BC to 1895AD,²⁴ and China had a long-lasting influence on Korea’s development.²⁵ Viewed in this vein, China recognized Korea as a place that could demonstrate China’s ambition as a regional ‘hegemony’ in the background of the Sino-centric order.²⁶ Seth indicates that the Qing government continued to strengthen its border along Manchuria, which protected Korea from other states’ invasion around northeast Asia.²⁷ In other words, ‘Sino-centrism’ played a role in stabilizing China’s relations with Korea from the Han Dynasty to the late Qing Dynasty,²⁸ which meant that China aimed to consolidate its strategic position on Korea and to prevent other nations from building presence in Korea. However, Westad argues that the Treaty of Nanjing historically became the first unequal treaty between the Qing government and the British government in the aftermath of the First Opium War (1840-1842).²⁹ In contrast, the ruler of Qing should keep cautious about the way of dealing with these ‘imperialist’ nations that caught an opportunity to exert pressure on China. Cummings emphasizes that Korea’s relations with Japan fundamentally changed in accordance with Korea’s first unequal treaty with Japan – the Treaty of Kanghwa, even though Japan had also been declined to a colonial state.³⁰ In brief, China’s struggle with imperialism

²³ Park, Il-keun. (1999). Chinese foreign policy and the Korean peninsula. *International Journal of Korean Studies*: Spring/Summer, III(1), 116-135, p116.

²⁴ Seth, J. Michael. (2006). A concise history of Korea: from the neolithic period through the 19th century. Rowman & Litterfield, p21, p211.

²⁵ Oberdorfer, Don. (2001). The Two Koreas: a contemporary history. *Basic Books*, 3-4.

²⁶ Eckert, J. Carter. & Lee, Ki-baik. & Lew, Young-ick. & Robinson, Michael. & Wagner, W. Edward. (1990). Korea old and new: a history. Korea Institute: *Harvard University*, p32, p78, p93, p122, p150. & Pratt, Keith. (2007). Everlasting flower: a history of Korea. *Reaktion Books*, p16. & Walker, L. Brett. (2015). A concise history of Japan. *Cambridge University Press*, p205.

²⁷ Seth, J. Michael. (2006). A concise history of Korea: from the neolithic period through the 19th century. Rowman & Litterfield, p181.

²⁸ Pratt, Keith. (2007). Everlasting flower: a history of Korea. *Reaktion Books*, p16.

²⁹ Westad, Arne. Odd. (2013). Restless empire: China and the world since 1750. London: *Vintage Books*, p43.

³⁰ Cummings, Bruce. (2005). Korea’s place in the sun: a modern history. New York & London: *W. W. North*, p86.

conversely elevated Japan's role in Korea's policy towards northeast Asia, which meant that Japan had a determination to grow as an aggressive 'imperialist' nation to Korea without China's interference.

China's policy towards Korea should be explained as a result of China's different images from a leading feudal state to a declining semi-colonial state, which meant that the Sino-Korean relations underwent significant changes after Japan aimed to swift Korea into an 'invasion corridor' to China. According to Olsen, the location of Korea imposed harsh restrictions on Korea's development since Korea's neighbouring states maintained a stronger comprehensive national strength, including China and Japan.³¹ On one hand, Cumings argues that the ruler of Korea failed to change Korea's situation as a stagnated hermit kingdom, whereas, Japan achieved the transformation from a backward feudal society into a modern industrialized state after the Meiji government (1867-1912) devoted to reform – the Meiji Restoration.³² Seth indicates that Japan underwent significant changes after Meiji and other Japanese reformists decided to bring in political systems and economic models from western 'imperialist' states, which conversely helped to explain the Japanese government's later plan to build 'unequal' political and commercial relations with Korea in a 'barbarian' style.³³ In brief, the Meiji Restoration that prevented western states from further utilizing the 'gunboat' diplomacy towards Japan meant a grave gap between Japan and Korea, which quickened Japan's colonization in Korea and strengthened Japan's role in Korea. On the other hand, Park argues that Korea declined as colonial society in the context of China's fall, which meant that China did not have the capability to restore its dominance over Korea in the aftermath of the Qing government's defeat in the 1894-1895 Sino-Japanese War.³⁴ It was a nightmare to China that Japan sent troops to Korea, which meant that China attempted to re-establish its presence in Korea: to maintain the tributary system in Korea and to discourage Japan from replacing itself as Korea's 'suzerain'.³⁵ Koh emphasizes that Japan emerged as a hostile power

³¹ Olsen, A. Edward. (2005). Korea, the divided nation. *Praeger Security International*, p4 & p6.

³² Cumings, Bruce. (2005). Korea's place in the sun: a modern history. New York & London: *W. W. North*, 86-87.

³³ Seth, J. Michael. (2006). A concise history of Korea: from the neolithic period through the 19th century. *Rowman & Litterfield*, 222-223.

³⁴ Park, Il-keun. (1999). Chinese foreign policy and the Korean peninsula. *International Journal of Korean Studies*: Spring/Summer, III(1), 116-135, p116.

³⁵ Eckert, J. Carter. & Lee, Ki-baik. & Lew, Young-ick. & Robinson, Michael. & Wagner, W. Edward. (1990). Korea old and new: a history. Korea Institute: *Harvard University*, 206-207.

and invaded China via the convenient ‘invasion corridor’ – Korea.³⁶ Viewed in this vein, Korea’s fate should be seen as an explanation of its relations with neighbouring states that imposed influence on its security, cultural and social development, which meant that China and Korea became more struggled to fight with imperialism in the context of Japan’s ascent.

Japan gradually emerged as a great military power in the international arena and maintained as a newly aggressive ‘hegemony’ in the Korean peninsula,³⁷ which conversely meant that the security order in northeast Asia came into a new stage after China and Russia yielded to a rising Japan. According to Park, the termination of the Sino-centric order had a grave impact on Korea that had been used to insisting on the “Closed-door” policy similar to the Qing government, which meant that Korea was trapped into struggle against competition among leading states in northeast Asia.³⁸ On one hand, Seth argues that Korea underwent significant changes in the late 19th century: Japan did not replace the Qing government as the *de facto* ‘suzerain’ to Korea until the Sino-Japanese War (1894-1895), which critically suggested a new security order in northeast Asia in the wake of Japan’s victory in the military confrontation with China.³⁹ Hane, Schmid and Paine indicate that the ruler of Qing made concession to the Japanese empire: both sides agreed on the Treaty of Shimonoseki that formally put an end to the Qing government’s tributary system in Korea in the year of 1895.⁴⁰ In the background of the Qing government’s defeat, Japan seized an opportunity to develop into the most vivid player in Korea, which helped to understand Japan’s objective to occupy China via Korea. On the other hand, An and Liu argue that Russia realized Japan’s increasing leverage in Korea as a threat to its strategic interest, which acted as a stimulus to the eruption of the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905).⁴¹

³⁶ Koh, Byung-chul. (1985). China and the Korean peninsula. *Korea & World Affairs*, 9(2), Summer, 254-255.

³⁷ Walker, L. Brett. (2015). A concise history of Japan. *Cambridge University Press*, p207.

³⁸ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China’s policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p8.

³⁹ Seth, J. Michael. (2016). A concise history of modern Korea: from the late 19th century to the present. *Rowman & Litterfield*, p30.

⁴⁰ Hane, Mikiso. (2000). Japan – a short history. *Oneworld*, p107. & Schmid, Andre. (2002). Korea between empires: 1895-1919. New York: *Columbia University Press*, p10. & Paine, S. C. M. (2003). The Sino-Japanese War of 1894-1895: perceptions, power and primacy. *Cambridge University Press*, p268.

⁴¹ An, Cheng-ri. & Liu, Yan. (2011). Riezhanzheng yu dongya guojitixi de chonggou [On the Russo-Japanese War and the new order in east Asia]. *Haerbin gongyedaxue xuebao (Journal of Harbin Institute of*

Cumings emphasizes that Japan achieved a success in the competition with Russia, and Japan built its leverage in the international arena while the Roosevelt government (1901-1909) did not seriously contemplate Korea's significance to Japan's expansion plan.⁴² In contrast, the Treaty of Portsmouth signed by Japan and Russia prevented Russia from further involving in Korean affairs, even though Russia had aimed to establish its control over Korea by humiliating Japan. In brief, Korea's strategic role as an 'invasion corridor' served as a stimulus to the eruption of the Sino-Japanese War and the Russo-Japanese War.

Japan's defeat in the Second World War influenced Korea's modern and contemporary history, which meant that the United States remained as the leading role in Korean affairs. According to He, the original international Versailles-Washington system had been replaced by the Yalta System that symbolized the United States' expanding political, economic and military role in the international arena, which had a long-lasting impact on the development of global politics in the Cold War period.⁴³ On one hand, Seth argues that the Japanese empire formally announced its annexation of Korea in 1910, even though China and Russia had attempted to expand military presence in Korea by participating in wars with Japan.⁴⁴ In contrast, Japan did not take control of Korean affairs until Japan achieved a series of military success on Korea, which conversely suggested Korea's long-term struggle against the Japanese empire's 'hegemony'.⁴⁵ On the other hand, the Japanese empire's military defeat in the Second World War resulted in Japan's unconditional acceptance of the Potsdam Declaration, which meant the demise of the Japanese military expansion and the Japanese Emperor Hirohito's (1926-1989) divine status in Korea.⁴⁶ However, Cumings argues that the United States immediately planned to occupy Korea after Korea had no need to continue to give in to the Japanese militarism, which helped to explain the United States' military force on the south of the thirty-

Technology), (2), 1-2.

⁴² Cumings, Bruce. (2005). Korea's place in the sun: a modern history. New York & London: *W. W. North*, p142.

⁴³ He, Tong-mei. (2008). Zhonghan zhengzhi waijiao guanxi yanjiu [On the political and diplomatic relations between China and South Korea]. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Yan Bian University*.

⁴⁴ Seth, J. Michael. (2006). A concise history of Korea: from the neolithic period through the 19th century. *Rowman & Litterfield*, p223.

⁴⁵ Hane, Mikiso. (2000). Japan – a short history. *Oneworld*, 110-111.

⁴⁶ Eckert, J. Carter. & Lee, Ki-baik. & Lew, Young-ick. & Robinson, Michael. & Wagner, W. Edward. (1990). Korea old and new: a history. Korea Institute: *Harvard University*, p327.

eighth parallel.⁴⁷ In the background the Cold War pattern, the Korean peninsula was split into two states with two distinctive systems in accordance with the thirty-eighth parallel: Kim Il-Sung (1948-1994) founded the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (hereafter, North Korea) under the Soviet Union's support, and Syngman Rhee (1948-1960) established the Republic of Korea (hereafter, South Korea) under the United States' tutelage.⁴⁸ Viewed in this vein, the United States aimed to intervene in Korean affairs after Japan had withdrawn military force from Korea, which enormously influenced Korea's development in the post-war eras.

In sum, Korea's fate always intertwines with its neighbouring nations' rise and fall, which elaborates the serious fragility of China's policy thinking on Korea's relations with regional powers around northeast Asia. On one hand, Seth argues that the ruler of Choson (1392-1910) focused on the significance of stabilizing the regime, expanding foreign relations with the Ming empire, and minimizing security risks from Manchuria and Japan.⁴⁹ Realizing both Manchuria and Japan as potential security threats, the Choson strove to secure its relations with the Ming, which conversely suggested that the Choson played a role in deterring Manchuria and Japan. On the other hand, Pratt argues that the security situation did not come into a newly critical stage until imperialist states waged aggression wars, which influenced the development of the triangular relations among China, Korea and Japan.⁵⁰ Walker emphasizes that Japan signed a treaty with Korea in order to shift into a vivid player in Korean affairs, which conversely put an end to China's tributary system in Korea.⁵¹ It was Japan's rule in Korea that fundamentally changed the situation: Korea's subsequent recognition of the "pro-Japan approach" as a priority greatly increased Japan's leverage around northeast Asia, which indicated that Japan seized an opportunity to compete with China and Russia. Park concludes that Korea has been considered as such a character that China hardly ignores, which suggests that China should be cautious about

⁴⁷ Cumings, Bruce. (2005). Korea's place in the sun: a modern history. New York & London: *W. W. North*, 186-187.

⁴⁸ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p9. & Oberdorfer, Don. (2001). The Two Koreas: a contemporary history. *Basic Books*, p7.

⁴⁹ Seth, J. Michael. (2006). A concise history of Korea: from the neolithic period through the 19th century. *Rowman & Litterfield*, p136.

⁵⁰ Pratt, Keith. (2007). Everlasting flower: a history of Korea. *Reaktion Books*, p20.

⁵¹ Walker, L. Brett. (2015). A concise history of Japan. *Cambridge University Press*, 206-207.

Korea's changing attitudes and be serious about China's policy calculation.⁵² In brief, it turns into a nightmare to China that foreign states make use of the strategic Korean peninsula to contain China, which illustrates that China has been struggled for security conflicts around the Korean peninsula. Oberdorfer emphasizes that the United States has paid extensive attention to the Korean peninsula since the Korean War, which conversely means that the United States has considered its presence in Korea as an imperative.⁵³ Faced with significant changes around the thirty-eighth parallel, China's role in the Korean peninsula has not been so prominent as the ancient times: China must be precautious of its input and output in the context of great power politics.

⁵² Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p6.

⁵³ Oberdorfer, Don. (2001). The Two Koreas: a contemporary history. *Basic Books*, pxiii.

The literature on foreign policy approaches

In this section, I will use the theoretical framework of foreign policy approaches to explain factors that influenced China's changing policy towards South Korea from the 1960s to the 2010s. I will argue that China's policy towards South Korea is a combination of China's rational policy thinking on national interest maximization, the Chinese leadership's psychological perception of communism and Chinese elites' fierce competition in factional conflict. In other words, I will explain China's policy towards South Korea from three main foreign policy approaches, including rationalism, psychology and bureaucracy. I will also demonstrate an analytical framework that helps to explain China's foreign policy with the rationalist approach, Mao's philosophy with the psychological approach and the Chinese reformists' role with the bureaucratic approach. In detail, I will articulate China's national interest calculation that played a main role in China's changing policy towards South Korea, I will specify Mao's pursuit of 'pure' communism that contributed to China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea, and I will explore the influence of the Chinese pragmatists' success in the campaign against the Chinese radicals on China's changing attitude towards South Korea.

In the first section, I will present my understandings of foreign policy and foreign policy analysis. In the following three sections, I will analyze the literature on three foreign policy approaches of rationalism, psychology and bureaucracy. In other words, I will identify main differences among these three foreign policy approaches. In the fifth section, I will demonstrate reasons why I decide to consider the rationalist model as the main approach to analyze Chinese foreign policy. In the last two sections, I will specify reasons why I take approaches of psychology and bureaucracy into account. In my opinion, the rationalist approach is the most appropriate approach to analyze China's changing policy towards South Korea. In other words, I will illustrate advantages of the rationalist approach as well. Apart from the rationalist approach, I will explain why the psychological approach would be useful to analyze Mao's diplomatic policy towards South Korea. I will explain why the bureaucratic approach would be helpful to analyze the influence of the Chinese pragmatists on China's attitude towards South Korea in the Deng era.

China's economic development has influenced China's diplomatic approaches, which meant that China aimed to build reciprocal cooperation with the international society. Hou argues that China instead of Japan as the second globally largest economy is playing a crucial role in the international politics.⁵⁴ Since China has been more and more attractively significant, global practitioners, politicians and scholars have recognized China as a vital rising power. In the context of China's ascent, Larsen emphasizes that China's diplomatic thinking has successfully attracted profound attention by an emerging number of researchers,

⁵⁴ Hou, X. S. (2014). Dissecting China's rise: controversies over the China model. *China Perspectives*, 2014(2), 61-67.

policymakers and multi-national players throughout the whole globe.⁵⁵ For example, China put forward the 'Freeze for Freeze' proposal (“双暂停” 倡议 – shuangzanting changyi) for North Korea's nuclear weapon programme, which aimed to stabilize the high-tension situation over the Korean peninsula.⁵⁶ In other words, China has striven for a more peaceful environment since Deng Xiao-ping was determined to promote modernization programme with the “Opening and Reform Policy” and the “Independent Foreign Policy of Peace”.

China views its “Two-Koreas Policy” as a strategy to enhance the security alliance relationship with North Korea and to develop the commercial trading relations with South Korea, which suggests the complexity of China's policy towards the Korean peninsula. Jun and Kim argue that the Korean peninsula manages to be a vital part of China's policy considerations at home and abroad, and influences China's interests in diverse ways.⁵⁷ China on one hand considers North Korea's stability as a factor that influences China's persistence in survival interest, on the other hand, realizes its cooperation with South Korea as a part of China's pursuit for pragmatic approach. The area around the mutual border between China and Korea shares the greatest amount of cultural similarity and historical connection with China.⁵⁸ Viewed in this vein, the relationship between China and Korea was considered as close as lips and teeth. The stability in the Korean peninsula plays a significant role in China's territorial security.⁵⁹ In contrast, China and Korea have common security interest, which enables both sides to face mutual security vulnerability.

Both political leaders' priorities and security concern contributed to the explanation of China's foreign policy decision-making process in the Mao era. According to Park, the situations and changes at home and abroad

⁵⁵ Larsen, K. W. (2012). China's rise and the Two Koreas: politics, economics, security. *China Review International*, 19(1), 119-122.

⁵⁶ Daekwon, Son. (2017). What does North Korea think of China's 'dual freeze' proposal? Available from: <https://thedi diplomat.com/2017/07/what-does-north-korea-think-of-chinas-dual-freeze-proposal/> (Viewed on 21st, September 2019).

⁵⁷ Jun, Byoung-kon. & Kim, Jang-ho. (2013). China's role and perception of a united Korea. *Korean Journal of Defense Analysis: Korea Institute for Defense Analyses*, 25(3). 369-383.

⁵⁸ Jun, Byoung-kon. & Kim, Jang-ho. (2013). China's role and perception of a united Korea. *Korean Journal of Defense Analysis: Korea Institute for Defense Analyses*, 25(3), 369-383.

⁵⁹ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (A Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics.

have been combined to influence China's foreign policy, including Chinese political paramount leaders' preference and recognition of state interests.⁶⁰ On one hand, Kissinger argues that Mao Ze-dong's personal attitudes and recognition helped to explain Chinese foreign policy, which means an imperative to take Mao Ze-dong's influence on China's diplomatic activity into account.⁶¹ In detail, Mao's pursuit of 'pure' communism⁶² influenced China's foreign policy and China's policy towards South Korea. On the other hand, He argues that China considered strategies to decrease the United States' influence on China's survival as the primary mission after the establishment of the PRC (PRC - more commonly known as China).⁶³ In the context of the United States' military presence in South Korea, the most urgent task was to protect China from foreign aggression after the eruption of the Korean War. From the perspective of the security interest maximization, the rational actor approach thereby should be considered in the analysis of China's attitude towards its territorial crisis.

In the aftermath of Mao Ze-dong's death, the competition of "line struggles" ("路线斗争" – luxiandouzheng) between the Chinese reformists and the Chinese conservatives in the Chinese Communist Party influenced China's diplomatic and economic policies. Deng Xiao-ping, a representative of the Chinese pragmatists, came to power in 1978,⁶⁴ which contributed to China's secret trading connection with South Korea in the reforming era.⁶⁵ Garver and Ross argue that researchers tended to use the bureaucratic politics model and the superior intellectuals model to analyze China's foreign policy in the era of Deng Xiao-ping.⁶⁶ Zhang

⁶⁰ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (A Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics.

⁶¹ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. *Penguin Press*, p100.

⁶² Zhang, Qin-min. (2014). Towards an integrated theory of Chinese foreign policy: bringing leadership personality back in. *Journal of Contemporary China*, 23(89), 902-922, p908.

⁶³ He, Di. (1994). The most respected enemy: Mao Ze-dong's perception of the United States. *The China Quarterly*, 144-158.

⁶⁴ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (A Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p23.

⁶⁵ Yi, X. (1995). China's Korea policy: from 'One Korea' to 'Two Koreas'. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 22(2), 119-140, 123-124.

⁶⁶ Garver, John. (1982). China's decision for rapprochement with the United States, 1969-1971. Boulder, CO: *Westview Press*. & Ross, S. Robert. (1989). From Lin Biao to Deng Xiao-ping: elite instability and

emphasizes that Deng Xiao-ping instead of Mao's designated heir Hua Guo-feng became the supreme leader after the "Gang of Four" had been sent to jail, which meant that the Chinese reformists achieved a success in the factional struggle.⁶⁷ On an account of the continuing competition in the Chinese Communist Party, it is not realistic to continue using the psychological approach that mainly emphasizes Mao's personal impact on China's foreign policy. Apart from the rational actor approach, it is also appropriate to use the bureaucratic actor approach to analyze the influence of the political struggle on China's security concern, diplomatic strategy and economic policy in the Deng era.

China has been more and more concerned about China's economic increase since the reforming era, which means that the Chinese leadership does not recognize ideology as an urgency. In terms of China's diplomatic policy, Tow and Rigby argue that China has been a more dynamic and flexible power, and China has been more capable of increasing its leverage on regional and global affairs.⁶⁸ In other words, the Chinese government has been more and more boldly realistic in the pursuit of China's material interests since China has been realized as a rising power. The Chinese government on one hand has learnt how to fairly treat international organizations as an important representative instrument for security, on the other hand, has been increasingly willing to undertake responsibility and cooperate with overseas countries in regard to global security challenges.⁶⁹ In brief, China has not only considered its national interest maximization as the main goal, but also attempted to resolve regional and global issues in a more flexible way. Viewed in this aspect, the rational actor approach will continue to be used to analyze China's policy towards South Korea in the post-Cold War era.

China encountered with security crisis as long as the PRC declared its establishment in 1949, and China's serious security situation did not change until the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991. In detail, China's confrontation with the Soviet Union constituted China's gravest security concern in the Cold War period, and the United States' changing attitude towards China illustrated China's security policy calculation from the 1960s to the 2010s. As a consequence, the rational actor approach turns out to be the most prevailing

China's US policy. *China Quarterly*, 118: 265-299.

⁶⁷ Zhang, Qing-min. (2015). Evolving bureaucratic politics in Chinese foreign policy-making. *The Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, 27(4), 453-468.

⁶⁸ Tow, William. & Rigby, Richard. (2011). China's pragmatic security policy: the middle-power factor. *The China Journal*, (65), 157-78.

⁶⁹ Johnson, I. Alastair. & Evans, Paul. (1999). China and multilateral security institutions. London: Routledge. & Lampton, M. David. (2007). The faces of Chinese power. *Foreign Affairs*, 86 (1), 115-127.

approach to analyze China's policy towards South Korea in the Cold War period. On an account of the absolute leadership of Mao Ze-dong, the influence of Mao's persistence in communism on China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea will be taken into account. On the ground of the Chinese Communist Party elites' factional struggle, the rise of Deng Xiao-ping and other Chinese reformists in the aftermath of Mao Ze-dong's death helped to interpret China's South Korea policy as "Guanmen bushangsuo" (the door is closed, but not locked).⁷⁰ On a basis of the principle of national interest maximization, I will continue using rationality to analyze China's "Two-Koreas Policy" in the post-Deng era.

⁷⁰ Chu, Sung-po. (1986). Beijing's relations with South and North Korea in the 1980s, *Issues & Studies*, 25(3), 70-71.

Background

Foreign policy is a combination of states' national interests, political leaders' personal considerations, governmental officials' factional concerns, and so on. In contrast, foreign policy is not only used to maximize national interests via various interactions in the international setting, such as arms race and trade war, but also to expand foreign policy decision-makers' and participants' domain of power. In the international community, foreign policy shapes international relations as we see today. It is thereby important to investigate the foreign policy decision-making process and analyze the decisive factors that implement foreign policy. Alden and Aran argue that the majority of researchers have reached consensus on the dominance of the rational actor approach in the study of foreign policy analysis.⁷¹ However, some scholars put forward the idea that political leaders' conception and governmental officials' calculation play a role in the foreign policy decision-making process. On one hand, Harold and Margret Sprout emphasize the importance of political leaders' psychological environment and the limitation of political leaders' psychological effect on the foreign policy decision-making process.⁷² On the other hand, Allison explains foreign policy from the aspect of the interaction among bureaucrats and elites who play a role in domestic and foreign affairs.⁷³

In order to analyze Beijing's policy towards Seoul, it is necessary to search for an appropriate foreign policy approach. China and South Korea maintained a seriously hostile and antagonistic relationship from the end of Second World War to the end of Cold War. China carried out the "Leaning-to One Side Policy" and focused on its diplomatic ties with the Soviet Union-led communist states in the Mao era. The Sino-South Korean bilateral relations did not change until Deng Xiao-ping came to power in 1978. Deng Xiao-ping who was a typical Chinese pragmatic reformist put forward the "Four Modernization Programme", which laid a basis for China's economic open-up to the global market. Deng Xiao-ping strategically adjusted Mao's foreign policy approach, which meant that China was determined to change its diplomatic dilemma. In brief, China on one hand downplayed the role of ideology and establish formal relations with the United States-led western advanced states, on the other hand, developed flexible diplomacy with surrounding countries. In the meantime, South Korea established secret trading connection with China in the early 1980s, and the South Korean government was determined to adopt "the Northern Policy". China's and South Korea's policy correction greatly eased the strained bilateral relationship, which contributed to regional peace and stability

⁷¹ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: *Routledge*.

⁷² Sprout, Harold. & Sprout, Margaret. (1956). Man-Milieu relationship hypotheses in the context of international politics. Princeton, NJ: *Princeton University Press*.

⁷³ Allison, Graham. T. (1969). Conceptual models and the Cuban missile crisis. *American Political Science Review*, 63(3), 689-718.

in northeast Asia.

In the 1980s, both Chinese and South Korean political leaders realized that a tense Sino-South Korean mutual ties would damage regional development, which meant that the Chinese government considered friendly diplomacy as a necessity.⁷⁴ The Chinese government has been specially concerned with the goals of security, stability, peace and development since Deng Xiao-ping aimed to accomplish social modernization and accelerate economic reform. Especially, the world has been into a multi-polar structure from a bipolar one. The implosion of the Soviet Union greatly eased tension in northeast Asia, and decreased hostility between the Northern Triangle that comprised the Soviet Union, North Korea and China and the Southern Triangle that included the United States, South Korea and Japan. The demise of the Soviet Union on one hand decreased China's security threat, on the other hand, enabled China to pay lesser attention to North Korea's leverage. With the two pills of friendly diplomacy and economic cooperation, both China and South Korea reached formal diplomatic relationship in 1992.

However, security on the Korean peninsula influences six countries' national interests at least. Due to the strategic location of the Korean peninsula, China views Korea as a combination of 'buffer zone' and 'invasion corridor'. In other words, stability or not in the Korean peninsula could act as such a key factor that has influenced China's security calculation since the ancient times. China was involved in several wars in Korea with three superpowers from the 1890s to the 1950s: Russia, Japan and the United States. Both Moscow and Washington have played an active role in the Korean peninsula since the end of the Second World War, attempting to expand each other's presence in northeast Asia. In contrast, Beijing's changing approach towards Seoul did not simply have an influence on surrounding countries in northeast Asia, but also on these main superpowers in the world. It is necessary to take giant powers' security concern on the Korean peninsula into account. Therefore, I will combine both internal and external factors to analyze China's policy towards South Korea.

⁷⁴ Chen, Qi-miao. (1993). New approaches in China's foreign policy: the post-Cold War era. *Asian Surveys*, 33 (3), 237-251, p240. & Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (A Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics.

Foreign policy

Foreign policy represents the will of the state, and foreign policy consists of strategies, purposes, methods and so on. On one hand, foreign policy is the strategically purposeful way that every state strives to maximize national interests.⁷⁵ In other words, foreign policy means tactics that governments use to realize purposes through discussions with political elites, which means that every political leader should carefully estimate every foreign policy. On the other hand, foreign policy is similar to such an area that states mean to develop connection and implement influence at home and abroad.⁷⁶ Foreign policy equalizes national strategy that political leaders come up with, whereas, it is unlikely that political leaders only combine national strategy with the domestic situation.⁷⁷ It is hard to ignore that foreign policy is shaped by internal as well as external factors. Therefore, foreign policy is the practical strategy that realizes states' will and guides international relations in the international arena. Similarly, China's policy towards South Korea does not only stand for the Chinese government's diplomatic thinking, but also for its consideration as well as evaluation of national interests. In detail, China strategically shifted its hostile approach towards South Korea in order to further build a peaceful environment for its "Opening and Reform" policy that catered to its security stability and economic growth.

As already noted, foreign policy can be commonly seen as states' relations with overseas areas.⁷⁸ The field does not only mean a simple guidance for foreign affairs, but also a significant strategy in relation to national security concern.⁷⁹ Foreign policy represents principles that serve diplomatic relationship development and measures that cater to national interest maximization. In contrast, an appropriate foreign policy makes a contribution to national interests, such as economic growth and national security. For instance, under Park Chung-hee's leadership, the South Korean former President, South Korea's economy developed at a

⁷⁵ Smith, Steve. & Hadley, Amelia. & Dunne, Tim. (2008). Foreign policy: theories, actors, cases. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

⁷⁶ Wallace, W. (1971). Foreign policy and the political process. London: Macmillan.

⁷⁷ Clarke, Michael. & White, Brian. (1989). Understanding foreign policy: the foreign policy systems approach. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

⁷⁸ Clarke, Michael. & White, Brian. (1989). Understanding foreign policy: the foreign policy systems approach. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

⁷⁹ Clarke, Michael. & White, Brian. (1989). Understanding foreign policy: the foreign policy systems approach. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

considerably fast speed in the wake of the restoration of the South Korea-Japan diplomatic relations.⁸⁰ It is reasonable to believe that these nations aim to decrease the possibilities of being involved in military tensions through a friendly diplomacy. In brief, a correct foreign policy would be seen as an effective pill to enhance national interests or to discourage nations from confrontations. As a consequence, every political leader has a responsibility to carefully calculate its impacts and to strategically minimize its negative ones, which means that every decision-maker should correctly take internal and external factors into account.

Foreign policy does not only mean states' will to maximize national interests, but also indicate the importance of political makers' role in the foreign policy decision-making process. Foreign policy represents a variety of strategies that include the relations with the outer world.⁸¹ Foreign policy on one hand contributes to peace and stability, on the other hand, leads to conflict and dispute, which significantly shapes regional politics as well as international relations. Weinstein argues that the significance of what consists of foreign policy is not shaped by major leading powers, but rather it associates with government officials' calculation of certain key interests.⁸² Foreign policy, thereby, can be considered as a combination of states' will and practitioners' attitudes towards national interests. For one, Kim Il-Sung who was a dictator as well as god-like figure insisted on the "anti-imperialism" policy.⁸³ In this regard, the Kim Il-Sung regime (1948-1994) strengthened relations with its military allies in the context of the United States' military presence in the south of the thirty-eighth parallel, such as the Soviet Union and China. North Korea's preference for communism prolonged the competition between the North Triangle of the Soviet Union, China and North Korea and the South Triangle of the United States, Japan and South Korea.

In case of unfavourable situations, every state has a responsibility to estimate a series of calculations in accordance with every foreign policy. Plenty of government officials and professional scholars on one hand devote themselves to foreign policy in order to get rid of possible crisis, on the other hand, every government should deeply recognize the difficulty of separating following consequences from a foreign policy.⁸⁴ In other

⁸⁰ Kim, Byung-kook. & Vogel, F. Ezra. (2013). The Park Chung-hee era: the transformation of South Korea. Harvard University Press, p452.

⁸¹ Frankel, J. (1963). The making of foreign policy. London: Oxford University Press.

⁸² Weinstein, F. B. (1972). The uses of foreign policy of Indonesia: an approach to the analysis of foreign policy in the less developed countries. *World Politics*, 24(3), 356-381.

⁸³ Smith, Hazel. (2015). North Korea: markets and military rule. Cambridge University Press, p90.

⁸⁴ Althaus, C. (2008). Calculating political risk. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.

words, foreign policy has been recognized as a problem-resolving means to cope with national issues, which would contribute to social stability and development in some ways. However, foreign policy can be a trouble-maker that would lead to national crisis, including social instability, economic depression, diplomatic tension and so on. For example, it is likely that foreign policy decision-makers would have difficulties in coping with problems in the context of incorrect strategies, including misguided military operations, misled diplomatic protocol, and miscalculated economic treaties and so forth.⁸⁵ It is therefore common to see that every foreign policy decision-making process consists of ways to manage emerging risks. Viewed in this vein, every vulnerable government has to pay the price when decision-makers could not come up with solutions to incorrect foreign policy.

It is necessary for every policymaker to come up with optimal foreign policy that serves to national interest maximization as much as possible. For example, South Korea decided to take a more reconciliatory approach – the “Northern Policy” in order to decrease tensions with the two leading communist states that included the Soviet Union and China.⁸⁶ It is important for political elites to debate with each other and absorb each other’s viewpoints in order to minimize these possible devastating consequences. In the meantime, foreign policy does not only stand for national interests, but also one specific faction’s interests or demands. For one, Deng Xiao-ping, the representative pragmatist figure in the aftermath the political struggle with the “Gang of Four”, was determined to carry out the “Opening and Reform” policy in order to protect China from longer economic depression.⁸⁷ Viewed in this vein, policymakers need to analyze foreign policy decisions in a critical way in order to ensure these policies are designed to conform to the principle of national interest maximization. In contrast, interactions between states in the international community originate from each other’s foreign policy, and the analysis of foreign policy contributes to the understanding of international relations.

⁸⁵ McConnell, Allan. (2016). A public policy approach to understanding the nature and causes of foreign policy failure. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23(5), 667-684.

⁸⁶ An, Bing-jun. & Hui, Shu. (1993). Beifang zhengce he nanbeihan guanxi [On the “Northern Policy” and the relationship between the two states on the Korean peninsula]. *Guoji zhengzhi yanjiu (The Journal of International Studies)*, (1), 90-97, p91.

⁸⁷ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. Penguin Press, p327. & Kraus, Curt. Richard. (2012). The Cultural Revolution: a very short introduction. Oxford University Press, p101.

Foreign policy analysis

Foreign policy analysis is the field of explanation about relations among a variety of international actors.⁸⁸ Foreign policy analysis is the study of global politics that intends to analyze states' strategy or performance, related to the analytical groundwork for an understanding of foreign policy decision-making participant's behaviour in individual or in organizational activity.⁸⁹ Namely, foreign policy analysis is an interpretation of how practitioners decide a policy, which has been the fundamental aspect of the foreign policy essence.⁹⁰ In terms of foreign policy analysis, emphasizing these foreign policy decision-makers' effects is insufficient, it is equally essential to identify a wide-range of factors that have an influence on foreign policy.⁹¹ Viewed in this vein, foreign policy analysis provides description as well as explanation of governments' strategies made to achieve certain national goals, who plays an important role in the foreign policy decision-making process and how these strategies are affected by various reasons at home and abroad. In this thesis, I will make use of foreign policy analysis to explain factors that contributed to the deteriorated Sino-South Korean relationship in the late Mao era. I will work out reasons why Deng Xiao-ping still insisted on the "One-Korea Policy", even though South Korea developed secret trading connection with China in the 1980s. I will search out reasons why China was determined to adopt the "Two-Koreas Policy" in the post-Cold War period.

Foreign policy analysis, as the section of International Politics that much associates with the authorities, and the discovery from the professional can be viewed as a part of the government's thinking.⁹² In one sense, these experts who have a full understanding of history and engage in foreign policy analysis, have investigated reasons why the authority of the state has carried out these policies.⁹³ The description of foreign

⁸⁸ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: *Routledge*.

⁸⁹ Smith, Steve. & Hadley, Amelia. & Dunne, Tim. (2008). Foreign policy: theories, actors, cases. Oxford: *Oxford University Press*.

⁹⁰ Clarke, Michael. & White, Brian. (1989). Understanding foreign policy: the foreign policy systems approach. Cheltenham: *Edward Elgar*.

⁹¹ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: *Routledge*.

⁹² Clarke, Michael. & White, Brian. (1989). Understanding foreign policy: the foreign policy systems approach. Cheltenham: *Edward Elgar*.

⁹³ Hudson, M. Valerie. (2007). Foreign policy analysis: classic and contemporary theory. Lanham: *Rowman & Littlefield*.

policy analysis aims to investigate why states and decision-makers behave in accordance with certain foreign policy decisions.⁹⁴ The central part of foreign policy analysis is a critical and analytical decision-making process, decision-makers, motivations and circumstances that influence foreign policy and the consequences of these policies.⁹⁵ Historians, scholars, political philosophers and practitioners always long for concrete as well as critical analysis of governmental activities and achievements in the international arena. In addition, they seek causes why the government decides to carry out certain sorts of foreign policies. On an account of the significance of political leaders, I will articulate Chinese political leaders' attitudes towards South Korea at different times. In detail, I will specify reasons for Mao Ze-dong's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea. I will identify why Deng Xiao-ping did not establish a formal diplomatic relationship with South Korea, even though the Chinese government paid attention to the increasing trading volume with South Korea. Meanwhile, I will demonstrate reasons why China's policymakers decided to change from the "One-Korea Policy" to the "Two-Koreas Policy" in the post-Cold War period.

Foreign policy analysis has traditionally taken the government and these individual practitioners into account, which has been considered as the vital aspects of global politics.⁹⁶ However, globalization enables non-state actors to play an important role as well, which means that globalization has influenced international relations.⁹⁷ In terms of foreign policy explanation, it has been a necessity to highlight the importance to decompose the government's role into different segments and pay attention to these determining factors in the foreign policy decision-making process.⁹⁸ In other words, it is important for people who undertake foreign policy analysis to admit the complexity of the foreign policy decision-making process, especially, it is not rare to see that decision-makers under-estimate the effects of various actors, such as governmental organizations and non-governmental organizations.⁹⁹ In brief, it is not sufficient to explain foreign policy

⁹⁴ Hudson, M. Valerie. (2007). Foreign policy analysis: classic and contemporary theory. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

⁹⁵ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: Routledge.

⁹⁶ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: Routledge.

⁹⁷ Baumann, Rainer. & Stengel. A. Frank (2014). Foreign policy analysis, globalization and non-state actors: state-centric after all?. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 17(4), 489-521.

⁹⁸ Snyder, Richard. C. & H. W. Bruck. & Burton, Sapin. (1954). Decision-making as an approach to the study of international politics. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

⁹⁹ Baumann, Rainer. & Stengel. A. Frank (2014). Foreign policy analysis, globalization and non-state actors: state-centric after all?. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 17(4), 489-521.

from only one perspective. As a result, insights from various aspects will be a practically effective contributor to understanding foreign policy decision-making analysis. With the development of globalization, non-state actors have been more and more meaningful in the foreign policy decision-making process. South Korean non-state contact with Beijing played a role in the process of the final bilateral relationship normalization in 1992. For example, China sought for foreign investment in order to prepare for the 1990 Asian Games, which enabled Beijing to contact with Seoul's governmental officials as well as non-governmental entrepreneurs.¹⁰⁰ It did not only ease military tension between China and South Korea, but also sustain regional peace in northeast Asia. Viewed in this vein, it built a bridge between China's "Two-Koreas Policy" and South Korea's "Northern Policy".

In reality, both the individual decision-maker and the decision-making organization play a vital role in the foreign policy decision-making process. The understanding of factors that influence policy-making participants' consideration constitutes the key point in the study of foreign policy analysis. In contrast, it is not meaningful to adopt a policy with a lack of specific investigation of decision-makers' calculation over foreign policy outcomes, such as potential gains and losses. Thereby, a number of decision-makers take rationality into account in the foreign policy decision-making process. In the arena of international politics, the competition among states originates from the interaction between the decision-maker and the individual policy choice. Some scholars pay attention to the key decision-maker's significance, and they believe that some foreign policy decisions should be explained with an analysis of the psychological environment's effect. Apart from the paramount leader, more and more relevant group members participate in the foreign policy decision-making process in order to find out the optimal policy. In the following section, I will present literature on three main foreign policy approaches that will be used to explain China's changing policy towards South Korea from 1961 to 2017.

¹⁰⁰ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics.

The rational approach

In the Cold War period, the competition between the Capitalist Camp and the Communist Camp shaped the pattern of the world, from military arms build-up to economic friction escalation. Especially, the United States-led Capitalist Camp and the Soviet Union-led Communist Camp devoted sources to nuclear programmes. In the background of the Soviet-United States confrontation, the escalation of military expansion became increasingly obvious in northeast Asia. For example, the eruption of the Korean War in the Korean peninsula was considered as a critical event that deeply influenced the relations between the United States-led Capitalist Camp and the Soviet Union-led Communist Camp. The two leading states attempted to enhance each other's presence by participating in the Korean War, which meant the existence of the rationality was taken into account. The two competing camps strove for a number of interest protection, including security, sovereignty, and material interests. With the comparison between gains and losses, the decision-making process focused on objective-orientation in the context of the contradiction between two camps. Thereby, the section will discuss in detail China's calculation of national interests and its effects on China's policy towards South Korea.

The idea of rationality shares a historically significant status in the field of international relations. According to Hill, it is hard to under-estimate the significance of the rational actor, as the majority of academics have recognized rationality as the most representative factor in both individual and organizational decision-making processes.¹⁰¹ On one hand, Alden and Aran argue that rationality has played the most leading role in the realm of global politics, and its application has been accepted as the most dominant approach that contributes to comprehending global affairs.¹⁰² In other words, it is a necessity to take the rational actor into account in the majority of the foreign policy decision-making process: the rational actor has been a decisive actor, which could build abundant understanding in the area of foreign policy analysis. On the other hand, Hill argues that rationality stands for one of the most typically challenging difficulties in the domain of social science, and it significantly helps to understand contemporary international politics in the last century.¹⁰³ In contrast, it is difficult to ignore the rational actor's role in the arena of international politics, which means that the idea of rationality has been largely mentioned and utilized in the process of foreign policy analysis.

In the first place, a foreign policy decision does not stand for decision-makers' personal will, which means that the foreign policy decision-making process is based on state will. According to Smith, Hadley and Dunne,

¹⁰¹ Hill, Christopher. (2003). The changing politics of foreign policy. Basingstoke: *Palgrave Macmillan*.

¹⁰² Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: *Routledge*.

¹⁰³ Hill, Christopher. (2003). The changing politics of foreign policy. Basingstoke: *Palgrave Macmillan*.

rationality in the decision-making process associates with what choice ought to be made.¹⁰⁴ On one hand, choices should be decided in accordance with a series of critical analyses in a rational decision-making process.¹⁰⁵ Viewed in this vein, foreign policy decision-makers have a responsibility to calculate every possible decision that influences national interests, such as gains and losses. On the other hand, rational decision-makers should have various accesses to the latest knowledge as much as possible, and they should endeavour to amend as well as evaluate every latest information that includes important decision calculations.¹⁰⁶ It is common to see that foreign policy decision-makers pay attention to newly reliable and valuable information that would shape the decision-making process. In contrast, foreign policy decision-makers who have an access to comparatively comprehensive information would serve national development.

Foreign policy decision-makers have struggles about what they ought to do and what they want to do, which suggests the complexity in the decision-making process. According to Clarke and White, there have been some risks that the aspect of a 'rational actor approach' enables to get involved with the idea of rationalism, since people have difficulty in separating the meaning of 'rationality' from accuracy all the time.¹⁰⁷ On one hand, Smith, Hadley and Dunne argue that policy-makers have a responsibility to make decisions in a critically precise way: they should not only be capable of justifying and accepting the latest information, but also have an idea of how to react to controversy.¹⁰⁸ On the other hand, Harbert argues that foreign policy decision-makers, therefore, behave rationally and sensibly under restrictions placed on choices.¹⁰⁹ However, Frankel argues that rationality is such an unclear concept within the case: it is a more appropriate

¹⁰⁴ Smith, Steve. & Hadley, Amelia. & Dunne, Tim. (2008). Foreign policy: theories, actors, cases. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

¹⁰⁵ Smith, Steve. & Hadley, Amelia. & Dunne, Tim. (2008). Foreign policy: theories, actors, cases. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

¹⁰⁶ Smith, Steve. & Hadley, Amelia. & Dunne, Tim. (2008). Foreign policy: theories, actors, cases. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

¹⁰⁷ Clarke, Michael. & White, Brian. (1989). Understanding foreign policy: the foreign policy systems approach. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

¹⁰⁸ Smith, Steve. & Hadley, Amelia. & Dunne, Tim. (2008). Foreign policy: theories, actors, cases. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

¹⁰⁹ Herbert, Simon. Cited in Hill, Christopher. (1981). Public opinion and British foreign policy. *Millennium*, 15(4), 33-59.

understanding that rationality is simply seen as a critical and logical policy-making element.¹¹⁰ Viewed in this vein, it is common to recognize the reality that foreign policy decision-makers should keep rationality in mind, rather than individual wills.

In the second place, the rational actor model shares connection with realism, and it is difficult to ignore the role of Realism that heavily combines with the idea of rationality. On one hand, Alden and Aran argue that the bases of foreign policy analysis associate with its responses to the prevailing role of realism and its description of the country and its influence on other countries via foreign diplomacy or international organizations, such as the United Nations and the World Trade Organization, and realism's insufficient capability to contribute to sensible as well as valuable analyses of foreign policy consequences.¹¹¹ On the other hand, Hill argues that the world-wide famous 'rationalism' in the domain of international relations has been considered to be the most predominant choice with regard to understanding of contemporary global affairs.¹¹² Viewed in this vein, realism that has been seen as a dominant theoretical component that influences the development of international relations.

In terms of the importance of national interests in realism, Hill (2003, p98) emphasizes that

“Realism privileges national security as the criterion for state decision-makers, whereas the ‘rational actor’ refers principally to the idea of the state as unitary decision-maker – what kinds of criteria the unitary actor employs in foreign policy are left open”.¹¹³

In this context, national interest is a key element in the traditional realist theory. It is clear to see that national interest should be estimated carefully and rationally with a logical calculation of states' own situation as well as states' unfavourable options.¹¹⁴ In contrast, it is necessary to take confrontations that states encounter into account. In brief, calculations of national interests require a complete estimate of factors that influence national interests. Morgenthau argues that national interests thereby share similar senses with power, both

¹¹⁰ Frankel, J. (1963). The making of foreign policy. London: *Oxford University Press*.

¹¹¹ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: *Routledge*.

¹¹² Hill, Christopher. (2003). The changing politics of foreign policy. Basingstoke: *Palgrave Macmillan*.

¹¹³ Hill, Christopher. (2003). The changing politics of foreign policy. Basingstoke: *Palgrave Macmillan*, p 98.

¹¹⁴ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: *Routledge*.

national interest and power can be recognized as the most important goals of foreign policy and the most appropriate means with effectiveness to realize national goals.¹¹⁵ In other words, foreign policy decision-makers must have a capability to completely fulfil national goals with the least cost.

Realists think pessimistically about the development of 'power politics', which means that policymakers should aim to expand 'power' as much as they can. According to Donnelly, *realpolitik*, the doctrine of political realism, has been considered as the most representative philosophy in the realm of international relations.¹¹⁶ On one hand, Jackson and Sorensen realize that the pursuit of power among nations has been the most significant part of political affairs, which conversely contributes to the nature of power politics – the perpetual struggle for power.¹¹⁷ In other words, states that aim at the realization of survival must devote themselves to a competition for power in the international arena, which means that power should be considered as the most indispensable component in the explanation of international politics. On the other hand, Morgenthau argues that realists subordinate conventional morality for the sake of power, which suggests a specific idea of sharp distinctions between political ethics and private ethics.¹¹⁸ Machiavelli emphasizes that rulers should react with a combination of lion and fox in order to protect themselves from potential risks.¹¹⁹ Realists argue that moral perceptions should be necessarily sacrificed for power in the world of *realpolitik*, which helps to explain why realists explicitly distinguish political principles from moral premises in terms of the complex power struggle in international politics.

Realists believe that the struggle for power gives rise to a confrontation, which entails a typically 'aggressive' attitude towards relations among nations. According to Waltz, the three elements of capacity, combat and conciliation contribute to the understanding of international politics.¹²⁰ Jackson and Sorensen emphasize that

¹¹⁵ Morgenthau, J. Hans. (1948). Politics among nations: the struggle for power and peace. New York: *Knopf*.

¹¹⁶ Donnelly, Jack. (2013). Realism. (Available from the book: *Theories of international relations*, fifth edition). *Palgrave Macmillan*, p32.

¹¹⁷ Jackson, Robert. & Sorensen, Georg. (2016). Introduction to international relations: theories and approaches, sixth edition. *Oxford University Press*, p62.

¹¹⁸ Morgenthau, J. Hans. (2018). Politics among nations: the struggle for power and peace, sixth edition. *Kalyani*, p13.

¹¹⁹ Machiavelli, Niccolo. (2019). The prince, second edition. *Cambridge University Press*, p60.

¹²⁰ Waltz, N. Kenneth. (2010). Theory of international politics, reissued edition. *Waveland Press, INC.*, p113.

states' endeavour to obtain and expand power aims not only to assert a comparative superiority, but also to prevent an absolute decline in state power.¹²¹ States compete for power in order not to be at the mercy of others that may or may not choose to be 'hostile', which creates a strong sense of fear in the world of realpolitik. Mearsheimer argues that realists hardly reach consensus on the perspective of durable and eternal peace, which suggests that states inevitably tend to be involved in conflicts and contests.¹²² In other words, the international situation fluctuates with the struggle for power among nations, which means that animosity and instability on the planet seldom disappear. Pashakhanlou maintains that states may take a series of defensive as well as offensive measures against perceived threats and risks in order to ensure security and enhance interests.¹²³

Realists suppose that enduring peace hardly sustain and exist among states, which indicates the security dilemma that frustrates policymakers. According to Jackson and Sorensen, sovereign states have difficulty in eradicating the international state of nature, which poses a threat to security and stability in the international community.¹²⁴ Mearsheimer argues that realists pay attention to leading states that play a significant role in the development of global affairs, which imposes an incentive to confrontational struggles among these powers as well.¹²⁵ In brief, realists do not only emphasize the will to power for the sake of self-protection, but also show how the pursuit of power militates against the achievement of peace. Hobbes supposes that states that are encouraged to compete always interact in a provocative manner, which results in the state of war.¹²⁶ Hobbes concludes that anarchy provides states with a stimulus to self-interested

¹²¹ Jackson, Robert. & Sorensen, Georg. (2016). Introduction to international relations: theories and approaches, sixth edition. *Oxford University Press*, 68-69.

¹²² Mearsheimer, J. John. (2014). The tragedy of great power politics, updated edition. *W. W. Norton*, p17.

¹²³ Pashakhanlou, Heydarian. Arash. (2017). Realism and fear in international relations – Morgenthau, Waltz and Mearsheimer reconsidered. *Palgrave Macmillan*, p11.

¹²⁴ Jackson, Robert. & Sorensen, Georg. (2016). Introduction to international relations: theories and approaches, sixth edition. *Oxford University Press*, p68.

¹²⁵ Mearsheimer, J. John. (2014). The tragedy of great power politics, updated edition. *W. W. Norton*, p17.

¹²⁶ Donnelly, Jack. (2013). Realism. (Available from the book: Theories of international relations, fifth edition). *Palgrave Macmillan*, 34-35. & Hobbes, Thomas. (1996). Leviathan, revised student edition. *Cambridge University Press*, 88-89.

struggles in the state of nature, which contributes to the logic of conflict.¹²⁷ Competition for power makes states hardly immune to security disputes, which contributes to the explanation of why states should fully prepare for the ever present danger of conflict. In addition, Waltz argues that the state of war increases the possibility of the use of military weapons.¹²⁸ In other words, there is always an urgent need for states to take precautionary measures so that they are always prepared for inevitable security challenges.

Realists advocate that policymakers should take the responsibility to guarantee security by every possible means. The inherent essence of states' foreign policy is national interest maximization. According to Kissinger, Jackson and Sorensen, foreign policy should take interest-driven calculations into account, which helps explain the principal element of realpolitik – every state considers ways to preserve as well as promote national interests as a priority.¹²⁹ Morgenthau argues that states can gain power (national interest) through diplomacy.¹³⁰ International peace is difficult because of the enduring reality of the existence of self-interested, competitive sovereign states,¹³¹ diplomacy can be seen as an apparatus that contributes to the realization of enhancing interest. On one hand, Waltz suggests states undertake the responsibility to come up with these solutions that could neither diminish power nor decrease interest, which conversely indicates that interest preservation and security protection are the criteria for states' policy.¹³² On the other hand, Mearsheimer emphasizes the significance of the changing world order in which leading states attempt to extend influence in the context of a series of rational input and output calculation.¹³³ In contrast, states that consider interest

¹²⁷ Donnelly, Jack. (2000). Realism and international relations. Cambridge University Press, p14. & Hobbes, Thomas. (1996). Leviathan, revised student edition. Cambridge University Press, p89.

¹²⁸ Waltz, N. Kenneth. (2010). Theory of international politics, reissued edition. Waveland Press, INC., p102.

¹²⁹ Kissinger, Henry. (1994). Diplomacy. Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, p137. & Jackson, Robert. & Sorensen, Georg. (2016). Introduction to international relations: theories and approaches, sixth edition. Oxford University Press, 62-63.

¹³⁰ Morgenthau, J. Hans. (2018). Politics among nations: the struggle for power and peace, sixth edition. Kalyani, p563.

¹³¹ Morgenthau, J. Hans. (2018). Politics among nations: the struggle for power and peace, sixth edition. Kalyani, p563.

¹³² Waltz, N. Kenneth. (2010). Theory of international politics, reissued edition. Waveland Press, INC., p117.

¹³³ Mearsheimer, J. John. (2014). The tragedy of great power politics, updated edition. W. W. Norton, p21.

and power as the main goal aim to have a capability to expand as great powers in the international arena, which confirms the central Realist understanding that states must maximize interests in the wake of states' anxiety about security.

Therefore, it is primarily essential for foreign policy decision-makers to preserve sovereignty as well as territorial integrity and to maximize their wealth of the same in various ways, which has a profoundly complex influence on global affairs under the principle of national interest maximization. Some rationalist scholars have ensured that national interest calculation in accordance with the pursuit of security and economic interest expansion is the inevitable necessity in the foreign policy decision-making process.¹³⁴ In this regard, the rational approach emphasizes the relations between the importance of security and material interests maximization and foreign policy. However, fierce contentions among states have an impact on security and economic interest calculation, placing restrictions on cooperation with each other and leading states to carry out such policies that would damage other states' profits.¹³⁵ In spite of cooperation, it is essential for foreign policy decision-makers to make an overall estimate about competing countries' interests. In this setting, the preservation of national interests has been the most significant intention, which greatly influences the outcome of every foreign policy. In some cases, the principle of national interest maximization would have detrimental effects on the diplomatic relations development if other countries must pay a price for a foreign policy.

In the third place, the domestic environment has been integrated into the description of the rational foreign policy decision-making process. On one hand, it is common to see that rationalists who engage in foreign policy analysis recognize that national limitations and the differences between the fundamental administrative philosophy of the national and international systems have a vital effect on foreign policy decisions.¹³⁶ In brief, the foreign policy decision-making process is full of complexity that decision-makers must consider a variety of powerful forces at home and abroad. On the other hand, the determining factor provides an indication of different foreign policy decisions and consequences that seem to have contradictions with rationalist explanation of foreign policy.¹³⁷ Tarar emphasizes that these national pressures are commonly accepted as an influential component in the decision-making process, which would

¹³⁴ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: Routledge.

¹³⁵ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: Routledge.

¹³⁶ Katzenstein, Peter. (1976). International relations and domestic structures: foreign economic policies of advanced industrial states. *International Organizations*, 30(1), 1-45.

¹³⁷ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: Routledge.

be exploited by political elites to make compromises with their counterparts.¹³⁸ In other words, the attention to the domestic environment would be more frequently utilized in the decision-making process. Viewed in this vein, the domestic environment provides foreign policy analysis with a more concrete description, which helps to build broader understanding of the rational actor approach in global politics.

Although foreign policy analysis has been complicated for various factors, scholars could have difficulty in making a full explanation with a lack of powerful and reliable information. In terms of the rational actor approach, it is common to see that there have been some noticeable comments and critiques.¹³⁹ In other words, the rational actor approach has contributed some disadvantages to the development of realist hypotheses.¹⁴⁰ For example, Alden and Aran argue that some rationalists who take part in the foreign policy decision-making process would be criticized as the one who could not properly apprehend the development of the factual decision-making process, such as limitations and restrictions placed on the decision-making process, which would result in inaccurate suspicions.¹⁴¹ Viewed in this aspect, the most obvious weakness of the rationalist approach relates with the use of ambiguity and the existence of inexplicability in foreign policy decision-making analysis. It is therefore essential for political leaders to frequently update and analyze estimates of information.

¹³⁸ Tarar, Ahmer. (2001). International bargaining with two-sided domestic constraints. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 45(3), 320-340.

¹³⁹ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: Routledge.

¹⁴⁰ Richard, Synder. & H. W. Bruck & Burton, Spain. (1962). Foreign policy decision making: an approach to the study of international politics. New York: Macmillan. & Harold, Sprout. & Margaret, Sprout. (1956). Man-milieu relationship hypotheses in the context of international politics. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

¹⁴¹ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: Routledge.

The psychological approach

According to Alden and Aran, foreign policy is the outcome of human beings' thoughts and reaction: it is the individual political leader who makes the final decision and takes the critical action in the aftermath of assessment and comparison of all possible accessible information.¹⁴² In the Cold War period, certain key Chinese political figures imposed influence on Chinese foreign policy, such as Mao Ze-dong and Deng Xiao-ping. However, it has been a critically evident example of how China changed respectively in the eras of Mao and Deng. Although Mao Ze-dong and Deng Xiao-ping insisted on socialism, Mao's perception of socialism was not totally equal to Deng's, especially in terms of ways that they choose to realize socialism. In the context of Mao's persistence in 'pure' communism, China adopted the most aggressive approach towards South Korea, which further enhanced instability in the Korean peninsula. In the background of Deng's dynamic socialism, China secretly established trading connection with South Korea, which contributed to China's "Two-Koreas Policy" in the post-Cold War era. Thereby, it is meaningful to trace the detailed explanation of the first paramount political leader's psychological thinking after the establishment of the PRC, which will help to articulate how these perceptions influenced China's approach towards South Korea.

Foreign policy is a complicated product that involves individuals as well as groups in comments on diplomatic activities, which means that these political elites are an apparatus in the decision-making process. According to Clarke and White, foreign policy analysis researchers have emphasized the role of policy makers' perception in the decision-making process, its influences on the important subject of adopting foreign policy and its consequences on the drawing and deciding of foreign policy choices.¹⁴³ On one hand, the second aspect of the foreign policy application system tends to be the use of the perception that explains political leaders' physiological effects.¹⁴⁴ In other words, the psychological approach pays attention to political leaders' behaviours and thoughts that have an impact on foreign policy decision-making analysis. On the other hand, the psychological approach guides to a new aspect of decision-making analysis that enables to comprehend political elites' psychological effects on foreign policy decisions.¹⁴⁵ In contrast, foreign policy should be also recognized as a combination of decision-makers' psychological thinking, which

¹⁴² Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: Routledge.

¹⁴³ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: Routledge.

¹⁴⁴ Clarke, Michael. & White, Brian. (1989). Understanding foreign policy: the foreign policy systems approach. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

¹⁴⁵ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: Routledge.

helps to explain the decision-making process.

The psychological model that highlights the understanding of influential political figures' role has been considered to be the cognitive revolution in foreign policy analysis, contributing to analysis of political elites' thinking on international politics. Although it is not the main aim, Smith, Hadley and Dunne argue that the ignorance of decision-makers' psychological effect can be extensively seen as a critical critique on the rational actor approach.¹⁴⁶ It is impossible that foreign policy decision-makers are full of logic and rationality in abiding by the rationalist's predominant principle that maximizes national interests.¹⁴⁷ In other words, decision-makers' psychological thinking play a crucial role in the decision-making process, even though political figures mean to realize goals and reap benefits as much as possible. Hill emphasizes that a main constraint on the rational actor, in spite of one that can hardly ignore historical background and social situation, is these political leaders' psychological effects in the decision-making process.¹⁴⁸ Viewed in this vein, different leaders make different decisions and adopt different policies in response to the same diplomatic issue, which helps to explain why the psychological approach has exerted restriction on the rational approach.

The conception that action as well as attitude partly rest on cognition has included and absorbed in the field of foreign policy since the 1950s.¹⁴⁹ For example, Clarke and White (1989, p136) indicate that,

“one of the earliest formulations was Sprout and Sprout's well-known distinction between the the psychological and operational environments of the decision-maker, were: ‘what matters in the process of policy-making is not conditions and events as they actually are operational environment but what the policy-maker imagines them to be psychological environment’”.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁶ Smith, Steve. & Hadley, Amelia. & Dunne, Tim. (2008). Foreign policy: theories, actors, cases. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

¹⁴⁷ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: Routledge.

¹⁴⁸ Hill, Christopher. (2003). The changing politics of foreign policy. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

¹⁴⁹ Clarke, Michael. & White, Brian. (1989). Understanding foreign policy: the foreign policy systems approach. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

¹⁵⁰ Sprout, Harold. & Sprout, Margaret. (1956). Man-Milieu relationship hypotheses in the context of international politics. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. & Clarke, Michael. & White, Brian. (1989). Understanding foreign policy: the foreign policy systems approach. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, p136.

Therefore, there are plenty of academic writings on decision-makers' perception effect in the foreign policy decision-making process, and some analyses consider the image effect to be the heart of the explanation of the whole foreign policy decision-making process. For example, Kenneth Boulding refers to the importance of the idea of cognition, people's performance counts on what they perceive in mind.¹⁵¹ In other words, it is decision-makers' perception that influences their behaviour. It is the most significant comprehension, at the central point of the behaviourist criticism of these rationalists' decision-making process, which devoted to a learning focal point of the key decision-maker's psychological effects on foreign policy.¹⁵² Viewed in this way, the concept of decision-making does not only associate with the concept of knowing options, but also with a series of individual, departmental, governmental and environmental impacts that contribute to the development of foreign affairs.¹⁵³

The psychological model that equalizes the behaviourist approach emphasizes the influence of decision-makers' psychological thinking on their behaviour and reaction, which has a complex influence on the decision-making process. According to Alden and Aran, underlying this behaviourist approach was the awareness that a nation's leader exerts an effect on the foreign policy decision-making process in accordance with their know-how.¹⁵⁴ Foreign policy decision-makers adopt policies by dint of their cognitive settings.¹⁵⁵ In the context of different psychological environment, policies and consequences greatly differentiate all the time. It is important to pay attention to political leaders' psychological changes that play a role in the foreign policy decision-making process. Viewed in this vein, it is reasonable to say that many decisions tend to be a part of the key decision-maker's vigorous perception.¹⁵⁶ In contrast, it is difficult to tell political leaders' consciousness and unconsciousness in the decision-making process.

¹⁵¹ Boulding, K. E. (1956). The image. Ann Arbor: *Michigan University Press*.

¹⁵² Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: *Routledge*.

¹⁵³ Clarke, Michael. & White, Brian. (1989). Understanding foreign policy: the foreign policy systems approach. Cheltenham: *Edward Elgar*.

¹⁵⁴ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: *Routledge*.

¹⁵⁵ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: *Routledge*.

¹⁵⁶ Smith, Steve. & Hadley, Amelia. & Dunne, Tim. (2008). Foreign policy: theories, actors, cases. Oxford: *Oxford University Press*.

Psychological factors that influence foreign policy decisions include the impact of personalized understanding, human comprehension, a political leader's personality and the changes of group decision-making.¹⁵⁷ Robert Jervis demonstrates that individual governors take advantage of their own interpretation of history in an attempt to both describe international affairs and create proper reactions to them.¹⁵⁸ In the meantime, Jervis's investigation of 'cognitive consistency' denotes that foreign policy decision-makers commonly under-estimate the violent influences by coming up with a sensible way of merging them into the rational actor approach for a specific foreign policy alternative.¹⁵⁹ In other words, Robert's research emphasizes political leaders' role of perception and cognition in the foreign policy decision-making process. Attention to political leaders' psychological behaviour has been a significant part in the process of foreign policy analysis.

Foreign policy decisions tend to be the outcome of the assumptions that decision-makers focus on their personal roots that impose influence on their capability to adopt rational foreign policy.¹⁶⁰ For advocates of the psychological approach, foreign policy decision-makers perform in a world that consists of uncertainties and restrictions, including linguistic-cultural shocks, stereotypes, imperfect message.¹⁶¹ In other words, it is critically evident to see some limitations of the psychological approach. For example, Clarke and White indicate that some case studies of factual international crises have demonstrated the relationship between misperception and pressure, which means that unfavourable stereotypes and insufficient capability imposed influence on the decision-making process.¹⁶² These include growing percentages of mistake, an emerging trend to use provocation, which means an incapability to separate sense from nonsense, to comprehend the

¹⁵⁷ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: Routledge.

¹⁵⁸ Jervis, Robert. (1976). Perception and misperception in international politics. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.

¹⁵⁹ Jervis, Robert. (1976). Perception and misperception in international politics. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.

¹⁶⁰ Boulding, Kenneth. (1959). National images and international systems. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 3(2), 120-131.

¹⁶¹ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: Routledge.

¹⁶² Clarke, Michael. & White, Brian. (1989). Understanding foreign policy: the foreign policy systems approach. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

development of politics and to decrease confusions.¹⁶³

The psychological actor approach means an explanation of why political leaders would behave in certain ways, and represents a vital area for scholars who engage in foreign policy analysis.¹⁶⁴ In other words, it is necessary for researchers who undertake foreign policy analysis to pay attention to political leaders' psychological thoughts and changes. In spite of the significance of psychological factors, it is not to deny struggles to deal with the complexity of decisions. Viewed in this aspect, it is not realistic to believe that political leaders' mental factors have been the most essential one in the decision-making process. It would not make sense if foreign policy analysis scholars only pay attention to political leaders' perception, cognition and personality without an explanation of the influence of internal and external situations that impose restriction on the decision-making process.¹⁶⁵ In other words, every change at home and abroad would influence political leaders' psychological thinking, which means a necessity to pay attention to problems and criticisms of the psychological approach.

¹⁶³ Holsti, O. R. (1972). Crisis, escalation, war. Montreal: *McGill-Queens University Press*.

¹⁶⁴ Shepard, Graham. (1988). Personality effects on American foreign policy, 1968-1984: a second test of international generation theory. *International Studies Quarterly*, 32(1), 91-123.

¹⁶⁵ Holsti, Ole. (1970). The operational code approach to the study of political leaders: John Foster Dulles' philosophical and instrumental beliefs. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 3(1), 123-157.

The bureaucratic approach

The bureaucratic approach offers a critical thinking on how the administrative group plays a vital role in the final foreign policy decision. On one hand, Hill argues that the theory of the bureaucratic approach implies the relationship between the foreign policy decision and the foreign policy bureaucracies, or emphasizes how bureaucrats influence foreign policy.¹⁶⁶ In other words, the idea of the bureaucratic theory provides initial insights among organizational participants or bureaucrats who engage in the foreign policy decision-making process. On the other hand, Clarke and White argue that the bureaucratic approach clearly differentiates from the rational approach, it mainly describes the importance and the influence of state leaders and governmental officials who participate in the foreign policy decision-making process.¹⁶⁷ Viewed in this vein, the foreign policy can be seen as a result that originates from different bureaucrats' interactions and influences.

With regard to the bureaucratic approach, it was in the 1950s that the concept of the bureaucrats' roles firstly became a part of academic writings in the realm of political science.¹⁶⁸ It is meaningful to mention Graham Allison who has been considered to be a prominent contributor in the field of bureaucratic politics. It is a necessity to mention Allison's work related to the Cuban Missile Crisis that has been widely accepted as a critical example of explaining the bureaucrats' role in a complex environment.¹⁶⁹ Allison considers the rational approach as a singly personal process, and it differentiates from the one that bureaucrats jointly engage in the foreign policy decision-making process.¹⁷⁰ In other words, Allison put forward a new argument that largely varies from his former rational actor that sees the foreign policy decision-making process as an individual way. Or, with respect to the bureaucratic approach, Allison emphasized bureaucrats make

¹⁶⁶ Hill, Christopher. (2003). The changing politics of foreign policy. Basingstoke: *Palgrave Macmillan*.

¹⁶⁷ Clarke, Michael. & White, Brian. (1989). Understanding foreign policy: the foreign policy systems approach. Cheltenham: *Edward Elgar*.

¹⁶⁸ Clarke, Michael. & White, Brian. (1989). Understanding foreign policy: the foreign policy systems approach. Cheltenham: *Edward Elgar*.

¹⁶⁹ Graham, T. Allison. (1969). Conceptual models and the Cuban missile crisis. *American Political Science Review*, 63(3), 689-718.

¹⁷⁰ Clarke, Michael. & White, Brian. (1989). Understanding foreign policy: the foreign policy systems approach. Cheltenham: *Edward Elgar*.

decisions as a whole. Allison endeavoured to offer an exclusive summary of how bureaucrats play a role in the foreign policy decision-making process, such as efficiencies and shortcomings.¹⁷¹

It is critical to introduce Allison's masterpiece, *The Essence of Decision-Making*, it puts forward a few of profound insights in the field of the bureaucratic approach. Apart from a detailed and comprehensive analysis of the Cuban Missile Crisis, Allison also had a concern about solutions to the general problems of how to analyze foreign policy behaviour. Allison suggested two typically different patterns that are worthy of being imitated in order to fill in the gap and figure out the argument: the Model II that emphasizes organizations' roles, and the Model III that emphasizes bureaucrats' roles.¹⁷² In other words, Allison made an important contribution to the development of explanation with respect to the bureaucratic approach. Allison also tried to set the Cuban Missile Crisis as an example, and to investigate the paramount confusion in accordance with the Cuban Missile Crisis.¹⁷³ The main aim of Allison's research of the Cuban Missile Crisis was to demonstrate the approach that serves to respond to a variety of suspicions in relation to foreign policy decision-making, and even put forward advice about what questions are worthy of being asked.¹⁷⁴

Hill (2003, p86) attempts to make a conclusion about the bureaucratic politics approach as follows:

“the bureaucratic politics approach has two general consequences for the study of foreign policy: it reinforces the whole domestic politics approach, against the skepticism of realism, neo-realism and some forms of historicism, and it represents a picture of decision-making in which ‘foul-ups’, as opposed to either rationality or inevitability, are very prominent”.¹⁷⁵

¹⁷¹ Clarke, Michael. & White, Brian. (1989). Understanding foreign policy: the foreign policy systems approach. Cheltenham: *Edward Elgar*.

¹⁷² Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: *Routledge*.

¹⁷³ Clarke, Michael. & White, Brian. (1989). Understanding foreign policy: the foreign policy systems approach. Cheltenham: *Edward Elgar*.

¹⁷⁴ Clarke, Michael. & White, Brian. (1989). Understanding foreign policy: the foreign policy systems approach. Cheltenham: *Edward Elgar*.

¹⁷⁵ Hill, Christopher. (2003). The changing politics of foreign policy. Basingstoke: *Palgrave Macmillan*, p86.

Viewed in this vein, the domestic environment has been an increasingly important actor in the bureaucratic politics approach, and the theory of realism and the philosophy of rationality do not associate with the bureaucratic approach. Alden and Aran argue that the bureaucratic politics model attempts to provide a combination of elements in relation to the bureaucratic politics model, which aims to describe the correlation between foreign policy and these actors that consist of state bureaucrats and governmental organizations.¹⁷⁶ Based on the theory of the bureaucratic approach, Hill emphasizes that the component of state could not compete with the actor of governmental agencies that ought to undertake the responsibility to engage in a series of unavoidable political competitions.¹⁷⁷ In contrast, the fierce political arena results in a range of more complex contradiction among different governmental apparatus. From this aspect, it is difficult to ensure whether or not the decision-making process is on purpose, or other components impose influence on the decision-making process.¹⁷⁸ In other words, there have been doubts about which principles that the governmental bureaucrats should be taken into account in the foreign policy decision-making process.

Political figures who serve different interests put forward a variety of views on foreign affairs, which results in the complexity in the decision-making process. It is obvious that political elites and national bureaucrats in different states consider foreign policy affairs from different perspectives that clearly lead to contrasting opinions.¹⁷⁹ Although there exists a number of viewpoints, Alden and Aran on one hand argue that the bureaucratic approach seeks for similar point of opinions as much as possible.¹⁸⁰ Alden and Aran on the other hand argue that the bureaucratic approach will make use of similar point of opinions among governmental elites to do further research in relation to the possible results as well as impacts of foreign policy.¹⁸¹ In other words, the foreign policy decision-making process tends to result in massive fierce competitions, foreign policy decision-makers who account for the eventual decision seem to be in order as

¹⁷⁶ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: Routledge.

¹⁷⁷ Hill, Christopher. (2003). The changing politics of foreign policy. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

¹⁷⁸ Hill, Christopher. (2003). The changing politics of foreign policy. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

¹⁷⁹ Schilling, W. Roller. & Hammond, Y. Paul. & Synder, Herald. Glenn. (1962). Strategy, politics, and defense budgets. New York: Columbia University, Institute of War and Peace Studies. & Crozier, Michael. (1964). The bureaucratic phenomenon. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

¹⁸⁰ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: Routledge.

¹⁸¹ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: Routledge.

well as in routine.¹⁸²

It is common to see that participants who engage in the foreign policy decision-making process compete for different interests in order to enhance their own political status and to increase their influence in the political arena, as Alden and Aran (2012, p93) argue as follows:

“Bureaucracies also derive influence over foreign policy from their positions in the power-sharing structure comprising state and government, in which these large organizations and political actors have individual interest”.¹⁸³

Freedom argues that every governmental official actually influences foreign policy in the way that coincide with its special interests, and bureaucrats tend to put their own thinking above national interests.¹⁸⁴ In other words, the main aim of bureaucrats is to advance both their own and their organizations’ interests that may not meet with national interests, which means that political leaders probably take advantage of political issues to enhance their own interests or to dismiss their opponents’ power. A foreign policy, therefore, does not represent the outcome of political figures’ opinion on national developmental interests, but reveal the unique deal among governmental officials who fight for different interests and can accept as well as tolerate to the largest extent.¹⁸⁵

In terms of the bureaucratic approach, it is a combination of praises and critiques, many researchers consider the bureaucratic politics as a separate or an exclusive aspect that can be used to explain some political issues in the foreign policy decision-making process.¹⁸⁶ As to critiques about the bureaucratic politics, decision-makers do not complain about the model, and meet with its conditions all the time, they seldom recognize

¹⁸² Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: *Routledge*.

¹⁸³ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: *Routledge*, p93.

¹⁸⁴ Freedom, Lawrence. (1976). Logic, politics and foreign policy processes: a critique of the bureaucratic politics model. *International Affairs*, 52(3), 434-449.

¹⁸⁵ Clarke, Michael. & White, Brian. (1989). Understanding foreign policy: the foreign policy systems approach. Cheltenham: *Edward Elgar*.

¹⁸⁶ Clarke, Michael. & White, Brian. (1989). Understanding foreign policy: the foreign policy systems approach. Cheltenham: *Edward Elgar*.

its proposals or suggestions, which means that policy makers tend to pay less attention to doing analysis of the influence on the more extensively meaningful areas of options, freedom and obligation.¹⁸⁷ In the meantime, other researchers emphasize the correlation between the bureaucratic politics and the psychological prediction, or how communication issues influence bureaucrats' attitude and thinking in the decision-making process.¹⁸⁸

There is no doubt that the bureaucratic politics model has aroused massive critiques.¹⁸⁹ Some researchers have emphasized that the bureaucratic politics tends to neglect the significance of bureaucrats' belief and perception in the decision-making process.¹⁹⁰ In contrast, it is a necessity to draw attention to bureaucrats' cognitive factors in the foreign policy decision-making process. As demonstrated above, the paramount leader's values have been one of the bureaucratic factors that have a comparatively important impact in the decision-making process. In terms of important affairs and political thinking, it is not a necessity to arouse obvious but hostile debates, since a majority of powerful members have similar political thinking with each other.¹⁹¹

The decision-making process is full of comprises as well as competition among political figures, which reveals the nature of the bureaucratic politics. By illustrating foreign policy decision-making in relation to the 'pulling and hauling' of many political teams that have no opportunity to be selected as powerful leaders, political leaders and governmental officials tend to ignore or decline their responsibility to undertake the consequence of foreign policy.¹⁹² In other words, many politicians can see such a 'pulling and hauling' process of the bureaucratic political model as an excuse for their incapability to carry out appropriate policies

¹⁸⁷ Hill, Christopher. (2003). The changing politics of foreign policy. Basingstoke: *Palgrave Macmillan*.

¹⁸⁸ Clarke, Michael. & White, Brian. (1989). Understanding foreign policy: the foreign policy systems approach. Cheltenham: *Edward Elgar*.

¹⁸⁹ Smith, Steve. (1980). Allison and the Cuban missile crisis: a review of the bureaucratic politics model of foreign policy decision-making. *Millennium*, 9(1), 21-40.

¹⁹⁰ Jervis, Robert. (1976). Perception and misperception in international politics. Princeton, NJ: *Princeton University Press*.

¹⁹¹ Art, R. J. (1973). Bureaucratic politics and American foreign policy. *Policy Science*, 4, 467-490.

¹⁹² Clarke, Michael. & White, Brian. (1989). Understanding foreign policy: the foreign policy systems approach. Cheltenham: *Edward Elgar*.

as well as irresponsibility to account for possible consequences. Similarly, those politicians who suppose they have no responsibility should account for every policy carried out by the government, rather than those political officials who have succeeded in the elections.¹⁹³ In other words, it turns into a challenge for the realization of the idea that political officials should keep their responsibility in mind, which means that some political elites suppose the final result of actions has little impact on their own. Viewed in this vein, it is a reasonable excuse for political officials who tend to get rid of their responsibility.

The bureaucratic approach seeks to explain the influence of bureaucrats' involvement in political struggle on the following policy decision-making process. It is common to see that several political factions that engage in political struggle would influence policy decisions. Although different bureaucrats' idea of national interests varies from each other's, the policy decision represents one faction's shared conception of the primary national interest. In other words, different factions insist on different interpretations in terms of national interest maximization. In this regard, bureaucrats' aim to succeed in the political struggle reflect the importance of the bureaucratic approach. For example, Lee Myung-bak, one of the leading conservative representatives who insists on a comparatively hostile approach towards North Korea, shifted the "Sunshine Policy" that had lasted for a decade before he came to power. In the arena of global politics, foreign policy does not only mean to maximize so-called 'national interest', but also to compromise for an acceptable national interest. Apart from national interest calculation and individual leader's role, the bureaucrats' thinking over group interest and national interest influenced China's policy towards South Korea. In the next section, I will therefore clarify a brief theoretical analysis of how to use the three main approaches to analyze China's policy towards South Korea.

¹⁹³ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: Routledge.

The rationalist approach in the study of China's foreign policy (1949-1976)

The rational actor approach that emphasizes the principle of national interest maximization tends to be the most prevailing model that helps to understand China's foreign policy. Zhang argues that the majority of scholars made use of the rationalist model to do research about China's diplomacy.¹⁹⁴ On one hand, Alden and Aran emphasize that the rationalist model is such an approach that has been widely accepted to interpret and evaluate consequences in the foreign policy decision-making process.¹⁹⁵ In other words, many political leaders' decisions can be explained from the perspective of the rational actor approach. On the other hand, Clarke and White highlight that the rational approach process is considered to be a reasonable and sensible element, in spite of certain incorrect messages and irrational material, or explanation with errors, an investigation and operation in the critical decision-making process is purposeful.¹⁹⁶ Viewed in this vein, the most evident feature of the rationalist approach indicates the imperative of realizing various aims and goals in the foreign policy decision-making process.

Alden and Aran argue that a government ought to firstly take foreign policy purposes into account, and then analyze and choose from the approaches or solutions that can be used to effectively reach goals or maximize interests with the lowest cost.¹⁹⁷ It shows that every state's primary responsibility is to maximize national interests with the very least cost, which means that every country strives for the identification of states' interests. Researchers who recognize foreign policy sources priorities in the process of the rationalist model analysis advise that it is the essence in international politics and following structural equality between nations yielded by sovereignty, rather than other special national characteristics in an acknowledged nation, that persists in the most important decisive factor of decision.¹⁹⁸ It is meaningless that states endeavour to pursue other material interests in the wake of border crisis or sovereignty damage. In the context of the rationalist approach, every state's sovereignty and territorial integrity should by no means be impinged on.

¹⁹⁴ Zhang, Qing-min. (2015). Evolving bureaucratic politics in Chinese foreign policy-making. *The Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*: 27(4), 453-468.

¹⁹⁵ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: Routledge.

¹⁹⁶ Clarke, Michael. & White, Brian. (1989). Understanding foreign policy: the foreign policy systems approach. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

¹⁹⁷ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: Routledge.

¹⁹⁸ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: Routledge.

According to the rationalist perspective, it is alarming that a nation is on the verge of foreign invasion. Han argues that China tends to take measures in order to protect itself from crisis if China realizes the necessity of national interest protection, such as sovereignty, territory and security.¹⁹⁹ In other words, China sees the survival interest as the fundamental criteria in the whole foreign policy thinking. On 1st, October 1949, Mao Ze-dong who was the Chairman of the Chinese Communist Party formally announced the founding of the PRC. However, Westad argues that the newly established PRC did not expect to intervene in the Korean War, even though China had sent troops to Korea already.²⁰⁰ It was disturbing that China confronted with border crisis as soon as the single communist political party set out to rule the state. Fang notes that the Chinese Communist Party recognized the Sino-North Korean relationship and the China-Korea border protection as a priority, which constituted China's involvement in the Korean War.²⁰¹ Viewed in this aspect, it was a symbol of security threat to China that the United States' troops had an access to the Yalu River (the border between China and North Korea).

Security has been the most critically decisive factor in China's foreign policy decision-making process since the establishment of the PRC. According to Lu, national security is the most sensitive and important national interest.²⁰² In 1950, only one year later after the establishment of the PRC, China would have had to encounter with a series of crises if the Korean peninsula had been taken over by the United States, China therefore dispatched its troops to Korea, involved in the Korean War and fought against the United States on behalf of the North under the slogan that "Saving North Korea is protecting aggression from imperialist countries".²⁰³ Both China and the United States were involved in the long-lasting influential military conflict from 1950 to 1953. Han indicates that it has been a necessity for China to consider the significant Korean

¹⁹⁹ Han Kwan-soo. (2015). Discussion on whether the Korean peninsula will be included in China's core interests. *Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, 27(1), 57-69.

²⁰⁰ Westad, Arne. Odd. (2013). Restless empire: China and the world since 1750. London: *Vintage Books*, p294.

²⁰¹ Fang, Xiu-yu. (2013). Zhongguo juanru chaoxianzhanzheng de kaoliang [On China's calculation of involvement in the Korean War]. *Dongfang zaobao (The Oriental Morning Post)*.

²⁰² Lu, Ning. (2005). Yetan yinxiang zhongguo chubin chaoxian juece de yinsu [On factors of why China decided to dispatch troops to Korea]. *Dangdai zhongguoshi yanjiu (Contemporary China History Studies)*, 12(5), 87-93.

²⁰³ Park, Il-keun. (1999). Chinese foreign policy and the Korean peninsula. *International Journal of Korean Studies*, III(1), 116-135.

peninsula into account.²⁰⁴ Foreign troops on the Korean peninsula would easily have an access to the Mainland China.²⁰⁵ As a result, China kept a long-term hostility and isolation with western societies from the 1950s to the 1970s, and China missed out on an opportunity to send troops to Taiwan and wage a reunification war in the post-war period.²⁰⁶ Meanwhile, China insisted on an aggressive approach to the regime of the Republic of Korea (ROK – more commonly known as South Korea) from the end of the Korean War to the end of the Cold War. Therefore, the central mission of the Chinese government was to protect China from foreign invasion in the whole Mao era.

²⁰⁴ Han Kwan-soo. (2015). Discussion on whether the Korean peninsula will be included in China's core interests. *Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, 27(1), 57-69.

²⁰⁵ Han Kwan-soo. (2015). Discussion on whether the Korean peninsula will be included in China's core interests. *Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, 27(1), 57-69.

²⁰⁶ Ing, Ch'ing-yao. (1973). Chinese foreign policy and diplomatic relations. Taipei: *International Relations Research Institute*.

The psychological approach under the presidency of Mao Ze-dong

Policy-makers' cognition, emotion and perception have an effect on their diplomatic policy thinking, which helped to explain Mao's role in Chinese diplomacy. In terms of the subject of perception, people's actions associate with what they suppose in their minds, or what they have learnt of a separate governor or departmental organizations.²⁰⁷ On one hand, Clarke and White argue that foreign policy must be decided within such a situation that is not only filled with ambiguity, but also with vulnerability.²⁰⁸ In other words, external and internal factors are combined to understand complexity as well as uncertainty in the foreign policy decision-making process. On the other hand, Weber argues that the ruler with 'God-given' power controlled and dominated the authority of the political administration in the Chinese ancient history.²⁰⁹ It was not a change to the newly established PRC that became the ruling party in 1949, which suggested the Chinese leadership's significance in Chinese foreign policy decision-making process.²¹⁰ Mao Ze-dong ruled China from 1949 to 1976, it is necessary to understand Mao Ze-dong's perception as well as recognition that greatly influenced China's foreign policy towards South Korea.

China's diplomatic thinking should be understood in the context of Mao's pursuit of communism, which contributed to China's "Anti-America Policy" and "Anti-capitalism Policy". Due to the fierce ideological competition between the Capitalist Camp and the Socialist Camp, both camps applied their forces to fierce nuclear competition in the post-war eras.²¹¹ However, Hao and Zhai argue that the newly established PRC was recognized as an ally of being supporting Moscow in order to compete against Washington.²¹² In other words, Mao's separate views on the United States and the Soviet Union helped to explain the Sino-Soviet

²⁰⁷ Boulding, K. E. (1956). The image. Ann Arbor: *Michigan University Press*.

²⁰⁸ Clarke, Michael. & White, Brian. (1989). Understanding foreign policy: the foreign policy systems approach. Cheltenham: *Edward Elgar*.

²⁰⁹ Weber, Max. (1964). The religion of China. New York: *Free Press*.

²¹⁰ Zuo, Ji-ping. (1991). Political religion: the case of the Cultural Revolution in China. *Sociological Analysis*, 52(1), 99-110.

²¹¹ Park, Il-keun. (1999). Chinese foreign policy and the Korean peninsula. *International Journal of Korean Studies*, III(1), 116-135.

²¹² Hao, Yu-fan. & Zhai, Zhi-lai. (1990). China's decision to enter the Korean War: history revisited. *The China Quarterly*, 121, 94-115.

relations, which meant that both the PRC and the Soviet Union insisted on communism. Instead, the United States apparently took a lopsided policy of supporting Chiang Kai-shek against the Communists.²¹³ In other words, Washington considered the idea of communism as a threat, even though the Soviet Union had realized a great success under the communist construction by the middle 1930s. On one hand, Washington continued to intervene with the competition between the Kuomintang and the Chinese Communist Party, which meant that Washington did not cease to provide the Kuomintang with a variety of supports.²¹⁴ On the other hand, Mao Ze-dong insisted on his assumption that the new world war was on the way, which associated with his opinion about the perception of ally versus opponent.²¹⁵ Viewed in this aspect, the newly established PRC decided to lean to the Soviet Union in order to promote communism and protect security.

The confrontation between the western capitalism and the eastern communism contributed to China's involvement in the Korean War, which helped to explain China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea. According to Lee, it was necessary for Mao Ze-dong to take measures to protect communism that was heavily threatened by capitalism.²¹⁶ On one hand, the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) Military Committee informed Xiao Jin-guang, commander in chief of the CCP Navy, on June 30, that the Chinese Communist Party must take measures after the United States dispatched its military forces to the Korean peninsula, which meant that the Chinese Communist Party decided to postpone the plan to liberate Taiwan.²¹⁷ In other words, Mao considered the Korean issue as the first priority, even though the Chinese Communist Party missed out on an opportunity to realize unification with Taiwan. On the other hand, Mao was determined to intervene in the Korean War and to compete against with the imperialist capitalism, which was similar to the

²¹³ Hao, Yu-fan. & Zhai, Zhi-lai. (1990). China's decision to enter the Korean War: history revisited. *The China Quarterly*, 121, 94-115.

²¹⁴ Tang, Tsou. (1963). America's failure in China, 1941-1950. Chicago: *University of Chicago Press*. & Warren, I. Cohen. (1971). America's response to China: an interpretive history of Sino-American relations. New York: *Wiley*. & Foster, Rhea. Dulles. (1972). American foreign policy toward the communist China. New York: *Thomas Crowell Co.*. & Robert, M. Blum. (1982). Drawing the line, the origins of the American containment policy in East Asia. New York: *Norton*. & William, U. Stueck. (1981). The road to confrontation, American policy toward China and Korea, 1947-1950. Chapel Hill: *University of North Carolina Press*.

²¹⁵ Ahn, Byung-joon. (1992). China's modernization and the political economy. Seoul: *Parkyoung Company*.

²¹⁶ Lee, Bong. (2003). The unfinished war: Korea. New York: *Algora Pub.*

²¹⁷ Michael, M. Sheng (1995). Korea and world affairs. *University of Missouriism*, XIX (2), p4.

United States' intention of competing with communism.²¹⁸ In contrast, the Korean War was not only a battle that the North and the South fought for the leadership of the Korean peninsula, but also a war between the Capitalist Camp and the Communist Camp. In order to keep communism from collapse, it was a necessity for China to furnish North Korean troops with arms and equipment in the period of the Korean War.²¹⁹ Viewed in this vein, both America and China saw each other as an obstacle to ideological concern as well as security calculation, which meant that China aimed to decrease the United States' role and the influence of capitalism on the Korean peninsula. So much so that, Kim emphasizes that Beijing only developed its relations with Pyongyang, and officially refused to consider Seoul as a legitimate state on the Korean peninsula.²²⁰ In this regard, Mao totally ignored the development of the Sino-South Korean relationship in the context of Mao's perception of threats of the United States and capitalism on Korea.

²¹⁸ Lee, Bong. (2003). The unfinished war: Korea. New York: *Algora Plub*.

²¹⁹ Lee, Chae-jin. & Hsieh, Stephanie. (2001). China's "Two-Koreas Policy" at trial: the Hwang Chang Yop Crisis. *Pacific Affairs*, 74(3), 321-341.

²²⁰ Kim, Heungkyu. (2012). Enemy, homager or equal partner? Evolving Korea-China relations. *Journal of National and Area Studies*, Seoul National University, 19(2), 47-62, p48.

The rationalist approach in the study of China's foreign policy (1978-1992)

Foreign policy is full of different national interest elements, whereas, national interests varied from the 1960s to the 2010s. Han argues that “the fundamental interests influence China's foreign policy from time to time”.²²¹ In other words, China's central mission has been to keep from foreign aggressions since the establishment of China, whereas, China shifted its core interest from security protection to economic construction in the Deng era. In this regard, the Chinese government has realized the importance of economic increase that should be viewed as important as security protection since Deng Xiao-ping came to power in 1978. In spite of Deng Xiao-ping's success in the factional struggle, he (1992, p4) noted as follows,

“if China cannot rapidly develop its economy and gradually reduce the gap with western countries and Asian NIEs, or even worse, if China's economic reform fails as a result of political setback, stagnation, or hyperinflation, then the People's Republic of China will definitely deign to slide into oblivion”.²²²

Due to inappropriate economic policies, China confronted with disastrous economic loss in the Mao era. The three-year famine from 1958 to 1961, the most catastrophic incident in Chinese contemporary history, was critically recognized to be a typical disaster that heavily resulted from the Great Leap Forward and the pursuit of communism in China's countryside.²²³ Deng Xiao-ping decided to engage in economic reform in order to protect China from economic depression, which meant that China adopted the “Opening and Reform Policy”. With the significance of China's economic prosperity, Deng Xiao-ping considered flexible diplomacy as a strategy to promote China's relations with the international community, which contributed to new explanation of China's five diplomatic principles of peaceful coexistence.²²⁴ Meanwhile, China decided to take advantage of a pragmatic foreign policy, hoping to relieve from security dilemmas and contribute to

²²¹ Han, Kwan-soo. (2015). Discussion on whether the Korean peninsula will be included in China's core interests. *Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, 27(1), 57-69.

²²² Zhongguo Shiyou. (1992). Fresh impetus from Deng's message. *Beijing Reivews*, 35 (15): 4(13-19 April). & Yi, X. (1995). China's Korea policy: from 'One Korea' to 'Two Koreas'. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 22(2), 119-140, p121.

²²³ Yang, D. L., & Su, F. (1998). The politics of famine and reform in rural china. *China Economic Review* (1043951X), 9(2), 141-155.

²²⁴ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1987). The establishment of the Chinese characteristic socialism. Beijing: *Public Publishing*, 1-5.

modernization programme.²²⁵

The Chinese government realized the importance of economic interest and strove for peaceful diplomacy after Deng Xiao-ping came to power, which greatly influenced China's policy towards South Korea. Park argues that China considered its interest-driven policy and developmental programme as a part of China's policy towards the Korean peninsula, which laid a basis for China's secret business with South Korea.²²⁶ Viewed in this vein, China caught an opportunity to improve its foreign relations with other countries, which was a significant part of China's economic construction. The recognition of economic interest in the process of China's economic construction significantly influenced China's "pro-Pyongyang approach" and gradually decreased China's tension with South Korea, as the Chinese government was determined to promote economic interest by cooperating with other nations.²²⁷ In contrast, China prepared to establish and develop its friendly cooperative trading relations with the international community in order to expand its economic interest.

Qian Qi-chen, a former Chinese Foreign Minister, argues that China had an expectation of promoting China's cooperative relationship with states around the periphery of China, thereby, it was a key aspect of China's diplomatic thinking in China's reforming age.²²⁸ In contrast, China's foreign policy has greatly taken advantage of pragmatism as well as dynamism, which has been a strategy to develop friendly diplomacy and pursue economic growth. It was the very beginning of China's new thoughts on its foreign policy that greatly influenced China's policy calculation on South Korea. In this regard, the Chinese government shifted its policy towards the Korean peninsula in order to decrease military confrontations as well as political conflicts between both Koreas, which meant that the Chinese government endeavoured to promote its long-term interests with the Korean peninsula.²²⁹ In other words, China has been long for a comparatively peaceful and

²²⁵ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1993). The maintenance of world peace and the development of the internal construction. Beijing: *Public Publishing*.

²²⁶ Park, Il-keun. (1999). Chinese foreign policy and the Korean peninsula. *International Journal of Korean Studies*, III(1), 116-135.

²²⁷ Park, Il-keun. (1999). Chinese foreign policy and the Korean peninsula. *International Journal of Korean Studies*, III(1), 116-135.

²²⁸ Qian, Qi-chen. (1990). The changing international situation and China's foreign policy. Seeking Truth, as reported in Press Release No.27, Embassy of the PRC, 27 December 1990.

²²⁹ Park, Il-keun. (1999). Chinese foreign policy and the Korean peninsula. *International Journal of Korean Studies*, III(1), 116-135.

stable Korean peninsula that could have favourable influence on China's economic development and social advancement.

The bureaucratic approach under the presidency of Deng Xiao-ping

The bureaucratic politics model suggests that the government does not belong to a rationalist part, but that every single official in a governmental organization is “an actor who involves in a fierce competition battle”, and the battle that people commonly recognize as “politics”.²³⁰ On one hand, bureaucrats who strive for organizational as well as individual interests have an effect on the consequences of foreign policy decisions; on the other hand, bureaucrats who engage in different interest competitions do not have to undertake a series of follow-up consequences. In brief, officials’ stances associate with officials’ positions.²³¹ In other words, bureaucrats’ interactions that are influenced by internal and external factors in the foreign policy decision-making process is based on which interests bureaucrats strive for.

In contrast, both organizational and single interests play an active role in the foreign policy decision-making process and the follow-up process.²³² It is critically meaningless to criticize bureaucrats who only fight for interests. In other words, the pursuit of interests is a part of decisive factors that bureaucrats must take into account in the foreign policy decision-making process. In terms of Chinese diplomacy, both political leaders’ psychological effect and institutional structure are combined to understand China’s foreign policy.²³³ However, the Chinese society underwent massive changes in the context of China’s “Opening and Reform Policy”, which meant a new beginning of China’s foreign policy. Viewed in this vein, domestic factors and bureaucratic politics had an important impact on China’s foreign policy decision in the reforming era.

The fierce competition among different factions in the Chinese Communist Party helped to explain Deng Xiao-ping’s exile in the late Mao era, which meant that Deng Xiao-ping and other Chinese pragmatists did not come to power until the downfall of the Chinese radicals. According to the MFA-prepared *Diplomacy of Contemporary China*, the “Gang of Four” were four main representatives who secretly colluded with each other and largely made use of ‘leftist’ views in order to play a role in China’s domestic politics and foreign

²³⁰ Zhang, Qing-min. (2015). Evolving bureaucratic politics in Chinese foreign policy-making. *The Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, 27(4), 453-468.

²³¹ Graham, T. Allison. & Philip, Zelikow. (1999). Essence of decision: explaining the Cuban missile crisis. New York: Longman.

²³² Morton, H. Halperin. (2006). Bureaucratic politics and foreign policy. Washington, D. C.: Brookings Institution.

²³³ Zhang, Qin-min. (2014). Towards an integrated theory of Chinese foreign policy: bringing leadership personality back in. *Journal of Contemporary China*, 23(89), 902-922.

affairs in the Cultural Revolution period.²³⁴ Zhao and Liu argue that Deng Xiao-ping was criticized as a member who intended to adopt the “pro-capitalist” line, which meant that Deng Xiao-ping was under supervision in the Cultural Revolution period.²³⁵ In other words, the “Gang of Four” aimed to grab power by participating in the line struggles, which meant that the “Gang of Four” considered Deng Xiao-ping as a key adversary. Zhang emphasizes that the political struggle in the Deng era was not so cruel as in the Mao era, which conversely meant that the Chinese radicals and the “Gang of Four” played a critical role in the late Mao era.²³⁶ In contrast, Chinese cadres who engaged in the ‘rightist’ routine did not achieve a success and return to power until the demise of Mao Ze-dong, which had an essential impact on China’s foreign policy development.

Deng Xiao-ping and other Chinese pragmatists did not return to power until the downfall of the Chinese radicals, which meant a beginning to achieve China’s economic increase and to consolidate their political leadership. According to Park, Beijing set out to modify its diplomatic policy after Deng Xiao-ping became the paramount leader in the 1978 Third Plenum of the Eleventh Chinese Communist Party Central Committee.²³⁷ Hsueh argues that Deng Xiao-ping and a small group of reform-oriented Chinese pragmatists changed China’s core mission from Mao’s political conflict to Deng’s economic modernization.²³⁸ In other words, Deng Xiao-ping’s ascent to power meant a historic change in Chinese contemporary history, which meant that the Chinese pragmatists caught an opportunity to realize the common concept that China’s foreign policy must cater to China’s economic construction. Meanwhile, the success or failure of Deng’s economic development stood for whether or not the Chinese pragmatists had an opportunity to further enhance their political careers.²³⁹ In this regard, the Chinese reformists set out to adjust China’s diplomacy in order to

²³⁴ Han, Nian-long. (1988). Dangdai zhongguo waijiao [Diplomacy of contemporary China]. Beijing: Zhongguo shehuikexue chubanshe (*Chinese Social Sciences Press*).

²³⁵ Zhao, Xiao-guang. & Liu, Jie. (2011). Deng Xiao-ping de sanluosanqi [The three falls and three rises of Deng Xiao-ping]. Shengyang: Liaoning renmin chubanshe (*Liaoning People’s Press*), p182.

²³⁶ Zhang, Qing-min. (2015). Evolving bureaucratic politics in Chinese foreign policy-making. *The Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, 27(4), 453-468.

²³⁷ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China’s policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics.

²³⁸ Hsueh, Chun-tu. (1981). Modernization and diplomacy of China. Ed. Liao, Kuang-sheng. *The Chinese University of Hong Kong*.

²³⁹ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China’s policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral

realize modernization programme.²⁴⁰ In contrast, the Chinese pragmatists viewed China's economic development as a strategy to realize benefits of their own, which helped to explain the determination to adopt the "Opening and Reform Policy".

Deng Xiao-ping and other Chinese reformists decided to view economic construction as the focus of state work, which greatly influenced China's diplomatic relations building and the Sino-South Korean relationship. According to Dillon, the Chinese conservatives had a grave concern that economic construction would threaten the Chinese Communist Party, which helped to explain Deng Xiao-ping's decision to see his visit to southern China as a means to compete with his political opponents.²⁴¹ On one hand, Park argues that the Chinese government was determined to advance China's economic increase and to promote the notion of "One China", including the peaceful settlement of unification with Taiwan, the resistance against the development of hegemony politics, and the promotion of peaceful diplomacy.²⁴² On the other hand, Chen argues that China realized the significance of normalizing diplomatic relations with its neighbouring countries, which meant that China considered friendly diplomacy as a necessity.²⁴³ In other words, the Chinese government endeavoured to build a peaceful and stable environment for China's "Four Modernization Programme", which helped to understand Deng Xiao-ping's pragmatic diplomatic thinking in the reforming era. In this regard, Yi emphasizes that Beijing's participation in the 1988 Seoul Olympics represented the beginning of the Sino-South Korean relationship normalization.²⁴⁴ Following the games, plenty of important South Korean bureaucrats were formally invited by the Chinese government to call at Beijing.²⁴⁵ In brief, China did not pay attention to developing its diplomacies with its neighbouring countries

Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics.

²⁴⁰ Sutter, G. Robert. (1984). Realities of international power and China's independence in foreign affairs, 1981-1984. *Journal of Northeast Asian Studies*, III(4), 3-28.

²⁴¹ Dillon, Michael. (2015). Deng Xiao-ping: the man who made modern China. *Ibtauris*, 229-230.

²⁴² Park, Il-keun. (1999). Chinese foreign policy and the Korean peninsula. *International Journal of Korean Studies*, III(1), 116-135.

²⁴³ Chen, Qi-miao. (1993). New approaches in China's foreign policy: the post-Cold War era. *Asian Surveys*, 33 (3), 237-251, p240.

²⁴⁴ Yi, X. (1995). China's Korea policy: from 'One Korea' to 'Two Koreas'. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 22(2), 119-140, p126.

²⁴⁵ Zhang, Wei. (1989). China at the 24th Olympics Games. *Beijing Review*, 31(41): pp. 24-28 (10-16 October

until the Chinese reformists emphasized economic growth, which promoted the development of the Sino-South Korean relations in the 1980s.

1988).

The rationalist approach in the study of China's foreign policy (1992-2014)

The Chinese government has striven to label itself as a responsible power and enhance its influence in the international arena, which means that China has been determined to take advantage of flexible diplomacy to promote its national interests.²⁴⁶ In brief, the Chinese government has realized the importance of using a more pragmatic foreign policy approach to deal with international affairs, which has contributed to the explanation of China's endeavour to build a new image. In the meantime, China aimed to enhance cooperative relations with Australia and South Korea, which meant that China had an intention of increasing mutual trust with these two nations.²⁴⁷ In contrast, the full diplomacy between China and South Korea has been considered as an example of China's newly pragmatic foreign policy approach that has been used to strengthen China's economic interests since the end of the Cold War.

China's pursuit of economic interest provided a basis of China's diplomatic policy change on the Korean peninsula. On one hand, China has striven for economic construction, which means that China has aimed to expand trade and attract investment via a more stable diplomatic relations with overseas states. China has strategically adhered to the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence, which means that China has seen the "Independent Foreign Policy of Peace" as a vital part of the realization of China's economic growth. On the other hand, the implosion of the Soviet Union enabled China to pay less attention to North Korea, which provided possibility to take a bolder step towards China's changing policy towards South Korea. In August, 1992, China and South Korea formally agreed to reach a formal diplomatic relationship and promote regional peace and stability, which symbolically put an end to the long-term hostility and isolation.²⁴⁸ In other words, China shifted its hard-line stance towards South Korea, and became determined to take a "dual-track" policy on the Korean peninsula in the post-Cold War period.

According to Chen Qi-miao, global economic competition is increasingly fierce in the context of the development of globalization, which means that the traditional military contests could not play a dominant role in the post-Cold War period.²⁴⁹ It critically points out the significance of states' economic strength that

²⁴⁶ Tow, William. & Rigby, Richard. (2011). China's pragmatic security policy: the middle-power factor. *The China Journal*, 65, 157-178.

²⁴⁷ Tow, William. & Rigby, Richard. (2011). China's pragmatic security policy: the middle-power factor. *The China Journal*, 65, 157-178.

²⁴⁸ Park, Il-keun. (1996). Chinese roles in the reconstruction of peace in the Korean peninsula. International Peace Research Center of Kyungbook University, *Peace Studies*.

²⁴⁹ Chen, Qi-miao. (1993). New approaches in China's foreign policy: the post-Cold War era. *Asian Survey*,

greatly influences states' survival interest in economic competition. Furthermore, regarding China's economic growth, the Chinese Gross Domestic Product per person will have been expanded to 800 dollars by the end of 2000, which means that people's living standard will be greatly improved and people will have higher degree of satisfaction with the government.²⁵⁰ In other words, the Chinese government has regarded the capability to enhance economic prosperity as a vital part of its long-term strategy, which means that China aims to build a more prosperous and stable society.

Meanwhile, China has realized the "Independent Foreign Policy of Peace" as a strategy to promote economic cooperation with the global community, which helps to explain the rapid development of the Sino-South Korean relations. In this regard, South Korea, located in the central point of the northeast Asia (from the perspective of geography, economy and diplomacy), has realized the importance of enhancing its role in China's interest-oriented diplomatic policy.²⁵¹ In other words, the friendly diplomatic relations between China and South Korea has contributed to economic benefits as well as regional peace. Thereby, it is reasonable to believe both Kim's and Zhang's introduction to the Sino-South Korean relationship development as follows: China and South Korea steadily upgraded their relationship from a 'friendly cooperative relationship' in 1992, to a 'cooperative partnership toward twenty-first century' in 1998, to a 'comprehensive cooperative partnership' in 2003, to a 'strategic cooperative partnership' in 2008, which is one of the highest forms of bilateral relationship in Chinese foreign policy.²⁵²

33(3), 237-251.

²⁵⁰ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1984). Our greatest object and China's modernization. *Deng Xiao-ping Wenxuan*, 3, 65-69.

²⁵¹ Yi, X. (1995). China's Korea policy: from 'One Korea' to 'Two Koreas'. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 22(2), 119-140.

²⁵² Kim, Heungkyu. (2012) Enemy, homager or equal partner? Evolving Korea-China relations. *Journal of National and Area Studies*, Seoul National University, 19(2), 47-62, 47-48. & Kim, Heungkyu. (2009). China's partnership diplomacy: concept, process, and implications. *Korean Political Science Review*, 43(2), 287-305. & Zhang, Yu-shan. (2010). Zhonghan guanxi de huigu yu zhanwang [A review and outlook of Sino-South Korean relationship]. *Dangdai hanguo (Contemporary South Korea)*, 2010 (Spring), 1-9, p1.

The Literature on China's relations with the Korean peninsula (1950s-2010s)

The competition between the two leading states accelerated the outbreak of the Korean War, which laid a hard foundation for the complex situation on the Korean peninsula. According to Kissinger, the United States dispatched its military troops to Pusan in southern Korea, which meant that the United States decided to meddle in the Korean War.²⁵³ Truman argues that the victory of the Korean War would be recognized as the United States' strategic victory in Asia, even though Korea is a small state.²⁵⁴ From the United States' perspective, the Korean peninsula has been considered as an important arena that great powers aim to expand its military presence and increase its political influence since the beginning of the Cold War. He argues that the Korean peninsula became a major front of confrontation between the West and the East, and the escalating confrontation among super powers led to the final split of the Korean peninsula.²⁵⁵ On one hand, Oberdorfer indicates that Stalin sent Soviet troops to the Korean peninsula and preserved its military presence in the north of the thirty-eighth parallel.²⁵⁶ In brief, the Soviet Union aimed to discourage other nations' armed forces from occupying North Korea. On the other hand, Peng signifies that the United States insisted on the "Cold War Policy", which influenced the development of the Korean peninsula.²⁵⁷ Despite the fact that the United States did not have long-term interests in the Korean peninsula, the United States attempted to intervene in the Korean issue, and considered the Korean peninsula to be a 'buffer zone' that would help to protect the Soviet Union from attacking Japan.²⁵⁸ Viewed in this vein, relations between the United States and the Soviet Union contributed to the development of Korean affairs.

China decided to participate in the Korean War in order to protect security and contain capitalism, which

²⁵³ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. Penguin Press, p129.

²⁵⁴ Truman, Harry. S. (2008). Dulumen huiyilu [Memoir of Truman]. Yanji: Yanbian Press.

²⁵⁵ He, Tong-mei. (2008). Zhonghan zhengzhi waijiao guanxi yanjiu [On the political and diplomatic relations between China and South Korea]. (Doctoral Dissertation) Yan Bian University.

²⁵⁶ Oberdorfer, Don. (2001). The Two Koreas: a contemporary history. Basic Books, p7.

²⁵⁷ Peng, An-yu. (2003). Lengzhan zhengce yu chaoxianzhanzheng de baofa [On the Cold War policy and the outbreak of the Korean War]. *Junshi lishi yanjiu (Journal of Military History Analysis)*, (1), 102-107.

²⁵⁸ Wang, Shu-zeng. (2009). Chaoxianzhanzheng baofaqian de daguo zhengzhi jiaoliang [On the political competition among great powers ahead of the eruption of the Korean War]. *Baocan huicui (Newspaper Meta)*, (10), 68-70.

contributed to China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea. According to Allen, China's determination to protect North Korea from collapse could be understood by a series of reasons – fear of foreign aggressions, national security interest, and socialist ideology concern.²⁵⁹ On one hand, Wang argues that China must attend the Korean War, especially the United States still hampered the Chinese Communist Party from liberating Taiwan, the China-Korea border would never be at peace, the image of a weak country would be displayed, and China would not have an access to foreign aid.²⁶⁰ Lu emphasizes that the United States dispatched troops to Korea by intervening in the Korean War, which meant that China must come up with solution for a border security crisis.²⁶¹ On the other hand, Yan argues that the Korean War was not only a military battle, but also a typical ideological battle.²⁶² In detail, China did not only consider American troops on Korea as a grave security threat to itself, but also realize capitalism as an aggressive competitor to communism, which helped to explain China's participation in the Korean War. Due to security and ideological concerns, it was a necessity for both China and North Korea to develop and enhance the strategic military alliance relationship.²⁶³ In brief, the Korean War was seen as an important signal or milestone of the Sino-Korean peninsula relationship.²⁶⁴ In other words, China's involvement in the Korean War on behalf of North Korea symbolized China's hostile as well as volatile relations with South Korea.

China's relations with the two superpowers influenced China's foreign policy and security strategy, which

²⁵⁹ Allen, Whiting. (1960). China crosses the Yalu: the decision to enter the Korean War. Stanford: *Stanford University Press*.

²⁶⁰ Wang, Dong-yan. (2010). Chaoxianzhangzheng: Zhongguo weishengme yaocanzhan [The Korean War: why China attended the war]. *Fujian dangshi yuekan (Journal of Fujian Monthly History)*, (17), 22-24.

²⁶¹ Lu, Ning. (2005). Yetan yinxiang zhongguo chubin chaoxian juece de yinsu [On factors of why China decided to dispatch troops to Korea]. *Dangdai zhongguoshi yanjiu (Contemporary China History Studies)*, 12(5), 87-93.

²⁶² Yan, Su-e. (2011). Yishixingtai yuxia de chaoxianzhanzheng [On the Korean War from the aspect of ideology]. *Qianyan (Forward Position)*, (24), 48-51.

²⁶³ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics.

²⁶⁴ Liu, Jin-zhi. & Zhang, Min-qiu. & Zhang, Xiao-ming. (1998). Dangdai zhonghan guanxi [On the contemporary Sino-South Korean relationship]. Beijing: *Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe (China Social Sciences Press)*.

constituted China's security relations with the Korean peninsula in the Cold War period. According to Yi, the outbreak of the Korean War, the confrontation with the United States, the Sino-Soviet split and the eruption of the Vietnamese War posed a series of formidable security threats towards China from the 1950s to the 1970s.²⁶⁵ Westad argues that China was in jeopardy after China confronted with the United States and the Soviet Union, which contributed to China's frustration in the domestic politics and isolation from the international community.²⁶⁶ In other words, China came into a more chaotic period in the context of the "Fighting-with Two Fists Strategy". On one hand, Zhang and Qi emphasize that China's relations with the United States formally stepped into a complete confrontation era after the Korean War, which meant that the United States imposed harsh restrictions on China's domestic and foreign affairs.²⁶⁷ On the other hand, Brown describes that Beijing's relations with Moscow did not escalate into a security crisis until the 1969 border clash at Chenbao Island, which increased Beijing's fear about Moscow's invasion plans.²⁶⁸ However, Shi and Wen argue that the long-standing alliance relationship between the United States and South Korea has been an obstacle to the development of the Sino-South Korean diplomacy.²⁶⁹ Sarantakes notes that the Park Chung-hee administration (1963-1979) declared its involvement in the Vietnamese War.²⁷⁰ From China's perspective, South Korea played a role in the United States' aggressive approach towards China. Besides, Snyder argues that North Korea realized the Sino-Soviet split as an opportunity to build its role,

²⁶⁵ Yi, X. (1995). China's Korea policy: from 'One Korea' to 'Two Koreas'. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 22(2), 119-140, p120.

²⁶⁶ Westad, Arne. Odd. (2013). Restless empire: China and the world since 1750. London: *Vintage Books*, p333.

²⁶⁷ Zhang, Jun-fa. & Qi, Xiao-yu. (2015). Chaoxianzhanzheng dui zhongguo de yingxiang [The influence of the Korean War on China]. *Puyang zhiye jishu xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Puyang Vocational and Technical College)*, 28(5), 48-50, p48.

²⁶⁸ Brown, G. R. (1976). Chinese politics and American policy: a new look at the triangle. *Foreign Policy*, 23, 3-23, p4.

²⁶⁹ Shi, Yuan-hua. & Wen, En-xi. (2012). Shilun zhonghan zhanlve hezuo huoban zhong de meiguo yinsu [On the United States' role in the strategic cooperative partnership between China and South Korea]. *Dongbeiyi luntan (Northeast Asia Forum)*, (5). 15-22, p15.

²⁷⁰ Sarantakes, Evan. Nocholas. (1999). In the service of pharaoh? The United States and the deployment of Korean troops in Vietnam, 1965-1968. *Pacific Historical Review*, 68(3), 425-449.

even though the Soviet Union and China provided North Korea with foreign aid.²⁷¹ In this regard, China strengthened its military alliance relationship with North Korea in the context of the ‘Soviet threat’, which meant that both China and South Korea insisted on the “Non-diplomatic Policy” towards each other.

China decided to adopt the “One United Front Approach” and realize the Sino-United States formal diplomacy, which helped to explain why China gradually changed its attitude towards South Korea in the Deng era. According to Kissinger, Deng Xiao-ping’s appearance in Washington symbolized the realization of the Sino-United States full diplomacy, which meant that China and the United States reached consensus on the Shanghai Communique and the strategy to contain the Soviet Union.²⁷² Burr argues that the United States and China did not realize the necessity of stepping towards rapprochement until the Sino-Soviet clash awakened the awareness of a more aggressive Soviet empire.²⁷³ In other words, both Beijing and Washington became fearful of Moscow’s expanding military presence and political influence in a global context, even though Washington had had some expectation on the more conflicting border dispute and ideological divergence between Beijing and Moscow. On one hand, Kim emphasizes that the Soviet Union’s aggression against Afghanistan speeded up the United States’ plan to contain the Soviet Union with China, which meant that the United States considered the Soviet Union as the greatest enemy.²⁷⁴ On the other hand, Westad clarifies that the United States realized that China played a strategic role in imposing restriction on the Soviet Union’s expansion.²⁷⁵ In contrast, the Soviet Union turned into the weakest party in the context of the collaboration between China and the United States, which meant that China caught an opportunity to promote its relations with the United States in the context of the ‘Soviet threat’. Park indicates that the Deng Xiao-ping administration boldly utilized a flexible diplomacy in order to realize China’s national interest maximization.²⁷⁶ In this regard, Snyder points out China and South Korea developed trading connection in

²⁷¹ Snyder, Scott. (2009). China’s rise and the Two Koreas: politics, economics, security. London: *Boulder*, p25.

²⁷² Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. *Penguin Press*, p360.

²⁷³ Burr, W. (2001). Sino-American relations, 1969: the Sino-Soviet border war and steps towards rapprochement. *Cold War History*, 1(3), 73-112, p103.

²⁷⁴ Kim, S. Samuel. (1982). Focus on: the Sino-American collaboration and Cold War II. *Journal of Peace Research*, 19(1), 11-20, p13.

²⁷⁵ Westad, Arne. Odd. (2013). Restless empire: China and the world since 1750. London: *Vintage Books*, p383.

²⁷⁶ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China’s policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral

the 1980s, even though both sides did not establish formal diplomatic relations.²⁷⁷ In contrast, China cautiously dealt with its business relations with South Korea in the context of China's changing relations with the United States and the Soviet Union.

Both China and South Korea established full diplomacy in the context of the expanding economic interdependence, which meant that China initiated a "dual-track" strategy towards the Korean peninsula in the post-Cold War period. According to Kahler, South Korea enabled China to normalize the Sino-South Korean relationship and develop the Sino-North Korean relationship as well.²⁷⁸ On one hand, Hua argues that cooperation between China and South Korea has helped to decrease hostility and tension in the Korean peninsula.²⁷⁹ Workman indicates that China has been South Korea's largest trading partner, and China's trade with South Korea reached \$124.4 billion in 2016.²⁸⁰ In other words, China has insisted on the "Opening and Reform Policy" since the Deng Xiao-ping era, which significantly influenced China's relations with the Korean peninsula. On the other hand, the smooth development of the Sino-South Korean relations was praised as a phenomenal impressive bilateral diplomacy.²⁸¹ Cieslik argues that the growing trading volume between China and South Korea and the rapid development of the Sino-South Korean diplomacy helped to stabilize power balance in the Korean peninsula.²⁸² In brief, China's "Two-Koreas Policy" played a vital role

Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p47.

²⁷⁷ Snyder, Scott. (2009). China's rise and the Two Koreas: politics, economics, security. London: *Boulder*, p28.

²⁷⁸ Kahler, Miles. (2006). Strategic uses of economic inter-dependence: engagement policies on the Korean peninsula and across the Taiwan Strait. *Journal of Peace Research*, 43(5), 523-541.

²⁷⁹ Hua, Chuang-ming. (2007). Shi fenxi lengzhan hou de zhonghan guanxi [On the relations between China and South Korea in the post-Cold War period]. *Changchun daxue xuebao (Journal of Chang Chun University)*, 17(3), 53-56.

²⁸⁰ Workman, D. (2017). South Korea's top trading partners. Available from: <http://www.worldstopexports.com/south-koreas-top-import-partners/> (Viewed on 11th, April 2017).

²⁸¹ Wang, Sheng. (2007). "Zhonghanjianjiao 15nian (Fifteen years since normalization of Sino-Korea relationship)". *Waijiao (China's Diplomacy)*.

²⁸² Cieslik, T. (2010). Scott Snyder, ed. China's rise and the Two Koreas: Politics, economics, security. *Journal of Chinese Political Science*, 15(3), 345-346.

in peace and stability in northeast Asia, which meant that China and South Korea should strengthen the bilateral diplomacy.²⁸³ However, China's relationship with South Korea encountered a new crisis after the Park Geun-hye government's agreement on the deployment of the Terminal High Altitude Area Defence (more commonly known as THAAD) system with the United States in 2016.²⁸⁴ Lee and Woody emphasize that South Korea under-estimated the economic impact on South Korea's trade as well as tourism and on China's security interest calculation.²⁸⁵ Viewed in this aspect, the trading volume between China and South Korea had a complex influence on the Sino-South Korean relations, which meant that both sides could make use of the economic inter-dependence to destroy the basis of the bilateral relations as well.

²⁸³ Ou-Yang, wei. (2013). Shenhua zhonghan guanxi dui baochi chaoxianbandao wending juyou zhongyao yiyi [On the deepening Sino-South Korean relationship and its significance for stabilizing the Korean peninsula]. *Heping yu fazhan (Peace and Development)*, (6), 27-30.

²⁸⁴ Swaine, D. Michael. (2017). Chinese views on South Korea's deployment of Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD). Available from: <http://carnegieendowment.org/2017/02/02/chinese-views-on-south-korea-s-deployment-of-terminal-high-altitude-area-defense-thaad-pub-67891>. (Viewed on 21st, August 2017).

²⁸⁵ Lee, O. H. (2017). THAAD: a critical litmus test for South Korea-China relations. Available from: <http://www.38north.org/2017/03/hlee030217/> (Viewed on 10th, June 2017). & Woody, Christopher. (2017). China is going after South Korea's wallet in their dispute over the THAAD missile system. Available from: <http://uk.businessinsider.com/china-south-korea-economic-boycott-protests-over-thaad-missile-system-2017-3?r=US&IR=T> (Viewed on 10th, June 2017).

Research gap

Kim argues that there was little difference between China's "One-Korea Policy" and China's policy towards the Korean peninsula.²⁸⁶ For the sake of security and ideological interests, China insisted on the "pro-Pyongyang approach" in the Cold War period. However, Deng's "Four Modernization Programme" and "Opening and Reform Policy" provided China's economy with a new engine, which promoted China's economic connection with the whole world. In brief, China did not boldly respond to South Korea's proposal of the Sino-South Korean relationship normalization until the 1990s, which helped to explain why the study of the Sino-South Korean relationship would be recognized as an expanding area of research topic in the aftermath of the demise of the Soviet Union. As we have seen above, some studies have emphasized that some major great powers influenced the development of the Sino-South Korean relationship, such as the Soviet Union and the United States; and some researchers have indicated that the Sino-South Korean relationship did not change until Deng Xiao-ping came to power in 1978. In other words, researchers did not pay much attention to the influence of China's diplomatic and economic strategies changes on China's changing policy towards South Korea from the era of Mao Ze-dong to the era of Xi Jin-ping. Therefore, the research gap between other scholars' and mine is the lack of an analysis of how and why China's economic and diplomatic policies' change influenced China's policy towards South Korea at different stages: from Mao's socialist planned economy development to Deng's socialist market economy construction, from the "Learning-to One Side Policy" to the "Independent Foreign Policy of Peace".

Zhao argues that China has emerged as a newly economic hub since China aimed to realize the "Four Modernization Programme", even though China underwent serious economic recession and fierce factional conflict in the late Mao era.²⁸⁷ In other words, China did not adopt a more pragmatic foreign policy until the demise of Mao Ze-dong and the downfall of the Chinese radicals, which contributed to China's ascent as a regional economic hub in the context of the interest-driven strategy. Viewed in this vein, there have been a number of studies on China's pragmatic foreign policy and economic strategy since the end of the 1970s, which constitutes a part of explanation of China's secret trading connection with South Korea in the 1980s and China's formal diplomatic relations with South Korea in the 1990s. However, Kissinger argues that Mao Ze-dong's philosophy of communism and Deng Xiao-ping's return to power significantly influenced China's relations with the international community.²⁸⁸ In the realm of China's foreign policy, it is also important to

²⁸⁶ Kim, Hak-joon. (1991). China's Korea policy since the Tiananmen Square Incident. The China Challenge: American Policies in East Asia, *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 38(2), 107-114, 108-109.

²⁸⁷ Zhao, Sui-sheng. (2016). Chinese foreign policy – pragmatism and strategic behaviour (Available from the book: Chinese foreign policy – pragmatism and strategic behaviour). *Routledge*, p1.

²⁸⁸ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. *Penguin Press*, p97 & p329.

explain from perspectives of Mao's attitudes towards capitalism and Deng's success in struggles. In spite of the two paramount leaders' roles in China's modern history, there has been little literature on the influence of Mao's perception of communism and Deng's ascent from exile on China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea in the Cold War period. All in all, I will not only use the rational actor approach to analyze China's changing attitudes towards South Korea, but also explain the impact of Mao's pursuit of 'pure' communism and Deng's factional struggle with the Chinese radicals on China's foreign policy towards South Korea.

Research question

Both China and South Korea insisted on an aggressive approach from the dawn of the Korean War to the end of the Cold War. In the context of geo-politics, China and South Korea did not establish formal diplomatic relations while China maintained a friendly diplomacy with North Korea that China realized as an important security and ideological ally. In other words, China adopted the “Aiding Korea to resist the United States Policy” (“抗美援朝”政策 – kangmeiyuanchao zhengce) and China fought on behalf of the North against the South. Hereafter, the Korean peninsula was divided into the Soviet Union-backed Pyongyang government and the United States-backed Seoul administration, and Beijing considered Seoul as Washington’s “puppet regime” in the Mao era. However, China’s diplomatic and economic policies have been changed from time to time, and China shifted its policy from the “One-Korea Policy” to the “Two-Koreas Policy” towards the Korean peninsula. Both Beijing and Seoul have attempted to strengthen the Sino-South Korean relationship since the 1992 formal diplomacy normalization. The research intends to analyze the dramatic Sino-South Korean relationship: why was China determined to change its policy towards South Korea from the “Non-Policy” to the “Two-Koreas Policy”?

Since the Sino-South Korean diplomacy has been changed from a completely hostile political relationship to a *de facto* economical one, this thesis seeks to explain China’s policy towards South Korea from 1961 to 2017. At the beginning of the 1970s, China recognized the necessity of the normalization of relations with ‘the Capitalist Camp’. Diplomatically, China set out to shift away from the lopsided foreign policy that focused on ‘the Socialist Camp’ to China’s “Independent Foreign Policy of Peace”. Economically, the Chinese pragmatic reformists insisted on the “Opening and Reform Policy” as a strategy to promote China’s economic development in the 1978 Third Plenary Session of the Eleventh Chinese Communist Party Central Committee. China endeavoured to pursue the urgent integration into the global community and expand its influence around the Asia-Pacific region under the leadership of Deng Xiao-ping.²⁸⁹ China’s new policies of opening found a receptive environment in South Korea, because South Korea’s long-standing “Export-oriented Policy” was open to increasing economic links with China. In the 1980s, South Korea had secretly tried to enhance its trading relations with China, and the Roh Tae-woo administration (1988-1993) put forward the “Northern Policy” that saw China as an important market and aimed to reduce tension on the Korean peninsula.

China’s changing policy towards South Korea can be explained by a series of factors that conclude China’s “Opening and Reform Policy” and “Independent Foreign Policy of Peace”, South Korea’s “Export-oriented Policy” and “Northern Policy”, and the increasing economic inter-dependence. Therefore, I trace the development of China’s diplomacy with South Korea from the era of Park Chung-hee to the era of Park

²⁸⁹ Lee, Chae-jin. & Hsieh, Stephanie. (2001). China’s “Two-Koreas Policy” at trial: the Hwang Chang Yop Crisis. *Pacific Affairs*, 74(3), 321-341.

Geun hye, including the late Mao era (1961-1976), the Deng era (1978-1991), and the post-Deng era (1991-2017). My thesis on one hand suggests that China's "Opening and Reform Policy" coincided with South Korea's "Export-oriented Policy" to provide the foundation to the normalization of China's relationship with South Korea; on the other hand, the deeper economic independence between China and South Korea finally stimulated the Sino-South Korean normalization.

Methodology

The thesis will be based on qualitative analysis, which means that the thesis thereby will utilize qualitative research to deliver an overall understanding of China's changing policy towards South Korea from the 1960s to the 2010s. Bryman (2001, p264) explains qualitative research as follows:

“qualitative research is an epistemological position described as interpretivist, meaning that, in contrast to the adoption of a natural scientist model in quantitative research, the stress is on the understanding of the social world through an examination of interpretation of that world by its participants”.²⁹⁰

Qualitative research emphasizes a description or discussion in a specific social research field in accordance with analyses. Qualitative research methods will be used to interpret the underlying reasons and motivations in relation to explaining China's changing policy towards South Korea.

The purpose of this dissertation is to analyze China's policy towards South Korea from 1961 to 2017. Beijing insisted on the “pro-Pyongyang approach” in the context of the Korean War, which meant that Beijing did not recognize the Seoul regime in the Cold War period (1945-1991).²⁹¹ Beijing formally shifted the “Non-Policy” towards South Korea and adopted the “Two-Koreas Policy” towards the Korean peninsula after the implosion of the Soviet Union (1922-1991). Specifically, China strategically seized the opportunity to use the “double strategy” to develop new economic ties with South Korea as well as consolidate traditional military ties with North Korea. Therefore, the main aim of the research is to explain how China's diplomatic and economic policies influenced China's relationship with South Korea from 1961 to 2017.

My hypothesis is that China's changing policy towards South Korea can be explained by a series of factors that include China's “Opening and Reform Policy” and “Independent Foreign Policy of Peace”, South Korea's “Export-oriented Policy” (“出口为导向” 政策 – chukoudaoxiang zhengce) and “Northern Policy” (“北方政策” – beifang zhengce), and the increasing economic inter-dependence. China's policy towards South Korea underwent a change after Deng Xiao-ping put forward the “Four Modernization Programme”. The Chinese government decided to use a friendly approach towards neighbouring countries in order to provide a more profound and stable environment for the historic market-oriented economic construction in the post-Mao era. With the increasing necessity of China's economic modernization, the Chinese government therefore paid attention to its trading connection with South Korea that had achieved the “Miracle on the

²⁹⁰ Bryman, Alan. (2001). Social research methods. Oxford: *Oxford University Press*, p264.

²⁹¹ Kim, Hak-joon. (1991). China's Korea policy since the Tiananmen Square Incident. *The China Challenge: American Policies in East Asia, Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 38(2), 107-114, 108-109.

Han River” under the presidency of Park Chung-hee (1963-1979). In the course of China’s modernization, China established secret business relations with South Korea that had a capability to provide capitals and high-techs.

In order to explain the hypothesis, I will make an analysis through many secondary sources that consist of articles, books, and journals. I will use both Chinese language and English language literature regarding China’s changing policy towards South Korea from 1961 to 2017 in order to explain China’s “Non-Policy” and its “Two-Koreas Policy”. On one hand, I have an access to the material through UCLAN library and UCLAN E-journals, from where I will obtain secondary sources in English. For example, I have useful online journal sources in relation to China’s “Independent Foreign Policy of Peace” that influenced China’s policy calculations over South Korea, such as *the China Journal*, *Journal of Northeast Asian Studies*, and so on.²⁹² On the other hand, I have been allowed to use Chinese Academic Journal Electronic Publishing House through its official website that provides abundant articles and essays written by Chinese scholars and researchers.²⁹³ In terms of Chinese language journals, I use key words such as Mao’s “Leaning-to One Side Policy” as well as “One United Front” approach to find journals in relation to China’s policy thinking on South Korea from 1961 to 2017. For example, *Collected Papers for Korean Studies* (Hanguo yanjiu conglun) that originates from the Korean Studies in the Fudan University Centre has been an important source for

²⁹² The China Journal: <https://www.jstor.org/journal/chinaj>

Journal of Northeast Asian Studies: <https://www.jstor.org/journal/jeastasianstudie?decade=2000>

Asian Survey: <https://www.jstor.org/journal/asiansurvey>

China Perspectives: <https://www.jstor.org/journal/chinaperspective>

Modern China: <https://www.jstor.org/journal/modernchina>

Pacific Historical Review: <https://www.jstor.org/journal/pacihistrevi>

Pacific Affairs: <http://www.jstor.org/journal/pacificaffairs>

The China Quarterly: <http://www.jstor.org/journal/chinaquarterly>

Psychology, Foreign Policy, and International Relations Theory:

http://www.jstor.org/stable/3791705?Search=yes&resultItemClick=true&searchText=China's&searchText=Foreign&searchText=Policy&searchText=and&searchText=Critical&searchText=Theory&searchText=of&searchText=International&searchText=Relations&searchUri=%2Faction%2FdoBasicSearch%3Fgroup%3Dnone%26amp%3BQuery%3DChina%2527s%2BForeign%2BPolicy%2Band%2BCritical%2BTheory%2Bof%2BInternational%2BRelations%26amp%3Bfc%3Doff%26amp%3Bwc%3Don%26amp%3Bacc%3Don&refreqid=search%3Aa6cd3ec3e7fade62c0b5afa5cf7c9b66&seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents

²⁹³ The Chinese Academic Journal Electronic Publishing House website (Zhiwang)

<http://www.cnki.net>

Chinese students and pundits to do researches related to the Korean peninsula.²⁹⁴ Apart from *Collected Papers for Korean Studies*, there are some journal sources in respect to the Chinese Communist Party's official viewpoints about China's diplomatic and economic policies, such as *Journal of Chinese Communist Party History Studies* (Zhonggong dangshi yanjiu), *Chinese Communist Party History Research and Teaching* (Dangshi yanjiu jiaoxue) and so on.²⁹⁵

In the meantime, I will also use primary sources to analyze China's changing policy through Chinese political leaders' selected works and Chinese diplomats' memoirs. As the research aims to interpret the underlying reasons and motivations in relation to explaining China's changing policy towards South Korea, the research requires an abundant understanding of Chinese political elites' policy thinking. Therefore, I will trace a variety of Chinese officials' views and opinions through Chinese edition books written by Chinese political leaders who engaged in the foreign policy decision-making process. In other words, previous as well as current Chinese national presidents' selected works will help to clarify the Chinese government's opinions on China's policy towards South Korea from 1961 to 2017.²⁹⁶ I will explain selected works of Mao Ze-dong,

²⁹⁴ Collected Papers for Korean Studies (Hanguo yanjiu zhongxin): <http://mall.cnki.net/magazine/magadetail/HGYL201301.htm>

²⁹⁵ Journal of Chinese Communist Party History Studies (Zhonggong dangshi yanjiu): <http://www.cnki.com.cn/Journal/G-G1-ZGDS.htm> & Chinese Communist Party History Research and Teaching (Dangshi yanjiu jiaoxue): <http://www.cnki.com.cn/Journal/G-G1-DSYJ.htm>

²⁹⁶ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1989). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – diyijuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the first volume]. Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House). & Deng, Xiao-ping. (1983). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – dierjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House). & Deng, Xiao-ping. (1993). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the third volume]. Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House). & Hu, Jin-tao. (2016). Hu Jin-tao wenxuan – diyijuan [Selected works of Hu Jin-tao – the first volume]. Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House). & Hu, Jin-tao. (2016). Hu Jin-tao wenxuan – dierjuan [Selected works of Hu Jin-tao – the second volume]. Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House). & Hu, Jin-tao. (2016). Hu Jin-tao wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Hu Jin-tao – the third volume]. Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House). & Jiang, Ze-min. (2006). Jiang, Ze-min wenxuan – diyijuan [Selected works of Jiang Ze-min – the first volume]. Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House). & Jiang, Ze-min. (2006) Jiang, Ze-min wenxuan – dierjuan [Selected works of Jiang Ze-min – the second volume]. Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House). & Jiang, Ze-min. (2006). Jiang, Ze-min wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Jiang Ze-min – the third volume]. Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House). & Mao, Ze-dong. Mao Ze-dong xuanji – diyijuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the first volume]. Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House). & Mao, Ze-dong. (1944). Mao Ze-dong xuanji – dierjuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-

Deng Xiao-ping, Jiang Ze-min, Hu Jin-tao and Xi Jin-ping's discussion on how to manage state affairs, from where I will have a specific idea of China's diplomatic and economic conditions that will contribute to understanding China's changing policy. For instance, Mao Ze-dong explained his own opinion on liberalism, which will help to connect his economic policy with his perception of capitalism.²⁹⁷

I will also trace the Chinese government's policy calculation in accordance with memoirs written by Chinese diplomats and ambassadors.²⁹⁸ These cadres in the Chinese Communist Party genuinely knew China's diplomatic activity, and some of them witnessed the whole process of China's changing policy towards South Korea from the "Non-Policy" to the "Two-Koreas Policy". In brief, memoirs that provide description and explanation of important historical events will help to explain China's policy towards South Korea. These credible sources will be an access to Chinese diplomats' own experience while they served as ambassadors in overseas countries. In other words, I will have an opportunity to clarify Chinese diplomats' personal arguments on China's diplomatic and economic policies that influenced China's "Non-Policy" and "Two-Koreas Policy". For instance, Zhang Ting-yan and Tan Jing wrote a book named "Eternal memory".²⁹⁹ The

dong – the second volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*. & Mao, Ze-dong. Mao Ze-dong xuanji – disanjuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the third volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*. & Mao, Ze-dong. Mao Ze-dong xuanji – disijuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the fourth volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*. & Xi, Jin-ping. (2014). Xi Jin-ping tan zhiguolizheng [Xi Jin-ping's discussion on how to manage state affairs and govern the country]. *Waiwen chubanshe (Foreign Languages Press)*.

²⁹⁷ Mao, Ze-dong. (1944). Mao Ze-dong xuanji – dierjuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the second volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*.

²⁹⁸ Huang, Hua. (2007). Qinli yu Qinwen – HuangHua huiyilu [Qinli yu Qinwen – Memoir of HuangHua]. *Shijie zhishi chubanshe (World Affairs Press)*. & Ji, Chao-zhu. (2012). Cong hongqiang fanyi dao waijiaoguang: Ji Chao-zhu koushu huiyilu [From being a communist translator to being a diplomat: oral memoir by Ji Chao-zhu]. *Shanxi renmin chubanshe (Shanxi People's Publishing House)*. & Qiao, Song-du. (2008). Qiao Guang-hua yu Gong Peng: wode fuqin muqin [Qiao Guang-hua and Gong Peng: my father and mother]. *Zhonghua shuju (Zhonghua Book Company)*. & Zhang, Ting-yan. & Tan, Jing. (2004). Chushi hanguo [Serving as a diplomat in South Korea]. *Shangdong daxue chubanshe (Shangdong University Publishing House)*. & Zhang, Ting-yan. & Tan, Jing. (2007). Yongyuan de jiyi [Eternal memory]. *Shangdong daxue chubanshe (Shangdong University Publishing House)*.

²⁹⁹ Zhang, Ting-yan. & Tan, Jing. (2007). Yongyuan de jiyi [Eternal memory]. *Shangdong daxue chubanshe (Shangdong University Publishing House)*.

book introduces a couple of diplomats' memory of serving as diplomats at the Chinese embassy in Pyongyang and Seoul.

Chapter outline

Introduction:

The main aim of the chapter is to demonstrate the research gap and clarify the research question. On one hand, there has been some literature on China's involvement in the Korean War in the beginning of the Cold War era, from where scholars suggested the newly established PRC's distinctive approaches towards North Korea and South Korea. In detail, these scholarships emphasized the influence of China's "Aid Korea to Resist the United States Policy" and "Leaning-to One Side Policy" on China's "pro-Pyongyang approach" in the early Mao era. On the other hand, some scholars have paid attention to China's changing attitudes towards South Korea since China's modernization era and China's "Two-Koreas Policy" since the post-Cold War era. In other words, these scholarships explained how China's "Independent Foreign Policy of Peace" and "Opening and Reform Policy" contributed to China's "Two-Koreas Policy". However, there is little discussion on why China insisted on the "Non-Policy" towards South Korea in the late Mao era. Therefore, the research question is as follows: why was China determined to change its policy towards South Korea from the "Non-Policy" to the "Two-Koreas Policy"?

The chapter also clarifies how to analyze China's policy towards South Korea through the theory of three foreign policy approaches, including the rational actor approach, the psychological actor approach and the bureaucratic actor approach. The rational actor approach has been considered as the most widely dominant approach in the study of foreign policy analysis.³⁰⁰ As security interest and ideological concern were combined to influence China's policy towards South Korea, I will use the rational actor approach to analyze China's changing attitudes towards South Korea from the late Mao era to the Xi era. The psychological actor approach emphasizes political leaders' psychological thinking effect on foreign policy decisions.³⁰¹ Since some scholars have indicated Mao Ze-dong's role in the process of Chinese foreign policy, I will use the psychological actor approach to analyze how Mao's perception of communism influenced China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea. The bureaucratic actor approach refers to the influence of bureaucrats' thinking as well as behaviour on foreign policy calculation and application.³⁰² China's diplomatic and economic policies underwent a significant change after Deng Xiao-ping became the paramount leader in the Chinese Communist Party. Deng Xiao-ping, a typical representative of the Chinese reformists, put forward the "Four Modernization Programme" after the pragmatic reformists had succeeded in the fierce competition with the "Gang of Four". Deng Xiao-ping and other party elites decided to use the "Independent Foreign Policy of Peace" and the "Opening and Reform Policy" as strategies to accomplish China's "Four

³⁰⁰ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: Routledge.

³⁰¹ Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: Routledge.

³⁰² Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: Routledge.

Modernization Programme”. In other words, Deng Xiao-ping, the leading figure of the Chinese pragmatists, set out to develop friendly relations with neighbouring countries in order to create a considerably peaceful environment for China’s economic construction. Thereby, I will use the bureaucratic actor approach to analyze the connection between Deng Xiao-ping’s success in the political struggle with the “Gang of Four” and China’s changing policy towards South Korea.

Chapter One:

The establishment of two states with two different systems influenced the political pattern in northeast Asia. However, the founding of the PRC and China’s participation in the Korean War on behalf of North Korea influenced China’s relations with neighbouring countries in the Cold War period. China’s lopsided foreign policy, China’s confrontation with the two giant powers and Mao’s pursuit of communism influenced China’s policy towards South Korea in the late Mao era.

On one hand, China’s struggle with the two leading powers contributed to China’s “Non-Policy” towards South Korea. In the context of Washington’s “Two Chinas” policy, South Korea adopted the “pro-Taipei approach” as a response to China’s “pro-Pyongyang approach”. In the early 1950s, the United States set three military island chains along the periphery of China. South Korea and other America’s allies spared effort to contain China in the First Island Chain, which further contributed to understanding China’s “pro-Pyongyang approach”. The United States’ and its allies’ aggressive approach posed a massive threat to China’s security. In contrast, China’s “Non-Policy” towards South Korea partly resulted from China’s confrontation with the United States and its allies in northeast Asia.

The Soviet Union’s decision to withdraw assistance from China influenced China’s economic development, which resulted in China’s “Self-reliance” economic policy. The “Self-reliance” strategy decreased China’s willingness to develop trading connection with the overseas market. In the meantime, China’s split with the Soviet Union contributed to China’s “pro-Pyongyang approach” after the 1969 Sino-Soviet border clash. In other words, China paid tribute to the North Korean administration, which suggested China’s aggressive approach towards South Korea.

On the other hand, China’s hostile approach towards South Korea was not only a product of China’s lopsided foreign policy, but also of Mao Ze-dong’s perception of communism. In other words, the newly established PRC adopted the “Leaning-to One Side Policy” in order to pursue communism and deter capitalism. In the meantime, Mao became dedicated to his pursuit of communism and decided to build an economically prosperous communist state as similar as the Soviet Union. In the context of Mao’s “Anti-capitalism Policy”, China had little willingness to normalize diplomatic relations with South Korea that adopted the “pro-Washington approach”.

Chapter Two:

China's diplomatic and economic policies underwent a significant change after Deng Xiao-ping came to power. Deng Xiao-ping and a small group of Chinese pragmatists in the Chinese Communist Party decided to equalize the importance of security interest and economic interest. Faced with the economic depression, Deng Xiao-ping decided to carry out the "Opening and Reform Policy" in order to accomplish China's modernization. In the meantime, Deng Xiao-ping paid attention to building friendly relations with neighbouring countries, and considered the "Independent Foreign Policy of Peace" as a strategy to develop diplomatic and economic connections with the overseas market. In the 1980s, South Korea adopted the "Northern Policy" in order to improve relations and decrease tensions with communist countries in northeast Asia. Both China and South Korea had a more specific intention of developing economic cooperation, which laid a hard foundation for China's "Two-Koreas Policy" in the post-Cold War era.

In the meantime, Deng Xiao-ping's success in the fierce competition with the "Gang of Four" influenced China's modernization development. Feared by the oblivion of the state of the People's Republic of China, Deng Xiao-ping and some reformists decided to take a more pragmatic approach. In the context of China's dynamism, Deng Xiao-ping boldly put forward China's developmental plan in order to grasp political power and pursue economic interest. In other words, Deng Xiao-ping's success did not only correct China's inappropriate economic routine, but also develop China's peaceful diplomatic relations. In contrast, China's changing policy towards South Korea should be understood in the context of the competition between the Chinese pragmatists and the Chinese leftists in the Chinese Communist Party.

Chapter Three:

China gradually resumed relations with capitalist countries in the aftermath of the Sino-United States rapprochement, which laid a foundation for China's peaceful relations buildings and stable diplomatic environment. In the meantime, the dissolution of the Soviet Union enabled China to play a more active role in the Korean peninsula. The demise of the Soviet Union on one hand decreased China's security threat, on the other hand, China set out to pay lesser attention to its relations with North Korea. In other words, China caught an opportunity to formally normalize its relations with South Korea in the post-Cold War era. In the context of China's "Two-Koreas Policy", South Korea also ceased to adopt the "pro-Taipei approach" in order to establish official relations with China. With the increasing economic inter-dependence, the 1992 Sino-South Korean friendly cooperative relationship has been escalated into the 2008 Sino-South Korean strategic cooperative partnership. However, the deeper commercial relations between China and South Korea influenced the pattern of northeast Asia. In the wake of China's economic ascent, the United States has paid attention to China's relations with its allies in northeast Asia since the 2010s. In the meantime, a rising China has been capable of using more leverage to protect its national interests in the aftermath of the deployment of THAAD system in South Korea.

Conclusion:

In the Cold War period, security interest and ideological concern were combined to understand China's

changing policy towards South Korea. China considered the “Non-Policy” as the main approach towards South Korea in the context of a series of security protection wars: such as the Korean War and the Vietnamese War. In other words, it would be a nightmare to China that the United States and South Korea have an access to the China-Korea border and the gate of northern China and western China. China would feel more threatened if the United States and its allies continue to reinforce military presence around the periphery of China. Apart from security concern, the newly established PRC insisted on the “Anti-imperialism Policy” and the “Anti-capitalism Policy” in order to chase communism. In the context of China’s “Pro-socialism Policy”, China did not have an intention of normalizing its relations with South Korea.

The Chinese government adopted a more pragmatic approach in order to pursue economic interest, which contributed to China’s “Two-Koreas Policy” in the post-Cold War era. In the background of China’s “Four Modernization Programme”, the Chinese pragmatic reformists in the Chinese Communist Party paved a way for China’s economic development with the “Independent Foreign Policy of Peace” and the “Opening and Reform Policy”. China set out to build a newly economic prosperous socialist modern country in order to pursue international status. With the increasing economic inter-dependence, China was enabled to carry out the “Two-Koreas Policy” in the aftermath of the dissolution of the Soviet Union. On one hand, China’s economic inter-dependence with South Korea contributed to the formal relationship normalization with South Korea. On the other hand, China’s rise has enabled China to have leverage to strengthen China’s role in northeast Asia, which also became the factor that influenced China’s relations with South Korea.

Chapter One: China's policy towards South Korea in the late Mao era (1961-1976)

Introduction

According to the theoretical framework, I argue that the dissertation will use both the rational actor approach and the psychological approach to analyze China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea in the late Mao era. This chapter aims to explain factors that influenced China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea, which includes China's foreign policy and Mao's ideological concern. In the chapter, I will demonstrate China's response and reaction to a series of security crises from the 1950s to the 1970s, which includes the Korean War, the Vietnamese War and the Sino-Soviet border clash. I will illustrate how China's security interest influenced China's policy calculation on South Korea, which concludes China's "Leaning-to One Side Policy" ("一边倒" 政策 – yibiandao zhengce), "Fighting-with Two Fists Strategy" ("两条线作战" 策略 – liangtiaoxian zhanlve), and "One United Front Approach" ("一条线" 策略 – yitiaoxian zhanlve). I will also specify the influence of Mao's ideological concern on China's distinctive approaches towards the two states on the Korean peninsula. I will articulate how Mao's perception of 'pure' communism deteriorated China's relations with the United States and the Soviet Union, which contributed to China's "Anti-imperialism Policy" ("反帝国主义" 政策 – fandiguo zhuyi zhengce) and "Anti-revisionism Policy" ("反修正主义" 政策 – fanxiuzheng zhuyi zhengce). Both policies helped to understand China's policy thinking in the Sino-United States confrontation and the Sino-Soviet Union dispute, which explained the influence of Mao's belief of 'pure' communism on China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea.

According to the research gap of this dissertation, there is a lack of literature on China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea in the late Mao era. Some scholars and pundits have paid attention to China's "pro-Pyongyang approach" from the aspect of China's participation in the Korean War on behalf of North Korea. In contrast, North Korea's relations with China further constituted China's escalating tension with the United States-backed South Korea in the late Mao era. In the first section, I will thereby argue that the research aims to explain why China insisted on the "Non-Policy" towards South Korea. In the second section, I will analyze factors that influenced China's "Aiding Korea to resist the United States Policy" ("抗美援朝" 政策 – kangmeiyuanchao zhengce) in the period of the Korean War, and China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea in the aftermath of the Korean War. In the third section, I will clarify factors that influenced China's "Leaning-to One Side Policy", which will help to understand China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea in the context of China's lopsided foreign policy and South Korea's "Two Chinas" policy. In the fourth section, I will explain China's aggressive policy towards South Korea in the background of China's confrontation with the United States and the Soviet Union. In the last section of this chapter, I will emphasize China's policy towards South Korea from the aspect of Mao's perception of capitalism and imperialism.

Background

Although the Chinese Communist Party became the single ruling party after the Kuomintang had lost the Chinese Civil War (1946-1949), the Republic of China under the leadership of the Kuomintang still received recognition from the United States-led capitalist nations. In other words, the People's Republic of China (PRC - more commonly known as China) was not accepted as a member in the United Nations, which significantly influenced China's foreign and economic relations with the international community in the Mao era. In the background of the escalating confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union, Mao's announcement of the founding of the PRC immediately became a serious threat to the United States. The United States and other capitalist states did not only refuse to acknowledge the newly established PRC, but also adopt a provocative approach towards the PRC. Consequently, the PRC insisted on the "Leaning-to One Side Policy" in order to pursue national independence and socialist transformation. However, the lopsided foreign policy dragged China into the confrontation with the United States and other capitalist states, which destructively influenced China's national interests. China's participation in the bloody Korean War on behalf of North Korea aimed to protect security interest and promote socialist ideology. It turned out to be a lethal blow to China that the United States grasped an opportunity to expand its military presence and capitalist influence in the Korean peninsula. Although the United States had withdrawn its troops back to the south of the thirty-eighth parallel, it greatly intensified the Sino-United States confrontation. In other words, China did not recognize the United States-backed South Korea. In the 1960s, South Korea participated in the Vietnamese War in order to preserve the United States' military presence in South Korea and to protect the Park Chung-hee militarized government. In spite of that, South Korea's military presence in Vietnam turned into a threat to China, which worsened the Sino-South Korean relationship.

China's confrontation with the two leading powers had a devastating impact on China's relations with the international community, which meant that China insisted on a provocative approach towards South Korea in the late Mao era. On one hand, the Sino-Soviet Union relations did not deteriorate until the Soviet Union shifted its approach towards China and became a 'revisionist' hegemonic power to China. Instead, China became the weakest party among the Northern Triangle that consisted of the Soviet Union, North Korea and China. China further enhanced its relations with North Korea after the Soviet Union had dispatched a great number of troops to the Sino-Soviet border. In the meantime, Moscow provided Pyongyang with financial assistance and military equipment, which meant that Pyongyang had more leverage on the triangular relations among Beijing, Moscow and Pyongyang. From the aspect of China, it was a necessity to decrease the tension between China and North Korea to the lowest point in the context of the Sino-Soviet friction. In contrast, North Korea played a more strategic role in China's security policy calculation in the background of the Sino-Soviet dispute, which contributed to China's "pro-Pyongyang approach". On the other hand, the United States reached a series of security treaty agreements with its allies in northeast Asia in order to expand its military presence. In contrast, the Park Chung-hee militarized government caught an opportunity to develop the United States-South Korean relations and protect South Korea from North Korea's sudden

invasion. On an account of South Korea's "pro-Washington approach", the United States' military force in South Korea damaged China's security interest and communist ideology, which constituted China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea.

It has been difficult to tell the influence of the confrontation among the United States, the Soviet Union and China on China's policy towards South Korea. The United States strengthened its military presence in the context of the adversarial relationship between the United States-led capitalist states and the Soviet Union-led communist states. China was thus determined to devote to nuclear weapon programme, which meant that China aimed to preserve its security interest in the wake of the fierce competition. However, the Sino-Soviet friction did not only promote China's "Fighting-with Two Fists Strategy" against the two hostile giant powers, but also stimulate China's changing attitude towards the United States. As the Soviet Union had military conflict with both the United States and China, the United States decided to secretly contact China after the Vietnamese War. In contrast, the Soviet Union slid into the common enemy of the United States and China. The Sino-United States rapprochement did not only mean an opportunity to build diplomatic and economic connection with the United States and other capitalist nations, but also a strategy to reverse China's serious security situation. In spite of that, the Sino-Soviet rift still influenced China's relations with the two states on the Korean peninsula. In other words, China still recognized North Korea as the sole legitimate government in the Korean peninsula after Nixon's historic state visit to China. Faced with the changing political climate in east Asia, the Park Chung-hee administration continued promoting its economic cooperative relations with the ROC, rather than soften its stance on the Kim Il-Sung regime.

China underwent a long-term economic stagnation in the Mao era, which seriously influenced China's trading relations with the global market. China leaned to the Soviet Union in the background of the lopsided foreign policy – the "Leaning-to One Side Policy", which helped to explain why China insisted on the Soviet Union's planned economic system. The Chinese leadership that were impressed by the Soviet Union's developmental model launched the Great Leap Forward Movement (1958-1962), hoping that China's socialist economy would catch up with advanced capitalist countries. Internally, the First Five-Year Plan did not promote China's economy, but turn out to be the devastating Great Famine (1958-1961). Externally, China's confrontation with the two leading powers did not only pose a threat to China's security, but also constitute an obstacle to China's economy. On one hand, China did not consider the "Self-reliance" economic policy ("自力更生" 经济政策 – ziligengsheng jingjizhengce) as a response until the Soviet Union withdrew assistance from China. In contrast, China did not have willingness to build economic relations with the overseas market. On the other hand, the United States and other capitalist states decided to impose strict restriction on China. In contrast, China missed out on an opportunity to bring in capitals and technologies to develop economy in the beginning of the Cold War period. Apart from China's tension with the two giant powers, Mao's perception of "anti-imperialism" as well as "anti-revisionism" helped to understand China's "Self-reliance" strategy. In other words, China did not have an intention of establishing diplomatic and economic relations with the United States and other capitalist states that had waged aggression wars on

China and with the Soviet Union that had changed its goal of 'Maxism-Leninism'.

China did not achieve socialist economic prosperity in the context of the "Self-reliance" strategy and the United States' containment policy, which meant that China did not realize economic inter-dependence with foreign countries as a strategy to promote China's diplomacy and increase China's leverage. From the United States' aspect, the United States insisted on an aggressive approach towards China in order to weaken China's role and impose restriction on the development of socialism. In other words, China's lopsided foreign policy and inappropriate economic practice massively damaged China's diplomatic relations with the international community. China did not have the capability to exert influence on other countries' economy, which equally decreased the economic inter-dependence between China and the overseas market to the lowest point. Apart from the severe diplomatic environment, the Chinese government struggled for the long-term economic stagnation in the Mao era, which constituted an increasingly clear economic gap between China and South Korea. On one hand, China's economic situation became worse after the Cultural Revolution (1966-1976), which meant that the Chinese leadership did not pay attention to economic construction in the late Mao era. On the other hand, the Park Chung-hee militarized government carried out the "Export-oriented Policy" ("出口为导向" 政策 – chukoudaoxiang zhengce), which laid a hard foundation for South Korea's economic take-off. Apart from South Korea's economic policy, the United States decided to provide South Korea with assistance in the wake of South Korea's participation in the Vietnamese War. In other words, the United States has played an important role in South Korea's security and economy since the Korean War, which contributed to South Korea's "pro-Washington approach". China thereby described South Korea as "the United States-backed puppet regime", even though South Korea achieved tremendous economic growth under the leadership of Park Chung-hee.

Literature on China's foreign policy to South Korea in the Mao era

The “Leaning-to One Side Policy” indicated the Chinese government’s ideological concern. According to Liu, ideology was a key apparatus in the explanation of China’s foreign policy decision-making process, and the newly established PRC that insisted on socialism decided to adopt the “Leaning-to One Side Policy”.³⁰³ On one hand, Ding argues that the formation of the Yalta system and the confrontation between the two competing blocs constituted the newly established PRC’s foreign policy thinking in the post-war eras.³⁰⁴ Tao emphasizes that China hesitated to make a choice of *shehuizhuyizhenying* [the Socialist Camp] and *zibenzhuyizhenying* [the Capitalist Camp] in the early Cold War period.³⁰⁵ On the other hand, Chen argues that Washington’s aggressive opinion about the Chinese Communist Party and its long-term assistance to the Kuomintang influenced Beijing’s “pro-Moscow approach”.³⁰⁶ Liu specifies that the Chinese leadership decided to implement a strategy of being close to the Soviet Union, which equally meant that China’s “Pro-Soviet Policy” had the greatest amount of similarity to China’s “Anti-America Policy”.³⁰⁷ In the context of the two blocs’ competition and the United States’ “Anti-communism Policy”, the Chinese government

³⁰³ Liu, Jian-fei. (2000). Yishixingtai dui xinzhongguo “yibiandao” juece de zuoyong [On the role of ideology in the newly established PRC’s lopsided foreign policy]. *Guoji luntan (International Forum)*, 2(5), 43-48.

³⁰⁴ Ding, Ming. (2003). Zhanhou guojiguanxi yu woguo jianguo chu “yibiandao” fangzheng de xingcheng [The influence of international relations in the post-war era on the formation of the “Leaning-to One Side Policy” in the early days of the newly established PRC]. *Dangdai zhongguoshi yanjiu (Contemporary China History Studies)*, 10(2), 92-99.

³⁰⁵ Tao, Ji-yi. (2005). Jinnianlai xifang xueshuji dui xinzhongguo “yibiandao” zhengce de yanjiushuping [On recent western academy’s comments on the newly established PRC’s “Leaning-to One Side Policy”]. *Dangdai zhongguoshi yanjiu (Contemporary China History Studies)*, 12(2), 117-122.

³⁰⁶ Chen, Jian. (2001). Mao’s China and the Cold War. Chapel Hill: *The University of North Carolina Press*, 46-47.

³⁰⁷ Liu, Jian-fei. (2000). Yishixingtai dui xinzhongguo “yibiandao” juece de zuoyong [On the role of ideology in the newly established PRC’s lopsided foreign policy]. *Guoji luntan (International Forum)*, 2(5), 43-48.

considered the lopsided foreign policy as a tool to deter the United States-led imperialist states.³⁰⁸ In spite of fierce ideological conflicts, these scholars do not mention the influence of China's "Pro-communism Policy" on China's policy towards South Korea.

The "Leaning-to One Side Policy" suggested the Chinese government's persistence in the two principles of "anti-imperialism" and "anti-capitalism". On one hand, Mao Ze-dong considered all the imperialist powers that had waged aggression wars on China on the planet as enemies, which meant that the Qing Dynasty's weak capability to protect the central kingdom from collapse contributed to Mao Ze-dong's socialist revolution.³⁰⁹ The Chinese society was viewed as one of the four greatest civilizations in the ancient times.³¹⁰ In spite of that, China was reduced to a semi-colonial and semi-feudal state after losing the First Opium War (1840-1842), which meant that the civilized kingdom was on the verge of collapse in the context of the signing of unequal treaties.³¹¹ In contrast, the purpose of the "Leaning-to One Side Policy" reflected the Chinese government's "anti-imperialism" stance.³¹² On the other hand, Mao Ze-dong expected to overturn the old China and build a newly independent prosperous socialist state.³¹³ In other words, the lopsided foreign policy did not only indicate the ancient civilized nation's struggle with imperialism, but also the

³⁰⁸ Dong, Zhen-rui. (2015). Shinianlai guonei xuesujie guanyu "yibiandao" waijiaofangzheng yanjiu shuping [On the national academic community's review of the "Leaning-to One Side Policy" within the decade]. *Dang de wenxian (Literature of CPC)*, (6), 98-105.

³⁰⁹ Mao, Ze-dong. (2008). Mao Ze-dong xuanji – dierjuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the second volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p680.

³¹⁰ Chen, Jian. (2001). Mao's China and the Cold War. Chapel Hill: *The University of North Carolina Press*, p47.

³¹¹ Mitter, Rana. (2008). Modern China: a very short introduction. *Oxford University Press*, p21.

³¹² Guo, Mei-lan. (2001). Meiguo de fanhua zhengce yu xinzhongguo "yibiandao" de waijiaozhengce [On the United States' "Anti-China Policy" and the new established PRC's "Leaning-to One Side Policy"]. *Xinyang shifan xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Xinyang Teachers College)*, 21(3), 118-121.

³¹³ Mao, Ze-dong. (2008). Mao Ze-dong xuanji – dierjuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the second volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p663.

newly established PRC's plan to contain capitalism.³¹⁴ Similarly, these scholars emphasize factors that influenced China's "Anti-capitalism Policy", but there is lack of discussion that how China's "Anti-imperialism Policy" influenced China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea.

The "Leaning-to One Side Policy" laid a solid ground for China's "Pro-Soviet Policy", which meant that Beijing strove to maintain a special diplomacy with Moscow. According to Chen, imperialist countries' invasion had made China miss out on opportunities to restore 'Sino-centrism' as similar as the ancient times.³¹⁵ On one hand, Lu emphasizes that China realized the Soviet Union's significance in China's national interests, which suggested China's strategy to lean to the Soviet Union.³¹⁶ On the other hand, Mao Ze-dong believes that China's socialist construction in the post-war eras could not be realized without the assistance of the socialist countries and the international proletariat.³¹⁷ Davin indicates that Mao Ze-dong had an intention to concentrate on economic reconstruction and social advancement by bringing in Soviet capitals, technologies and experts.³¹⁸ Wu argues that the "Leaning-to One Side Policy" was used as a tool to decrease Stalin's prejudice about the Chinese Communist Party government and to seek for international aid.³¹⁹ In

³¹⁴ Kong, Han-bing. (2003), Bingfei yifang xuanze de jieguo – lun xinzhongguo chuqi "yibiandao" waijiao zhengce de chansheng [On the creation of the "Leaning-to One Side Policy" in the early days of the newly established PRC]. *Eluosi yanjiu (Russian Studies)*, (3), 81-87. & Guo, Qiong. (1999). Shi xi zhonggong jianguo chuqi "yibiandao" waijiao zhengce xingcheng de lishi yuanyin [On the historical reasons of the formation of the "Leaning-to One Side Policy" in the early stage of the newly established PRC]. *Gansu shehui kexue (Gansu Social Sciences)*, (S1), 42-43.

³¹⁵ Chen, Jian. (2003). A response: how to pursue a critical history of Mao's foreign policy. *The China Journal*, (49), 137-142.

³¹⁶ Lu, Feng. (2003). Cong guojialiyi shijiao kan "yibiandao" waijiaozhengce chengyin [On the formation of the "Leaning-to One Side Policy" from the perspective of national interest]. *Heilongjiang jiaoyu xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Heilongjiang College of Education)*, 22(1), 67-69.

³¹⁷ Mao, Ze-dong. (2008). Mao Ze-dong xuanji – dierjuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the second volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p680.

³¹⁸ Davin, Delia. (2013). Mao: a very short introduction. *Oxford University Press*, p49.

³¹⁹ Wu, Chen-lin. (2011). Guojihua shiyuxia "yibiandao" waijiaozhengce de queli [On the formation of the "Leaning-to One Side Policy" from the aspect of internationalization]. *Guoji guanxi xueyuan xuebao (Journal of University of International Relations)*, (3), 13-17.

other words, Mao Ze-dong aimed not just to re-build the Chinese society, but also to obtain recognition from the Soviet Union-led communist community.³²⁰ Gao therefore concludes that China carried out the lopsided foreign policy in order to preserve security interest, promote economic reconstruction and build political status in the international community.³²¹ Although these scholars explain how China benefited from China's "Pro-Soviet Policy", they do not discuss the perspective on how these benefits stimulated China's distinctive approaches towards the Korean peninsula.

The "Leaning-to One Side Policy" also meant that the Soviet Union caught an opportunity to exert its influence on China in the Cold War period, which had a serious ramification on the Sino-Soviet relations. Dong argues that the "Leaning-to One Side Policy" imposed restriction on the development of China's diplomatic relationship buildings.³²² Wu indicates that China focused on ideological superiority in the background of the lopsided foreign policy, and such a diplomatic approach had limitations.³²³ Chen considers the lopsided foreign policy as a product of the Chinese Communist Party's long-term plan to be a part of the Soviet-led socialist revolution, which implied the inseparable relations between the Soviet Union and China's pursuit of the cause of communism.³²⁴ However, Davin argues that the signing of the Treaty of

³²⁰ Kong, Han-bing. (2003). Bingfei yifang xuanze de jieguo – lun xinzhongguo chuqi "yibiandao" waijiao zhengce de chansheng [On the creation of the "Leaning-to One Side Policy" in the early days of the newly established China]. *Eluosi yanjiu (Russian Studies)*, (3), 81-87. & Guo, Qiong. (1999). Shi xi zhonggong jianguo chuqi "yibiandao" waijiao zhengce xingcheng de lishi yuanyin [On the historical reasons of the formation of the "Leaning-to One Side Policy" in the early stage of the newly established PRC]. *Gansu shehui kexue (Gansu Social Sciences)*, (S1), 42-43. & Chen, Jian. (1994). China's road to the Korean War: the making of the Sino-American confrontation. New York: Columbia University Press, p64.

³²¹ Gao, Xian-chao. (2009). Xinzhongguo chengli chuqi "yibiandao" waijiaozhengce shi zhengque de xianshi xuanze [The newly established PRC's "Leaning-to One Side Policy" was the correct as well as practical choice]. *Sheke zongheng (Social Sciences Review)*, 24(9), 112-113.

³²² Dong, Zhen-rui. (2015). Shinianlai guonei xuesujie guanyu "yibiandao" waijiaofangzheng yanjiu shuping [On the national academic community's review of the "Leaning-to One Side Policy" within the decade]. *Dang de wenxian (Literature of CPC)*, (6), 98-105.

³²³ Wu, Chen-lin. (2011). Guojihua shiyuxia "yibiandao" waijiaozhengce de queli [On the formation of the "Leaning-to One Side Policy" from the aspect of internationalization]. *Guoji guanxi xueyuan xuebao (Journal of University of International Relations)*, (3), 13-17.

³²⁴ Chen, Jian. (1994). China's road to the Korean War: the making of the Sino-American confrontation. New York: Columbia University Press, p65.

Friendship, Alliance, and Mutual Assistance between Beijing and Moscow did not enhance the Sino-Soviet relations, but increase the Chinese leadership's dissatisfaction with the Stalin administration (1922-1953).³²⁵ China did not realize independent diplomacy in the context of the lopsided foreign policy, which conversely indicated the inequality of the Sino-Soviet relations.³²⁶ In other words, China made a range of concessions in the context of the Soviet 'hegemony', which directly turned into an obstacle to China's economic reconstruction.³²⁷ These scholars explain how China thought of the Soviet Union and how the Soviet Union shaped China's national interests, whereas, they do not mention the influence of the worsening Sino-Soviet Union relations on China's policy thinking on South Korea.

The "Leaning-to One Side Policy" meant that China did not pay an attention to its relations with the United States and other capitalist states, which contributed to the Sino-United States confrontation. According to Tao, western countries did not have a willingness to provide China with foreign assistance and restore China's legitimate seat in the United Nations, which meant that China had difficulties in coping with domestic as well as foreign affairs in the context of the Sino-United States confrontation.³²⁸ In spite of the establishment of the Chinese Communist Party regime, Mitter argues that the United States maintained its position and continued recognizing Chiang Kai-shek as the sole leader of China.³²⁹ Even though the United States did not wage aggression wars on China, Chen indicates that the Chinese leadership considered the United States and its aggressive approach as threats to the Chinese Communist Party regime.³³⁰ The United

³²⁵ Davin, Delia. (2013). Mao: a very short introduction. Oxford University Press, p50.

³²⁶ Zhou, Jian-chao. (2002). Zailun "yibiandao" waijiao zhengce de lishi yuanyin [On the historical causes of the "Leaning-to One Side Policy"]. *Yangzhou daxue xuebao (Journal of Yangzhou University)*, 6(2), 14-19.

³²⁷ Davin, Delia. (2013). Mao: a very short introduction. Oxford University Press, p50.

³²⁸ Tao, Ji-yi. (2005). Jinnianlai xifang xueshuji dui xinzhongguo "yibiandao" zhengce de yanjiu shuping [On recent western academy's comments on the newly established PRC's "Leaning-to One Side Policy"]. *Dangdai zhongguoshi yanjiu (Contemporary China History Studies)*, 12(2), 117-122.

³²⁹ Mitter, Rana. (2004). A bitter revolution: China's struggle with the modern world. Oxford University Press, p193.

³³⁰ Chen, Jian. (1994). China's road to the Korean War: the making of the Sino-American confrontation. New York: Columbia University Press, p65.

States' containment policy did not only mean political recognition, but also include military confrontation and economic restriction.³³¹ Kissinger highlights that the United States maintained a deteriorated relations with China, and did not have a plan to decrease tension with the PRC as well.³³² Sui notes that the United States built up three confrontational military island chains that included South Korea-Taiwan-South Vietnam, Japan-the Philippines-the Thailand and Guam-Australia-New Zealand in order to contain China and deter socialism, which meant that China missed out on an opportunity to promote friendly diplomacy and trading connection with the United States-led western countries.³³³ In the meantime, Steiner suggests that the United States curbed business with China in the context of China's "Pro-Soviet Policy", which further became an obstacle to China's economic reconstruction.³³⁴ These scholars articulate the influence of China's lopsided foreign policy on the Sino-United States relations, whereas, there is little analysis of how the Sino-United States confrontation constituted China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea.

The "Leaning-to One Side Policy" influenced the United States and other capitalist states' policy towards the Kuomintang that insisted on the "pro-Washington approach", which further strengthened the United States' military presence in northeast Asia and postponed the PRC's peaceful talk with the Kuomintang. According to Szonyi, it was not an easy thing to explain Jinmen's policy-making process (more commonly known as Kinmen), especially, China, Taiwan and the United States played a role in Jinmen.³³⁵ Roy argues that the United States did not have a graver concern on its strategic interests in Taiwan until the PRC was determined to realize unification with Taiwan: the United States insisted that the Soviet Union would benefit from the strategic island once Taiwan was under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, which would conversely impose harsh restrictions on the United States' long-term development in northeast Asia and southeast Asia.³³⁶ Chiang Kai-shek insisted on an aggressive policy towards the PRC in the context of

³³¹ Wu, W. Y. Friedrich. (1981). From self-reliance to inter-dependence? Developmental strategy and foreign economic policy in post-Mao China. *Modern China*, 7(4), 445-482, p459. & Buss, A. Claude. (1988). Reviewed work(s): Truman's "Two China" policy. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 47(2), 346-347, p346.

³³² Kissinger, Henry. (2011). White House Years: the first volume of his classic memoirs. *Simon & Schuster*, p163.

³³³ Sui, Shu-ying. (2004). Lun "yibiandao" zhengce de lishi juxianxing [On the historical limitation of the "Leaning-to One Side Policy"]. *Qilu xuekan (Qilu Journal)*, (6), 48-54.

³³⁴ Steiner, A. H. (1972). Re-thinking U.S. China policy. *Pacific Affairs*, 45(2), 255-268.

³³⁵ Szonyi, Michael. (2008). Cold War Island: Quemoy on the front line. *Cambridge University Press*: p4.

³³⁶ Roy, Denny. (2003). Taiwan: a political history. *Cornell University Press*, p108.

the United States' leverage on Taiwan.³³⁷ Simultaneously, the United States did not cease to provide the Kuomintang with assistance, which suggested the United States' "pro-Taipei approach".³³⁸ Wang highlights that the Kuomintang made a contribution to Taiwan's economic take-off, even though the Kuomintang underwent grave challenges in the 1950s and the 1960s.³³⁹ However, Chen argues that Mao Ze-dong and other Chinese leadership paid more attention to the United States' possible role in weakening China's socialist revolution after the Chinese Communist Party's success in the Chinese Civil War, which meant that Mao Ze-dong considered the lopsided foreign policy as a strategy to contain the United States-led Capitalist Camp as well as to protect the Chinese proletarian revolution.³⁴⁰ On one hand, Mao Ze-dong considered the Kuomintang's "pro-Washington approach" as a threat, which meant that China aimed to deter imperialism.³⁴¹ On the other hand, the Kuomintang decided to curb the development of communism in the wake of the United States-Taiwan Mutual Defence Treaty, which exaggerated the Sino-United States confrontation.³⁴² Although these scholars explain factors of the United States' "pro-Taipei approach", they do not argue how the Kuomintang's increasing role influenced Beijing's perspective on the United States-backed Seoul

³³⁷ Wang, Ya-jie. & Song, Xiao-wei. & Lan, Yu-ming. (2013). Mao Ze-dong queli "yibiandao" waijiao zhengce de yuanyin fenxi [On factors that constituted Mao Ze-dong's "Leaning-to One Side Policy"]. *Beihua daxue xuebao (Journal of Beihua University)*, 14(5), 72-75.

³³⁸ Gao, Xian-chao. (2009). Xinzhongguo chengli chuqi "yibiandao" waijiaozhengce shi zhengque de xianshi xuanze [The newly established PRC's "Leaning-to One Side Policy" was the correct as well as practical choice]. *Sheke zongheng (Social Sciences Review)*, 24(9), 112-113.

³³⁹ Wang, Chen-main (Peter). (2007). A bastion created, a regime reformed, an economy reengineered, 1949-1970. (Available from the book: Taiwan – a new history). London & New York: *Routledge*, p321.

³⁴⁰ Chen, Jian. (1994). China's road to the Korean War: the making of the Sino-American confrontation. New York: *Columbia University Press*, 65-66.

³⁴¹ Yang, Yun-long. & Xiao, Xiao-chen. (2013). "Yibiandao" waijiao zhengce xingcheng yuanyin zaixi [A review of the formation of the "Leaning-to One Side Policy"]. *Shangdong xingzheng xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Shangdong Academy of governance)*, 4, 50-53.

³⁴² Lu, Feng. (2003). Cong guojiali yi shijiao kan "yibiandao" waijiaozhengce chengyin [On the formation of the "Leaning-to One Side Policy" from the perspective of national interest]. *Heilongjiang jiaoyu xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Heilongjiang College of Education)*, 22(1), 67-69. & Szonyi, Michael. (2008). Cold War Island: Quemoy on the front line. *Cambridge University Press*: p62.

government.

China participated in the Korean War on behalf of North Korea against the United States, which revealed the Korean peninsula's role in China's security. With the United States' controlling of the southern part, the Syngman Rhee regime (1948-1960) declared the founding of the Republic of Korea (ROC – more commonly known as South Korea) on 15th, August 1948.³⁴³ On one hand, Zhang argues that the United States' military presence in Korea and South Korea's "pro-Washington approach" quickened the eruption of the Korean War.³⁴⁴ On the other hand, Davin argues that Mao Ze-dong was afraid of the United States' intention to wage aggression war against the newly established PRC.³⁴⁵ Plant and Rhode regard the Korean peninsula as a convenient 'invasion corridor', thereby, it was alarming to Beijing that the United States dispatched military forces to the Korean peninsula in the period of the Korean War.³⁴⁶ The United States' expanding military presence in the Korean peninsula was recognized as a massive security threat to China, which helped to explain why the newly established PRC decided to send troops to North Korea.³⁴⁷ These scholars mention how China responded to the United States' widening influence on the Korean peninsula. In spite of that, there is a lack of explanation of how the United States' military presence in South Korea shaped China's policy towards the Korean peninsula.

Apart from security calculation, China was determined to involve in the Korean War with other concerns. According to Lee, it was not sufficiently reasonable to believe that the Chinese government's decision to send troops to Korea was only aimed to protect security interest.³⁴⁸ Wang argues that the United States

³⁴³ Oberdorfer, Don. (1997). The Two Koreas: a contemporary history. Basic Books: p7.

³⁴⁴ Zhang, Ming. (2001). Lun chaoxianzhanzheng de qiyin he jieju [On origins as well as results of the Korean War]. *Dang de wenxian (Literature of Chinese Communist Party)*, (2), 65-70.

³⁴⁵ Davin, Delia. (2013). Mao: a very short introduction. Oxford University Press, p51.

³⁴⁶ Plant, T. & Rhode, B. (2013). China, North Korea and the spread of nuclear weapons. *Survival*, 55(2), 61-80. & Lee, Chae-jin. (1996). China and Korea: dynamic relations. Stanford: Hoover Institution.

³⁴⁷ Zhang, Bai-jia. (2005). "Kangmei yuanchao" yu "yuanyue kangmei" – zhongguo ruhe yingdui chaoxianzhanzheng he yuenanzhanzheng ["Aiding Korea to resist the United States" and "Aiding Vietnam to resist the United States" – how China responded to the Korean War and the Vietnamese War]. *Shijie jingji yu zhengzhi (World Economics and Politics)*, (3), 8-15.

³⁴⁸ Lee, Bong. (2003). The unfinished war: Korea. New York: Algora Plub.

adopted a provocative approach towards the Socialist Camp, which resulted in the escalation of the Soviet-United States confrontation in the post-Second World War period.³⁴⁹ On one hand, Hao and Zhai emphasize that China's humiliated history contributed to the newly established PRC's participation in the Korean War and persistence in the "Anti-imperialism Policy" in the Mao era.³⁵⁰ In contrast, the Chinese leadership joined in the battle in the Korean peninsula in order to beat its biggest opponent – the United States.³⁵¹ On the other hand, Davin highlights that Mao Ze-dong considered the participation in the Korean War as an opportunity to build China's image in the Communist Camp and to achieve the goal of raising China's political status, which meant that China aimed to decrease the United States' influence in northeast Asia and to expand the development of the Socialist Camp.³⁵² Thereby, the Chinese government considered China's participation in the Korean War as an example of China's determination to fight against hegemonism.³⁵³ These scholars analyze why China entered a war zone in the Korean peninsula, whereas, they do not explain how China's thinking of national building in the international arena influenced China's policy towards South Korea.

China's participation in the Korean War significantly influenced China's diplomatic and economic development in the Mao era. Zhang argues that China realized the United States' retreat to the south of the thirty-eighth parallel as a symbolic victory, which meant that China achieved a success in the campaign of

³⁴⁹ Wang, De-fu. (2007). Chaoxianzhanzheng qian meiguo de dongbeiya celve [On the United States' approach towards northeast Asia ahead of the Korean War]. *Daqing shifan xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Daqing Normal University)*, 28(4), 126-128.

³⁵⁰ Hao, Yu-fan. & Zhai, Zhi-lai. (1990). China's decision to enter the Korean War: history revisited. *The China Quarterly*, (21), 94-115.

³⁵¹ Chen, Jian. & Wilson, L. David. (1998-1999). All under the heaven is great chaos: Beijing, the Sino-Soviet border clashes and the turn towards Sino-American rapprochement, 1968-1969. *CWHPB II*, 155-175. & Chen, Jian. (2001). Mao's China and the Cold War. Chapel Hill: *The University of North Carolina Press*, p85.

³⁵² Davin, Delia. (2013). Mao: a very short introduction. *Oxford University Press*, p51.

³⁵³ Wang, Dong-yan. (2010). Chaoxianzhanzheng: Zhongguo weishengme yaocanzhan [The Korean War: why China attended the war]. *Fujian dangshi yuekan (Journal of Fujian Monthly History)*, (17), 22-24.

resisting the United States and aiding North Korea.³⁵⁴ However, Xu argues that North Korea was not ruined, which did not mean China secured its development in the post-war eras.³⁵⁵ Dong emphasizes that the United States and other capitalist states did not cease to contain China with economic sanctions, which further contributed to a highly centralized planned economic system.³⁵⁶ Apart from China's severe economic situation, Chen indicates that China's involvement in the Korean War soured the later Sino-United States relationship, which meant that China faced a more serious international situation.³⁵⁷ In the context of the Sino-United States confrontation, the United States had no intention of changing the status quo of the Taiwan Strait, which meant that China lost an opportunity to accomplish the goal of peaceful unification with Taiwan.³⁵⁸ Davin concludes that the United States insisted on the aggressive approach towards China, which indirectly constituted China's growing reliance on the Soviet Union.³⁵⁹ Even though these scholars analyze the consequence of China's involvement in the Korean War, they do not focus on the aspect of how China's diplomatic and economic situation influenced China's policy towards South Korea.

China's relations with both Koreas came into a critical period in the wake of the Korean War, which contributed to China's "pro-Pyongyang approach". According to Qian, both China and South Korea did not reach formal diplomacy in the period of the Cold War, which meant that China refused to officially recognize

³⁵⁴ Zhang, Ming. (2001). Lun chaoxianzhanzheng de qiyin he jieju [On origins as well as results of the Korean War]. *Dang de wenxian (Literature of Chinese Communist Party)*, (2), 65-70.

³⁵⁵ Xu, Xiao-ming. (2013). Lun chaoxianzhanzheng de qiyuan yu zhongguo canzhan –Stalin, Jin Ri-chen, Mao Ze-dong yu chaoxianzhanzheng [On the origin of the Korean War and China's involvement – Stalin, Kim Il-Sung, Mao Ze-dong and the Korean War]. *Zhanjiang shifan xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Zhanjiang Normal University)*, 34(4), 65-71.

³⁵⁶ Dong, Zhi-kai. (2001). Chaoxian zhanzheng yu xinzhongguo jingxi [On the Korean War and the newly established PRC's economy]. *Zhonggong Ningboshi changweixiao xuebao (Journal of the Party School of Chinese Communist Party Ningbo Municipal Committee)*, 23(5), 5-13.

³⁵⁷ Chen, Jian. (1994). China's road to the Korean War: the making of the Sino-American confrontation. New York: Columbia University Press.

³⁵⁸ Saunders, C. P. (2005). Long-term trends in China-Taiwan relations: implications for U.S. Taiwan policy. *Asian Survey*, 45(6), 970-991.

³⁵⁹ Davin, Delia. (2013). Mao: a very short introduction. Oxford University Press, p51.

the South Korean government in the context of China's "pro-Pyongyang approach".³⁶⁰ On one hand, Shen argues that China forged a strong relations with North Korea, even though China did not reach agreement with North Korea ahead of the Korean War.³⁶¹ In other words, the Sino-North Korean relationship was as close as lips and teeth: both nations promoted the strategic partnership with a series of treaties and agreements.³⁶² On the other hand, Chen argues that the Chinese leadership became concerned about the United States' military presence in the Korean peninsula, especially the United States' troops had an access to the industrial centre in northern China, which meant that China could hardly under-estimate North Korea's significance in the context of the United States' containment policy.³⁶³ These scholars explain China's "pro-Pyongyang approach" from the aspect of China's security concern. Nevertheless, there is little analysis about how China thought of South Korea and how South Korea's relations with the United States contributed to China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea.

China's intervention in the Korean War contributed to the forming of the United States and other capitalist countries "Two Chinas" policy, which exaggerated China's confrontation with the United States-backed Kuomintang. According to Zhou, Mao's decision to participate in the Korean War aimed not only to save North Korea, but also to build such an image that the newly established PRC had the capability to resist the United States.³⁶⁴ Roy argues that the Kuomintang had an assumption that the United States planned to downplay the Kuomintang' role while the United States did not meet the pledge to supply assistance as the

³⁶⁰ Qian, Qi-chen. (2003). *Waijiao shiji [Ten episodes in China's diplomacy]*. Beijing: *Shijie zhishi chubanshe (World Affairs Press)*, p139.

³⁶¹ Shen, Zhi-hua. (2012). *Chaoxianzhanzheng qijian de zhongchao tongmeng [On the alliance relationship between China and North Korea in the period of the Korean War]*. *Fazhan (Developing)*, (4), 63-69.

³⁶² Cai, Jian. (2006). *Chaoxianzhanzheng dui zhongguo yu chaoxianbandao guanxi de yingxiang [The influence of the Korean War on the relationship between China and the Korean peninsula]*. *Hanguo yanjiu congjun (Collected Papers for Korean Studies)*, (00), 79-90.

³⁶³ Chen, Jian. (2001). *Mao's China and the Cold War*. Chapel Hill: *The University of North Carolina Press*, p87.

³⁶⁴ Zhou, Cai-fang. (2000). *Shixi chaoxianzhanzheng dui xinzhongguo fazhanlicheng de yingxiang [An analysis of the influence of the Korean War on the developmental process of the newly established PRC]*. *Nanjing shehui kexue (Social Science in Nanjing)*, (12), 45-51.

Soviet Union did in the period of the Chinese Civil War.³⁶⁵ However, Zhang argues that the United States changed its attitude towards the Chiang Kai-shek administration in the wake of the Korean War, which meant that the United States decided to re-estimate the Taiwan Strait and the Kuomintang.³⁶⁶ On one hand, Szonyi highlights that China's participation in the Korean War postponed its plan to reunify with Taiwan, which prolonged the Kuomintang regime and explained Jinmen's symbolic role in containing communism in the post-war eras.³⁶⁷ On the other hand, Chen indicates that China struggled for the Taiwan Strait tensions in the context of the Sino-United States confrontation.³⁶⁸ Davin and Roy conclude that Chiang Kai-shek who had attended the Cairo Conference with the United States' support was considered as the paramount Chinese leader in the Second World War period; the ROC, one of the United States' allies in the War of Resistance against Japan, was accepted as one member in the United Nations.³⁶⁹ Although scholars illustrate why the Korean War shifted the United States' policy thinking over the Kuomintang and saved the Chiang Kai-shek regime, whereas, they do not analyze how South Korea's calculation of the Kuomintang stimulated China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea in the context of the United States' "pro-Taipei approach".

The United States' "Two Chinas" policy constituted an obstacle to the stable development of the Chinese Communist Party's regime, which suggested that the United States planned to perpetuate the division in the international community. According to Szonyi, Jinmen (more commonly known as Kinmen) was symbolized as such a danger area that represented the confrontation between the Chinese government and the Kuomintang regime.³⁷⁰ Liu argues that the United States-backed South Korean government developed its

³⁶⁵ Roy, Denny. (2003). Taiwan: a political history. Cornell University Press, p107.

³⁶⁶ Zhang, Bin. (2009). Chaoxianzhazheng baofa qianhou meiguo duitai zhanlve juece zhuanbian tanxi [An analysis of the United States' policy shift towards Taiwan before and after the eruption of the Korean War]. *Yingcai gaozhi luntan (The Forum of Yingcai Higher Vocational Education)*, 5(2), 40-44.

³⁶⁷ Szonyi, Michael. (2008). Cold War Island: Quemoy on the front line. Cambridge University Press: p62.

³⁶⁸ Chen, Qi-miao. (1996). The Taiwan Strait crisis: its crux and solutions. *Asian Survey*, 36(11), 1055-1066.

³⁶⁹ Davin, Delia. (2013). Mao: a very short introduction. Oxford University Press, p51. & Roy, Denny. (2003). Taiwan: a political history. Cornell University Press, 105-106.

³⁷⁰ Szonyi, Michael. (2008). Cold War Island: Quemoy on the front line. Cambridge University Press: p4 & p27.

relations with the Kuomintang in order to contain communism.³⁷¹ On one hand, Wang highlights that South Korea was determined to establish formal diplomatic office in Taipei while some states acknowledged the PRC in the background of the Soviet Union's "pro-Beijing approach", or some states did not decide to recognize both Beijing and Taipei in the context of the United States' "Two Chinas" policy.³⁷² On the other hand, Zhang suggests that South Korea adopted the "pro-Washington approach", which increased China's discontent with the United States and its allies in east Asia.³⁷³ Han indicates that South Korea agreed to sign the Mutual Security Treaty with the United States in order to protect further invasions from North Korea, which meant that the United States strengthened its role and expanded its military presence in northeast Asia.³⁷⁴ China on one hand strengthened its relations with the Soviet Union and North Korea in order to curb the Kuomintang's development, on the other hand, promoted the "pro-Pyongyang approach" in order to deter the United States-backed Seoul government.³⁷⁵ These scholars emphasize factors that influenced the confrontation between Taipei and Beijing in the context of Washington's containment policy towards China, whereas, they do not build understanding of China's perspective on South Korea's "pro-Taipei approach" and its influence on China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea.

The Soviet Union played a complicated role in China's security policy and economic strategy, which helped to explain China's disappointment to the Sino-Soviet relations. Hua and Meng argue that China developed its strategic alliance relationship with the Soviet Union in the wake of the outbreak of the Korean War, which further triggered the confrontation between the Northern Triangle that included the Soviet Union, North

³⁷¹ Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094, p1089. & Heo, Uk. & Kim, Hayam. (2012). Private-sector networks, democracy, and interstate relations: a case study of South Korea and Taiwan. *Asian Perspective*, (36), 71-93, p71.

³⁷² Wang, Chen-main (Peter). (2007). A bastion created, a regime reformed, an economy reengineered, 1949-1970. (Available from the book: Taiwan – a new history). London & New York: *Routledge*, p321.

³⁷³ Zhang, Bin. (2009). Chaoxianzhazheng baofa qianhou meiguo duitai zhanlve juece zhuanbian tanxi [An analysis of the United States' policy shift towards Taiwan before and after the eruption of the Korean War]. *Yingcai gaozhi luntan (The Forum of Yingcai Higher Vocational Education)*, 5(2), 40-44.

³⁷⁴ Han, Sung-joo. (1980). South Korea and the United States: the alliance survives. *Asian Survey*, 20(11), 1075-1086.

³⁷⁵ Hao, Yu-fan. (1987). China and the Korean peninsula: a Chinese perspective. *Asian Survey*, 27(8), 862-884.

Korea and China and the Southern Triangle that contained the United States, South Korea and Japan.³⁷⁶ However, Kissinger emphasizes that China's relations with the Soviet Union in the post-war eras should be understood in the context of Mao's persistence in 'Sino-centrism', which meant that Mao did not have an intention of being into a part of the Soviet Union-led communist social order.³⁷⁷ Davin on one hand indicates that China was not satisfied with the Soviet Union that asked China to afford all assistance that China received in the period of the Korean War, on the other hand suggests that the Soviet Union was not described as a 'revisionist' government until Khrushchev came to power and shifted its aim of achieving communism, which further constituted China's anxiety about the Soviet Union.³⁷⁸ Sheng additionally suggests that Mao Ze-dong did not reach an agreement on the Soviet Union's plan to jointly develop nuclear programme, whereas, the Soviet Union meant to build a stronger defence capability than the United States and other capitalist states.³⁷⁹ These scholars emphasize the Soviet Union's significance in China's foreign policy thinking, such as the Soviet Union's hostile attitude towards China and the Khrushchev administration's (1953-1964) revisionism. However, they do not mention the influence of the Soviet Union's changing policy on China's role in the Korean peninsula and China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea.

China's worsening relations with the Soviet Union meant a setback for the PRC, which further damaged China's interest and decreased China's role in the Korean peninsula. According to Chen, China's relations with the Soviet Union became totally deteriorated in the wake of the 1969 border dispute on Damansky Island.³⁸⁰ Kissinger argues that the Soviet Union immediately dispatched troops to the Sino-Soviet Union border and enhanced its military presence in the aftermath of the Sino-Soviet border clash.³⁸¹ Shen and Xia

³⁷⁶ Hua, Qi. & Meng, Fan-ming. (2014). Chaoxianzhanzheng yu zhongsutongmengguanxi de yanbian [The Korean War and the evolution of the Sino-Soviet Union alliance relationship]. *Shijiqiao (Bridge of Century)*, (3), 63-64.

³⁷⁷ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. Penguin Press, p163.

³⁷⁸ Davin, Delia. (2013). Mao: a very short introduction. Oxford University Press, p52 & p76.

³⁷⁹ Sheng, M. Michael. (2008). Mao and China's relations with the superpowers in the 1950s: a new look at the Taiwan Strait crises and the Sino-Soviet split. *Modern China*, 34(4), 477-507, p495.

³⁸⁰ Chen, Jian. (2001). Mao's China and the Cold War. Chapel Hill: The University of North Caroline Press, p240.

³⁸¹ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. Penguin Press, p217.

emphasize that the Soviet Union asked the Chinese government to return all Soviet experts to the Soviet Union and decided to withdraw all assistance from China, which meant that China's relations with the Soviet Union became tenser in the 1960s.³⁸² Lee additionally argues that China considered the Soviet Union's troops as an immense security threat, and China immediately improved its relations with North Korea in order to protect China from aggressions.³⁸³ Barnds indicates China paid an increasing attention to North Korea, and intended to endorse Kim-Il Sung's unification plan in the context of the Sino-Soviet split.³⁸⁴ Hao concludes that Beijing could not undertake the unbearable consequence that North Korea shifted its approach towards China and adopted the "Pro-Soviet Policy".³⁸⁵ Although these scholars analyze why China enhanced its relations with North Korea that played a more important role in shaping China's national interest calculation in the context of the Sino-Soviet dispute, they do not explain China's perspective on the Northern Triangle relations and its influence on China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea.

China's relations with South Korea seriously deteriorated after South Korea's involvement in the Vietnamese War, which suggested China's perspective on the United States-backed South Korea's military presence in Vietnam. According to Zhai, the escalation of the Vietnamese War enabled the United States to further expand its military presence from northeast Asia to southeast Asia, which posed a security threat to China.³⁸⁶ Zhang argues that both China and North Vietnam had a grave concern on the United States' intervention in the Vietnamese War, which suggested that the PRC devoted to the movement to resist the United States to aid North Vietnam.³⁸⁷ It was deeply precarious to Beijing that the United States waged aggression war

³⁸² Shen, Zhi-hua. & Xia, Ya-feng. (2012). Between aid and restriction: the Soviet Union's changing policies on China's nuclear weapons program, 1954-1960. *Asian Perspective*, 36, 95-122. & Davin, Delia. (2013). Mao: a very short introduction. *Oxford University Press*, p75.

³⁸³ Lee, Yung-hong. (1977). Korea's future: Peking's perspective. *Asian Survey*, 17(11), 1088-1102.

³⁸⁴ Barnds, J.W. (1976). The Two Koreas in east Asian affairs. New York: *New York University Press*, p39.

³⁸⁵ Hao, Yu-fan. (1987). China and the Korean peninsula: a Chinese perspective. *Asian Survey*, 27(8), 862-884.

³⁸⁶ Zhai, Qiang. (2000). China and the Vietnam War, 1950-1975. Chapel Hill: *University of North Carolina Press*, p141.

³⁸⁷ Zhang, Bai-jia. (2005). "Kangmei yuanchao" yu "yuanyue kangmei" – zhongguo ruhe yingdui chaoxianzhanzheng he yuenanzhanzheng ["Aiding Korea to resist the United States" and "Aiding Vietnam

against North Vietnam.³⁸⁸ However, Sarantakes argues that South Korea also participated in the Vietnamese War and dispatched troops to South Vietnam in order to protect the United States' troops from withdrawing from the Korean peninsula.³⁸⁹ In contrast, the Park Chung-hee administration caught an opportunity to enhance the Washington-Seoul relations through military cooperation.³⁹⁰ Kim and Vogel suggest that the Kennedy government (1961-1963) did not cancel the plan to decrease the United States' assistance to South Korea until Park Chung-hee decided to send troops to Vietnam, which further strengthened South Korea's national defense capability.³⁹¹ Park additionally indicates that the Johnson administration (1963-1969) agreed to provide South Korea with financial assistance after the South Korean government had promised to send more South Korean military forces to South Vietnam, which promoted the Park Chung-hee regime's second five-year economic developmental programme.³⁹² These scholars do not emphasize South Korea's military presence in Vietnam and China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea, even though they explain China's perspective on the eruption of the Vietnamese War and South Korea's aims to join in the Vietnamese War.

It has been controversial to describe the purpose of both Beijing's and Seoul's participation in the Vietnamese War. On one hand, Jin and Hao argue that Park Chung-hee aimed to obtain the United States' assistance for

to resist the United States" – how China responded to the Korean War and the Vietnamese War]. *Shijie jingji yu zhengzhi* (World Economics and Politics), (3), 8-15.

³⁸⁸ Chen, Jian. (1995). China's involvement in the Vietnam War, 1964-69. *The China Quarterly*, (142), 356-387, p359.

³⁸⁹ Sarantakes, Evan.Nocholas. (1999). In the service of pharaoh? The United States and the deployment of Korean Troops in Vietnam, 1965-1968. *Pacific Historical Review*, 68(3), 425-449, p425. & Cao, Zhong-ping. (2005). Dangdai hanguo shi [Modern and contemporary South Korean history]. *Nankai daxue chubanshe* (Nankai University Press), p292.

³⁹⁰ Bi, Yuan-hui. (2008). Hanguo dui yuezhan wenti chutan [On South Korea's participation in the Vietnamese War]. *Qixue jikan* (Collected Papers of History Studies), (6), 78-84.

³⁹¹ Kim, Byung-kook. & Vogel, F. Ezra. (2013). The Park Chung-hee era: the transformation of South Korea. *Harvard University Press*, p426.

³⁹² Park, Tae-gyun. (2009). Beyond the myth: reassessing the security on the Korean peninsula during the middle 1960s. *Pacific Affairs*, 82(1), 93-110, p97.

South Korea's economic take-off and support for his ruling power, which helped to explain why Park Chung-hee emphasized South Korea's cooperation with the United States in the period of the Vietnamese War.³⁹³ Kim and Vogel emphasize that South Korea's intervention in the Vietnamese War did not only realize South Korea's Five-Year Plan as well as establish export-oriented industry with help of foreign states' massive financial loans, but also increase Park Chung-hee's political influence in the global community.³⁹⁴ Park Chung-hee considered the United States' military presence in the Korean peninsula as a necessity to stabilize the newly established military government in the aftermath of the military coup.³⁹⁵ In addition, South Korea's troops in Vietnam was considered as the United States-led Capitalist Camp's determination to deter communism, which strengthened the United States' military presence in east Asia.³⁹⁶ On the other hand, the United States realized tension in Vietnam as an opportunity to contain the Soviet Union and other socialist nations by dispatching American forces to Vietnam, which meant that the United States did not cease to fight for capitalism.³⁹⁷ It was an unacceptable scenario to the Chinese government that the United States would seize an opportunity to wage an aggression war on China in the background of the Vietnamese War, which meant that the PRC became afraid of the United States' invasion of North Vietnam.³⁹⁸ Apart from China's pursuit of communism, Mitter highlights that China endeavoured to pursue a more important role in the

³⁹³ Jin, Guang-xi. & Hao, Xin. (2010). Yuenanzhanzheng “Texu” he piaozhenxi de “kaifaducui” [On South Korea's “special demands” in the course of the Vietnamese War and the development of Park Chung-hee's “autarchy”]. *Yanbian daxue xuebao (Journal of Yanbian Universtiy)*, 43(1), 83-88.

³⁹⁴ Kim, Byung-kook. & Vogel, F. Ezra. (2013). The Park Chung-hee era: the transformation of South Korea. *Harvard University Press*, 425-426.

³⁹⁵ Sarantakes, Evan. Nicholas. (1999). In the service of pharaoh? The United States and the deployment of Korean troops in Vietnam, 1965-1968. *Pacific Historical Review*, 68(3), 425-449, p425.

³⁹⁶ Bi, Yuan-hui. (2008). Hanguo dui yuezhan wenti chutan [On South Korea's participation in the Vietnamese War]. *Qixue jikan (Collected Papers of History Studies)*, (6), 78-84.

³⁹⁷ McNamara, S. Robert. & Blight, James. & Brigham, Robert. (1999). Argument without end: in search of answers to the Vietnam tragedy. New York: *Public Affairs*. & Chen, Jian. (2001). Mao's China and the Cold War. Chapel Hill: *The University of North Carolina Press*, p205.

³⁹⁸ Zhang, Bai-jia. (2005). “Kangmei yuanchao” yu “yuanyue kangmei” – zhongguo ruhe yingdui chaoxianzhazheng he yuenanzhanzheng [“Aiding Korea to resist the United States” and “Aiding Vietnam to resist the United States” – how China responded to the Korean War and the Vietnamese War]. *Shijie jingji yu zhengzhi (World Economics and Politics)*, (3), 8-15.

international arena, especially independent movements prevailed in African and Asian countries.³⁹⁹ It was difficult to ignore the Chinese government's plan to boost the development of communism in the international community, which meant that China attempted to play a more active role in the world-wide independent revolution campaign.⁴⁰⁰ Although these scholars analyze how both China and South Korea responded to the escalation of the Vietnamese War, they do not mention China's perspective on South Korea's role in the Vietnamese War and its implications for China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea.

The Park Chung-hee government was determined to promote South Korea's national modernization programme, which contributed to South Korea's historic "Miracle on the Han River". According to Xu and Xu, the Park Chung-hee administration focused on South Korea's economic increase, which laid a hard foundation for the adjustment of South Korea's industries.⁴⁰¹ Huang and Yang argue that Park Chung-hee played a crucial role in South Korea's economic rise, which brought economic prosperity and national strength into South Korea.⁴⁰² Piao and An indicate that South Korea achieved tremendous economic prosperity in the 1960s and the 1970s, which sets a typical example for emerging markets.⁴⁰³ More than 7000 Koreans and additionally over 1500 experts were sent to foreign countries to acquire advanced technology, science and management skills from 1962 to 1971.⁴⁰⁴ South Korea, one of the Four Asian Dragons, achieved

³⁹⁹ Mitter, Rana. (2004). A bitter revolution: China's struggle with the modern world. Oxford University Press, p193.

⁴⁰⁰ Chen, Jian. (2001). Mao's China and the Cold War. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, p230 & p207.

⁴⁰¹ Xu, Jia-bin. & Xu, Jia-rong. (2000). Chanye tiaozheng zhong de zhengce jidian fenxi – hanguo de gongyehua lichen jiqi dui zhongguo de qishi [An analysis of policy base point of industrial adjustment – the development process of South Korea industrialization and its implications for China]. *Zhongguo gongye jingji (China Industrial Economics)*, (12), 51-55.

⁴⁰² Huang, Zhao-qun. & Yang, Guo-mei. (2001). Piao Zheng-xi yu hanguo [Park Chung-hee and South Korea]. *Yantai shifan xueyuan xuebao (Yantai Teachers University Journal)*, 18(3), 29-35.

⁴⁰³ Piao, Dong-jun. & An, Hua-shan. (2011). Lun Piao Zhen-xi shiqi hanguo fazhanxing guojia de xingcheng yu yanbian [On the formation and evolution of South Korea's developmental state in the Park Chung-hee period]. *Yanbian jiaoyu xuebao (Journal of Yanbian Institute of Education)*, 44(1), 81-87.

⁴⁰⁴ Kharas, H. & Makino, K. & Jung, W. (2011) Overview: an agenda for the Busan high-level forum on aid effectiveness. in H. Kharas, K. Makino and W. Jung (eds) *Catalyzing Development: A New Vision for Aid*,

rapid economic growth in the 1970s, and its “Export-oriented Policy” has been a model of economic development in east Asia, which meant that the Park Chung-hee administration made use of the “Export-oriented Policy” so as to ensure economic development and expand overseas trade.⁴⁰⁵ Buell and Lua conclude that South Korea’s economic gain has greatly helped to build a more stable South Korean society.⁴⁰⁶ These scholars speak highly of Park Chung-hee’s contribution to South Korea modernization, whereas, they do not explain China’s perspective on a rising South Korea and its influence on China’s “Non-Policy” towards South Korea.

The Chinese society underwent a long-term economic setback in the context of improper economic practice and incorrect economic policy, which meant that China missed out on an opportunity to build economic ties with overseas countries. According to Chen, China did not realize the consequence of the Great Leap Forward Movement until the Great Famine broke out, which meant that the Chinese leadership must come up with solutions to overcome national crisis.⁴⁰⁷ Mitter argues that the Soviet Union model became the sole one that China could imitate to realize socialist economic development in the context of the Soviet-United States confrontation.⁴⁰⁸ From the aspect of the PRC, the Great Leap Forward Movement was considered as an economic strategy to catch up with the gap between China and western developed countries.⁴⁰⁹ However, Fenby argues that the Great Leap Forward Movement resulted in the most disastrous agricultural crisis in the 20th century, which meant a setback for China’s plan to achieve socialist economic prosperity.⁴¹⁰ China’s

Washington, DC: *The Brookings Institution Press*, 1–37.

⁴⁰⁵ Jiang, Da-yang. & Yang, Ying-chao. (2013). Zhanhou hanguo duiwai jingjizhanlve de yanjin jiqi pingjia [On South Korea’s foreign economic strategy in the post-war eras]. *Dangdai jingji guanli (Contemporary Economy & Management)*, 35(10), 72-78.

⁴⁰⁶ Tom, De, Lua. & John, Buell. (2006). Free trade: a paradox for democracy. *Routledge*, in New political science, 507-525.

⁴⁰⁷ Chen, Jian. (2001). Mao’s China and the Cold War. Chapel Hill: *The University of North Carolina Press*, p206.

⁴⁰⁸ Mitter, Rana. (2008). Modern China: a very short introduction. *Oxford University Press*, p101.

⁴⁰⁹ Chen, Yi-xin. (2009). Cold war competition and food production in China, 1957-1962. *Agricultural History*, 83(1), 51-78.

⁴¹⁰ Fenby, Jonathan. (2008). History of modern China: the fall and rise of a great power, 1850-2008. *Penguin*

food production heavily dropped from 1959, and the Chinese society suddenly encountered with a catastrophic agricultural crisis.⁴¹¹ Chen and Zhou estimate that the Great Famine (1959-1961) put an end of nearly 30 million Chinese' lives.⁴¹² Selden concludes that technical backup, financial assistance and managerial talent were combined to factors that postponed China's economic development in the 20th century.⁴¹³ These scholars explain factors that influenced China's economic stagnation in the Mao era, whereas, they do not mention the influence of the long-term economic recession on China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea.

China's confrontation with the United States and the Soviet Union stimulated China's economic stagnation in the context of the "Self-reliance" economic policy. According to Mitter, China's economic recession in the Mao era should not only emphasize internal factors, but also external factors.⁴¹⁴ On one hand, Zhou argues that China's participation in the Korean War curbed China's economic resurgence, and the Chinese leadership had difficulty in coping with the economic decline in the context of the United States containment policy and the PRC's policy of seclusion.⁴¹⁵ Dong indicates that the United States and other capitalist countries insisted on a hostile approach towards China and played a role in curbing China's economic development, which meant that both China and capitalist nations had little plan to promote trade dealings.⁴¹⁶

Books, p415.

⁴¹¹ Yao, Shu-jie. (1999). A note on the causal factors of China's famine in 1959-1961. *Journal of Political Economy*, 107(6), 1365-1369.

⁴¹² Chen, Yu-yu. & Zhou, Li-an. (2007). The long-term health and economic consequences of the 1959-1961 famine in China. *Journal of Health Economics*, 26, 659-681.

⁴¹³ Selden, Mark. (2006). Jack Gray, Mao Ze-dong and the political economy of Chinese development. *The China Quarterly*, (187), 680-685, p681.

⁴¹⁴ Mitter, Rana. (2008). Modern China: a very short introduction. *Oxford University Press*, p101.

⁴¹⁵ Zhou, Cai-fang. (2000). Shixi chaoxianzhazheng dui xinzhongguo fazhanlicheng de yingxiang [An analysis of the influence of the Korean War on the developmental process of the newly established PRC]. *Nanjing shehui kexue (Social Science in Nanjing)*, (12), 45-51.

⁴¹⁶ Dong, Zhi-kai. (2001). Chaoxian zhazheng yu xinzhongguo jingxi [On the Korean War and the newly established PRC's economy]. *Zhonggong Ningboshi changweixiao xuebao (Journal of the Party School of Chinese Communist Party Ningbo Municipal Committee)*, 23(5), 5-13.

On the other hand, Grow and Dennis argue that the Soviet Union's decision to withdraw capitals and technologies seriously influenced China's economic reconstruction, which meant that the Sino-Soviet split posed a threat to China's both security interest and economic development.⁴¹⁷ Chen concludes that the Chinese government must re-estimate its economic policy and Mao's doctrine of continuous revolution.⁴¹⁸ These scholars explain the two leading states' role in China's economic under-development in the Mao era, but there is a lack of analysis of the influence of China's inappropriate economic practice on China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea in the context of the two leading states' aggressive policy towards China.

Apart from the Great Leap Forward Movement, China underwent a long-term economic decline in the context of the Cultural Revolution, which had a devastating influence on China's economic development in the late Mao era. According to Xia and Kochavi, Mao Ze-dong emphasized that the Chinese should not rely on others to solve problems.⁴¹⁹ Chen argues that Mao Ze-dong considered the plan to build a newly prosperous socialist state as a part of China's foreign policy, which constituted a part of China's continuous revolution.⁴²⁰ However, Kraus argues that the Cultural Revolution (1966-1976) played a role in China's later immense change into a new economic hub, even though the Cultural Revolution severely influenced China's economic performance in the late Mao era.⁴²¹ Mitter emphasizes that the Chinese society did not improve

⁴¹⁷ Grow, R. F. (1974). Soviet economic penetration of China, 1945-1960: 'imperialism' as a level of analysis problem. In Steven Rosen and James Kruth (eds.) *Testing theories of imperialism*, Lexington: Heath. & Ray, Dennis. M. (1975). China's perception of social imperialism and economic dependency: the impact of Soviet aid. *Stanford J. of International Studies*, 5(Spring), 36-82.

⁴¹⁸ Chen, Jian. (2001). Mao's China and the Cold War. Chapel Hill: *The University of North Caroline Press*, p83.

⁴¹⁹ Xia, Ya-feng. (2006). Negotiating with the enemy: US-China talks during the Cold War, 1949-1972. Bloomington: *Indiana University Press*, 109-14, 234. & Kochavi, Noam. (2002). A conflict perpetuated: China's policy during the Kennedy Years. Westpor, Conn.: *Praeger*, 101-14.

⁴²⁰ Chen, Jian. (2001). Mao's China and the Cold War. Chapel Hill: *The University of North Caroline Press*, p236.

⁴²¹ Kraus, Curt. Richard. (2012). The Cultural Revolution: a very short introduction. *Oxford University Press*, pxiv.

after China became more isolated from the international community during the Cultural Revolution.⁴²² Li concludes that China should integrate into the global market and concentrate on the peaceful diplomacy, rather than attempt to take advantage of China's confrontation with the two leading states.⁴²³ Apart from huge economic loss, there is little scholarship on the influence of China's policy thinking on China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea in the background of a more impoverished Chinese society during the Cultural Revolution period.

China's confrontation with the United States and the Soviet Union stimulated China's nuclear weapon programme development after China's "Fighting-with Two Fists Strategy" had seriously damaged China's security interest and economic construction, which contributed to the United States' changing approach towards China. On one hand, Ditter argues that Mao Ze-dong aimed to be the third nuclear superpower after the United States and the Soviet Union while the Eisenhower administration (1953-1961) possibly planned to launch a pre-emptive on China.⁴²⁴ The United States paid attention to China's nuclear development in the 1960s, even though China was considered as a threat to the United States and its allies in east Asia.⁴²⁵ In contrast, the Chinese government was determined to concentrate on nuclear weapon programme in the context of the Sino-United States confrontation.⁴²⁶ On the other hand, Shen and Xia argue that the Soviet Union dropped out of the Sino-Soviet joint nuclear weapon programme ahead of the Sino-Soviet border clash.⁴²⁷ However, Kissinger argues that China played a more important role in the United States' security calculation than the Soviet Union.⁴²⁸ In detail, China's nuclear weapon capability and China's hostile

⁴²² Mitter, Rana. (2008). Modern China: a very short introduction. Oxford University Press, p60.

⁴²³ Li, Jie. (2001). Changes in China's domestic situation in the 1960s and the Sino-United States relations. In Robert S. Ross and Jiang, Chang-bin, eds., *Re-examining the Cold War: US-China diplomacy, 1954-1973*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, p302.

⁴²⁴ Dittmer, Lowell. (2006). Pitfalls of charisma. *The China Journal*, (55), 119-128, p121.

⁴²⁵ Gavin, J. Francis. (2004/2005). Blasts from the past: proliferation lessons from the 1960s. *International Security*, 29(3), 100-135, p103.

⁴²⁶ Crinicioni, Joseph. (2000). The Asian nuclear reaction chain. *Foreign Policy*, (118), 120-136, p127.

⁴²⁷ Shen, Zhi-hua. & Xia, Ya-feng. (2012). Between aid and restriction: the Soviet Union's changing policies on China's nuclear weapons program, 1954-1960. *Asian Perspective*, 36, 95-122.

⁴²⁸ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. Penguin Press, p205.

relations with the Soviet Union became a more and more massive threat to the United States' security, the United States thereby must re-think its approach towards China that had strength to produce nuclear weapon and contain the Soviet Union.⁴²⁹ These scholars analyze the development of the triangular relations among the United States, the Soviet Union and China, and explain the differences of China's role in the United States' policy thinking from the 1950s to the 1960s. In spite of that, they do not mention the impact of China's perspective on the triangular relations on China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea.

Apart from China's nuclear weapon development, the Soviet Union's escalating confrontation with the United States and China contributed to the Sino-United States rapprochement. According to Fenby, China did not realize the importance of re-amending its foreign strategies until the beginning of the 1970s.⁴³⁰ Sneider argues that the United States had a serious concern about the Soviet Union's expanding military presence in the 1960s.⁴³¹ However, Jr. Hummel argues that the Soviet Union threatened both China and the United States, which conversely meant that the Soviet Union became a common foe at the end of the 1960s.⁴³² On one hand, Nogee and Donaldson highlight that the Soviet Union strengthened its military relations with socialist states in order to ensure Soviet's leading role and to deter capitalism.⁴³³ Besides, Edmonds indicates that the Soviet Union's military spending was up to 53 billion dollars.⁴³⁴ On the other hand, Barnouim and Yu argue that the Soviet Union became the biggest enemy to China in the context of the

⁴²⁹ Liu, Ya-wei. (1998). Mao Ze-dong and the United States: a story of misperception. In Li Hong-shan and Hong Zhao-hui, eds., *Image, Perception, and the making of the United States-China relations*. Lanham: *University Press of America*, p202. & Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. *Penguin Press*, p205.

⁴³⁰ Fenby, Jonathan. (2008). History of modern China: the fall and rise of a great power, 1850-2008. *Penguin Books*, p496.

⁴³¹ Sneider, L. Richard. (1986). United States' security interests. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 36(1), 76-87, p84.

⁴³² Jr. Hummel. W. Arthur. (1989). China's changing relations with the United States and the Soviet Union. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 133(1), 75-83, p82.

⁴³³ Nogee, L. Joseph. & Donaldson, H. Robert. (1981). Soviet foreign policy since World War II. *Pergamon Press*, p142.

⁴³⁴ Edmons, Robin. (1975). Soviet foreign policy: 1962-1973. London: *Oxford University Press*, p41.

Sino-Soviet split, even though China still recognized the United States as a hostile imperialist state.⁴³⁵ Chen emphasizes that the Sino-Soviet Union split had a serious impact on the Soviet Union's plan to deter the United States, which meant that the United States caught an opportunity to protect national interests in the context of the Sino-United States rapprochement.⁴³⁶ These scholars explain reasons why the United States shifted aggressive policy towards China in the context of the confrontation among the United States, the Soviet Union and China. Nonetheless, they mention little about China's perspective on the Sino-United States rapprochement, namely, about how the changing triangular relations stimulated China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea.

Apart from China's security strategies, Mao's perception of communism should be viewed as a part of understanding of China's policy towards South Korea. According to Oksenberg, since Mao Ze-dong ruled China for 28 years, the analysis of China's development could not ignore Mao Ze-dong's role.⁴³⁷ On one hand, Chen argues that China's humiliation history played a role in Mao Ze-dong's pursuit of independence, which gave rise to Mao's perception of "anti-imperialism" and intention of realizing the transformation of a new socialist society.⁴³⁸ On the other hand, Markey argues that Mao's communist ideology influenced his choice of allies and enemies, and his radical plans for the transformation of the Chinese society repeatedly urged him to harness foreign policy to domestic ends.⁴³⁹ Starr emphasizes that Mao exploited China's modern humiliation history in relation to imperialist countries' aggressions to deter capitalism.⁴⁴⁰ Compared

⁴³⁵ Barnouim, Barbara. & Yu, Chang-gen. (1998). Chinese foreign policy during the cultural revolution. Columbia University Press, p98.

⁴³⁶ Chen, Jian. (2001). Mao's China and the Cold War. Chapel Hill: *The University of North Caroline Press*, p276.

⁴³⁷ Oksenberg, C. M. (1971). Policy making under Mao Tse-tung, 1949-1968. *Comparative Politics*, 3(3), 323-360.

⁴³⁸ Chen, Jian. (2001). Mao's China and the Cold War. Chapel Hill: *The University of North Carolina Press*, p51.

⁴³⁹ Markey, S. Daniel. (2002). Reviewed work(s): of Mao's China and the Cold War by Chen Jian. *Political Science Quarterly*, 117(2), 328-329.

⁴⁴⁰ Starr, Bryan. John. (1977). On Mao's self-image as a Marxist thinker. *Modern China*, 3(4), 435-442, p440.

with capitalism, Ahn highlights that Mao stressed the superiority of communism.⁴⁴¹ Mao persists that only China attempted to pursue communism and to suppress capitalism as exemplified in Mao's pursuit of the Cultural Revolution.⁴⁴² Apart from China's foreign policy, Womack indicates that China's inappropriate economic strategy should be understood in the context of Mao's perception – Mao's leftism.⁴⁴³ Mao used the "Anti-intellectuals Policy" to cut off Chinese scholars' connections with the outer world.⁴⁴⁴ Although these scholars emphasize reasons that contributed to Mao's persistence in the "Anti-capitalism Policy" and the "Anti-imperialism Policy", there is little scholarship on how Mao's personal perception constituted China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea. Having looked at literature on China's policy thinking in the Mao era, this thesis will go on with explanation of the influence of China's diplomatic calculation and security concern on China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea before and after the Korean War.

⁴⁴¹ Ahn, Byung-joon. (1992). China's modernization and the political economy. Seoul: Parkyong Company, p67, p85.

⁴⁴² Zhang, Qin-min. (2014). Towards an integrated theory of Chinese foreign policy: bringing leadership personality back in. *Journal of Contemporary China*, 23(89), 902-922, p908.

⁴⁴³ Womack, Brantly. (1986). Where Mao went wrong: epistemology and ideology in Mao's leftist politics. *The Australian Journal of Chinese affairs*, (16), 23-40, p24.

⁴⁴⁴ Mitter, Rana. (2008). Modern China: a very short introduction. Oxford University Press, p60.

The rational actor explanation of China's policy during the Korean War: the priority of supporting the national interest

The impact of the geographic link of the Korean peninsula on China

The Korean peninsula is surrounded by some great powers in northeast Asia, including China, Japan and Russia, which accelerated the outbreak of the Korean War in the context of the complexity of the geo-strategic location. Zhang argues that the geographic location of the Korean peninsula helps to understand its pivotal geo-political role in the international community.⁴⁴⁵ However, Oberdorfer argues that the Korean peninsula has been one of the world's most unstable areas where military conflicts would easily take place.⁴⁴⁶ In other words, states around the strategic Korean peninsula competed to rise as a regional hegemony, which conversely suggested the inevitability of bloody struggles. Park indicates that China maintained an enormous significance in Korea's political development and social advancement in the ancient times.⁴⁴⁷ In spite of that, Mitter emphasizes that imperialist countries' invasion turned out to be a serious challenge in the nineteenth century.⁴⁴⁸ Due to imperialist countries' growing colonial expansion into Asia, Korea underwent drastic changes in the context of Japan's race for control of Korea, which meant that Korea slid into a colonial state and signed a series of unequal treaties. China, the Mongols, Japan, and during the World War II, the United States and the Soviet Union became occupying powers.⁴⁴⁹ In contrast, Korea's fate could not be separated from Korea's struggles with its neighbouring countries that have aimed to preserve presence in the strategic Korean peninsula since the ancient times.

It has been difficult to describe the role of the Korean peninsula's strategic location in China's security thinking since Korea was viewed as a 'buffer zone' and an 'invasion corridor'. On one hand, Fang argues that tensions in the strategic Korean peninsula could cause grave damage to China's security interest and social stability, which conversely means that the Korean peninsula has been considered to be an important

⁴⁴⁵ Zhang, Xiao-ming. (2005). Chaoxianzhanzheng de diyuan zhengzhixue fenxi [An analysis of the Korean War from the aspect of geo-politics]. *Nankai xuebao (Academic Journal of Nan Kai)*, (3), 1-7.

⁴⁴⁶ Oberdorfer, Don. (1997). The Two Koreas: a contemporary history. *Basic Books*: xii.

⁴⁴⁷ Park, Il-keun. (1999). Chinese foreign policy and the Korean peninsula. *International Journal of Korean Studies*, III(I), 116-135. & Cumings, Bruce. (2010). The Korean War: a history. *Modern Library*, p3.

⁴⁴⁸ Mitter, Rana. (2013). China's war with Japan, 1937-1945. *Penguin Press*, p19.

⁴⁴⁹ Oberdorfer, Don. (1997). The Two Koreas: a contemporary history. *Basic Books*, p3.

'buffer zone'.⁴⁵⁰ It is hard to deny that the border between China and Korea remains as a controversy to China's stability. The Korean peninsula that influences China's interests in diverse ways constitutes a vital part of China's policy considerations.⁴⁵¹ Park realizes the Korean peninsula's stability as an important element that has influenced China's security since the ancient times.⁴⁵² Besides, Seth argues that Japan aimed not only to protect China from exerting influence on Korean affairs, but also to hamper Russia from rising as a more active role in Korea.⁴⁵³ In other words, Japan had such a plan to be such a state that could build the greatest leverage on the Korean peninsula, which laid a basis for Japan's confrontation with China and Russia. Pratt indicates that Japan did not completely grab hold of Korea until Korea signed the Treaty of Annexation in 1910, which helped Japan to occupy Manchuria in the 1930s.⁴⁵⁴ In contrast, if any contradiction between neighbouring countries and Korea escalates, China must prepare to deal with tensions from an unstable Korea.⁴⁵⁵ In the light of the mutual border, the Korean peninsula and China have little possibility to under-estimate mutual security sensitiveness and vulnerability, which helps to explain Korea's significance in China's foreign policy calculations and security policy concerns.

On the other hand, Hao considers the strategic Korean peninsula as a vital area that aggressors could occupy China via Korea.⁴⁵⁶ Kim argues that the geographic and historic links were combined to understand the

⁴⁵⁰ Fang, Xiu-yu. (2013). Zhongguo juanru chaoxianzhanzheng de kaoliang [On China's calculation of involvement in the Korean War]. *Dongfang zaobao (The Oriental Morning Post)*. & Fang, Xiu-yu. (2011). Zhanhou hanguo waijiao yu zhongguo – lilun yu zhengce fenxi [On South Korea's diplomacy and China in the post-war eras – an analysis based on theory and policy]. *Shanghai cishu chubanshe (Shanghai Lexicographic Publishing House)*, p6.

⁴⁵¹ Jun, Byoung-kon. & Kim, Jang-ho. (2013). China's role and perception of a united Korea. *Korean Journal of Defense Analysis: Korea Institute for Defense Analyses*, 25(3), 369-383. & Jia, Hao. & Zhuang, Qu-bing. (1992). China's policy towards the Korean peninsula. *Asian Survey*, 32(12), 1137-1156, p1137.

⁴⁵² Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics.

⁴⁵³ Seth, J. Michael. (2016). A concise history of modern Korea: from the late 19th century to the present. *Rowman & Litterfield*, p27.

⁴⁵⁴ Pratt, Keith. (2007). Everlasting flower: a history of Korea. *Reaktion Books*, p209.

⁴⁵⁵ Lee, Yung-hong. (1977). Korea's future: Peking's perspective. *Asian Survey*, 17(11), 1088-1102.

⁴⁵⁶ Hao, Yu-fan. (2009). The Korean peninsula: a Chinese view on the North Korean nuclear Issue. (Available

importance of the Korean peninsula in China's policy thinking.⁴⁵⁷ Geographically, the Yalu River divides China and Korea, Russia borders on Korea, and Japan lies east of Korea.⁴⁵⁸ Historically, it would be a grave security threat to the remaining countries if one neighbouring super-power controls the Korean peninsula.⁴⁵⁹ Lee emphasizes that the Korean peninsula was regarded by China as a convenient 'invasion corridor' in relation to the two wars in which Japan invaded China in the modern and contemporary history, first in 1884-1885, and then in 1937-1945.⁴⁶⁰ Korea was under the imperialist Japan's colonial rule from the 1890s to the 1940s, which equally declared China's failure in the race for a single hegemony around northeast Asia. Mitter indicates that Japan decided to participate in the Russo-Japanese War via Manchuria and Korea in order to enlarge its sphere of influence in northeast Asia.⁴⁶¹ In contrast, Japanese colonial rule in Korea constituted China's security concern. Korea, a key Japanese colony, provided logistic support to Japan's military expansion from the 1930s to the 1940s.⁴⁶² In other words, Japan had an access to China's strategic north-

from the book: Challenges to China's foreign policy). *The University Press of Kentucky*, p155.

⁴⁵⁷ Kim, S. Samuel. (1997). The future of China and Sino-ROK relations, the future of China and northeast Asia. Edited by Tae-Hwan Kwak and Melvin Gurtov, *The Institute for Far Eastern Studies*, Kyungnam University.

⁴⁵⁸ Park, Il-keun. (1999). Chinese foreign policy and the Korean peninsula. *International Journal of Korean Studies*, III(I), 116-135. & Smith, Hazel. (2003). Asymmetric nuisance value: the border in China-Democratic People's Republic of Korea relations. In Timothy Hildebrandt (ed), 'Uneasy allies: fifty years of China-North Korea relations'. Washington, DC.: *Woodrow Wilson International Centre*, Asia Program Special Report, (115), 18-25, p19.

⁴⁵⁹ Young, Whan-kihl. (2002). Security on the Korean peninsula: continuity and change. *Sage Publications*: 33(1), 59-79.

⁴⁶⁰ Lee, Chae-jin. (1996). China and Korea: dynamic relations. Stanford: *Hoover Institution*. & Wang, Dong-yan. (2010). Chaoxianzhangzheng: Zhongguo weishengme yaocanzhan [The Korean War: why China attended the war]. *Fujian dangshi yuekan (Journal of Fujian Monthly History)*, (17), 22-24.

⁴⁶¹ Mitter, Rana. (2013). China's war with Japan, 1937-1945. *Penguin Press*, p25.

⁴⁶² Koh, Byung-chul. (1985). China and the Korean peninsula. *Korea & World Affairs*, 9(2), Summer. & Kim, Dalchoong. (1986). China's relations with the Two Koreas: continuity and adjustment. *Journal of East and West Studies*, 15(1), Spring-Summer, p83.

eastern provinces via Korea.⁴⁶³

⁴⁶³ Han, Kwan-soo. (2015). Discussion on whether the Korean peninsula will be included in China's core interests. *Korean Journal of Defence Analysis*, 27(1), 57-69.

The Korean War and Chinese “Aiding North Korea” policy

The Korean War was not only a civil war between North Korea and South Korea, but also a large-scale arms-race that significantly challenged the pattern of global security relations. Zhang argues that the competition between the two leading states continued to accelerate after the formation of the United States-led Capitalist Camp and the Soviet Union-led Socialist Camp, which created the division of the Korean peninsula.⁴⁶⁴ Lee indicates that the development of communism meant a massive threat to the expansion of capitalism.⁴⁶⁵ In spite of the fact that the Second World War had ended, both competing camps’ participation in the Korean War seriously increased the complexity of the situation in northeast Asia. Xiao and Lu emphasize that the United States and the Soviet Union quickly realized how to respond to the changing security order in northeast Asia as an imperative, which meant that both sides could not under-estimate the strategic Korean peninsula’s role.⁴⁶⁶ In contrast, the eruption of the Korean War meant an opportunity to further expand both camps’ political influence and military presence in northeast Asia. Fisher thereby suggests that the Korean War triggered the confrontation between the Soviet Union-led Communist powers and the United States-led Capitalist powers.⁴⁶⁷ Viewed in this vein, the two great powers did not cease to meddle in Korean affairs, which meant that both Koreas had more difficulty in reaching an agreement.

China’s dominant position in the ancient times and China’s earlier humiliated history were combined to understand China’s communist revolution, which contributed to China’s involvement in the Korean War. According to Mao, “the United States’ military presence in the Korean peninsula was a threat to China’s security interest”.⁴⁶⁸ Chen argues that China became a declining state in the context of imperialist states’

⁴⁶⁴ Zhang, Shao. (2014). Yishixingtai shijiaoxia chaoxianbandao fenlie de neiyin fenxi [An analysis of the internal origin of the division of the Korean peninsula from the aspect of different ideologies]. *Minzu luntan* (Minzu Tribune), (2), 56-59.

⁴⁶⁵ Lee, Bong. (2003). The unfinished war: Korea. New York: *Algora Plub*.

⁴⁶⁶ Xiao, Jun. & Lu, Jian-hong. (1991). Baofa chaoxianzhanzheng de genbenyuanyin tanxi [On the fundamental factor that influenced the eruption of the Korean War]. *Shangdong yikedaxue xuebao shehuikexueban* (Journal of Shangdong Medical University – Social Sciences Edition), (1), 53-56.

⁴⁶⁷ Fisher, A. Charles. (1954). The role of Korea in the Far East. *The Geographical Journal*, 120(3), 282-298.

⁴⁶⁸ Chen, Jian. (1994). China’s road to the Korean War: the making of the Sino-American confrontation. New York: *Columbia University Press*.

aggression wars and unequal treaties.⁴⁶⁹ Westad indicates that China's long-term confrontation with imperialist nations led to the bankruptcy of China's dominance, which meant that a vulnerable China underwent immeasurable loss in the background of imperialist conquest.⁴⁷⁰ Viewed in this vein, the Chinese leadership could not under-estimate the growing sentiment against these imperialist nations that had made China miss out on opportunities to increase national strength since the Opium War, which constituted a part of China's reaction to the United States' domineering ambition on Korean affairs. However, Cumings argues that the United States decided to support the Syngman Rhee regime after the Second World War, and the United States did not fully realize the influence of its armed forces on Korea's development.⁴⁷¹ In other words, China's policy thinking on the Korean War should be understood in the context of the United States' expanding leverage in Korea. Besides, Chen indicates that Mao Ze-dong considered communist revolution as a means to realize socialist transformation in the Chinese society and to re-build China's central role in the international community.⁴⁷² In contrast, China would not further promote its influential communist revolution without the United States' occupation of South Korea.

China's participation in the Korean War aimed not only to build its image in the communist revolution, but also to compete with the United States in the international arena. According to Mao, the Chinese ought to prepare to fight against the imperialist state – the United States that made use of various excuses to build its military base and expand its military presence in the world.⁴⁷³ On one hand, Chen argues that the Chinese leadership aimed to raise China's reputation in the global community and protect China's border security from foreign invasions.⁴⁷⁴ In other words, China also considered its participation in the Korean War against

⁴⁶⁹ Chen, Jian. (2003). A response: how to pursue a critical history of Mao's foreign policy. *The China Journal*, (49), 137-142.

⁴⁷⁰ Westad, Arne. Odd. (2013). Restless empire: China and the world since 1750. London: *Vintage Books*, p79.

⁴⁷¹ Cumings, Bruce. (2010). The Korean War: a history. *Modern Library*, p104.

⁴⁷² Chen, Jian. (1994). China's road to the Korean War: the making of the Sino-American confrontation. *New York: Columbia University Press*, p47.

⁴⁷³ Mao, Ze-dong. Mao Ze-dong xuanji – disijuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the fourth volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p1194 & p1483.

⁴⁷⁴ Chen, Jian. (2002). Review works: Mao's generals remember Korea by Xiao-bing Li, Allan R. Millet and Bin Yu. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 61(2), 704-705.

the United States-led imperialist states as an opportunity to restore China's political status. On the other hand, Kissinger argues that Mao Ze-dong possibly realized that the Korean peninsula could provide logistical support for the Soviet troops even for China's unification with Taiwan once the South was occupied.⁴⁷⁵ He indicates that the United States military forces did mean to cross the China-Korea border and to wage a war against China.⁴⁷⁶ In spite of that, the United States' intervention in the Korean War influenced China's policy considerations. From China's perspective, it was deeply precarious to Beijing if the United States finally had an access to northern China via the Korean peninsula.⁴⁷⁷ In the context of the United States' armed forces on Korea, the Chinese government dispatched 50,000 to 70,000 troops into the China-Korea border and fought against the United States and other capitalist states under the slogan "saving one's neighbourhood is saving oneself".⁴⁷⁸

China also considered its military presence in Korea as a strategy to enhance its position in the Socialist Camp, which conversely intensified its competition with the Soviet Union. Hao and Zhai argue that Beijing did not put forward its plan to join in the battle with North Korea at the dawn of the Korean War, but orally promised to offer assistance to Pyongyang.⁴⁷⁹ Seth indicates that Kim Il-Sung came to Moscow with his co-worker Pak, and attempted to convince Stalin to approve his plan to realize unification of the Korean peninsula.⁴⁸⁰ In the view of Kim Il-Sung, the Soviet Union was the sole military power that had capability to provide North Korea with a large amount of assistance. However, Lee argues that China's involvement in

⁴⁷⁵ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. Penguin Press, p128.

⁴⁷⁶ He, di. (1994). The most respected enemy: Mao Ze-dong's perception of the United States. *The China Quarterly*, (137), 144-158, p150.

⁴⁷⁷ Plant, T. & Rhode, B. (2013). China, North Korea and the spread of nuclear weapons. *Survival*, 55(2), 61-80.

⁴⁷⁸ Cumings, Bruce. (1990). The origins of the Korean War. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2:363. & Park, Il-keun. (1999). Chinese foreign policy and the Korean peninsula. *International Journal of Korean Studies*: Spring/Summer, III(1), 116-135.

⁴⁷⁹ Hao, Yu-fan. & Zhai, Zhi-lai. (1990). China's decision to enter the Korean War: history revisited. *The China Quarterly*, (21), 94-115.

⁴⁸⁰ Seth, J. Michael. (2016). A concise history of modern Korea: from the late 19th century to the present. Rowman & Littlefield, p111.

the Korean War was to expand its military influence.⁴⁸¹ Chen highlights that the Chinese leadership recognized its troops on Korea as an imperative, which meant that China aimed to strengthen its role in a new order in northeast Asia.⁴⁸² From China's aspect, the Sino-Soviet alliance should not only be seen as a guarantee to China's security, but also as an example of how the Sino-Soviet alliance would contribute to China's increasing importance to the socialist revolution.⁴⁸³ In other words, China contemplated the Soviet Union-led Communist Camp's role in China, which further influenced its participation in the Korean War. From North Korea's aspect, Kim Il-Sung caught an opportunity to take advantage of China's involvement in the Korean War to reduce its reliance on the Soviet Union, which conversely meant a strategy to deter the Soviet Union.⁴⁸⁴ In contrast, China's participation in the Korean War helped North Korea to realize independence in the context of the Soviet Union-led socialist order, which extensively soured the Sino-Soviet relations.

⁴⁸¹ Lee, Bong. (2003). The unfinished war: Korea. New York: *Algora Plub*.

⁴⁸² Chen, Jian. (2001). Mao's China and the Cold War. Chapel Hill: *The University of North Carolina Press*, 87-88.

⁴⁸³ Chen, Jian. (2001). Mao's China and the Cold War. Chapel Hill: *The University of North Carolina Press*, p54.

⁴⁸⁴ Lankov, Andrei. (2015). The real North Korea: life and politics in the failed Stalinist utopia. *Oxford University Press*, p13.

The influence of the Korean War on China's "Non-Policy" toward South Korea

It has been controversial to define the influence of China's participation in the Korean War on the development of China's domestic and foreign affairs in the Cold War era. According to Kissinger, Mao made an important strategic error.⁴⁸⁵ Lee argues that the Chinese government considered the signing of the Korean Armistice Agreement in 1953 as a sign of China's success of overall campaign in the Korean peninsula, because the agreement helped to protect China from the United States' potential future invasions.⁴⁸⁶ The consequence of the so-called acceptable cease-fire agreement, however, was damaging for China's development at home and abroad for the next three decades.⁴⁸⁷ In brief, China paid a whopping price for the decision to attend the Korean War. Chen emphasizes that China's involvement in the Korean crisis brought enormous loss of Chinese People's Volunteers' lives, huge military expenditures at the cost of China's socialist building as well as social development, the escalation of the Taiwan Strait Crisis, the increasing conflict with western powers and the loss of the seat in the United Nations, which equally trapped China to lean more to the Soviet Union as it had no alternative.⁴⁸⁸ Besides, Hang indicates that China was recognized as such a state that the United States aimed to contain with military and economic tools, which further destroyed China's political status, influenced China's security protection and postponed China's socialist transition.⁴⁸⁹ In other words, the United States played a role in hampering China from growing as a newly socialist giant power.

The formation of the Northern Triangle and the Southern Triangle further symbolized China's confrontation with the United States in the Korean peninsula, which stimulated China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea. On one hand, Cumings argues that the United States rapidly escalated into an active player in the global

⁴⁸⁵ Kissinger, Henry. (2015). Shijie zhixu [World order]. Beijing: Zhongxin chubanshe (China CITIC Publishing Group), p379.

⁴⁸⁶ Lee, Yung-hong. (1977). Korea's future: Pecking's perspective. *Asian Survey*, 17(11), 1088-1102.

⁴⁸⁷ Lee, Yung-hong. (1977). Korea's future: Pecking's perspective. *Asian Survey*, 17(11), 1088-1102.

⁴⁸⁸ Chen, Jian. (1994). China's road to the Korean War: the making of the Sino-American confrontation. New York: Columbia University Press, p220.

⁴⁸⁹ Hang, Fu-zhen. (2011). Chaoxianzhazheng yu meiguo duihuazhengce de zuizhongxingcheng [On the Korean War and the formation of the United States' policy towards China]. *Nanjing gongcheng xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Nanjing Institute of Technology)*, 11(2), 1-6.

community in the wake of the United States' participation in the Korean War.⁴⁹⁰ Since the Korean War, the United States has paid huge attention to building military bases around the world. Fang indicates that the United States considered its military treaties with South Korea, Japan and Taiwan as a strategy to remain its military presence in northeast Asia.⁴⁹¹ In other words, the United States caught an opportunity to exert its influence on South Korea, which helped to explain China's security concern and diplomatic consideration in the context of the United States and other capitalist states' hostile policy. On the other hand, Sui argues that South Korea agreed on the United States' confrontational military island chain, which meant that South Korea played a role in the United States' containment policy towards China.⁴⁹² It was a nightmare to Beijing that Seoul insisted on the "pro-Washington approach". Zhao emphasizes that the United States and South Korea insisted on the harsh ban on economic contacts with China, which indirectly prolonged China's economic stagnation.⁴⁹³ In contrast, the United States-backed Seoul administration seriously influenced Beijing's security protection and economic reconstruction, which contributed to China's "pro-Pyongyang approach" in the context of the United States' aggressive approach towards China.

Apart from the Seoul-Washington alliance relationship, Pyongyang's economic development and its economic relations with Moscow turned into a stimulus to Beijing's "pro-Pyongyang approach". According to Seth, North Korea on one hand had been the most favourable party of the Japanese colonial heritage, including industrialized factories, raw material and electricity stations; on the other hand, the Korean peninsula seriously influenced the development of the majority of North Korean industrial urban areas.⁴⁹⁴ The Korean War had a devastating impact on North Korea: North Korea that had been largely destroyed suffered huge economic loss.⁴⁹⁵ However, Pratt argues that both Beijing and Moscow played an important

⁴⁹⁰ Cumings, Bruce. (2010). The Korean War: a history. *Modern Library*, p208.

⁴⁹¹ Fang, Xiu-yu. (2013). Zhongguo juanru chaoxianzhanzheng de kaoliang [On China's calculation of involvement in the Korean War]. *Dongfang zaobao (The Oriental Morning Post)*.

⁴⁹² Sui, Shu-ying. (2004). Lun "yibiandao" zhengce de lishi juxianxing [On the historical limitation of the "Leaning-to One Side Policy"]. *Qilu xuekan (Qilu Journal)*, (6), 48-54.

⁴⁹³ Zhao, Xue-gong. (1996). Chaoxianzhanzheng yu meiguo de dongyazhengce [The Korean War and the United States' policy towards east Asia]. *Lishijiaoxue (History Teaching)*, (11), 42-44.

⁴⁹⁴ Seth, J. Michael. (2016). A concise history of modern Korea: from the late 19th century to the present. *Rowman & Litterfield*, 108-109.

⁴⁹⁵ Smith, Hazel. & Rhodes, Chris. & Pritchard, Diana. & Magill, Kevin. (1996). North Korea in the new world order. *Palgrave Macmillan Press*, p7.

role in Pyongyang's socialist construction in order to catch up with Tokyo's position in northeast Asia.⁴⁹⁶ Shen and Dong indicate that the Soviet Union-led communist states provided North Korea with financial assistance, which further helped North Korea to concentrate on economic reconstruction.⁴⁹⁷ In other words, North Korea's economic relations with communist nations did not only enhance China's economic cooperation with North Korea, but also explain China's "pro-Pyongyang approach". Besides, Pratt argues that the Sino-Soviet Union relations underwent significant changes in the 1960s, which enabled North Korea to play a more strategic role in the Northern Triangle.⁴⁹⁸ Lankov highlights that North Korea considered China as such a state that had little capability to pay the cost of the Soviet Union's decreasing financial supplies in the early 1960s, and the North Korean leadership realized the influence of China's Cultural Revolution as the one that tended to be more unfavourable than the legacy from the Soviet Union.⁴⁹⁹ In contrast, China's continuous socialist revolution as well as ongoing economic depression influenced North Korea's policy thinking towards the Soviet Union, which conversely promoted North Korea's relations with the Soviet Union in the middle 1960s. Dong notes that China insisted on the assistance policy towards North Korea in order to seek political benefits from North Korea.⁵⁰⁰ Mao Ze-dong became more concerned about Pyongyang's attitudes towards Beijing in the context of the Sino-Soviet dispute, and had more doubts about the impact of the Soviet Union's economic aid towards North Korea on China, which further prolonged China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea. Having explained the influence China's involvement in the Korean War on China's Korea policy, the next section will elaborate China's foreign strategies and China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea in the late Mao era.

⁴⁹⁶ Pratt, Keith. (2007). Everlasting flower: a history of Korea. Reaktion Books, p270.

⁴⁹⁷ Shen, Zhi-hua. & Dong, Jie. (2011). Chaoxian zhanhou chongjian yu zhongguo de jingji yuanzhu 1954-1960 [On North Korea's post-war reconstruction and China's economic aid 1954-1960]. *Zhonggong dangshi yanjiu (The Chinese Communist Party History Studies)*, (3), 48-57.

⁴⁹⁸ Pratt, Keith. (2007). Everlasting flower: a history of Korea. Reaktion Books, p270.

⁴⁹⁹ Lankov, Andrei. (2015). The real North Korea: life and politics in the failed Stalinist utopia. Oxford University Press, p20.

⁵⁰⁰ Dong, Jie. (2014). Zhongsu fenlie hou zhongguo dui chaoxian de yuanzhu 1961-1965 [On China's financial aid to North Korea in the aftermath of the Sino-Soviet dispute 1961-1965]. *Waijiao pinglun (Foreign Affairs Review)*, (4), 41-58.

China's policies towards South Korea after the Korean War: the rational actor explanation

The “Leaning-to One Side Policy”

The two leading states' relationship with China constituted China's foreign policy consideration. On one hand, Qu argues that the Sino-Soviet Union relationship did not strengthen until Stalin made a pledge to acknowledge the newly established regime of the People's Republic of China (PRC – more commonly known as China) and to provide massive aid during Liu Shao-qi's visit to Moscow.⁵⁰¹ In return, Liu Shao-qi, the first vice president of the PRC, endorsed the Soviet Union's leading role in the international communist movement.⁵⁰² On the other hand, Hang argues that the United States attempted to use political, economic and diplomatic measures to curb the development of the Sino-Soviet relations.⁵⁰³ On an account of the two socialist states' expanding leverage, it was an urgency for the United States to destroy the Sino-Soviet alliance relationship. Tian emphasizes that the United States considered the Soviet Union as a vital part in its global strategy, which meant that the United States became more cautious about the Soviet Union after the end of the Second World War.⁵⁰⁴ In contrast, the Second World War did not eradicate the contradiction between the United States-led Capitalist Camp and the Soviet Union-led Communist Camp, which had a serious influence on international politics. Garver highlights that the Truman administration (1945-1953) immediately shifted its approach towards China that had been an ally of the Soviet Union.⁵⁰⁵

⁵⁰¹ Qu, Guang-long. (2012). Xinzhongguo jianguochu “yibiandao” waijiaozhengce yanjiu [On the “Leaning-to One Side Policy” in the early stage of the newly established PRC]. *Fazhi yu shehui (Legal System and Society)*, (12), 153-154.

⁵⁰² Shi, Zhe. (1993). With Mao and Stalin: Liu Shao-qi in Moscow. *Chinese Historians*, 6 (Spring), 84-85. & Chen, Jian. (1994). China's road to the Korean War: the making of the Sino-American confrontation. New York: *Columbia University Press*, 74-75.

⁵⁰³ Hang, Fu-zhen. (2011). Chaoxianzhanzheng yu meiguo duihuazhengce de zuizhongxingcheng [On the Korean War and the formation of the United States' policy towards China]. *Nanjing gongcheng xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Nanjing Institute of Technology)*, 11(2), 1-6.

⁵⁰⁴ Tian, Jing. (2005). Meiguo duihuazhengce yu xinzhongguo “yibiandao” zhengce de queli [On the United States' policy towards China and the formation of the newly established PRC's “Leaning-to One Side Policy”]. *Liaoning gongcheng jishu daxue xuebao (Journal of Liaoning Technical University)*, 7(4), 355-357.

⁵⁰⁵ Garver, W. John. (2003). The opportunity costs of Mao's foreign policy choices. *The China Journal*, (49), 127-136, p132.

In other words, the United States' relations with China became tenser in the context of the increasingly intimate Sino-Soviet relationship.⁵⁰⁶

The United States adopted distinctive approaches towards the Chinese Communist Party and the Kuomintang, which stimulated the PRC's lopsided foreign policy. Garver argues that the PRC could have had a choice to establish its diplomacy with the United States.⁵⁰⁷ However, the Truman administration became more concerned that the Chinese Communist Party would achieve a victory and become the ruling party in the aftermath of the Chinese Civil War, thereafter, the United States aimed to deter the rising Communist Camp and to destroy the Chinese Communist Party's relations with the Soviet Union.⁵⁰⁸ In other words, the United States had viewed the Chinese Communist Party as a potential threat ahead of the Chinese Civil War. Lin emphasizes that the United States did not sever its relations with the Kuomintang that had retreated to Taiwan, and had no intention to reach diplomacy with the newly established PRC.⁵⁰⁹ The United States thereby decided to shift its attitude towards Mao Ze-dong.⁵¹⁰ In contrast, the United States did not have to re-calculate its strategic interest in northeast Asia until the establishment of the PRC, which fundamentally changed the United States' plan to promote the "pro-Washington approach" in east Asia.

⁵⁰⁶ Chen, Jian. (2001). Mao's China and the Cold War. Chapel Hill: *The University of North Carolina Press*, p44.

⁵⁰⁷ Garver, W. John. (2003). The opportunity costs of Mao's foreign policy choices. *The China Journal*, (49), 127-136.

⁵⁰⁸ Trucker, N. (1983). Patterns in the dust: Chinese-American relations and the recognition controversy, 1949-1950. New York: *Columbia University Press*. & Stueck, W. (1981). The road to confrontation, American policy toward China and Korea, 1947-1950. Chapel Hill: *University of North Carolina Press*. & Gaddis, J. (1980). The strategic perspective: the rise and fall of the 'defense perimeter' concept, 1949-1951. New York: *Columbia University Press*, 61-118. & Chang, G. (1990). Friends and enemies: the United States, China and the Soviet Union, 1948-1972. Stanford: *Stanford University Press*, 7-75.

⁵⁰⁹ Lin, Li-min. (2000). Chaoxianzhazheng yu meiguoduihua ezhizhengce de queli [On the Korean War and the formation of the United States' containment policy towards China]. *Shixuejikan (Collected Papers of History Studies)*, (2), 90-95.

⁵¹⁰ Garver, W. John. (2003). The opportunity costs of Mao's foreign policy choices. *The China Journal*, (49), 127-136.

However, the PRC caught an opportunity to strengthen its role in the communist revolution in the context of the United States' "pro-Taipei approach", which laid a foundation for the PRC's lopsided foreign policy. Mao argues that the PRC should unite and organize the revolutionary forces to overthrow the Chiang Kai-shek regime and defeat the United States imperialism.⁵¹¹ In contrast, Mao Ze-dong realized the United States' relations with the Kuomintang as a threat to the development of China's socialist revolution. Lu indicates that the PRC realized its relations with the Communist Camp and its insistence on the anti-imperialist movement as a significant part of China's continuous revolution, which contributed to the PRC's lopsided foreign policy.⁵¹² Simultaneously, Mao insisted that the PRC's continuous communist revolution and anti-imperialist movement would not complete without the Soviet Union, which meant that the PRC clearly understood the Soviet Union's role in the post-war eras.⁵¹³ Viewed in this vein, the PRC's determination to lean to the Soviet Union had little difference from the "Anti-America Policy". Kissinger indicates that Mao did not intend to establish official relations with capitalist states under the principle of "cleaning the house before inviting the guests".⁵¹⁴ In other words, the Chinese Communist Party considered its communist revolution as an inspiring example that aimed to deter western imperialism in the rest of world.⁵¹⁵

Both China's earlier humiliated history and China's 'Sino-centrism' conception were combined to understand the pursuit of being an independent communist state, which helped to understand the origin of the PRC's lopsided foreign policy. On one hand, Kissinger argues that China could not achieve national liberation until the end of the Chinese Civil War, which meant that the Chinese leadership seized an opportunity to completely overthrow colonialism and imperialism.⁵¹⁶ From the perspective of China,

⁵¹¹ Mao, Ze-dong. Mao Ze-dong xuanji – disijuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the fourth volume]. *Renmin chubanshe* (People's Publishing House), p1359.

⁵¹² Lu, Wen-pei. (1994). Waijiao "yibiandao" zhengce de lishi fenxi [A historical analysis of the "Leaning-to One Side Policy"]. *Lilun jianshe* (Theory Research), (4), 73-76.

⁵¹³ Mao, Ze-dong. Mao Ze-dong xuanji – disijuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the fourth volume]. *Renmin chubanshe* (People's Publishing House), p1358.

⁵¹⁴ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. *Penguin Press*, p100.

⁵¹⁵ Zhang, Bai-jia. (1992). Zhou En-lai-the shaper and founder of China's diplomacy. In Michael H. Hunt and Niu Jun, eds., *Towards a history of Chinese communist foreign relations, 1920s-1960s: personalities and interpretive approaches*. Washington, D. C.: *Woodrow Wilson International Centre for scholars*, Asia program, p77.

⁵¹⁶ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. *Penguin Press*, p88.

western imperialism constituted an obstacle to China's independence. Mitter notes that western imperialist states' aggression wars seriously damaged China's national development and intensified China's social contradictions in the context of a series of unequal treaties.⁵¹⁷ In other words, China was declined as a semi-colonial and semi-feudal state from a Sino-centric society in the background of imperialist states' military presence. On the other hand, Mao Ze-dong endeavoured to prevent China from the influence of the bipolarity, hoping that China would emerge as a significantly strategic power with independence after the founding of the PRC.⁵¹⁸ According to Mao Ze-dong's (1961, p407) speech, Mao Ze-dong aimed to build a newly self-reliant state that would have the competence to deter the sphere of influence of hegemony and imperialism:

“China must be independent; China must be liberated. China's affair must be decided and ran by the Chinese people themselves, and no further interference, not even the slightest, will be tolerated from any imperialist country.”⁵¹⁹

In other words, the newly established PRC put out all stops to chase for China's independence, including both domestic and foreign affairs. Cheng and Zhang consider the PRC's lopsided foreign policy as an approach to secure China's security interest and ensure the Chinese Communist Party regime's continuity.⁵²⁰ In contrast, there has been no way to under-estimate the Chinese government's determination to fight for independence. Thereby, on 30th, June 1949, Mao Ze-dong issued an essay of “On the People's Democratic Dictatorship”, a description of the “Leaning-to One Side” as follows:

“the forty years' experience of Sun Yat-sen (1866-1925) and the twenty-eight years' experience of the Communist Party have taught us to lean to one side and we are firmly convinced that in order to win victory and consolidate it we must lean to one side of socialism.

⁵¹⁷ Mitter, Rana. (2008). Modern China: a very short introduction. Oxford University Press, p21.

⁵¹⁸ Cheng, Yu-shek, Joseph. & Zhang, Wan-kun, Franklin. (1999). Chinese foreign relations strategies under Mao and Deng: a systematic and comparative analysis. *Philippine Journal of Third World Studies*, 14(3), 91-114, p91.

⁵¹⁹ Mao, Ze-dong. (1961). On the People's Democratic Dictatorship. Selected works of Mao Ze-dong. IV, Pecking: Foreign Languages Press, p407.

⁵²⁰ Cheng, Yu-shek, Joseph. & Zhang, Wan-kun, Franklin. (1999). Chinese foreign relations strategies under Mao and Deng: a systematic and comparative analysis. *Philippine Journal of Third World Studies*, 14(3), 91-114, p96.

In the light of the experiences accumulated in these forty years and these twenty-eight years, all Chinese without exception must lean either to the side of imperialism or to the side of socialism. Sitting on the fence will not do, nor is there a third road. We oppose the Chiang Kai-shek (1887-1975) reactionaries who lean to the side of imperialism, and we also oppose the illusions about a third road”.⁵²¹

In other words, the Chinese leadership was determined to develop communism and deter imperialism in China, and the only choice thereby was to establish as well as enhance China’s diplomatic ties with socialist countries in order to realize China’s independence.

However, the “Leaning-to the Soviet Union” policy had a controversial influence on the development of China’s domestic and foreign affairs. According to Mao Ze-dong, “the ‘Leaning-to One Side’ means that we are on the side of the Soviet Union, this ‘Leaning-to One Side’ is a relationship of equality.”⁵²² On one hand, Garver argues that the Chinese government raised China’s international prestige and reputation by leaning towards the Soviet Union-led Socialist Camp.⁵²³ At the time of the PRC’s establishment, Mao Ze-dong and the Chinese Communist Party elites aimed to put an end to the old China’s tradition, which contributed to China’s new foreign policy.⁵²⁴ In brief, the Chinese leadership had an intention to write a new chapter in China’s diplomatic history with the lopsided foreign policy. On the other hand, Zhao argues that China missed out on an opportunity to take part in global affairs in the Soviet Union-led Communist Camp, which meant that China did not increase its leverage in the international arena.⁵²⁵ In order to realize mutual equality

⁵²¹ Mao, Ze-dong. (1961). On the People’s Democratic Dictatorship. Selected works of Mao Ze-dong. IV, Pecking: *Foreign Languages Press*, 411-424.

⁵²² Mao, Ze-dong. (1994). Mao Ze-dong Waijiao Wenxuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong on foreign policy]. Beijing: *Zhongyang Wenxian Chubanshe and Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe (Central Party Literature Press & World Affairs Press)*, p279.

⁵²³ Garver, W. John. (2003). The opportunity costs of Mao’s foreign policy choices. *The China Journal*, (49), 127-136.

⁵²⁴ Xue, Mou-hong. Et al. (1988). Dangdai zhongguo waijiao [Contemporary Chinese diplomacy]. Beijing: *Zhongguo Shehui Kexue Chubanshe (China Social Sciences Press)*, 4-5.

⁵²⁵ Zhao, Shu-zhao. (2008). Dui woguo jianguochuqi “yibiandao” waijiaozhengce de fansi [Some reflection on the “Leaning-to One Side Policy” in the early state of the newly established PRC]. *Chongqing keji xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Chongqing University of Science and Technology)*, (4), 4-5.

and reciprocal benefit, Li indicates that the PRC utilized the lopsided foreign policy to promote its relations with the Soviet Union-led communist states.⁵²⁶ In other words, China viewed the Soviet Union as such a nation that could acknowledge the Chinese Communist Party regime and provide foreign assistance to restore China's economy. In spite of that, Kissinger emphasizes that the Soviet Union imposed strict restriction on China's handling of strategic northern area, such as Xinjiang and Manchuria.⁵²⁷ In contrast, China maintained unequal relations with the Soviet Union in order to ensure China's security, which increased the Chinese leadership's dissatisfaction with the Soviet Union.

Apart from the assymmetric Sino-Soviet Union relations, the lopsided foreign policy fundamentally shaped the United States and other capitalist states' thinking of China. On one hand, Wu argues that China had distinctive attitudes towards the two giant powers in the context of the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship and Alliance, which utterly postponed the United States' plan to persuade the PRC to be a hostile power towards the Soviet camp.⁵²⁸ In contrast, it was necessary for Stalin to ally with China in order to contain the United States.⁵²⁹ In other words, the Sino-Soviet Union alliance relationship meant a serious blow to the United States' geo-strategic interest at the dawn of the Cold War. On the other hand, Chen argues that Mao's continuous revolution greatly sacrificed the improvement of Chinese people's living standard and decreased Chinese citizens' confidence in pursuing socialism.⁵³⁰ Sun indicates that the PRC did not mean to shift its foreign strategy in the context of the "Leaning-to One Side Policy", which equally cut off China's diplomatic and economic connection with western capitalist states.⁵³¹ In return, the United States decided to adopt a

⁵²⁶ Li, Yan. (2002). Jianguo chuqi "yibiandao" waijiaozhengce de biranxing he helixing [On the necessity and the reasonability of the "Leaning-to One Side Policy" in the early stage of the newly established PRC]. *Jiangxi shehui kexue (Jiangxi Social Sciences)*, (2), 95-98.

⁵²⁷ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. *Penguin Press*, p99.

⁵²⁸ Wu, Xin-quan. (1985). Eight years in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (January 1950 – October 1958)-Memoirs of a Diplomat. Beijing: *New World Press*, p16.

⁵²⁹ Wang, Ya-jie. & Song, Xiao-wei. & Lan, Yu-ming. (2013). Mao Ze-dong queli "yibiandao" waijiao zhengce de yuanyin fenxi [On Mao Ze-dong's "Leaning-to One Side Policy"]. *Beihua daxue xuebao (Journal of Beihua University)*, 14(5), 72-75.

⁵³⁰ Chen, Jian. (2003). A response: how to pursue a critical history of Mao's foreign policy. *The China Journal*, (49), 137-142.

⁵³¹ Sun, Qi-ming. (1995). Shi lun jianguo chuqi shixing "yibiandao" zhengce de libideshi [On gains and losses of carrying out the "Leaning-to One Side Policy" in the early days of the newly established PRC].

provocative approach towards the PRC, which gave rise to political isolation, diplomatic hostility and economic restriction.⁵³² In other words, the United States-led Capitalist Camp considered its aggressive policy towards China as a response to China's lopsided foreign policy, which further damaged China's national interests.

Ideology played an important role in China's relations with the Soviet Union-led communist states and with the United State-led capitalist states. According to Shi, the Chinese leadership perceived the "Leaning-to One Side Policy" as a tool to realize communism.⁵³³ On one hand, Kissinger argues that China considered the Soviet Union as a vital ideological ally to deter the United States and guarantee China's communist revolution.⁵³⁴ The ideological concern became the most obvious feature of the "Leaning-to One Side Policy". The Cold War originated from the confrontation between two camps that insisted on different ideologies: capitalism and communism respectively.⁵³⁵ In contrast, the history of the Cold War was a history of competition between two distinctive ideologies. On the other hand, Chen argues that the Marxist-Leninist ideology helped to build understanding of China's security strategy, and to explain factors of the Chinese leadership's plan to expand socialism in the Chinese society and establish China's status in the international society.⁵³⁶ The "Leaning-to One Side Policy" laid a foundation for the explanation of Chinese foreign policy in the 1950s, China therefore became an important member of the Soviet Union-led Socialist Camp and

Shanghai dangshi yanjiu (Shanghai CPC History Research), (1), 9-15.

⁵³² Tian, Jing. (2005). Meiguo duihuazhengce yu xinzhongguo "yibiandao" zhengce de queli [On the United States' policy towards China and the formation of the newly established PRC's "Leaning-to One Side Policy"]. *Liaoning gongcheng jishu daxue xuebao (Journal of Liaoning Technical University)*, 7(4), 355-357.

⁵³³ Shi, Zhi-fu. (1994). Zhonghua renmin gongheguo duiwai guanxi (1949.10 -1989.10) [A history of the foreign relations of the People's Republic of China (1949.10-1989.10)]. Beijing: *Beijing daxue chubanshe (Pecking University Press)*, 5-8.

⁵³⁴ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. *Penguin Press*, p98.

⁵³⁵ Chen, Jian. (2001). Mao's China and the Cold War. Chapel Hill: *The University of North Carolina Press*, p6.

⁵³⁶ Chen, Jian. (2001). Mao's China and the Cold War. Chapel Hill: *The University of North Carolina Press*, p8.

confronted with the United States-led Capitalist Camp.⁵³⁷

Simultaneously, ideology became the dividing line of friends and enemies in China's foreign policy consideration, which helped to explain China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea. Chen argues that the Marxist-Leninist communism served as a stimulus to foreign relations development among communist states and parties in the early beginning of the Cold War period.⁵³⁸ In contrast, different ideologies immediately became a creator of the escalating confrontation between the Capitalist Camp and the Socialist Camp. However, Oberdorfer argues that South Korea has been into the United States' sphere of influence since the establishment of the Republic of Korea on 15th August 1948 in the context of the thirty-eighth parallel.⁵³⁹ In contrast, the United States did not see South Korea as a part of its containment plan until China was determined to carry out the lopsided foreign policy, which meant that China's communist revolution development and China's lopsided foreign policy influenced both Beijing's and Washington's respective strategies towards the Korean peninsula. Sui emphasizes that South Korea posed a threat to China's security protection and economic reconstruction, which increased China's discontent with South Korea.⁵⁴⁰ Seth additionally indicates that the United States became South Korea's largest financial sponsor, which helped the Seoul regime to survive and develop in the post-war eras.⁵⁴¹ In order to deter the United States' military presence and diplomatic leverage on the Korean peninsula, the PRC recognized South Korea as a hostile regime in the Cold War period.

⁵³⁷ Cheng, Yu-shek, Joseph. & Zhang, Wan-kun, Franklin. (1999). Chinese foreign relations strategies under Mao and Deng: a systematic and comparative analysis. *Philippine Journal of Third World Studies*, 14(3), 91-114, p96.

⁵³⁸ Chen, Jian. (2001). Mao's China and the Cold War. Chapel Hill: *The University of North Carolina Press*, p7.

⁵³⁹ Oberdorfer, Don. (2001). The Two Koreas: a contemporary history. Basic Books, p7.

⁵⁴⁰ Sui, Shu-ying. (2004). Lun "yibiandao" zhengce de lishi juxianxing [On the historical limitation of the "Leaning-to One Side Policy"]. *Qilu xuekan (Qilu Journal)*, (6), 48-54.

⁵⁴¹ Seth, J. Michael. (2016). A concise history of modern Korea: from the late 19th century to the present. *Rowman & Litterfield*, p121.

The “Non-Policy” towards South Korea

The Cold War pattern in northeast Asia enhanced tensions on the Korean peninsula, which helped to understand the two competing triangular powers’ security policy towards Korea. According to Ahn, the confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union significantly influenced the situation in the Korean peninsula.⁵⁴² Seth argues that the United States aimed to stop the Soviet Union from expanding presence in Korea, which contributed to a proposal to divide Korea into two areas.⁵⁴³ Lynch indicates that the United States and the Soviet Union separately took over the Korean peninsula in accordance with the thirty-eighth parallel.⁵⁴⁴ In contrast, neither the United States nor the Soviet Union would agree each other to control the whole Korean peninsula after the defeat of Japan. However, Song argues that the newly established PRC decided to slide into the Soviet Union-led Communist Camp, which stimulated the United States’ plan to drive a wedge between the Soviet Union and China.⁵⁴⁵ In other words, the United States’ confrontation with the Soviet Union did not come into a new stage until the PRC declared its lopsided foreign policy, which suggested that the formation of the Sino-Soviet alliance relationship damaged the United States’ strategic interests in northeast Asia. Chen emphasizes that the United States decided to participate in the Korean War in order to contain China and the Soviet Union, which further intensified its competition with the Soviet Union-led Communist Camp.⁵⁴⁶ In contrast, the United States grasped an opportunity to impose capitalist control over the Korean peninsula, which turned into a severe blow to the PRC’s continuous revolution and security protection.

Both the United States and the Soviet Union played a role in China’s “Non-Policy” towards South Korea. According to Segal, China had no way to ignore both leading states’ influence on China’s security

⁵⁴² Ahn, Byung-joon. (1980). South Korea and the communist countries. *Asian Survey*, 20(11), 1098-1107.

⁵⁴³ Seth, J. Michael. (2016). A concise history of modern Korea: from the late 19th century to the present. Rowman & Litterfield, p94.

⁵⁴⁴ Lynch, Michael. (2015). Mao’s China: 1936-1997. Third Edition, *Hodder Education*, p57.

⁵⁴⁵ Song, Hai-qiong. (2001). Chaoxianzhazheng qianhou liangguo sanfang guanxi qianxi [On the relationship among three sides of two nations before and after the Korean War]. *Zhongguo kuangye daxue xuebao (Journal of China University of Mining & Technology)*, (4), 111-114, p112.

⁵⁴⁶ Chen, Jian. (2001). Mao’s China and the Cold War. Chapel Hill: *The University of North Carolina Press*, p2.

calculation.⁵⁴⁷ Yi argues that Beijing paid more attention to Pyongyang than Seoul in the Cold War period.⁵⁴⁸ On one hand, Mao Ze-dong's involvement in the Korean War aimed not only to protect China's security from foreign aggression via the Korean peninsula, but more significantly, to transfer the security burden into opportunities to consolidate the new-born political regime as well as promote Mao's "continuous revolution".⁵⁴⁹ Threatened by the United States' expanding sphere of influence on the Korean peninsula, China insisted on the "Non-Policy" towards the United States-backed South Korea. On the other hand, Lynch emphasizes that China considered its participation in the Korean War as a means to enhance its relations with the Soviet Union that played a role in China's national reconstruction, even though the eruption of the Korean War had constituted an obstacle to China's security concern.⁵⁵⁰ In contrast, the escalating triangular confrontation among the Soviet Union, the United States and China contributed to China's hostile approach towards South Korea.

South Korea's "anti-communism" rhetoric and South Korea's tension with North Korea were combined to understand China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea. According to Seth, South Korea was viewed as such a state that strove to fight against communism in the post-war eras.⁵⁵¹ On one hand, Liang argues that South Korea aimed to protect itself from collapse in the context of the United States' military presence, which contributed to South Korea's "Anti-communism Policy".⁵⁵² The Republic of Korea, namely South Korea, founded on August 15, 1948, decided to consider the "Pro-America Policy" as a symbolic measure.⁵⁵³ Ahn

⁵⁴⁷ Segal, Gerald. (1980). China and the great power triangle. *The China Quarterly*, (83), 490-509, p492.

⁵⁴⁸ Yi, X. (1995). China's Korea policy: from 'One Korea' to 'Two Koreas'. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 22(2), 119-140, p119.

⁵⁴⁹ Telegram, Mao Ze-dong to Stalin, October 2, 1950, (1987). Jianguo yilai Mao Ze-dong wengao [Mao Ze-dong's Manuscripts since the formation of the PRC]. Beijing: *Zhongyang Wenxian Chubanshe and Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe (Central Party Literature Press & World Affairs Press)*, 539-540.

⁵⁵⁰ Lynch, Michael. (2015). Mao's China: 1936-1997. Third Edition, *Hodder Education*, p55.

⁵⁵¹ Seth, J. Michael. (2016). A concise history of modern Korea: from the late 19th century to the present. *Rowman & Litterfield*, p121.

⁵⁵² Liang, Zhi. (2008). Hanguo zhengzhi fazhanzhong de meiguo: 1945-1961 [On the United States' role in the development of South Korea's politics: 1945-1961]. *Lengzhan guojishi yanjiu (Cold War International History Studies)*, (1), 216-239, p216.

⁵⁵³ Piao, Rui-lin. (1999). Hanguo wajiaozhengce de fazhanguocheng [On the developmental process of

argues that South Korea, an important ally of the United States, insisted on a provocative approach towards the Soviet Union-led socialist countries.⁵⁵⁴ Han indicates that South Korea's "Anti-communism Policy" and "pro-Washington approach" became the two most important strategies at the dawn of the Cold War.⁵⁵⁵ In contrast, the possibility that South Korea would reach rapprochement with communist states decreased to the lowest point. On the other hand, Ahn argues that the escalating confrontation between North Korea and South Korea helped to explain South Korea's hostile relations with communist nations.⁵⁵⁶ In other words, the Soviet Union-led Socialist Camp's "pro-Pyongyang approach" laid a foundation for China's policy towards South Korea.

The United States caught an opportunity to expand military presence in the Korean peninsula and develop the United States-South Korean relations, which further deteriorated China's relations with South Korea. On one hand, Han argues that the United States has significantly influenced South Korea's foreign affairs since American military troops participated in the Korean War.⁵⁵⁷ In contrast, the United States played a vital role in South Korea in the context of a divided Korea. On the other hand, Shen argues that the United States and other capitalist states formally recognized South Korea as a legitimate regime, which contributed to South Korea's security protection and economic reconstruction.⁵⁵⁸ Han indicates that the signing of the United States-South Korean mutual defence treaty served as a strategy to discourage North Korea from attack.⁵⁵⁹

South Korea's foreign policy decision]. *Hanguo yanjiu luncong (Collected Papers for Korean Studies)*, (00), 23-38, p25.

⁵⁵⁴ Ahn, Byung-joon. (1980). South Korea and the communist countries. *Asian Survey*, 20(11), 1098-1107, p1099.

⁵⁵⁵ Han, Sung-joo. (1980). South Korea and the United States: the alliance survives. *Asian Survey*, 20(11), 1075-1086.

⁵⁵⁶ Ahn, Byung-joon. (1980). South Korea and the communist countries. *Asian Survey*, 20(11), 1098-1107, p1098.

⁵⁵⁷ Han, Sung-joo. (1980). South Korea and the United States: the alliance survives. *Asian Survey*, 20(11), 1075-1086.

⁵⁵⁸ Shen, Ding-chang. (2002). Hanguo waijiaozhengce de fazhanguocheng jiqi bianqianyuanyin [On developmental process and influential factors of South Korea's foreign policy]. *Hanguo xuelun wenji (Collected Papers of Study of Korea)*, (00), 296-308.

⁵⁵⁹ Han, Xian-dong. (2012). Hanguo de waijiao kunjing: yige gaikuoxing kuangjia de jiedu [South Korea's

Besides, Piao notes that the United States provided South Korea with massive military and economic support, which aimed to secure the Syngman Rhee regime.⁵⁶⁰ From the perspective of South Korea, the development of the United States-South Korean relations has been a pre-requisite to its foreign affairs and security concerns. In the context of South Korea's "pro-Washington approach", Hao emphasizes that China viewed South Korea as "the United States-backed puppet regime".⁵⁶¹ In other words, South Korea's relations with the United States posed a massive threat to the PRC's security interest, economic development and communist revolution.

diplomacy dilemma: a general framework of analysis]. *Dongbeiyaluntan (Northeast Asia Forum)*, (3), 62-38, p63.

⁵⁶⁰ Piao, Rui-lin. (1999). Hanguo waijiaozhengce de fazhanguocheng [On the developmental process of South Korea's foreign policy decision]. *Hanguo yanjiu luncong (Collected Papers for Korean Studies)*, (00), 23-38, p24.

⁵⁶¹ Hao, Yu-fan. (1987). China and the Korean peninsula: a Chinese perspective. *Asian Survey*, 27(8), 862-884.

China's perspective on the South Korea decision to establish relation with Taiwan

The Chinese Communist Party did not become the ruling political party until the end of the Chinese Civil War, which had a controversial influence on the Kuomintang's policy consideration. According to Lin, the Truman administration had agreed on the then Secretary of the United States, Dean Acheson's plan to pay little attention to Taiwan and South Korea, which increased doubts about whether or not Mao Ze-dong could have had an opportunity to bring Taiwan into the PRC's sphere of influence.⁵⁶² On one hand, Kissinger argues that the Kuomintang did not change its plan to deter the Chinese Communist Party, even though the Kuomintang had retreated to Taiwan.⁵⁶³ In brief, the Chinese Civil War did not put an end to the confrontation between the Chinese Communist Party and the Kuomintang, but laid a foundation for the separation status quo between China and Taiwan. On the other hand, Szonyi argues Chiang Kai-shek, Mao Ze-dong's opponent, decided to lean to the United States in order to seek for assistance.⁵⁶⁴ In contrast, Chiang Kai-shek's "pro-Washington approach" further worsened the PRC's relations with the United States. Sneider indicates that the United States considered Taiwan as a strategic military base in northeast Asia.⁵⁶⁵ In other words, the United States seized an opportunity to take advantage of tensions between the Chinese Communist Party and the Kuomintang. Ji emphasizes that Taiwan received military and economic assistance from the United States, which meant that the United States used a tactic to protect Taiwan from sudden collapse and hamper Taiwan from unification with China.⁵⁶⁶ In other words, the Chiang Kai-shek administration made use of the escalating Sino-United States confrontation to strengthen Taiwan's role in the United States' strategic calculation.

The PRC's participation in the Korean War and its pursuit of socialist revolution laid a foundation for the United States' "Two Chinas" policy, which contributed to the PRC's confrontation with the United States-led Capitalist Camp. Roy on one hand argues that the United States attempted to deteriorate the PRC's

⁵⁶² Lin, Hsiao-ting. (2012). Taiwan's secret ally. *Hoover Institution*, (2), Available from: <https://www.hoover.org/research/taiwans-secret-ally> (Viewed on 24th, June 2019).

⁵⁶³ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. *Penguin Press*, p90.

⁵⁶⁴ Szonyi, Michael. (2008). Cold War Island: Quemoy on the front line. *Cambridge University Press*: p2.

⁵⁶⁵ Sneider, L. Richard. (1986). United States security interests. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 36(1), 76-87, p80.

⁵⁶⁶ Ji, Yan-jun. (2015). Chaoxianzhanzheng dui zhanhou guojiguanxi de yinxiang [On the Korean War and the development of international relations in the post-war eras]. *Shang (Business)*, (1), 71.

relations with the Soviet Union, on the other hand, considered the division between the PRC under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party and the ROC under the control of the Chiang Kai-shek regime as an imperative to maintain the United States' interests.⁵⁶⁷ The United States aimed to stop the PRC from imposing influence on Taiwan, and continued to consider the Kuomintang as a part of its strategic plan to contain the PRC. However, Lin argues that the PRC's involvement in the Korean War served as a stimulus to the United States' changing attitude towards the PRC.⁵⁶⁸ In contrast, the PRC's active role in the "anti-capitalism" revolution campaign postponed the United States' plan to recognize the Chinese Communist Party regime. Due to the Chinese Communist Party's victory in China's communist revolution, Buss highlights that the Truman administration decided to carry out the "Two Chinas" policy in order to protect the United States' interest in northeast Asia and to decrease the Soviet Union-led communist states' leverage.⁵⁶⁹ In other words, the United States' aggressive approach towards the PRC should be understood in the context of the two leading states' escalating tension in northeast Asia, which meant that the United States became frightened after the PRC stepped into the Communist Camp's sphere of influence.

The United States insisted on the "Two Chinas" policy in order to contain the PRC, which helped to explain South Korea's "pro-Taipei approach". According to Lin, the Chiang Kai-shek administration's retreat to Taiwan further protected the Kuomintang from being defeated by the Chinese Communist Party, which constituted the post-war competition between the ROC led by the Kuomintang and the PRC led by the Chinese Communist Party in the international arena.⁵⁷⁰ Roy on one hand argues that both the Chiang Kai-shek's "Anti-communism Policy" and the importance of Taiwan were combined to understand the United States' decision to send military equipment to Taiwan, on the other hand, Mao Ze-dong's lopsided foreign policy stimulated the Truman government's relations with the ROC.⁵⁷¹ In contrast, the United States was

⁵⁶⁷ Roy, Denny. (2003). Taiwan: a political history. Cornell University Press, p109.

⁵⁶⁸ Lin, Li-min. (2000). Chaoxianzhazheng yu meiguoduihua ezhizhengce de queli [On the Korean War and the formation of the United States' containment policy towards China]. *Shixuejikan (Collected Papers of History Studies)*, (2), 90-95.

⁵⁶⁹ Buss, A. Claude. (1988). Reviewed work(s): Truman's "Two China" policy. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 47(2), 346-347, p346.

⁵⁷⁰ Lin, Hsiao-ting. (2012). Hoover fellow and library & archives curator Hsiao-ting Lin Publishes a new view of modern Taiwan. *Hoover Institution*, (2), Available from: <https://www.hoover.org/news/hoover-fellow-and-library-archives-curator-hsiao-ting-lin-publishes-new-view-modern-taiwan> (Viewed on 24th, June 2019).

⁵⁷¹ Roy, Denny. (2003). Taiwan: a political history. Cornell University Press, 110-111.

determined to carry out the “Two Chinas” policy in order to deter China and contain communism. Sneider highlights that the United States reached agreements on security defence in order to maintain its grip on northeast Asia, including South Korea, Japan and Taiwan.⁵⁷² In other words, the United States could not under-estimate South Korea’s and Taiwan’s role in its overall security calculation. Besides, Jin argues that South Korea could hardly overlook the difficulties in the more volatile situation on the Korean peninsula and the more serious conflict between the two Koreas, which influenced South Korea’s policy towards the Kuomintang.⁵⁷³ In contrast, South Korea reached a common consensus about the “Two Chinas” policy with the United States, and decided to insist on the “pro-Taipei approach” in order to fight against communist aggression.

Both ideological concern and interest calculation laid a pre-requisite for the strategic partnership between Taipei and Seoul, which enhanced Washington’s persistence in the “Anti-communism Policy”. According to Liu, South Korea remained a comparatively close alliance relationship with the Chiang Kai-shek regime.⁵⁷⁴ Xia argues that both Taipei and Seoul aimed to contain Beijing and develop diplomacy, which helped to explain the two anti-communist regimes’ decision to deliver political recognition to each other.⁵⁷⁵ Heo and Kim emphasize that Seoul and Taipei had exchanged ambassadors prior to the outbreak of the Korean War.⁵⁷⁶ In other words, the Chinese Nationalist Party regime saw the South Korean government as the solely legitimate administration in the Korean peninsula, and the South Korean government insisted on the “pro-Taipei approach”. Ahead of the eruption of the Korean War, Chiang Kai-shek (1927-1975), the paramount political leader of the Chinese Nationalist Party, initiated a visit to Seoul in order to form an “anti-

⁵⁷² Sneider, L. Richard. (1986). United States security interests. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 36(1), 76-87, p78.

⁵⁷³ Jin, Jing-yi. (2002). Qianlun chaoxianzhazheng qian Jiang Jie-shi yu Li Cheng-wan guanxi de hexinxiansuo [On the core clue of the relationship between Chiang Kai-shek and Syngman Rhee ahead of the Korean War]. *Guoji zhengzhi yanjiu (Studies of International Politics)*, (4), 127-130.

⁵⁷⁴ Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094, p1089.

⁵⁷⁵ Xia, Fei. (2012). Chaoxianzhazheng qijian de jiangjieshi [Chiang Kai-shek in the period of the Korean War]. *Dangshi zongheng (Over the Party History)*, (1), 8-11.

⁵⁷⁶ Heo, Uk. & Kim, Hayam. (2012). Private-sector networks, democracy, and interstate relations: a case study of South Korea and Taiwan. *Asian Perspective*, (36), 71-93, p71.

communism” alliance.⁵⁷⁷ In return, Park Chung-hee (1963-1979) was invited to visit Taipei in the year of 1966.⁵⁷⁸ In brief, both Seoul and Taipei paid a high attention to the Seoul-Taipei ties through mutual visits and frequent contacts. However, Chen argues that the Sino-Soviet relations further weakened in the 1960s, and the Khrushchev administration adopted a hostile approach towards the PRC.⁵⁷⁹ Lankov additionally highlights that Moscow did not set out to repair its relations with Pyongyang until Brezhnev came to power.⁵⁸⁰ In other words, Moscow’s unstable relations with Beijing and Pyongyang provided Moscow with an excuse for paying less attention to northeast Asia.

Apart from political considerations, South Korea developed a friendly cooperative relationship with Taiwan, which contributed to the economic inter-dependence building between Seoul and Taipei. According to Ji, the economic increase in both Taiwan and South Korea should be understood in the context of the United States’ economic assistance policy.⁵⁸¹ On one hand, Park argues that Park Chung-hee insisted on the “Export-oriented Policy” and achieved a miraculous economic growth through a series of effective measures.⁵⁸² In contrast, South Korea strove to establish and enhance trading relations with the overseas market under the leadership of Park Chung-hee, which helped South Korea to expand mutual economic cooperation with its partners. On the other hand, Liu argues that both sides became an important commercial partner to each

⁵⁷⁷ Heo, Uk. & Kim, Hayam. (2012). Private-sector networks, democracy, and interstate relations: a case study of South Korea and Taiwan. *Asian Perspective*, (36), 71-93, p71. & Xia, Fei. (2012). Chaoxianzhazheng qijian de jiangjieshi [Chiang Kai-shek in the period of the Korean War]. *Dangshi zongheng (Over the Party History)*, (1), 8-11.

⁵⁷⁸ Lee, Min-yung. (2015). The similar histories of Taiwan and South Korea. Available from: <http://www.taipeitimes.com/News/editorials/archives/2016/12/18/2003661427> (Viewed on 25th, June 2019).

⁵⁷⁹ Chen, Jian. (2001). Mao’s China and the Cold War. Chapel Hill: *The University of North Carolina Press*, p82.

⁵⁸⁰ Lankov, Andrei. (2015). The real North Korea: life and politics in the failed Stalinist utopia. *Oxford University Press*, p20.

⁵⁸¹ Ji, Yan-jun. (2015). Chaoxianzhazheng dui zhanhou guojiguanxi de yinxiang [On the Korean War and the development of international relations in the post-war eras]. *Shang (Business)*, (1), 71.

⁵⁸² Park, Young-soo. (2011). Revisiting the South Korean developmental state after the 1997 financial crisis. *Australian journal of international affairs*, 590-606.

other.⁵⁸³ In brief, the Seoul-Taipei relationship was a complex combination of political concern as well as economic interest. Heo and Kim emphasize that the Chiang Kai-shek regime and the South Korean government reached a series of agreements, such as business cooperation and cultural communication.⁵⁸⁴ Both sides endeavoured to promote their trading connection after South Korea established ties with Taiwan in 1948.⁵⁸⁵ In other words, both South Korea and Taiwan made full use of the economic incentive to strengthen the Seoul-Taipei bilateral economic relationship, which further helped to explain South Korea's "pro-Taipei approach".

South Korea developed relations with Taiwan, which suggested South Korea's "pro-Taipei approach" in the context of the United States' persistence in the "One China, One Taiwan" policy ("一中一台"政策 – yizhongyitai zhengce). According to Roy, both Truman and Acheson persisted that Washington's relations with Beijing and Moscow did not escalate into a more serious confrontation until the Korean War broke out.⁵⁸⁶ On one hand, Whiting argues that Mao Ze-dong considered the United States' military presence in South Korea and the Chiang Kai-shek's relations with Washington as threats to the PRC's national interests.⁵⁸⁷ It turned into a lethal blow to Beijing that Washington enhanced relations with Seoul and Taipei. Liu emphasizes that both Taiwan and the mainland belong to "One China", and there is only "One China" in the world in accordance with the PRC's acknowledgement in the United Nations.⁵⁸⁸ In other words, the United States' "One China, One Taiwan" policy seriously damaged the PRC's status in the international arena. On the other hand, Chen argues that the PRC's attitude towards the territorial conflict over Taiwan could be understood in the context of the 1962 Sino-Indian dispute as well as the 1969 Sino-Soviet border

⁵⁸³ Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094, p1089.

⁵⁸⁴ Heo, Uk. & Kim, Hayam. (2012). Private-sector networks, democracy, and interstate relations: a case study of South Korea and Taiwan. *Asian Perspective*, (36), 71-93, p71.

⁵⁸⁵ Heo, Uk. & Kim, Hayam. (2012). Private-sector networks, democracy, and interstate relations: a case study of South Korea and Taiwan. *Asian Perspective*, (36), 71-93, p77.

⁵⁸⁶ Roy, Denny. (2003). Taiwan: a political history. *Cornell University Press*, p112.

⁵⁸⁷ Whiting, S. Allen. (2001). China's use of force, 1950-1996, and Taiwan. *International Security*, 26(2), 103-131, p107.

⁵⁸⁸ Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094.

clash.⁵⁸⁹ From the perspective of Beijing, the Seoul-Taipei relationship was a proof of an activity that aimed to split the mainland and Taiwan and to bolster the Chiang Kai-shek regime, which conversely hampered the PRC from realizing unification with Taiwan. Having explained China's policy towards South Korea after the Korean War, the next part aims to tell the influence of China's security strategies on China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea.

⁵⁸⁹ Chen, C. King. (1977). Peking's attitude towards Taiwan. *Asian Survey*, 17(10), 903-918, p904.

The impact of China's national security priorities on China's post-Korean War international relations

China's security policies

China's security policy in the late Mao period should be understood in the background of the complex relations among the United States, the Soviet Union and China, which conversely meant that the two leading states played a vital role in China's defense strategies. On one hand, Chen argues that the establishment of the PRC and the PRC's decision to be an ally of the Soviet Union turned into a threat towards the United States.⁵⁹⁰ Roy highlights that the United States had an intention to prevent China from developing relations with the Soviet Union.⁵⁹¹ In contrast, the United States' confrontation with the Soviet Union came into a new phase after the Second World War, which enabled China to be a significant part of the United States' security thinking. On the other hand, Kissinger argues that the Nixon administration (1969-1974) decided to adopt a more flexible approach towards China in order to ensure the United States' global interests.⁵⁹² In other words, the Soviet Union was viewed as the common foe in the context of the Sino-United States rapprochement. In the era of Mao (1949-1976), the development of China's relations with the Soviet Union and the United States was realized as the primary focus of China's changing foreign strategies, including China's lopsided foreign policy – the “Leaning-to One Side Policy” in the 1950s, China's “Fighting-with Two Fists Strategy” in the 1960s, and China's “One United Front Approach” in the 1970s.⁵⁹³ In brief, both leading powers' changing policies from the 1960s to the 1970s laid a foundation for the explanation of China's security policies.

The competition among the Soviet Union, the United States and China influenced China's position in the Cold War period. On one hand, Brown argues that the Soviet Union, the United States and China had no account but to take each other into each other's security policy calculation.⁵⁹⁴ In brief, China emerged as a

⁵⁹⁰ Chen, Jian. (2001). Mao's China and the Cold War. Chapel Hill: *The University of North Carolina Press*, p2.

⁵⁹¹ Roy, Denny. (2003). Taiwan: a political history. *Cornell University Press*, p109.

⁵⁹² Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. *Penguin Press*, p215.

⁵⁹³ Cheng, Yu-shek, Joseph. & Zhang, Wan-kun, Franklin. (1999). Chinese foreign relation strategies under Mao and Deng: a systematic and comparative analysis. *Philippine Journal of Third World Studies*, 14(3), 91-114.

⁵⁹⁴ Brown, G. R. (1976). Chinese politics and American policy: a new look at the triangle. *Foreign Policy*, 23, 3-23.

power from the third world, so much so that both the Soviet Union and the United States could not ignore it. Simultaneously, Mao's success in China's socialist revolution brought northeast Asia into the latest remarkable front line in place of Europe.⁵⁹⁵ In other words, China's confrontation with the United States and the Soviet Union meant an opportunity to enhance China's role in northeast Asia. On the other hand, Chen argues that China's struggle with the United States and the Soviet Union helped states around northeast Asia - the dangerous battlefield to exert calmness and restraint.⁵⁹⁶ In contrast, the Soviet Union, the United States and China did neither have the strength to re-new war fighting, nor have an attempt to undertake the possible consequence after the Korean War ended in 1953. Thereby, China, the Soviet Union and the United States prolonged the no-war-no-peace confrontation, which should be viewed as an acceptable scenario.

New changes in northeast Asia influenced China's security policy calculation in the 1950s. According to Lee, the Korean peninsula was divided into two states with two different political systems, and Japan was not considered as a powerful militaristic nation.⁵⁹⁷ On one hand, China's participation in the Korean War caused some serious consequences,⁵⁹⁸ even though China had achieved anti-Japanese aggression victory that put an end to China's "century of humiliation".⁵⁹⁹ Xie emphasizes that China did neither earn recognition from the United States and other capitalist countries, nor hold a seat in the United Nations.⁶⁰⁰ In other words, the majority of western capitalist states persisted in the "pro-Washington approach" so as to contain China and

⁵⁹⁵ Chen, Jian. (2001). Mao's China and the Cold War. Chapel Hill: *The University of North Carolina Press*, 2-3.

⁵⁹⁶ Chen, Jian. (2001). Mao's China and the Cold War. Chapel Hill: *The University of North Carolina Press*, p3.

⁵⁹⁷ Lee, Yung-hong. (1977). Korea's future: Peking's perspective. *Asian Survey*, 17(11), 1088-1102.

⁵⁹⁸ Zhang, Jun-fa. & Qi, Xiao-yu. (2015). Chaoxianzhanzheng dui zhongguo de yingxiang [The influence of the Korean War on China]. *Puyang zhiye jishu xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Puyang Vocational and Technical College)*, 28(5), 48-50.

⁵⁹⁹ Schiavenza, Mattt. (2013). How humiliation drove modern Chinese history. Available from: <https://www.theatlantic.com/china/archive/2013/10/how-humiliation-drove-modern-chinese-history/280878/> (View on 25th June 2019)

⁶⁰⁰ Xie, Tao. (2008). Congress and China policy: an analysis of China bills. *Journal of Contemporary China*, 17(54), 141-165.

deter communism. On the other hand, the escalating tension between the United States and China conversely enabled the Soviet Union to play an increasingly important role in the Communist Camp.⁶⁰¹ In contrast, Beijing had difficulties in reaching breakthrough in its relations with Washington, which turned into a nightmare to Beijing in the context of the Sino-United States confrontation. Lee views the Soviet Union as the unique power that had strength to compete with the United States.⁶⁰² As a result, China immediately signed the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance on 14th February 1950 in order to protect China's border security from sudden aggressive invasions.

The Sino-United States confrontation from the 1950s onwards and the Sino-Soviet Union split from the 1960s onwards significantly influenced China's security policy, which contributed to China's policy towards the Korean peninsula. On one hand, Kissinger argues that the Soviet troops on the Sino-Soviet border accelerated an inevitable war between the two communist states in 1969.⁶⁰³ In contrast, both the United States and the Soviet Union considered China as a hostile adversary in the 1960s. Cheng and Zhang emphasize that the Chinese government identified this approach as the "Fighting-with Two Fists Strategy".⁶⁰⁴ In other words, China felt threatened by the Sino-United States confrontation in the context of the Vietnamese War (1961-1964), and China became anxious about a serious border security crisis in the background of the Sino-Soviet Union border clash. On the other hand, Zagoria argues that Moscow continued to provide Pyongyang with business assistance and military equipment from the middle 1960s.⁶⁰⁵ Viewed in this vein, China should be specifically cautious about the development of the Sino-North Korean realtions in the context of the complex Northern Triangle among the Soviet Union, China and North Korea, which meant that the Sino-Soviet Union split enabled North Korea to play a more critical role in China's security policy consideration.

In the 1970s, China's security policy did not change until the Sino-United States rapprochement. According

⁶⁰¹ Ji, Yan-jun. (2015). Chaoxianzhazheng dui zhanhou guojiguanxi de yinxiang [On the Korean War and the development of international relations in the post-war eras]. *Shang (Business)*, (1), 71.

⁶⁰² Lee, Yung-hong. (1977). Korea's future: Peking's perspective. *Asian Survey*, 17(11), 1088-1102.

⁶⁰³ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. *Penguin Press*, p217.

⁶⁰⁴ Cheng, Yu-shek, Joseph. & Zhang, Wan-kun, Franklin. (1999). Chinese foreign relation strategies under Mao and Deng: a systematic and comparative analysis. *Philippine Journal of Third World Studies*, 14(3), 91-114, p97.

⁶⁰⁵ Zagoria, S. D. (1977). Korea's future: Mosow's perspective. *Asian Survey*, 17(11), 1103-1112.

to Lee, the Sino-Soviet rift, Japan's rapid economic development, and Nixon's dynamic approach towards China were combined to understand the new political order in northeast Asia.⁶⁰⁶ On one hand, Kissinger argues that the Sino-Soviet split became a turning point to the United States' changing policy towards China.⁶⁰⁷ In contrast, the United States did not mean to shift its aggressive approach towards China until the Sino-Soviet border clash. On the other hand, Cheng and Zhang argue that China considered the United States as the sole power that had capability to compete with the Soviet Union's military strength.⁶⁰⁸ Gong highlights that China realized the significance of the two giant powers' hostility to each other, which meant a key step to ease China's security situation.⁶⁰⁹ Viewed in this vein, the United States adopted a reconciliatory approach towards China, which enabled China to feel more relieved from its confrontation with the two leading states. Nixon's meeting with Mao Ze-dong in 1971 meant that China strategically managed to use the increasing contradictions between the United States and the Soviet Union to preserve China's national interests.⁶¹⁰ Faced with the Soviet military presence along the border, it was necessary for China to come up with solutions to deter the security threat posed by the Soviet Union, which helped to understand the Sino-United States reconciliation.

The United States considered China as security competitor as well as co-operator while the Soviet Union's role was changed into a border aggressor to China, which helped to explain China's security strategies in the late Mao era. Lee argues that the Sino-United States confrontation, the Sino-Soviet dispute and the Sino-United States rapprochement were combined to understand China's policy towards South Korea.⁶¹¹ In brief,

⁶⁰⁶ Lee, Yung-hong. (1977). Korea's future: Peking's perspective. *Asian Survey*, 17(11), 1088-1102.

⁶⁰⁷ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. *Penguin Press*, p216.

⁶⁰⁸ Cheng, Yu-shek, Joseph. & Zhang, Wan-kun, Franklin. (1999). Chinese foreign relation strategies under Mao and Deng: a systematic and comparative analysis. *Philippine Journal of Third World Studies*, 14(3), 91-114, p98.

⁶⁰⁹ Gong, Li. (2013). Mao Ze-dong yu dakai zhongmeiguanxi damen de zhanlue juece [On Mao Ze-dong and the strategic decision to open the gate of the Sino-United States relations]. *Lishi yanjiu (Historical Research)*, 6, 14-18.

⁶¹⁰ Cheng, Yu-shek, Joseph. & Zhang, Wan-kun, Franklin. (1999). Chinese foreign relation strategies under Mao and Deng: a systematic and comparative analysis. *Philippine Journal of Third World Studies*, 14(3), 91-114, p98.

⁶¹¹ Lee, Yung-hong. (1977). Korea's future: Peking's perspective. *Asian Survey*, 17(11), 1088-1102.

the two leading states' changing attitudes towards China evoked intense repercussion, which contributed to the "One United Front Approach" in replacement of the "Fighting-with Two Fists Strategy". However, geopolitics combined the Korean peninsula with four major powers in the Cold War period, including the Soviet Union, the United States, Japan and China. With the lack of an explanation of the two leading powers' attitudes towards China, it has been little possible to analyze China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea in the late Mao era. In other words, Beijing's consideration on Seoul was not only a product of its own diplomatic interests, but also of its neighbouring countries' diplomatic calculations.

China's confrontation with the United States

The fate of South Korea has been little possible to take no notice of the United States' role since American troops marched into the thirty-eighth parallel. On one hand, Chen argues that the United States participated in the Korean War in order to deter communism and contain the Soviet expansion.⁶¹² In contrast, the outbreak of the Korean War meant an opportunity for the United States to compete with the Soviet Union-led communist states. On the other hand, Han argues that South Korea has relied on the United States' military presence in South Korea to guarantee its security, especially to discourage North Korea's aggression.⁶¹³ In other words, the United States has played an important role in South Korea's security policy consideration since American forces involved in the Korean War. Han emphasizes that the United States has been South Korea's largest military sponsor since the Korean War.⁶¹⁴ In contrast, South Korea's dependence on the United States has been a vital part in South Korea's security protection, which contributed to the United States-South Korean military alliance relationship. So much so that, the survival of South Korea has been a priority for the United States' strategy to ensure its influence over northeast Asia.

China's earlier humiliated history influenced China's concern on the United States' military presence in South Korea, which contributed to the Sino-United States confrontation. On one hand, Gordon argues that China's foreign policy was strongly underpinned by its experience of humiliation by foreign countries.⁶¹⁵ China viewed east Asia as a politically unstable area, which directly influenced China's security in northern regions.⁶¹⁶ Viewed in this vein, the United States' military force would grow as a new invasion force that could use the Korean peninsula as a corridor to obtain an access to northern China. On the other hand, Hao and Zhai argue that the United States sent its military and financial assistance to Taiwan and South Korea in

⁶¹² Chen, Jian. (2001). Mao's China and the Cold War. Chapel Hill: *The University of North Carolina Press*, p2.

⁶¹³ Han, Sung-joo. (1980). South Korea and the United States: the alliance survives. *Asian Survey*, 20(11), 1075-1086, p1075.

⁶¹⁴ Han, Sung-joo. (1980). South Korea and the United States: the alliance survives. *Asian Survey*, 20(11), 1075-1086, p1077.

⁶¹⁵ Gordon, Leonard. (1969). Communist China's foreign policy in history perspective. *The History Teacher*, 2(4), 45-51, p46.

⁶¹⁶ Chen, Jian. (2001). Mao's China and the Cold War. Chapel Hill: *The University of North Carolina Press*, p87.

order to contain China and deter communism.⁶¹⁷ Sneider emphasizes that both the Korean peninsula and the Taiwan Strait have been important to the United States' strategic interests.⁶¹⁸ Kim and Vogel mention that the Park Chung-hee administration realized South Korea's involvement in the Vietnamese War as a step to develop the United States-South Korean military alliance relationship and preserve the United States' force in Korea.⁶¹⁹ Fu indicates that China further missed out on an opportunity to impose influence on Taiwan in the context of the United States' mutual defence treaty with the ROC, which conversely secured the United States' presence in Taiwan and prolonged the Chiang Kai-shek regime.⁶²⁰ From China's perspective, the United States' increasing military presence in South Korea and Taiwan was considered as a challenge to China's survival interest and as an impetus to China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea, which meant that China could not under-estimate the influence of the confrontational military island chain from the East China Sea to the Taiwan Strait.

The United States' increasing leverage on South Korea and South Korea's growing animosity towards communism acted as a stimulus to China's discontent with South Korea. Piao argues that Seoul received military and economic supplies in the context of Washington's assistance policy.⁶²¹ Han indicates that the United States provided South Korea with more than 3.5 billion dollars from 1954 to 1970, which was as equal as five percents of South Korea's national gross domestic product.⁶²² In other words, the United States

⁶¹⁷ Hao, Yu-fan. & Zhai, Zhi-hai. (1990). China's decision to enter the Korean War: history revisited. *The China Quarterly*, (121), 94-115, p95.

⁶¹⁸ Sneider, L. Richard. (1986). United States security interests. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 36(1), 76-87.

⁶¹⁹ Kim, Byung-kook. & Vogel, F. Ezra. (2013). The Park Chung-hee era: the transformation of South Korea. *Harvard University Press*, p169.

⁶²⁰ Fu, Chang-qing. (2001). Chaoxianzhanzheng dui wodang jiejie Taiwanwenti de yingxiang [The influence of the Korean War on the Chinese Communist Party's settlement of the Taiwan question]. *Xi-an waiguoyu xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Xi-an Foreign Languages University)*, 9(1), 111-115, p114.

⁶²¹ Piao, Rui-lin. (1999). Hanguo waijiaozhengce de fazhanguocheng [On the developmental process of South Korea's foreign policy decision]. *Hanguo yanjiu luncong (Collected Papers for Korean Studies)*, (00), 23-38, p25.

⁶²² Han, Sung-joo. (1980). South Korea and the United States: the alliance survives. *Asian Survey*, 20(11), 1075-1086, p1076.

had an intention to rise as South Korea's largest sponsor, which promoted South Korea's relations with the United States. However, Pratt argues that the United States had a grave concern on the expanding influence of communism, which helped to explain the United States' attempt to enhance relations with allies in east Asia.⁶²³ Besides, Dong argues that China's economic reconstruction entered into a stagnant period in the wake of the United States-led Capitalist Camp's containment policy.⁶²⁴ Shen emphasizes that South Korea was determined to insist on the "pro-Washington approach", which meant that South Korea had an provocative attitude towards communism.⁶²⁵ In contrast, communist countries and South Korea did not recognize each other, which meant that China had no opportunity to exert its influence over South Korea in the post-war eras.⁶²⁶ Viewed in this vein, China had no way to under-estimate South Korea's "Pro-America Policy" and "Anti-communism Policy", which further prolonged China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea.

⁶²³ Pratt, Keith. (2007). Everlasting flower: a history of Korea. Reaktion Books, p265.

⁶²⁴ Dong, Zhi-kai. (2001). Chaoxian zhanzheng yu xinzhongguo jingxi [On the Korean War and the newly established PRC's economy]. Zhonggong Ningboshi changweixiao xuebao (Journal of the Party School of Chinese Communist Party Ningbo Municipal Committee), 23(5), 5-13.

⁶²⁵ Shen, Ding-chang. (2002). Hanguo waijiaozhengce de fazhanguocheng jiqi bianqianyuanin [On developmental process and influential factors of South Korea's foreign policy]. Hanguo xuelun wenji (Collected Papers of Study of Korea), (00), 296-308.

⁶²⁶ Ahn, Byung-joon. (1980). South Korea and the communist countries. Asian Survey, 20(11), 1098-1107.

The Sino-Soviet Union split

Due to the “Leaning-to One Side Policy”, China’s reliance on the Soviet Union stimulated the asymmetric Sino-Soviet Union relations. Chen argues that the Chinese Communist Party regime received political recognition as well as economic assistance from the Soviet Union in the context of China’s “pro-Moscow approach”.⁶²⁷ In brief, the Soviet Union grasped an opportunity to exert influence on China’s national development. However, Halpern argues that China faced serious economic consequences after the Soviet Union withdrew capital and technology from China.⁶²⁸ On one hand, Davin emphasizes that Mao Ze-dong did not deliver disappointment as well as express dissatisfaction until the Soviet Union asked China to return interests of financial and technological assistance.⁶²⁹ In contrast, the Soviet Union’s hostile approach meant a grave challenge to China’s economic development, even though China had considered the Soviet Union as the sole giant power that had capability to assist China. On the other hand, Hudson highlights that the Sino-Soviet relations became deteriorated after the Soviet Union withdrew nuclear scientists and technologies from China.⁶³⁰ So much so that, the Soviet Union did not have an intention of helping China to recover from its backward economy, and China’s lopsided foreign policy did not help China to maintain independence and equality.

China slid into the weakest party in the context of the Khrushchev administration’s changing approach towards the United States. According to Westad, China could no longer continue to promote its relations with the outer world after China had dispute with the Soviet Union.⁶³¹ Kissinger argues that Mao became more determined to contain the United States, especially after the Soviet Union had played a prevailing role in satellite technology.⁶³² In contrast, both camps’ military confrontation laid a foundation for the Soviet

⁶²⁷ Chen, Shao-ming. (2013). [Ershishiji wushiniandai xinzhongguo waijiaozhengce de tiaozheng [On the newly established PRC’s diplomatic policy adjustment in the 1950s]. *Zhonggong dangshi yanjiu (Journal of Chinese Communist Party History Studies)*, (12), 82-90, p84.

⁶²⁸ Halpern, M. A. (1962). Communist China’s foreign policy: the recent phase. *The China Quarterly*, (11), 89-104, p89.

⁶²⁹ Davin, Delia. (2013). Mao: a very short introduction. *Oxford University Press*, p51.

⁶³⁰ Hudson, Geoffrey. (1969). Paper tigers and nuclear teeth. *The China Quarterly*, (39), 64-75, p65.

⁶³¹ Westad, Arne. Odd. (2013). Restless empire: China and the world since 1750. London: *Vintage Books*, p333.

⁶³² Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. *Penguin Press*, p167.

Union-led communist states' "pro-Moscow approach", which strengthened the Sino-Soviet relations. However, Barnouin and Yu argue that China was not satisfied with the Khrushchev administration's changing policy of reaching agreement with United States while insisting on a hostile approach towards China.⁶³³ In other words, China's lopsided foreign policy did not encounter with a crisis until Khrushchev came to power. Hudson emphasizes that the Chinese leadership felt deeply disappointed that Khrushchev had a historic summit with Eisenhower held in Paris, which severely deteriorated the Sino-Soviet Union relations.⁶³⁴ In contrast, China's relations with the Soviet Union became notably hostile, which constituted China's isolation in the context of the "Fighting-with Two Fists Strategy" in the 1960s.

The Great Polemics and the Chenbao Island Incident accelerated the Sino-Soviet Union rift. On one hand, Nogee and Donaldson argue that the Sino-Soviet ideological clash did not bring a great disturbance to the Communist Camp until Khrushchev criticized Stalin in 1956.⁶³⁵ In other words, Beijing and Moscow had different perspectives on communism, which escalated into a new blow to the Communist Camp. Gurley indicates that Khrushchev no longer viewed the mission of achieving communism as the primary goal of the Soviet Union.⁶³⁶ Due to Moscow's changing attitudes towards socialism, Beijing considered the Soviet Union as a 'revisionist' imperialist regime. On the other hand, Lee argues that the Chenbao Island Incident (March 1969) had a more serious influence on the Sino-Soviet Union relationship after the Soviet Union decided to strengthen its military presence around the border between China and the Soviet Union.⁶³⁷ In contrast, the largest communist power's aggressive approach towards China contributed to understanding China's security policy in the 1960s. Davin emphasizes that the Soviet Union's armed forces along the Sino-Soviet border became a graver security threat to China.⁶³⁸ In brief, China's security situation became more

⁶³³ Barnouin, Barbara. & Yu, Chang-gen. (1998). Chinese foreign policy during the Cultural Revolution. Columbia University Press, p85.

⁶³⁴ Hudson, Geoffrey. (1969). Paper tigers and nuclear teeth. *The China Quarterly*, (39), 64-75, 64-65.

⁶³⁵ Nogee, L. Joseph. & Donaldson, H. Robert. (1981). Soviet foreign policy since World War II. Pergamon Press, p205.

⁶³⁶ Gurley, G. John. (1978). The dialectics of development: USSR versus China. *Modern China*, 4(2), 123-156.

⁶³⁷ Lee, Yung-hong. (1977). Korea's future: Peking's perspective. *Asian Survey*, 17(11), 1088-1102.

⁶³⁸ Davin, Delia. (2013). Mao: a very short introduction. Oxford University Press, p51.

serious in the context of China's confrontation with the Soviet Union and the United States.

North Korea played a vital role in China's security consideration in the background of the Sino-Soviet dispute, which further stimulated China's "One-Korea Policy". On one hand, Cheng and Zhang argue that China did not consider the Soviet Union as the most formidable threat to China's security until the border clash.⁶³⁹ In other words, China carefully calculated its role in northeast Asia in the context of its dispute with the hegemonic giant state – the Soviet Union. Lankov highlights that North Korea attempted to downplay the Soviet Union's role in order to discourage the Soviet Union from imposing excessive influence on North Korea in the post-war eras.⁶⁴⁰ On the other hand, Koh argues that Kim Il-Sung did not reach an agreement with Khrushchev following the Soviet Union's drastic changes in policy towards China, and relations between North Korea and the Soviet Union became tense after Khrushchev had decided to stop providing North Korea with financial support.⁶⁴¹ In contrast, Beijing realized that frictions between North Korea and the Soviet Union enabled China to strengthen its ally with North Korea. In order to realize the goal, China did not cease to provide a series of financial, technical and military aid for North Korea.⁶⁴² China did not only recognize the Kim Il-Sung administration in the Korean peninsula, but also endorse Kim Il-Sung's official position on the Korean peninsula unification issue.⁶⁴³ So much so that, China aimed to protect China from sudden invasion from the Soviet Union and North Korea.

Simultaneously, the Sino-Soviet Union dispute greatly damaged China's security interest, which contributed to China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea. According to Hao, Beijing insisted on the "pro-Pyongyang approach", and considered the "Non-Policy" as a response to "the United States-backed Seoul puppet

⁶³⁹ Cheng, Yu-shek, Joseph. & Zhang, Wan-kun, Franklin. (1999). Chinese foreign relations strategies under Mao and Deng: a systematic and comparative analysis. *Philippine Journal of Third World Studies*, 14(3), 91-114, p98.

⁶⁴⁰ Lankov, Andrei. (2015). The real North Korea: life and politics in the failed Stalinist utopia. *Oxford University Press*, p13.

⁶⁴¹ Koh, Byung-chul. (1969). North Korea and the Sino-Soviet schism. *Western Political Quarterly*, 22(4), 940-962.

⁶⁴² Li, Yue. (2006). Chaoxianzhazheng duiyu liangda zhenying geju de yingxiang [The influence of the Korean War on the pattern of the two Camps]. *Hanguo xuelun wenji (Social Science Documentation Publishing House)*, (00), 105-112, p111.

⁶⁴³ Barnds, J.W. (1976). The Two Koreas in east Asian affairs. New York: *New York University Press*, p39.

regime”.⁶⁴⁴ For China, Segal argues that the 1960s was not an easy decade: the Chinese leadership had to carefully consider both factors of the United States and the Soviet Union that gravely influenced its security interest.⁶⁴⁵ On one hand, Du emphasizes that the United States enhanced military relations with its allies in the post-war eras, and the United States’ race for global supremacy constituted the escalation of the Cold War.⁶⁴⁶ China paid a higher attention to security after the Soviet Union had strengthened military force in the north of China.⁶⁴⁷ On the other hand, Sneider highlights that South Korea became more concerned about the United States’ military force that could deter the Soviet Union and North Korea.⁶⁴⁸ In contrast, it would be a security burden to China if the United States-backed South Korea suddenly waged war on North Korea in the context of the Sino-Soviet split. As a result, the United States’ military presence in South Korea and South Korea’s perspective on North Korea stimulated China’s “pro-Pyongyang approach”, especially in the background of China’s confrontation with the two leading states.

⁶⁴⁴ Hao, Yu-fan. (1987). China and the Korean peninsula: a Chinese perspective. *Asian Survey*, 27(8), 862-884.

⁶⁴⁵ Segal, Gerald. (1980). China and the great power triangle. *The China Quarterly*, (83), 490-509, p492.

⁶⁴⁶ Du, Yong-xin. (2001). Meiguo jieru chaoxianzhanzheng de yuanyin ji yingxiang [On factors and consequences of the United States’ involvement in the Korean War]. *Xi-an waiguoyu xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Xi-an Foreign Languages University)*, 9(1), 111-115, p115.

⁶⁴⁷ Lee, Yung-hong. (1977). Korea’s future: Peking’s perspective. *Asian Survey*, 17(11), 1088-1102.

⁶⁴⁸ Sneider, L. Richard. (1986). United States security interests. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 36(1), 76-87, p79.

The Vietnamese War

China insisted on the “One-Vietnam Policy” in the context of the United States’ military presence in South Vietnam, even though the Sino-North Vietnamese relations worsened in the 1960s. On one hand, Cheng argues that China provided North Vietnam with essential assistance, and China played an important role in North Vietnam’s policy calculations.⁶⁴⁹ Vietnam was divided into two antagonistic zones along the seventeenth parallel: the Soviet Union-backed North Vietnam and the United States-backed South Vietnam. Zhai argues that China considered the “Pro-North Vietnam Policy” as a strategy to deter the United States’ invasion.⁶⁵⁰ In the light of China’s security policy and ideological concern, China only acknowledged North Vietnam as the sole legitimate government. On the other hand, Sneider argues that the United States enhanced its relations with states in the Asia-Pacific region in order to protect the United States’ national interests.⁶⁵¹ In contrast, the United States meant to persuade its allies in southeast Asia to adopt the “pro-Washington approach”. Zhai emphasizes that China’s primary task was to decrease the United States’ influence in southeast Asia.⁶⁵² From China’s perspective, China’s security interest and global communism development would be damaged if a newly reunited Vietnamese government insists on “pro-Washington approach”.

China participated in the Vietnamese War on behalf of North Vietnam in order to deter the United States-backed South Vietnam. On one hand, Sneider argues that the United States has used its deepening military presence as a means to ensure its own interest.⁶⁵³ In other words, the United States recognized the United States’ armed forces on Vietnam as a strategy to contain China. On the other hand, Zhai argues that China’s involvement in the Vietnamese War can be partly explained by its common border and shared ideology with

⁶⁴⁹ Cheng, A. G. (1997). Vietnamese communists’ relations with China and the second Indochina conflict, 1956-1962. Jefferson, N. C.: *McFarlan*. p233.

⁶⁵⁰ Zhai, Qiang. (2000). China and the Vietnam War, 1950-1975. Chapel Hill: *University of North Carolina Press*, 140-147.

⁶⁵¹ Sneider, L. Richard. (1986). United States security interests. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 36(1), 76-87, p78.

⁶⁵² Zhai, Qiang. (2000). China and the Vietnam War, 1950-1975. Chapel Hill: *University of North Carolina Press*, 53-54.

⁶⁵³ Sneider, L. Richard. (1986). United States security interests. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 36(1), 76-87, p77.

North Vietnam.⁶⁵⁴ In order to deter the United States, China sent a large amount of military equipment to North Vietnam, and China's military aid to North Vietnam amounted to 320 million Chinese yuan from 1956 to 1963.⁶⁵⁵ Apart from military supplies and financial assistance, Zhang notes that the Chinese government immediately helped North Vietnam to take its own experience into practice in the period of the First Indochina War (1946-1954).⁶⁵⁶ So much so that, China could not under-estimate the risk of American military force on Vietnam and undertake the consequence of American troops' sudden invasion if North Vietnam was defeated by South Vietnam.

In the context of the Vietnamese War, the United States-backed Seoul administration also attended the Second Indochina War, which strengthened South Korea's relations with its largest sponsor – the United States. On one hand, Sarantakes argues that South Korea encouraged the United States to expand its military presence in both southeast Asia and northeast Asia in the post-war eras.⁶⁵⁷ In contrast, the South Korean government aimed to pursue a stronger military alliance relationship with the United States, which helped to explain the significance of the United States' leverage on South Korea. On the other hand, Liang argues that the Kennedy government decided to encourage the Park Chung-hee regime to realize South Korea's economic take-off with the "Export-oriented Policy", which contributed to the United States' economic interdependence with South Korea.⁶⁵⁸ In order to obtain economic supplies from the United States, South Korea considered its participation in the Vietnamese War as an opportunity to enhance relations with the United

⁶⁵⁴ Zhai, Qiang. (2000). China and the Vietnam War, 1950-1975. Chapel Hill: *University of North Carolina Press*, 140-147.

⁶⁵⁵ Li, Ke. & Hao, Sheng-zhang. (1989). Wenhua dageming zhong de renmin jiefangjun [The People's Liberation Army during the Cultural Revolution]. Beijing, *CCP Historical Materials Press*, 408-409. & Chen, Jian. (1995). China's involvement in the Vietnam War, 1964-1969. *The China Quarterly*, (142). 356-387.

⁶⁵⁶ Zhang, Bai-jia. (2006). 'Resist America': China's role in the Korean and Vietnam Wars. In managing Sino-American crises: Case Studies and Analysis, edited by Michael D. Swaine. Washington D.C.: *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, p196.

⁶⁵⁷ Sarantakes, E. N. (1999). In the service of Pharaoh? The United States and the deployment of Korean troops in Vietnam, 1965-1968. *Pacific Historical Review*, 68(3), 425-449.

⁶⁵⁸ Liang, Zhi. (2008). Hanguo zhengzhi fazhanzhong de meiguo: 1945-1961 [On the United States' role in the development of South Korea's politics: 1945-1961]. *Lengzhan guojishi yanjiu (Cold War International History Studies)*, (1), 216-239, p216.

States. Sarantakes emphasizes that South Korea, an important ally of the United States in northeast Asia, sent more than 50,000 troops to South Vietnam since the outbreak of the Vietnamese War.⁶⁵⁹ Apart from the United States' military and economic support, Kim and Vogel indicate that South Korea further developed export-oriented business with South Vietnam after its involvement in the Vietnamese War.⁶⁶⁰ South Vietnam also received other military equipment support from South Korea in 1965 and 1966.⁶⁶¹ Viewed in this vein, the United States influenced Park Chung-hee's decision to take part in the Vietnamese War.

China insisted that the United States and its allies' presence in South Vietnam damaged China's national interest, which contributed to China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea. Blackburn argues that the South Korean government sent its troops to South Vietnam for its own purpose.⁶⁶² The Park Chung-hee government aimed to secure the United-States-South Korean alliance relationship and to use the United States' military presence to ensure South Korea's security.⁶⁶³ However, Zhai argues that China would have to come with up solutions for a nightmare scenario if the United States established its supremacy in Korea, Taiwan and Vietnam.⁶⁶⁴ Viewed in this vein, China was determined to take further measures against these states that insisted on the "pro-Washington approach", and China considered South Korea's participation in the Vietnamese War as a means to increase the United States' military presence in Vietnam. In other words, South Korea's decision to involve in the Vietnamese War further upgraded China's contradictions with South Korea, which seriously postponed the normalization of the Sino-South Korean relations. China thereby

⁶⁵⁹ Sarantakes, E. N. (1999). In the service of Pharaoh? The United States and the deployment of Korean troops in Vietnam, 1965-1968. *Pacific Historical Review*, 68(3), 425-449.

⁶⁶⁰ Kim, Byung-kook. & Vogel, F. Ezra. (2013). The Park Chung-hee era: the transformation of South Korea. *Harvard University Press*, p426.

⁶⁶¹ Sarantakes, E. N. (1999). In the service of Pharaoh? The United States and the deployment of Korean troops in Vietnam, 1965-1968. *Pacific Historical Review*, 68(3), 425-449, p425.

⁶⁶² Blackburn, M. R. (1994). Mercenaries and Lyndon Johnson's "more flags": the hiring of Korean, Filipino, and Thai soldiers in the Vietnam War. *Jefferson, N. C.*

⁶⁶³ Sarantakes, E. N. (1999). In the service of Pharaoh? The United States and the deployment of Korean troops in Vietnam, 1965-1968. *Pacific Historical Review*, 68(3), 425-449, p428.

⁶⁶⁴ Zhai, Qiang. (2000). China and the Vietnam War, 1950-1975. Chapel Hill: *University of North Carolina Press*, p141.

described the Park Chung-hee administration as a “puppet of the United States imperialism”,⁶⁶⁵ which meant that hostility and tension between China and South Korea did not decrease in the late Mao era.

⁶⁶⁵ Li, Yan. (2015). Piaojinhui fuqin zai zhongguo de xingxiang zhuanbian [On Park Geun-hye's father – Park Chung-hee's image changes from the aspect of China]. Available from: <https://cul.qq.com/a/20150911/043447.htm> (Viewed on: 28th, September 2019).

The Sino-United States rapprochement

Nixon's state visit to China should be considered as one of the most significant political events of the Cold War period,⁶⁶⁶ which suggested the United States' newly crucial thinking on the two communist giants in the context of the Sino-United States historic rapprochement. Kim argues that the Nixon administration and American geo-strategists reached an important consensus about the United States' reconciliatory approach towards China.⁶⁶⁷ In other words, the Nixon government decided to shift its hostile approach towards China after the United States had carefully calculated its national interests. Kissinger emphasizes that the United States had a concern about whether or not China would insist on the "Fighting-with Two Fists Strategy".⁶⁶⁸ In contrast, the United States planned to take advantage of the Sino-Soviet conflict and align with China to contain the Soviet Union's expanding military presence. From the perspective of the United States, Andrew argues that China's national interests had been damaged in the course of the Sino-Soviet Union border clash, the United States therefore concluded that the Chinese leadership could have an intention to terminate the long-term confrontation with the United States.⁶⁶⁹ In brief, Nixon's perspective of threats from the Soviet Union and China underwent a significant change in the late 1960s.

The United States insisted that China had suffered a lot in the context of the escalating contradiction with the Soviet Union, which meant that the United States took advantage of the Sino-Soviet split. On one hand, Westad argues that the Soviet Union did not stop to dispatch troops to the Sino-Soviet border in order to enhance its military presence from the beginning of the 1960s.⁶⁷⁰ On an account of the immense 'Soviet threat', Zhou En-lai had difficulty in dealing with China's foreign affairs during the Cultural Revolution, even though Zhou attempted to change China's diplomatic environment by achieving recognition from the

⁶⁶⁶ Khoo, Nicholas. (2005). Realism redux: investigating the causes and effects of Sino-US rapprochement. *Cold War History*, 5(4), 529-549.

⁶⁶⁷ Kim, S. Samuel. (1982). Focus on: the Sino-American collaboration and Cold War II. *Journal of Peace Research*, 19(1), 11-20.

⁶⁶⁸ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. *Penguin Press*, p210.

⁶⁶⁹ Andrew, N. & Ross, R. (1997). The great wall and the empty fortress: China's search for security. New York: *W.W. Norton*, p65.

⁶⁷⁰ Westad, Arne. Odd. (2013). Restless empire: China and the world since 1750. London: *Vintage Books*, p344.

international community.⁶⁷¹ In other words, the Chinese leadership missed out on an opportunity to build peaceful diplomacies in the background of China's "Fighting-with Two Fists Strategy". On the other hand, Rice argues that China strategically decided to consider the role of the United States as a crucially important power in northeast Asia after the Soviet Union.⁶⁷² In contrast, China did not realize the imperative to improve its relations with United States until China underwent grave losses in the wake of the Sino-Soviet border dispute, which conversely meant that China altered its diplomatic thinking after the Soviet Union had imposed restriction on China's national interests.

The development of China's nuclear weapon programme and the escalation of the Vietnamese War contributed to the United States' changing policy towards China. Kissinger seemed to realize that the complex triangular relations among Beijing, Moscow and Washington would undergo significant changes if both Beijing and Moscow were persuaded to shift aggressive policies towards Washington.⁶⁷³ However, it was not a surprise to the United States that China had a successful test of its first hydrogen bomb on 17th June, 1967.⁶⁷⁴ In contrast, it was necessary for the United States to properly deal with its relations with China that had been a nuclear power. Besides, Richard Nixon came to power in 1969, and he had difficulty in coping with a series of crises at home and abroad.⁶⁷⁵ Andrew argues that the United States suffered strategic losses in the wake of the Vietnamese War, which did not enhance the United States' military presence in southeast Asia.⁶⁷⁶ Zhang indicates that the Nixon administration did not go on to dispatch armed forces to Vietnam, but decide to withdraw American troops from Vietnam.⁶⁷⁷ Viewed in this vein, the United States

⁶⁷¹ Rice, E. E. (1973). The Sino-United States détente: how durable? *Asian Survey*, 13(9), 805-811.

⁶⁷² Rice, E. E. (1973). The Sino-United States détente: how durable? *Asian Survey*, 13(9), 805-811.

⁶⁷³ Burr, W. (2001). Sino-American relations, 1969: the Sino-Soviet border war and steps towards rapprochement. *Cold War History*, 1(3), 73-112.

⁶⁷⁴ Hudson, Geoffrey. (1969). Paper tigers and nuclear teeth. *The China Quarterly*, (39), 64-75, p65.

⁶⁷⁵ Burr, W. (2001). Sino-American relations, 1969: the Sino-Soviet border war and steps towards rapprochement. *Cold War History*, 1(3), 73-112.

⁶⁷⁶ Andrew, N. & Ross, R. (1997). The great wall and the empty fortress: China's search for security. New York: *W.W. Norton*, p65.

⁶⁷⁷ Zhang, Bai-jia. (2005). "Kangmei yuanchao" yu "yuanyue kangmei" – zhongguo ruhe yingdui chaoxianzhanzheng he yuenanzhanzheng yuenanzhanzheng ["Aiding Korea to resist the United States" and "Aiding Vietnam to resist the United States" – how China responded to the Korean War and the Vietnamese

had difficulty in preserving its dominance in southeast Asia, which conversely helped China relieve from security crisis.

Moscow was perceived as the major enemy in the wake of the Sino-United States détente, which meant that Beijing and Washington reached consensus on the 'Soviet threat'. On one hand, Kissinger argues that the Soviet Union planned to wage a pre-emptive nuclear strike on China.⁶⁷⁸ Burr indicates that China decided to use the "American card" to contain the Soviet Union by repairing its relations with the Nixon administration.⁶⁷⁹ It was necessary for China to shift its "Fighting-with Two Fists Strategy" that had worsened China's diplomatic situation. On the other hand, Kissinger argues that Nixon calculated both communist giants' influence on the United States' interest, and realized that the United States could have suffered a more enormous loss if the Soviet Union had suddenly invaded China.⁶⁸⁰ In contrast, the United States did not become much concerned about the survival of China until the Nixon administration considered the Soviet Union as a greater threat than China. In order to deter the Soviet Union's expansion, Kissinger also enabled China to establish strategic alliance relations with the United States after he had a secret dialogue with the Chinese leadership in Beijing.⁶⁸¹ In other words, China decided to play the "American card" against the Soviet Union, which reflected China's downplaying of communist ideology and determination to ensure China's security interest.

China's diplomatic situation came into a new stage in the background of Nixon's landmark visit to China, which influenced China's policy thinking on South Korea. Lee argues that Beijing started to use the term "the South Korean authority" to describe the South Korean administration, which suggested that Beijing did not continue to insist on a provocative attitude towards Washington and Seoul.⁶⁸² In other words, China no longer regarded South Korea as "the United States-backed puppet regime", which conversely meant that

War. *Shijie jingji yu zhengzhi (World Economics and Politics)*, (3), 8-15.

⁶⁷⁸ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. Penguin Press, p219.

⁶⁷⁹ Burr, W. (2001). Sino-American relations, 1969: the Sino-Soviet border war and steps towards rapprochement. *Cold War History*, 1(3), 73-112.

⁶⁸⁰ Kissinger, Henry. (1979). The White House Years. Boston: Little, Brown, p168.

⁶⁸¹ Burr, W. (1999). The Kissinger transcripts: the top secret talks with Beijing and Moscow. New York: *The New Press*, p85, 99-100, 170-173, 209-212.

⁶⁸² Lee, Yung-hong. (1977). Korea's future: Peking's perspective. *Asian Survey*, 17(11), 1088-1102.

China had an intention to promote the Sino-United States reconciliation. On the other hand, Liang argues that it has been an imperative to take Washington's policy changes into account when it comes to Seoul's security policy.⁶⁸³ In contrast, South Korea must re-think of its role in the United States' global strategy in the context of the Sino-United States détente. Yoo emphasizes that the Seoul administration decided to recalculate its security interest and take a conciliatory approach towards China in the beginning of the 1970s.⁶⁸⁴ Piao indicates that the Park Chung-hee administration did not plan to repair South Korea's relations with the Communist Camp until the 1970s.⁶⁸⁵ Viewed in this aspect, the Sino-United States rapprochement laid a foundation for the termination of South Korea's "Anti-communism Policy", which helped to explain South Korea's pragmatic policy towards communist states.

However, the Sino-United States détente did not enable neither Beijing nor Seoul to shift the "Non-Policy". On one hand, Yoo argues that the Sino-North Korean alliance relationship played an important role in South Korea's security calculation.⁶⁸⁶ In contrast, Seoul could not separate Beijing's attitude towards Pyongyang from Seoul's security thinking, which meant that Seoul had a grave concern on Beijing's "pro-Pyongyang approach". On the other hand, Hildebrandt argues that China's participation in the Korean War on behalf of North Korea suggested North Korea's significance to China's security in the 1950s.⁶⁸⁷ In brief, Beijing insisted on the "pro-Pyongyang approach", which conversely demonstrated that the development of the situation around Korea imposed immense pressure on Beijing. Hao indicates that the Soviet Union was the

⁶⁸³ Liang, Zhi. (2008). Hanguo zhengzhi fazhanzhong de meiguo: 1945-1961 [On the United States' role in the development of South Korea's politics: 1945-1961]. *Lengzhan guojishi yanjiu (Cold War International History Studies)*, (1), 216-239, p216.

⁶⁸⁴ Yoo, Hyon-joo. (2014). Reluctant flexibility caused by abandonment fears: a theoretical analysis of South Korea's approach toward China in the 1970s and the early 1980s. *The Korean Journal of Defence Analysis*, 26(2), 225-242, p226.

⁶⁸⁵ Piao, Rui-lin. (1999). Hanguo waijiaozhengce de fazhanguocheng [On the developmental process of South Korea's foreign policy decision]. *Hanguo yanjiu luncong (Collected Papers for Korean Studies)*, (00), 23-38, p28.

⁶⁸⁶ Yoo, Hyon-joo. (2014). Reluctant flexibility caused by abandonment fears: a theoretical analysis of South Korea's approach towards China in the 1970s and the early 1980s. *The Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, 26(2), 225-242.

⁶⁸⁷ Hildebrandt, Timothy. (2003). Uneasy allies: fifty years of China-North Korea relations. Washington, DC.: *Woodrow Wilson International Centre*, Asia Program Special Report, (115), 1-3.

largest supplier of financial and military to North Korea.⁶⁸⁸ On an account of Moscow's increasing leverage on Pyongyang, neither Beijing nor Pyongyang could have the capability to contain the Soviet Union. In order to enhance the Sino-North Korean relations, the Chinese state-owned official media that represented the organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China spoke highly of the Kim Il-Sung government and emphasized the similarity of both communist administrations' ideological concerns.⁶⁸⁹ Viewed in this vein, China could not under-estimate North Korea's attitude towards the Soviet Union and abandon the "pro-Pyongyang approach", which suggested that China was entrapped into fear over the Soviet Union's military presence.

Apart from the Northern Triangle relations, South Korea strengthened its defense capability in the context of the "Miracle on the Han River", which contributed to China's more aggressive thinking on South Korea. South Korea successfully achieved a miraculous economic growth, which meant that South Korea managed to protect the South Korean citizens from poverty as well as starvation under the leadership of the Park Chung-hee administration.⁶⁹⁰ In other words, South Korea, one representative of the poorest basket in the early Cold War period, has been desperate to seize every opportunity to develop its economy since Park Chung-hee came to power. Liang indicates that the United States considered South Korea's increasing growth as a means to decrease its economic burden, which meant that the United States encouraged South Korea to use the "Export-oriented Policy" to achieve economic take-off.⁶⁹¹ However, Lee argues that the Chinese leadership could not under-estimate the influence of South Korea's rising economic and military capability, even though China still recognized North Korea as the only legitimate state in the Korean peninsula.⁶⁹² In other words, South Korea's fascinating economic success deepened China's anxiety about South Korea's expanding military strength, which meant that South Korea's "Miracle on Han River" did not promote trading relations with China in the context of the Sino-United States rapprochement.

⁶⁸⁸ Hao, Yu-fan. (1987). China and the Korean peninsula: a Chinese perspective. *Asian Survey*, 27(8), 862-884.

⁶⁸⁹ Lee, Yung-hong. (1977). Korea's future: Peking's perspective. *Asian Survey*, 17(11), 1088-1102.

⁶⁹⁰ Kim, M. E. & Kim, H. P. & Kim, J. (2013). From development to development cooperation: foreign aid, country ownership, and the developmental state in South Korea. *The pacific review*, 26(3), 313-336.

⁶⁹¹ Liang, Zhi. (2009). Meiguo duiwai kaifa yuanzhu zhengce yu hanguo de jingji "qifei" [On the United States' assistance policy and South Korea's economic "take-off"]. *Dangdai hanguo (Contemporary Korea)*, (1), 30-38.

⁶⁹² Lee, Yung-hong. (1977). Korea's future: Peking's perspective. *Asian Survey*, 17(11), 1088-1102.

China did not shift its “Non-Policy” towards the Park Chung-hee militarized government, which meant that China realized South Korea as a threat. Due to South Korea’s rapid economic growth, Hao argues that South Korea began to enhance its national military capability in the middle 1970s, and to expand its military spending to 6 per cent of its annual Gross National Product.⁶⁹³ China, fearful of a stronger South Korea, decided to carefully re-estimate a rising South Korea’s influence on the development of the Korean peninsula in the context of the “Miracle on the Han River”. In contrast, Beijing could not ignore the fact that the United States-backed Seoul administration had the capacity of being a regional military power in the background of South Korea’s economic take-off. It was a nightmare to China that a neighbouring country had the capability to increase its military strength while China suffered a domestic stagnation and faced a diplomatic dispute with the Soviet Union. China, threatened by the Soviet Union’s military presence and South Korea’s growing military defence budget, insisted on its “Non-Policy” towards South Korea in order to ensure China’s security interest. So much so that, hostility and tension between China and South Korea still remained in the aftermath of the Sino-United States détente. Having emphasized the influence of China’s security strategies on China’s “Non-Policy” towards South Korea, the thesis will continue to use Mao’s pursuit of ‘pure’ communism to analyze Mao’s policy calculation on South Korea.

⁶⁹³ Hao, Yu-fan. (1987). China and the Korean peninsula –A Chinese perspective. *Asian Survey*, 27(8), 862-884.

China's policy towards South Korea after the Korean War: the psychological approach explanation

Mao's perception of the threat to China's security

Both Chinese political elites' thinking and Chinese political leaders' perception were combined to understand Chinese policy decisions in the early Cold War period. According to Tsai and Littlefield, a small group of the Chinese Communist Party core elites, namely, members of the Party Political Bureau, have significantly influenced China's policy decisions since the establishment of the People's Republic of China (PRC – more commonly known as China) in 1949.⁶⁹⁴ On one hand, Roy argues that Chinese foreign policy decision-makers made decisions on considerations of the development of China's national interests, which did not mean the Chinese leadership always responded to international affairs in accordance with the rational actor model.⁶⁹⁵ Instead, China's diplomatic and economic policies should be seen as a product of the Chinese leadership's concerns and China's national interest calculation. On the other hand, Zhao argues that the Chinese leadership insisted that China's foreign affairs should be based on the ideology-oriented principle, which suggested that communism was viewed as a crucial criteria for China's early foreign policy decisions.⁶⁹⁶ Mao Ze-dong did play a leading role in foreign policy decisions, and he sometimes did not take other comrades' views into account in the foreign policy decision-making process.⁶⁹⁷ Viewed in this vein, it has been reasonable to consider the factor of Mao Ze-dong's personal perception as well as pursuit to be a part of explanation of Chinese foreign policy.

On an account of his political perception of alliance versus enemy, Mao Ze-dong supposed that the eruption of a newly Third World War was just a matter of time,⁶⁹⁸ which helped to explain China's determination to

⁶⁹⁴ Tsai, G. T. & Littlefield, A. (2011). China's foreign policy: realpolitik or something new?. *Journal of Contemporary Eastern Asia*, 10(1), 1-13, p3.

⁶⁹⁵ Roy, Denny. (1998). China's foreign relations. London: *MacMillan Press*, p4.

⁶⁹⁶ Zhao, Sui-sheng. (2004). Chinese foreign policy: pragmatism and strategic behaviour. London & New York: *Routledge*, 7-8.

⁶⁹⁷ Lu, Ning. (1997). The Dynamics of foreign policy decision-making in China. Boulder, CO: *Westview Press*, p86. & Hermann, G. Margaret. (2001). How decision units shape foreign policy: a theoretical framework. *International Studies Review*, 3(2), p56.

⁶⁹⁸ Mao, Ze-dong. (1977). Mao Ze-dong xuanji – diwujuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the fifth volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p15.

be a nuclear power in the context of Mao's perspective of the threat of capitalism. According to Zhang, Mao believed that only China attempted to pursue communism and to suppress capitalism as exemplified in Mao's promotion of the Cultural Revolution (1966-1976).⁶⁹⁹ Due to the fierce ideological competition between the capitalist countries and the socialist countries, Park argues that both camps poured resources into fierce nuclear competition in the post-war eras.⁷⁰⁰ Mao firmly argues that "either the East wind prevails over the West wind, or the West wind prevails over the East wind, there is little room for compromise on the question of the two lines" ("不是东风压倒西风，就是西风压倒东风，在路线上没有调和的余地" – bushidongfengyadaoxifeng, jiushixifengyadaodongfeng, zailuxianshangmeiyoutiaohedeyudi).⁷⁰¹ Mao strongly believed, however, that capitalism would be defeated by communism.⁷⁰² Mao on one hand insisted that war between the two confrontational camps was inevitable,⁷⁰³ on the other hand, emphasized that communism shared a higher superiority.⁷⁰⁴ It was a necessity to devote sources to nuclear development to promote China's nuclear weapon programme and to prohibit China from the United States-led capitalist countries' military attacks.⁷⁰⁵ Tao indicates that the Chinese government thereby decided to go on with its nuclear programme even in the period of the Great Famine (1959-1962).⁷⁰⁶ In other words, Mao insisted that

⁶⁹⁹ Zhang, Qin-min. (2014). Towards an integrated theory of Chinese foreign policy: bringing leadership personality back in. *Journal of Contemporary China*, 23(89), 902-922, p908.

⁷⁰⁰ Park, Il-keun. (1999). Chinese foreign policy and the Korean peninsula. *International Journal of Korean Studies*, III(1), 116-135.

⁷⁰¹ Mao, Ze-dong. (1977). Mao Ze-dong xuanji – diwujuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the fifth volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p435.

⁷⁰² Ahn, Byung-joon. (1992). China's modernization and the political economy. Seoul: *Parkyong Company*, p67, p85.

⁷⁰³ Mao, Ze-dong. Mao Ze-dong xuanji – disijuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the fourth volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p1184.

⁷⁰⁴ Mao, Ze-dong. Mao Ze-dong xuanji – disijuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the fourth volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p1481.

⁷⁰⁵ Tao, Jay. (1968). Mao's world outlook: Vietnam and the revolution in China. *Asian Survey*, 8(5), 416-432, p417.

⁷⁰⁶ Tao, Jay. (1968). Mao's world outlook: Vietnam and the revolution in China. *Asian Survey*, 8(5), 416-432, p417.

China confronted with the United States and other capitalist states, which suggested that China planned to see nuclear weapon as a shield to protect itself.

The soured relations between the Soviet Union and China should be understood in the context of Mao's perception of 'pure' communism, which influenced China's security policy in the 1960s. According to Kissinger, Beijing and Moscow had different perspectives on communism, which escalated to a rhetorical war.⁷⁰⁷ Lynch argues that China considered the Soviet Union as the sole dedicator that had the capability to promote communist revolution.⁷⁰⁸ However, Hudson argues that China's relations with the Soviet Union encountered a huge setback after Khrushchev came to power.⁷⁰⁹ Barnouim and Yu emphasize that Mao Ze-dong realized the Soviet Union as the most severe threat to China after the Khrushchev administration had embarked on 'de-Stalinization', even though China still insisted on the "Anti-America Policy".⁷¹⁰ In other words, Mao Ze-dong changed its attitude towards the Soviet Union that betrayed Marxism-Leninism, which further stimulated the Sino-Soviet friction in the wake of the Soviet Union's revisionism. Besides, Zagoria indicates that Mao Ze-dong became more and more anxious about the Soviet Union's expanding influence on China's national development.⁷¹¹ In contrast, the rhetorical war between China and the Soviet Union deteriorated the bilateral relations, which finally escalated into a border crisis to China.

China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea should be understood in the background of Mao's pursuit of what he explained as a 'pure' version of communism. According to Hudson, China considered the United States' imperialism and the Soviet Union's revisionism as threats to China, and decided to propagandize the two leading states as hostile powers that attempted to contain China and deter communism.⁷¹² On one hand, Cheng and Zhang argue that China became weary of its conflicts with the two superpowers.⁷¹³ In other words,

⁷⁰⁷ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. Penguin Press, p166.

⁷⁰⁸ Lynch, Michael. (2015). Mao's China: 1936-1997. Third Edition, Hodder Education, p57.

⁷⁰⁹ Hudson, Geoffrey. (1969). Paper tigers and nuclear teeth. *The China Quarterly*, (39), 64-75, 66-67.

⁷¹⁰ Barnouim, Barbara. & Yu, Chang-gen. (1998). Chinese foreign policy during the cultural revolution. Columbia University Press, p98.

⁷¹¹ Zagoria, S. Donald. (1974). Mao's role in the Sino-Soviet conflict. *Pacific Affairs*, 47(2), 139-153, p147.

⁷¹² Hudson, Geoffrey. (1969). Paper tigers and nuclear teeth. *The China Quarterly*, (39), 64-75, 66-67.

⁷¹³ Cheng, Yu-shek, Joseph. & Zhang, Wan-kun, Franklin. (1999). Chinese foreign relations strategies under

Chinese diplomacy was underpinned by the confrontation with the United States and the deterioration with the Soviet Union. The United States and other capitalist states' containment policy prolonged China's security crisis and economic stagnation.⁷¹⁴ In the context of China's confrontation with the Capitalist Camp, Mao's "Anti-capitalism Policy" further stimulated China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea, which conversely meant that China missed out on an opportunity to build leverage on South Korea's security policy choices. On the other hand, Gittings argues that Mao Ze-dong's perception of great-nation 'chauvinism' imposed a graver restriction on China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea.⁷¹⁵ In the background of China's "Anti-revisionism Policy", China was propelled into a more serious conflict with the Soviet Union.⁷¹⁶ In other words, Mao's idea of 'pure' communism worsened the Sino-Soviet Union relations, which increased China's security concern on North Korea's attitude towards the Soviet Union and China.

Mao and Deng: a systematic and comparative analysis. *Philippine Journal of Third World Studies*, 14(3), 91-114, p95.

⁷¹⁴ Wu, W. Y. Friedrich. (1981). From self-reliance to inter-dependence? Developmental strategy and foreign economic policy in post-Mao China. *Modern China*, 7(4), 445-482, p459. & Buss, A. Claude. (1988). Reviewed work(s): Truman's "Two China" policy. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 47(2), 346-347, p346. & Dong, Zhi-kai. (2001). Chaoxian zhanzheng yu xinzhongguo jingxi [On the Korean War and the newly established PRC's economy]. *Zhonggong Ningboshi changweixiao xuebao (Journal of the Party School of Chinese Communist Party Ningbo Municipal Committee)*, 23(5), 5-13.

⁷¹⁵ Gittings, John. (1974). New light on Mao 1. his view of the world. *The China Quarterly*, (60), 750-766, p758.

⁷¹⁶ Noguee, L. Joseph. & Donaldson, H. Robert. (1981). Soviet foreign policy since World War II. *Pergamon Press*, p205.

Mao's perception of the threat from the capitalist powers

Mao realized that the fierce competition between the Capitalist Camp and the Socialist Camp would constitute an obstacle to China's pursuit of communism, which contributed to China's diplomatic policy thinking. According to Tsai and Litterfield, in terms of political leaders' policy decisions, every foreign policy approach is shaped by a series of factors, such as political leaders' thinking and states' ideological concern.⁷¹⁷ Ideology, namely Marxist-Maoism, was important in understanding Mao's political thinking.⁷¹⁸ In terms of Mao's perceptions, Oksenberg argues that the social crises and the economic depression served as factors that shaped Mao's decisions.⁷¹⁹ In particular, Mao's ideas of allies and enemies as well as his strong desire of promoting communism were combined to understand Mao's ideological concern and diplomatic calculation.⁷²⁰ Mao Ze-dong preserved communism as a higher ideological superiority in comparison with capitalism.⁷²¹ In the light of Maoist thought, the world was made up of two camps, and the Socialist Camp had no alternative but to face with the fierce competition with imperialist countries.⁷²² Mao criticizes that "all reactionaries are paper tigers", including the United States.⁷²³ Mao also insisted that the United States and other capitalist nations would compete with the Soviet Union-led communist countries in

⁷¹⁷ Tsai, G. T. & Littlefield, A. (2011). China's foreign policy: realpolitik or something new?. *Journal of Contemporary Eastern Asia*, 10(1), 1-13, p8.

⁷¹⁸ Brugger, B. (1990). Chinese marxism in the post-Mao era. Stanford: *Stanford University Press*.

⁷¹⁹ Oksenberg, C. M. (1971). Policy making under Mao Tse-tung, 1949-1968. *Comparative Politics*, 3(3), 323-360.

⁷²⁰ Markey, S. Daniel. (2002). Reviewed work(s): Mao's China and the cold war by Chen Jian. *Political Science Quarterly*, 117(2), 328-329.

⁷²¹ Zhang, Qin-min. (2014). Towards an integrated theory of Chinese foreign policy: bringing leadership personality back in. *Journal of Contemporary China*, 23(89), 902-922, p908.

⁷²² Tsai, G. T. & Littlefield, A. (2011). China's foreign policy: realpolitik or something new?. *Journal of Contemporary Eastern Asia*, 10(1), 1-13, p8.

⁷²³ Mao, Ze-dong. Mao Ze-dong xuanji – disijuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the fourth volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p1195. & Mao, Ze-dong. (1977). Mao Ze-dong xuanji – diwujuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the fifth volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p289.

an attempt to expand each camp's sphere of influence.⁷²⁴ Viewed in this vein, Mao endeavoured to defeat capitalism, which served as a part of explanation of Mao's foreign policy.

Mao Ze-dong aimed to knock down imperialist oppression and to fight for dignity and independence of a newly prosperous socialist nation. According to Mao Ze-dong, what the Chinese Communist Party was determined to abolish were the old semi-colonial system, the semi-feudal politics and the old culture.⁷²⁵ Friedman argues that China's humiliated invasion history that capitalist countries had expanded military presence and imposed diplomatic pressure should be viewed as a part of China's "Anti-capitalism Policy".⁷²⁶ In other words, Mao Ze-dong did not only consider imperialist states as aggressive invaders to China, but also as a major obstacle to China's freedom and independence. Mao argues that the United States imposed restriction on the development of socialist nations,⁷²⁷ and the world should unite to fight against imperialist nations' oppression.⁷²⁸ In short, the mission was to deter imperialist countries' presence by driving out the evil imperialism and transforming the dependent colonial state into a new socialist nation. Mao Ze-dong considers these imperialist powers on the planet as enemies,⁷²⁹ and insists that China should maintain strategic cooperative relations with socialist countries and the international proletariats to realize world peace.⁷³⁰ China therefore urgently expected to speed up the process of transition to socialism and planned

⁷²⁴ Friedman, Edward. (1979). On Maoist conceptualisations of the capitalist world system. *The China Quarterly*, (80), 806-837, p806.

⁷²⁵ Mao, Ze-dong. (1944). Mao Ze-dong xuanji – dierjuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the second volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p665.

⁷²⁶ Friedman, Edward. (1979). On Maoist conceptualisations of the capitalist world system. *The China Quarterly*, (80), 806-837, p806.

⁷²⁷ Mao, Ze-dong. (1993). Mao Ze-dong nianpu – diwujuan [The chronicle of Mao Ze-dong – the fifth volume]. *Zhongyang wenxian chubanshe (Central Party Literature Press)*, p9.

⁷²⁸ Mao, Ze-dong. (1977). Mao Ze-dong xuanji – diwujuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the fifth volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p292.

⁷²⁹ Mao, Ze-dong. (1944). Mao Ze-dong xuanji – dierjuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the second volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p680.

⁷³⁰ Mao, Ze-dong. (1977). Mao Ze-dong xuanji – diwujuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the fifth volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p9.

economy in order to pursue China's political independence and social development.

Both Mao's desperate pursuit of 'pure' communism and capitalist countries' expanding global influence helped to explain Mao's perception of imperialism. According to Mao, the existence of imperialism impeded the international socialist revolutionary movement, and inhibited the accomplishment of global revolution.⁷³¹ On one hand, McDonald argues that Mao considered imperialism as a part of great-nation 'chauvinism'.⁷³² In contrast, Mao Ze-dong realized imperialist states' leverage on China as a threat to China's communism transformation. On the other hand, Chen argues that Mao Ze-dong's rhetoric of "anti-imperialism" and "anti-capitalism" were a product of Chinese people's "victim mentality" – China had suffered from long-term economic plunder and military aggression and had missed out on opportunities to restore 'Sino-centrism' as in the ancient times.⁷³³ In contrast, China became a semi-colonial and semi-feudal society after the imperialist countries had imposed restrictions on China's social development. Mao Ze-dong therefore expected to build a politically independent as well as economically prosperous new China after the Chinese Communist Party came to power in 1949.⁷³⁴ In other words, the Chinese had made strenuous efforts to defeat colonial rule, oppose autocratic oppression and fulfil the will of becoming the masters of their own affairs.

Mao's persistence in communism and South Korea's "Anti-communism Policy" resulted in China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea. The Chinese government's "Anti-imperialism Policy"⁷³⁵ and "Anti-capitalism Policy"⁷³⁶ were the two important strategies to speed up socialist transition in the Chinese society. In other

⁷³¹ Bary, de Theodore. & Lufrano, Richard. (2000). From "the dictatorship of the People's Democracy": on Leaning-to One Side (Speech, July, 1, 1949). 2nd Edition, New York: *Columbia University Press*, 452-453.

⁷³² McDonald, Angus. (1976). Mao Ze-dong and the Hunan self-government movement, 1920: an introduction with five translations. *The China Quarterly*, (68), 750-777.

⁷³³ Chen, Jian. (2003). A response: how to pursue a critical history of Mao's foreign policy. *The China Journal*, (49), 137-142.

⁷³⁴ Mao, Ze-dong. (1944). Mao Ze-dong xuanji – dierjuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the second volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p663. & Mao, Ze-dong. (1977). Mao Ze-dong xuanji – diwujuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the fifth volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p10.

⁷³⁵ Chen, Jian. (2001). Mao's China and the Cold War. Chapel Hill: *The University of North Carolina Press*, p51.

⁷³⁶ Starr, Bryan. John. (1977). On Mao's self-image as a Marxist thinker. *Modern China*, 3(4), 435-442, p440.

words, Mao's perception of "anti-imperialism" and "anti-capitalism" should be understood in the background of the threat of imperialist countries' aggressions. However, Piao argues that the United States-backed South Korea had a grave concern on the spread of communism in the aftermath of the Korean War, which contributed to the perception of South Korea's threat of socialist ideology.⁷³⁷ Mao's "Anti-imperialism Policy" stimulated China's hostile approach towards the United States and other capitalist countries, which gave rise to South Korea's "Anti-communism Policy". In the context of Mao's "Anti-imperialism Policy", China did not develop relations with the United States-backed South Korea that implemented the United States' "Anti-communism Policy". Especially, China's historic presence in South Korea has been replaced by the United States since the Korean War. In order to protect South Korea from invasions, Shen emphasizes that South Korea strategically took advantage of the "Anti-communism Policy" that helped to contain the Soviet Union and China.⁷³⁸ In contrast, Beijing realized the Seoul regime as a threat to the movement of socialization in the Mao era.

⁷³⁷ Piao, Rui-lin. (1999). Hanguo waijiaozhengce de fazhanguocheng [On the developmental process of South Korea's foreign policy decision]. *Hanguo yanjiu luncong (Collected Papers for Korean Studies)*, (00), 23-38, p25.

⁷³⁸ Shen, Ding-chang. (2002). Hanguo waijiaozhengce de fazhanguocheng jiqi bianqianyuanyin [On developmental process and influential factors of South Korea's foreign policy]. *Hanguo xuelun wenji (Collected Papers of Study of Korea)*, (00), 296-308.

Mao's perception of the threat of the United States

Mao Ze-dong's "Anti-capitalism Policy" should be taken as a part of China's diplomatic thinking on the United States. On one hand, Mao argues that the liberation on the soil of China could not be achieved without communist countries' aid,⁷³⁹ whereas, China's security was mainly threatened by the United States.⁷⁴⁰ In contrast, Mao Ze-dong considered the Stalin administration as an important ally for Chinese revolutionary career and post-war transition to socialism, and realized the United States as an aggressive state that exerted pressure on China. On the other hand, Buss argues that the United States decided to impose strict economic sanctions on the newly established PRC, which turned into an obstacle to China's trade and business development.⁷⁴¹ In the context of the United States' "Anti-communism Policy", China had difficulties in the transition to socialism.⁷⁴² Viewed in this vein, Mao's commitment to "anti-capitalism" also underpinned a series of military conflicts with the United States, such as the Korean War and the Vietnamese War. In the Korean War period, Buss emphasizes that China was fearful of the prospect that the United States would play a dominant role in Korean affairs and Korea would step into the capitalist sphere of influence.⁷⁴³ During the Vietnamese War, Chen highlights that Mao's perception of "anti-imperialism" played a role in China's participation in the Vietnamese War.⁷⁴⁴ From China's perspective, the United States' military presence in Korea and Vietnam damaged its security and ideological interest.

The United States' changing policy towards China laid a foundation for the Sino-United States confrontation,

⁷³⁹ Mao, Ze-dong. (1944). Mao Ze-dong xuanji – dierjuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the second volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, 657-658.

⁷⁴⁰ Mao, Ze-dong. (1977). Mao Ze-dong xuanji – diwujuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the fifth volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p136.

⁷⁴¹ Buss, A. Claude. (1988). Reviewed work(s): Truman's "Two China" policy. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 47(2), 346-347, p346.

⁷⁴² Wu, W. Y. Friedrich. (1981). From self-reliance to inter-dependence? Developmental strategy and foreign economic policy in post-Mao China. *Modern China*, 7(4), 445-482, p459.

⁷⁴³ Park, Il-keun. (1999). Chinese foreign policy and the Korean peninsula. *International Journal of Korean Studies*, III(1), 116-135.

⁷⁴⁴ Chen, Jian. (2001). Mao's China and the Cold War. Chapel Hill: *The University of North Carolina Press*, p236.

which helped explain China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea. He argues that Mao carefully calculated the role of the United States in China's security and survival interest after the establishment of the PRC.⁷⁴⁵ China contacted the Truman administration in order to seek support after the Chinese Communist Party came to power in 1949.⁷⁴⁶ However, Garver argues China's "Anti-imperialism Policy" resulted in the United States' provocative approach towards China, which suggested a symbol of the United States' hostility to and discontent with China.⁷⁴⁷ In contrast, China faced with a serious crisis in the context of the United States' containment policy, which helped to explain the United States' persistence in the "Anti-communism Policy". South Korea, the United States' second largest ally in northeast Asia, has been an important military base of the United States.⁷⁴⁸ In other words, South Korea insisted on the "pro-Washington approach" in order to deter communism.⁷⁴⁹ In the context of Mao's "Anti-imperialism Policy", Hao emphasizes that China considered South Korea as "the United States-backed puppet regime".⁷⁵⁰ Viewed in this aspect, China's "Anti-capitalism Policy" and South Korea's "Anti-communism Policy" deteriorated the Sino-South Korean relations in the post-war eras.

The Sino-United States relationship underwent a significant change in the 1970s, which did not mean China softened its security policy towards the United States-backed Seoul government. Nixon argues that the

⁷⁴⁵ He, di. (1994). The most respected enemy: Mao Ze-dong's perception of the United States. *The China Quarterly*, (137), 144-158.

⁷⁴⁶ Garver, W. John. (2003). The opportunity costs of Mao's foreign policy choices. *The China Journal*, (49), 127-136, p132.

⁷⁴⁷ Garver, W. John. (2003). The opportunity costs of Mao's foreign policy choices. *The China Journal*, (49), 127-136, p132.

⁷⁴⁸ Sneider, L. Richard. (1986). United States security interests. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 36(1), 76-87.

⁷⁴⁹ Seth, J. Michael. (2016). A concise history of modern Korea: from the late 19th century to the present. Rowman & Litterfield, p121. & Liang, Zhi. (2008). Hanguo zhengzhi fazhanzhong de meiguo: 1945-1961 [On the United States' role in the development of South Korea's politics: 1945-1961]. *Lengzhan guojishi yanjiu (Cold War International History Studies)*, (1), 216-239, p216.

⁷⁵⁰ Hao, Yu-fan. (1987). China and the Korean peninsula: a Chinese perspective. *Asian Survey*, 27(8), 862-884.

United States ought to carefully re-define China's role in the United States' policy towards northeast Asia.⁷⁵¹ Steiner suggests that the Nixon administration adopted a more dynamic approach towards China to ensure the United States' long-range interest.⁷⁵² However, He argues that Mao Ze-dong's perception of security threat from the United States via Korea still dominated his foreign policy approach.⁷⁵³ On an account of the experience of the United States' troops in Korea and Vietnam, China has paid a great deal of attention to security interest since the Korean War. In addition, He argues that Mao Ze-dong's understanding of capitalist economy was influenced by liberalism and monopolism.⁷⁵⁴ In other words, Mao's inadequate understanding of the structure of market economy in capitalist countries also influenced China's economic connection with the outer world. Mao Ze-dong had a pessimistic attitude towards liberalism, and he stated that liberalism would give aid to the enemy.⁷⁵⁵ In other words, Mao's opinion on capitalism and liberalism played a role in China's "Anti-capitalism Policy", which helped to explain why China missed out on an opportunity to develop trading connection with South Korea in the late Mao era.

⁷⁵¹ Nixon, M. Richard. (1967). Asia after Vietnam. *Foreign Affairs*, 121-123.

⁷⁵² Steiner, Arthur, H. (1972). Re-thinking U.S. China policy. *Pacific Affairs*, 45(2), 255-268.

⁷⁵³ He, di. (1994). The most respected enemy: Mao Ze-dong's perception of the United States. *The China Quarterly*, (137), 144-158, p154.

⁷⁵⁴ He, di. (1994). The most respected enemy: Mao Ze-dong's perception of the United States. *The China Quarterly*, (137), 144-158, p156.

⁷⁵⁵ Mao, Ze-dong. (1944). Mao Ze-dong xuanji – dierjuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the second volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p361.

Mao's perception of the Chinese Nationalist Party

The Chinese Nationalist regime developed relations with the United States in the context of its “Anti-communism Policy”, which stimulated the PRC’s “Anti-capitalism Policy”. The Eisenhower administration insisted that the United States had a responsibility to defend Taiwan and the Penghu under the December 1954 Treaty of Mutual Defense between Washington and Taipei.⁷⁵⁶ However, Song and Luo argue that the Chinese Communist Party’s relationship with the Kuomintang moved towards stalemate in the context of the United States’ aggressive approach towards the PRC, which constituted an obstacle to the settlement of peaceful unification with Taiwan.⁷⁵⁷ In other words, the United States’ relations with the Chinese Nationalist regime should be viewed as a part of Mao Ze-dong’s perception of the Taiwan threat. On one hand, it was not a surprise to predict the Taiwan threat, especially after Chiang Kai-shek boldly decided to dispatch 30,000 troops to Jinmen (more commonly known as Kinmen) in 1954, and the number of military forces increased to 90,000 in 1958.⁷⁵⁸ In brief, the United States-backed Taiwanese regime aimed to compete with the PRC. On the other hand, Sheng emphasizes that the PRC has not ceased to propagandize its plan to liberate Taiwan since the end of the Chinese Civil War.⁷⁵⁹ Due to the United States’ military presence in Taiwan, the PRC missed out on an opportunity to take over the strategic island, which meant that the PRC had serious anxiety about the United States-Taiwan alliance relationship in the background of the “anti-imperialism” prism.

The Kuomintang insisted on the “pro-Washington approach”, which helped to explain China’s “Anti-Kuomintang Policy”. According to Gurtov, the United States and other capitalist countries expected that that

⁷⁵⁶ Gurtov, Melvin. (1976). The Taiwan Strait crisis revisited: politics and foreign policy in Chinese motives. *Modern China*, 2(1), 49-103, p68.

⁷⁵⁷ Song, Ji-he. & Luo, Bao-cheng. (2010). Lun kangmeiyuanchao de zhengyixing – jianping chaoxianzhanzheng dui Taiwanwenti de yingxiang [On the justice of the Korean War to resist United States aggression and aid Korea – comments on the impact of the Korean War on the situation regarding Taiwan]. *Dianzi keji daxue xuebao (Journal of University of Electronic Science and Technology of China)*, 12(6), 70-74, 73-74.

⁷⁵⁸ Gurtov, Melvin. (1976). The Taiwan Strait crisis revisited: politics and foreign policy in Chinese motives. *Modern China*, 2(1), 49-103, p68.

⁷⁵⁹ Sheng, M. Michael. (2008). Mao and China’s relations with the superpowers in the 1950s: a new look at the Taiwan Strait and the Sino-Soviet Split. *Modern China*, 34(4), 477-507, p477.

would encourage the disintegration of China in the post-war eras.⁷⁶⁰ On one hand, Buss argues that both the future of Taiwan and Chiang Kai-shek's personal future could not be separated from the United States.⁷⁶¹ In contrast, the United States seized an opportunity to impose influence on Taiwan. On the other hand, Zhao argues that the United States aimed to secure the United States' interest in Taiwan, which stimulated the Chinese Nationalist regime's plan to contain the PRC in the context the United States' assistance and support.⁷⁶² In other words, the United States' military presence in Taiwan protected the Kuomintang from collapse and discouraged the PRC from playing a role in Taiwan. However, He argues that Mao's perception of the threat from the United States' aggression war via Taiwan influenced the PRC's relations with the Chinese Nationalist regime.⁷⁶³ Zhang highlights that the PRC's image was seriously damaged since the United States took advantage of the "Taiwan card" that discouraged the PRC from being recognized as a member in the United Nations.⁷⁶⁴ In other words, both the United States' dissolution plan and the Chinese Nationalist regime's international status reinforced Mao Ze-dong's perception of "anti-capitalism" and exaggerated the PRC's military conflict with the United States-backed Chiang Kai-shek regime.

South Korea's "pro-Taipei approach" indicated Taiwan's role in South Korea's policy calculation in the context of the United States' "Anti-communism Policy", which constituted the PRC's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea. According to Secretary Dulles, it was necessary for the United States to impede the progress of international communism in the Chinese society and other places.⁷⁶⁵ On one hand, Cai and Li argue that

⁷⁶⁰ Gurtov, Melvin. (1976). The Taiwan Strait crisis revisited: politics and foreign policy in Chinese motives. *Modern China*, 2(1), 49-103, p68.

⁷⁶¹ Buss, A. Claude. (1988). Reviewed work(s): Truman's "Two China" policy. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 47(2), 346-347, p347.

⁷⁶² Zhao, Yu-qiang. (2010). Chaoxianzhazheng dui liangan guanxi de yingxiang [The influence of the Korean War on the cross-Taiwan Straits relations]. *Chifeng xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Chifeng University)*, 31(3), 21-22, p22.

⁷⁶³ He, di. (1994). The most respected enemy: Mao Ze-dong's perception of the United States. *The China Quarterly*, (137), 144-158, p156.

⁷⁶⁴ Zhang, Kun-sheng. (2004). Chaoxianzhazheng dui Taiwanwenti de yingxiang [The influence of the Korean War on the situation regarding Taiwan]. *Guancha yu sikao (Observation and Ponderation)*, (7), 44-46, 45-46.

⁷⁶⁵ Gurtov, Melvin. (1976). The Taiwan Strait crisis revisited: politics and foreign policy in Chinese motives. *Modern China*, 2(1), 49-103, p68. & Department of State Bulletin. (1957B). 37, 942, (July 15): 91-95.

the United States' "anti-communism" doctrine suggested its contradiction with socialist nations, which meant that the United States did not cease to deter China.⁷⁶⁶ In other words, the United States' "Anti-communism Policy" laid a foundation for its allies' attitudes towards communist states. On the other hand, Shen argues that the Park Chung-hee administration firmly promoted South Korea's relations with the Chiang Kai-shek regime in the background of the United States' "Anti-China Policy", which conversely revealed that South Korea had no intention to formally acknowledge the PRC.⁷⁶⁷ In contrast, both Seoul and Taipei insisted on "pro-Washington approach", which further imposed restrictions on the PRC's attempt to undermine the Chiang Kai-shek regime. Zhao indicates that the United States did not have a plan to terminate its relations with Taiwan that helped the United States to maintain its prominent role in the global strategic defence programme, which contributed to the PRC's deep hostility to the Chinese Nationalist Party regime.⁷⁶⁸ View in this vein, Park Chung-hee initiated a visit to Taipei and reached consensus about "anti-communism" with Chiang Kai-shek in the context of the United States' increasing presence along the First Island Chain, which helped to explain the PRC considered the Park Chung-hee administration as "the United States-backed puppet regime".

⁷⁶⁶ Cai, Yu-zhi. & Li, Qi. (2001). Lun chaoxianzhanzheng yu zhonggong duitai zhengce de zhuanbian [On the Korean War and the Chinese Communist Party's policy shift towards Taiwan]. *Yangzhou jiaoyu xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Yangzhou College of Education)*, 19(4), 29-33, p31.

⁷⁶⁷ Shen, Ding-chang. (2002). Hanguo waijiaozhengce de fazhanguocheng jiqi bianqianyuanyin [On developmental process and influential factors of South Korea's foreign policy]. *Hanguo xuelun wenji (Collected Papers of Study of Korea)*, (00), 296-308.

⁷⁶⁸ Zhao, Yu-qiang. (2010). Chaoxianzhanzheng dui liangan guanxi de yingxiang [The influence of the Korean War on the cross-Taiwan Straits relations]. *Chifeng xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Chifeng University)*, 31(3), 21-22.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I explained factors that contributed to China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea. On one hand, Chinese foreign policy in the late Mao era was a combination of China's national interest calculation and Mao's ideological superiority, which helped to understand China's confrontation with the United States and the Soviet Union. In contrast, the two leading states could not under-estimate China's role in each other's decision-making process. However, both the United States and the Soviet Union imposed harsh restrictions on China's security, diplomacy and economy in the context of the aggressive approach, which meant that China missed out on an opportunity to establish as well as enhance its friendly cooperative diplomacy with the international community. In the meantime, the United States-backed South Korea aimed to contain China and deter communism, which stimulated China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea. In other words, China's serious diplomatic environment postponed China's modernization programme, which suggested that China paid a huge price for its policy thinking in the beginning of the Cold War period.

On the other hand, China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea should be also understood in the context of China's "pro-Pyongyang approach". In contrast, it has been difficult to under-estimate North Korea's role in China's foreign policy decision-making process since China aimed to re-establish its dominance over Korea through involvement in the Korean War. China considered its "One-Korea Policy" as a key strategy to protect security as well as promote communism, which conversely intensified the inter-Korean confrontation. Simultaneously, the deteriorated relations between North Korea and South Korea should be viewed as a part of China's policy towards the Korean peninsula. Similarly, the United States and the Soviet Union caught an opportunity to strengthen each other's role in Korean affairs, which further damaged China's interest on the Korean peninsula and prolonged China's struggle for supremacy in northeast Asia. In other words, the United States' military presence in South Korea and the Soviet Union's political leverage in North Korea threatened the Chinese leadership.

Chapter Two: China's policy towards South Korea in the Deng era

Introduction

Having elaborated China's policy towards South Korea in the late Mao era, this chapter will analyze China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea in the period of Deng Xiao-ping with the rational actor approach and the bureaucratic approach. The second chapter aims to clarify factors that contributed to China "Non-Policy" towards South Korea in the reforming era, which includes China's flexible diplomacy, China's modernization programme and China's factional struggle between the Chinese conservatives and the Chinese pragmatists in the Chinese Communist Party. In the chapter, I will demonstrate why China's changing relations with the United States and the Soviet Union influenced China's security policy and China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea. In other words, China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea should be understood in the background of the continuing Sino-Soviet Union friction, the Sino-United States relationship normalization, the Sino-Soviet Union détente. I also will illustrate why China did not shift the "Non-Policy" towards South Korea from the perspective of South Korea's relations with the Chinese Nationalist Party. In the meantime, I will analyze why China shifted Mao's diplomatic and economic policies after the 1978 Third Plenary Session of the Eleventh Chinese Communist Party Central Committee. In contrast, I will specify the Chinese leadership' pragmatic thinking over China's national interest identification after Deng Xiao-ping came to power, which will also help to understand China's "Independent Foreign Policy of Peace" ("独立自主和平外交"政策 – *dulizizhu de heping waijiao zhengce*) and "Opening and Reform Policy" ("改革开放"政策 – *gaigekaifang zhengce*). In other words, I will articulate differences between the Chinese conservatives and the Chinese pragmatists ahead of China's modernization programme.

Beijing's policy towards the Seoul administration speeded to a new stage in the Deng era, which reflected China's complex national interest calculation and Chinese political elites' policy priorities. In detail, China's changing approach towards South Korea should not be only explained from the implement of China's flexible diplomacy, but also from the success of the Chinese reformists in the campaign against the Chinese radicals. In the first section, I thus will argue that this chapter aims to analyze factors that contributed to China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea with an interpretation of China's pragmatic diplomacy thinking and proper economic practice in the Deng era. In the second section, I will demonstrate China's security policies and clarify factors that prolonged China's complex diplomacy with the leading states, which also includes Beijing's perspective on Washington's relations with Taipei and on Moscow's leverage in Pyongyang. In the third section, I will specify China's diplomatic policy in the Deng era and its attitude towards South Korea in the context of the policy of "Separation the Officials from the People" ("官民分离"政策 – *guanminfenli zhengce*) towards South Korea. In the fourth section, I will articulate China's "Opening and Reform Policy" and its ramification on China's policy towards South Korea. In the fifth section, I will argue that China did not focus on pragmatic diplomacy and economic modernization until the end of the movement against the "Gang of Four", which laid a foundation for China's flexible diplomacy towards South

Korea.

Background

It has been controversial to describe the influence of the Cultural Revolution on China's socialist construction.⁷⁶⁹ On one hand, China was faced with a severer situation after Mao Ze-dong initiated the Cultural Revolution, which meant that the Chinese government did not pay attention to domestic development in the Mao era.⁷⁷⁰ Instead, Chinese cadres became concerned about the "Gang of Four" who attempted to grab power during the Cultural Revolution.⁷⁷¹ In contrast, the fierce political competition with the "Gang of Four" seriously impeded the progress of China's socialist cause. Consequently, Chen and Westad highlight that China's economy was on the brink of collapse, and China underwent a long-term economic recession in the context of Mao's "Self-reliance" economic policy ("自力更生" 经济政策 – ziligengsheng jingjizhengce).⁷⁷² In short, Mao's continuous revolution did not help China to transfer into a prosperous socialist nation, which meant that China suffered a setback on the way to tremendous economic increase in these tumultuous years. On the other hand, a historic factional struggle in the Chinese Communist Party emerged in the wake of Mao's demise. In spite of the downfall of the "Gang of Four", Hua Guo-feng and other Chinese conservatives completely persisted in the "Two Whatevers" viewpoint ("两个凡是" – lianggefanshi), which suggested that these Chinese cadres did not plan to abandon Mao's doctrine of class struggle and continuous revolution. China did not come into the reforming era until Deng Xiao-ping became the paramount leader in the year of 1978, which contributed to China's economic growth. The Chinese pragmatists' return to power laid a hard foundation for the road to China's peaceful development, which advanced China's socialist economic modernization and promoted China's friendly diplomatic relations. In other words, Deng Xiao-ping and other Chinese reform-oriented elites caught an opportunity to realize China's economic modernization with the strategy of "Opening and Reform" and to stabilize China's diplomatic environment with the policy of "Independent foreign policy of peace": to correct China's inappropriate economic practices as well as to coordinate China's inapplicable diplomatic strategies.

Deng Xiao-ping's ascent to power had a historic influence on China's flexible diplomatic and economic

⁷⁶⁹ Kraus, Curt. Richard. (2012). The Cultural Revolution: a very short introduction. Oxford University Press, pxiv.

⁷⁷⁰ Kraus, Curt. Richard. (2012). The Cultural Revolution: a very short introduction. Oxford University Press, 63-65. & Mitter, Rana. (2008). Modern China: a very short introduction. Oxford University Press, p61.

⁷⁷¹ Davin, Delia. (2013). Mao: a very short introduction. Oxford University Press, p90.

⁷⁷² Chen, Jian. (2001). Mao's China and the Cold War. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, p277. & Westad, Arne. Odd. (2013). Restless empire: China and the world since 1750. London: Vintage Books, p363.

policies towards South Korea in the aftermath of the arrest of the “Gang of Four”. In detail, the Chinese government did not decide to re-build its relations with other states with a more dynamic foreign policy approach until Deng Xiao-ping and other Chinese reformists came to power, which helped China to put an end to political isolation from the international community and to pave a way for economic cooperation with the global market. Since Deng Xiao-ping became the paramount leader, the Chinese pragmatists must find out a proper way to deal with China’s political struggle and economic stagnation that had dragged China into national crisis. In contrast, the Chinese reformists made a sober analysis of conditions in China, realizing that the majority of the Chinese people had lost faith in China’s socialist cause in the period of the Cultural Revolution. Consequently, Deng Xiao-ping announced the “Four Modernization Programme” (“四个现代化” – si ge xiandaihua) at Third Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee in December 1978, which meant that China formally decided to shift the focus of state work to economic modernization programme with the “Opening and Reform Policy”. In other words, it was necessary for the Chinese government to build socialism through a series of dynamic economic reform, which contributed to China’s “Opening and Reform Policy”.

Deng Xiao-ping and other reform-oriented Chinese pragmatists paid tremendous but meticulous attention to ways of improving China’s industry, agriculture, defence and science, which meant that the Chinese government considered the accomplishment of its ambitious modernization programme as China’s national strategic goal. In spite of that, Park highlights that China adopted a changing approach towards the Korean peninsula in the beginning of the 1980s, which did not mean that North Korea ceased to impose restriction on China’s policy calculation.⁷⁷³ In brief, it was still significant for Beijing to keep an eye on Pyongyang’s attitudes and reactions to Beijing’s policy towards Seoul. In the meantime, Deng Xiao-ping carried out pragmatic diplomacy in order to realize China’s economic take-off. China’s policy towards neighbouring countries came to a turning point in the background of China’s economic development, which paved a way for China’s secret economic relations with South Korea and South Korea’s “Northern Policy” (“北方政策” – beifang zhengce) in the 1980s.

The continuing triangular relations among the Soviet Union, the United States and China influenced China’s policy towards South Korea. Kissinger on one hand argues that the Nixon administration decided to consider China as an important partner for the United States’ global strategy in the context of the escalating Soviet-United States confrontation, which meant that the United States aimed to attain peace and contain the Soviet Union by restoring its relations with China.⁷⁷⁴ Park on the other hand argues that the Soviet Union took full

⁷⁷³ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China’s policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p43.

⁷⁷⁴ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). White House Years: the first volume of his classic memoirs. *Simon & Schuster*, p164.

advantage of its increasing military presence to persuade China to believe that the Soviet Union had such a capability to impeded the progress of China's national growth, which meant that China regarded the Soviet Union as an increasingly imminent factor that damaged China's security interest and social stability.⁷⁷⁵ In contrast, both Washington and Beijing became fully aware of the necessity of the realization of the formal diplomacy in order to contain Moscow. China grasped an opportunity to normalize diplomatic relations and establish trading connections with western countries, which shaped China's policy towards South Korea in the Deng era. In other words, the Chinese reformists put an end to its hostile approach towards the United States-backed South Korea in the context of the Sino-United States relationship normalization, which contributed to China's secret trading connection with South Korea. However, the Soviet Union retained its military force along the Sino-Soviet border, even though the Soviet-United States confrontation reflected China's strategic role in the two leading powers' policy calculation. Besides, China had a more serious concern about the Soviet Union's role in North Korea. In contrast, the Soviet Union exerted pressure on China's security interest, which prolonged China's "pro-Pyongyang approach". Despite the increasing economic inter-dependence with Seoul, Beijing still considered the Kim Il-Sung administration as the sole legitimate government in order to ensure China's national security interest. China thereby still insisted on the "Non-Policy" towards South Korea in the aftermath of Gorbachev's landmark visit to Beijing.

China paid huge attention to the other two triangle relations: Seoul-Moscow-Pyongyang and Seoul-Washington-Taipei. South Korea considered the "Northern Policy" as a strategy to increase its leverage by establishing contacts with communist states and to decrease North Korea's leverage by pursuing stability in the Korean peninsula. Besides, the Soviet Union's economic situation greatly influenced the Soviet Union's calculation over the Korean peninsula. Although North Korea received the largest amount of economic aid from the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union realized the importance of developing economic relations with South Korea for the sake of the Soviet Union's domestic development. In other words, Gorbachev embarked on the Soviet Union's economic reform and visited South Korea, which contributed to the 1990 Soviet Union-South Korean relationship normalization. South Korea insisted on the "Northern Policy" in the background of Gorbachev's flexible approach, which further promoted economic relations with China. However, Beijing could not neglect Seoul's relations with Washington and Taipei in the Deng era. On one hand, South Korea persuaded the United States to preserve military presence in order to protect North Korea from dispatching troops to the south of the thirty-eighth parallel. On the other hand, South Korea still maintained diplomacy with the Kuomintang that posed a threat to China's security, which acted as a stimulus to China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea.

⁷⁷⁵ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p48.

Literature on China's foreign policy to South Korea in the Deng era

China's "Opening and Reform Policy" reflected the Chinese pragmatists' success in the movement against the "Gang of Four". Kissinger argues that Deng Xiao-ping was faced with political purge in the late Mao era, which meant that Deng Xiao-ping was not allowed to implement the "Opening and Reform Policy" until the end of the historic political chaos – the downfall of the Chinese radicals.⁷⁷⁶ However, Park argues that Zhou En-lai's and Mao Ze-dong's demises brought about a significant power structure change in the wake of the political struggle between the Chinese pragmatists and the Chinese radicals, and Deng Xiao-ping and other Chinese reformists set out to modify China's diplomatic policy after the Third Plenary Session of the Eleventh Chinese Communist Party Central Committee on 18th December 1978.⁷⁷⁷ Kraus indicates that Deng Xiao-ping did not become the paramount leader in the Chinese Communist Party until the crash of the "Gang of Four", and the Chinese reformists' ascent influenced Chinese politics development and China's policy calculation.⁷⁷⁸ Vogel concludes that these Chinese political elites who convinced Deng Xiao-ping's capability acknowledged his leading role in the Chinese Communist Party, even though Hua Guo-feng had been appointed as the successor by Mao Ze-dong ahead of the overthrow of the Chinese radicals.⁷⁷⁹ These scholars emphasize Deng Xiao-ping's ascent and his rivals' fall, whereas, there is little discussion on how the political struggle among cadres in the Chinese Communist Party influenced China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea, especially on how the Chinese pragmatists' interests and thoughts influenced China's diplomatic and economic policies.

China's "Opening and Reform Policy" hinted Chinese political elites' determination to terminate the long-term economic recession in the Mao era. According to Harding, China's economy did not increase in the context of the "Self-reliance" economic policy, which suggested that China underwent undevelopment in the late Mao era.⁷⁸⁰ Kraus argues that the Cultural Revolution had a devastating influence on China's

⁷⁷⁶ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. Penguin Press, p327.

⁷⁷⁷ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) Durham University, Department of Politics, p44.

⁷⁷⁸ Kraus, Curt. Richard. (2012). The Cultural Revolution: a very short introduction. Oxford University Press, p101.

⁷⁷⁹ Vogel, F. Ezra. (2011). Deng Xiaoping and the transformation of China. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, p190.

⁷⁸⁰ Harding, Harry. (1987). China's second revolution: reform after Mao. Washington, D.C., the Brookings Institution, p99.

economic growth, even though China's "Self-reliance" economic policy did not utterly ruin China's socialist economy.⁷⁸¹ Mitter emphasizes that Mao's "Anti-intellectuals Policy" that prevailed in the period of the Cultural Revolution imposed strict restrictions on China's economy.⁷⁸² Deng emphasizes that China's national development was heavily impeded in the wake of the "Gang of Four's" power grabbing activities, which meant a halt to China's productive forces during the ten-year period up to 1976.⁷⁸³ Kissinger highlights that Deng Xiao-ping had a clear recognition that there existed a huge difference between Chinese citizens' living standard and western advanced states'.⁷⁸⁴ Zhang indicates that Chinese urban residents' per-capita income in 1978 only reached 315 Chinese dollars.⁷⁸⁵ Park thereby concludes that Deng Xiao-ping and other Chinese reformists realized the necessity of China's economic construction, and declared China's "Four Modernization Programme".⁷⁸⁶ Although these scholars analyze reasons why China decided to adopt the "Opening and Reform Policy", they do not mention the ramification of China's plan to stimulate economic growth on China's policy towards South Korea.

China's "Opening and Reform Policy" indicated the Chinese reformists' determination to adopt flexible diplomacy. According to Deng, China should adopt such a foreign policy that would cater to China's economic construction and serve China's economic increase.⁷⁸⁷ Zhang considers China's "Opening and

⁷⁸¹ Kraus, Curt. Richard. (2012). The Cultural Revolution: a very short introduction. Oxford University Press, pxiv.

⁷⁸² Mitter, Rana. (2008). Modern China: a very short introduction. Oxford University Press, p61.

⁷⁸³ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1983). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – dierjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House), p132.

⁷⁸⁴ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. Penguin Press, p334.

⁷⁸⁵ Zhang, Ying-qing. (1995). Zhongguo de gaigekaifang zhengce yu zhongri, zhonghan guanxi [On China's "Opening and Reform Policy" and the diplomacies with Japan, South Korea]. Guoji zhengzhi yanjiu (*The Journal of International Studies*), (2), 113-120.

⁷⁸⁶ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) Durham University, Department of Politics, p43.

⁷⁸⁷ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1983). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – dierjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House), p417.

Reform Policy” as a key step to the accomplishment of modernization campaign.⁷⁸⁸ Cheng and Zhang argue that China’s diplomatic strategies under the leadership of Deng Xiao-ping were driven by the pursuit of China’s “Four Modernization Programme”, and China’s policy priority has been changed from security protection to economic construction since 1978.⁷⁸⁹ Park emphasizes that the Chinese pragmatists on one hand realized that they ought to undertake every possible consequence of China’s upcoming economic practice, on the other hand, they regarded China’s “Four Modernization Programme” as a means to build Chinese people’s confidence on China’s socialism.⁷⁹⁰ Sutter indicates that the Chinese pragmatists decided to implement such diplomatic strategies that would serve China’s socialist economy.⁷⁹¹ Besides, Lin views Deng Xiao-ping’s diplomatic strategies as an effective tool to realize China’s economic growth and protect China’s national interests.⁷⁹² Fu thereby concludes that Deng Xiao-ping and other Chinese reformists made use of interest-oriented diplomatic strategies, which suggested that they endeavoured to ensure peace and pursue development.⁷⁹³ These scholars explain reasons why Deng Xiao-ping was determined to shift Mao’s foreign policy, whereas, they do not mention how Deng’s flexible diplomacy influenced China’s changing policy towards South Korea.

China’s “Opening and Reform Policy” implied China’s eager to establish economic connection with the international community. Park insists that China underwent a long-term poverty and backwardness in the

⁷⁸⁸ Zhang, Ying-qing. (1995). Zhongguo de gaigekaihang zhengce yu zhongri, zhonghan guanxi [On China’s “Opening and Reform Policy” and the diplomacies with Japan, South Korea]. *Guoji zhengzhi yanjiu* (*The Journal of International Studies*), (2), 113-120.

⁷⁸⁹ Cheng, Yu-sheck, J. & Zhang, Wankun, F. (1999). Chinese foreign relations strategies under Mao and Deng: a systematic and comparative analysis. *Philippine Journal of Third World Studies*, 14(3), 91-114, p104.

⁷⁹⁰ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China’s policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p47.

⁷⁹¹ Sutter, G. Rober. (1984). Relations of international power and China’s independence in foreign affairs, 1981-1984. *Journal of Northeast Asian Studies*, III(4), 3-28, 3-4.

⁷⁹² Lin, Jun-feng. (2004). Shixi Deng Xiao-ping linghuo wushi de waijiao zhanlve siwei [On Deng Xiao-ping’s flexible and pragmatic foreign policy thinking]. *Guangdong jiaoyu xueyuan xuebao* (*Journal of Guangdong Education Institute*), 24(3), 20-24.

⁷⁹³ Fu, Yao-zu. (2004). Zhongguo waijiao sixiang de youyici lishixing feiyue – zaixue Deng Xiao-ping waijiao sixiang [On another historic leap of China’s diplomatic thinking– reflections on Deng Xiao-ping’s foreign strategies]. *Waijiao xueyuan xuebao* (*Journal of China Foreign Affairs University*), (77), 25-30.

context of Mao's "Closed-door" policy.⁷⁹⁴ However, Naughton describes Deng Xiao-ping as a typical Chinese pragmatic policy calculator, especially, Deng boldly asserted that "only cats that have the capability to catch rats can be seen as good cats, no matter what color the cat is, black or white" ("不管黑猫白猫，能捉老鼠的就是好猫" – buguanheimaobaimao, nengzhuolaoshudejiushihaomao).⁷⁹⁵ Zhang argues that these countries that insist on a closed-door policy would not provide an incentive for economic growth, but isolate from the global society.⁷⁹⁶ In the opening of the Twelfth Chinese Communist Party Central Committee in September 1982, Deng Xiao-ping emphasized that China should realize the significance of foreign countries' modernization models and these states' experience.⁷⁹⁷ Vogel signifies that the Chinese government emulated the historic Japanese Iwakura Mission and dispatched some high-level officials to advanced countries to visit different sectors from 1977 to 1980, which broadened Chinese officials' horizon on China's economic reform.⁷⁹⁸ Gu Mu, an outstanding leader in China's economic construction, indicated that China should introduce as well as grasp western countries' advanced technologies, and expand commercial relations with the global market, and adopt multiple flexible trading mechanism during his visit to western states.⁷⁹⁹ Although these scholars mention that China became concerned about its business ties with foreign states, they do not analyze the influence of western states' economic development models on China's policy towards South Korea.

China's "Opening and Reform Policy" meant that China faced opportunity of absorbing western countries' developmental theories as well as challenge of realizing China's modernization programme. According to Deng Xiao-ping, China shall unswervingly insist on the policy of opening to the outside world, and actively

⁷⁹⁴ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p45.

⁷⁹⁵ Naughton, Barry. (1993). Deng Xiao-ping: the economist. *The China Quarterly*, (135), 491-514, p496.

⁷⁹⁶ Zhang, Ying-qing. (1995). Zhongguo de gaigekaihang zhengce yu zhongri, zhonghan guanxi [On China's "Opening and Reform Policy" and the diplomacies with Japan, South Korea]. *Guoji zhengzhi yanjiu (The Journal of International Studies)*, (2), 113-120.

⁷⁹⁷ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1993). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the third volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p2.

⁷⁹⁸ Vogel, F. Ezra. (2011). Deng Xiaoping and the transformation of China. *The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press*, p217.

⁷⁹⁹ Gu, Mu. (2009). Gu Mu huiyilu [Gu Mu's memoir]. *Zhongyang wenxian chubanshe (Central Party Literature Press)*, 319-326.

promote exchanges with foreign countries on a basis of equality and mutual benefit.⁸⁰⁰ On one hand, Vogel indicates that Chinese political elites who visited western states became aware of Mao's incorrect economic practice and reached consensus about Deng Xiao-ping's economic reform.⁸⁰¹ On the other hand, Wu notes that Chinese officials actively put forward their ideas of how to develop China's economy in the newly reforming era.⁸⁰² However, Kissinger argues that China realized the necessity of huge financial and technological support from overseas countries in the process of promoting economic increase.⁸⁰³ Yi demonstrates that China's modernization programme would be a fail if China could not seek assistance from developed states, including capitals, skills, technologies and so on.⁸⁰⁴ Mitter signifies that Deng Xiao-ping announced the establishment of Four Special Economic Zones (四个经济特区 – sigejingjitequ) in order to attract foreign investment, which meant that foreign companies shared a series of tax reduction.⁸⁰⁵ These scholars explain China's difficulties in the modernization programme, whereas, they do not analyze its influence on China's changing economic policy towards South Korea.

China's "Opening and Reform Policy" suggested China's pursuit of a peaceful northeast Asia. Deng Xiao-ping emphasizes that China should not only insist on the "Opening and Reform Policy", but also strive for a stable environment for China's modernization construction.⁸⁰⁶ Similarly, Zhang argues that China should not under-estimate the impact of peace and prosperity in northeast Asia on China's economic increase.⁸⁰⁷ On

⁸⁰⁰ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1993). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the third volume]. Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House), p3.

⁸⁰¹ Vogel, F. Ezra. (2011). Deng Xiaoping and the transformation of China. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, p218.

⁸⁰² Wu, Jing-lian. (2005). Understanding and interpreting Chinese economic reform. Mason, Ohio: Thomson/South-Western, 17-30.

⁸⁰³ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. Penguin Press, p335.

⁸⁰⁴ Yi, X. (1995). China's Korea policy: from 'One Korea' to 'Two Koreas'. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 22(2), 119-140, p122.

⁸⁰⁵ Mitter, Rana. (2008). Modern China: a very short introduction. Oxford University Press, p102.

⁸⁰⁶ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1993). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the third volume]. Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House), p156.

⁸⁰⁷ Zhang, Ying-qing. (1995). Zhongguo de gaigekaihang zhengce yu zhongri, zhonghan guanxi [On China's

one hand, Shi indicates that China viewed the “Non-Aligned” foreign policy (“不结盟” 外交政策 – bujiemeng waijiaozhengce) as a basis of promoting relations with western developed nations, and saw the establishment of long-term peaceful ties with all peripheral states as a strategy to create a favourable environment for economic reform.⁸⁰⁸ On the other hand, Levine signifies that China strengthened its trading relations with the United States and Japan in the 1980s, which clarified the significance of a more stable northeast Asia to China’s national interest protection.⁸⁰⁹ In the context of China’s “Opening and Reform Policy”, Park notes that China adopted an almost interest-driven policy in order to ease tensions and ensure stability in northeast Asia.⁸¹⁰ Yi thereby concludes that Deng Xiao-ping realized the significance of a peaceful Korean peninsula to China’s economic development, and decided to adopt a more flexible approach towards the United States-backed Seoul administration.⁸¹¹ Although these scholars mention why China endeavoured to build peace in northeast Asia, they do not explain why China still insisted on the “Non-Policy” towards South Korea.

Apart from the “Opening and Reform Policy”, China also considered its peaceful diplomacy as a means to promote China’s economic construction. According to Deng Xiao-ping, China aimed to shake off poverty and chase for peace, which helped to explain China’s endeavour to enhance its diplomatic relations and economic cooperation with the Third World.⁸¹² Cai argues that China did not realize the significance of a more appropriate foreign policy until China shifted its main focus to economic development, which meant

“Opening and Reform Policy” and the diplomacies with Japan, South Korea]. *Guoji zhengzhi yanjiu (The Journal of International Studies)*, (2), 113-120.

⁸⁰⁸ Shi, Yuan-hua. (2003). Zhongguo gaigekaihang yihou de dui han zhengce ji chaoxianhe wenti [On China’s policy towards South Korea in the post-“Opening and Reform” era and the North Korean nuclear issue]. *Hanguo yanjiu conglin (Collected Papers for Korean Studies)*, (0), 18-28, p18.

⁸⁰⁹ Levine, I. Steven. (1984). China in Asia: the PRC as a regional power. *China’s foreign relations in the 1980s*, edited by Harry Harding, p119.

⁸¹⁰ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China’s policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p43.

⁸¹¹ Yi, X. (1995). China’s Korea policy: from ‘One Korea’ to ‘Two Koreas’. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 22(2), 119-140, p122.

⁸¹² Deng, Xiao-ping. (1983). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – di erjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People’s Publishing House)*, 415-416.

that China saw ways to preserve China's national interests and promote China's diplomatic relations as an imperative.⁸¹³ On one hand, Mitter indicates that China immediately seized an opportunity to change its severe diplomatic situation in the wake of Nixon's visit to Beijing, especially, the United States and other capitalist states had insisted on a hostile approach towards China for two decades.⁸¹⁴ On the other hand, Park emphasizes that the Chinese leadership had been conscious of China's serious economic depression ahead of the smash of the "Gang of Four", which meant that Deng Xiao-ping deeply understood that Chinese people's confidence on China's socialism had been decreased in the period of the Cultural Revolution.⁸¹⁵ Cheng and Zhang conclude that Deng Xiao-ping considered peaceful development as the core mission of China's diplomatic policy.⁸¹⁶ Although these scholars explain why Deng Xiao-ping insisted on a peaceful diplomacy, they do not analyze how Deng Xiao-ping's diplomatic thought influenced China's policy towards South Korea.

On an account of China's flexible diplomacy, South Korea gradually shifted its hostile approach into a flexible one towards communist states and boldly adopted the "Northern Policy". Shen argues that South Korea aimed to repair its relations with communist states and realize peaceful unification on the Korean peninsula with a more reconciliatory approach, which contributed to the "Northern Policy".⁸¹⁷ On one hand, Cai signifies that South Korea could not under-estimate the influence of the volatile international situation, which meant that South Korea decided to pave a way for its new approach towards China, the Soviet Union and other communist states after South Korea had re-calculated its "Anti-communism Policy".⁸¹⁸ On the

⁸¹³ Cai, Liang. (2007). Jianjiao qian tiyujaoliu dui zhonghan guanxi yingxiang chutan [The influence of sport communication on the Sino-South Korean relationship in the pre-normalization period]. *Hanguo yanjiu conglin* (Collected Papers for Korean Studies), (3), 429-447.

⁸¹⁴ Mitter, Rana. (2008). Modern China: a very short introduction. Oxford University Press, p60.

⁸¹⁵ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) Durham University, Department of Politics, p45.

⁸¹⁶ Cheng, Yu-sheck, J. & Zhang, Wankun, F. (1999). Chinese foreign relations strategies under Mao and Deng: a systematic and comparative analysis. *Philippine Journal of Third World Studies*, 14(3), 91-114, p105.

⁸¹⁷ Shen, Ding-chang. (2002). Hanguo waijiaozhengce de fazhanguocheng jiqi bianqianyuanyin [On developmental process and influential factors of South Korea's foreign policy]. *Hanguo xuelun wenji* (Collected Papers of Study of Korea), (00), 296-308.

⁸¹⁸ Cai, Liang. (2007). Jianjiao qian tiyujaoliu dui zhonghan guanxi yingxiang chutan [The influence of sport communication on the Sino-South Korean relationship in the pre-normalization period]. *Hanguo yanjiu*

other hand, Liu indicates that Deng Xiao-ping strove for China's socialist modernization construction, which suggested that China decided to make earnest efforts to attain peace.⁸¹⁹ Yi points that China carefully adjusted its attitude towards Korea, and actively responded to its policy towards South Korea as "the door is closed but not locked".⁸²⁰ Park thus concludes that China paid attention to its relations with South Korea by promoting economic connection and initiating sports diplomacy, even though China still recognized North Korea as the sole legitimate government in the Korean peninsula.⁸²¹ These scholars describe the interaction between China and South Korea in the 1980s, whereas, they do not explain why South Korea's "Northern Policy" did not contribute to China's "Two-Koreas Policy" in the era of Deng Xiao-ping.

Both South Korea's "Export-oriented Policy" and "Northern Policy" catered to Deng Xiao-ping's pragmatic economic policy thought, which contributed to the increasing economic inter-dependence between China and South Korea. Zhang argues that the increasing economic inter-dependence has enabled both China and South Korea to enhance political trust, which has been the most obvious feature of the Sino-South Korean diplomacy.⁸²² On one hand, Zhang and Tan suppose that South Korea achieved a historic economic take-off – the "Miracle on the Han River" under the leadership of Park Chung-hee, which has quickened South Korea's plan to seek for more overseas markets since the 1980s.⁸²³ On the other hand, Lin signifies that Chinese experts and pundits hardly took little notice of South Korea's economic development model from

conglun (Collected Papers for Korean Studies), (3), 429-447.

⁸¹⁹ Liu, Ya-xian. (2005). Guanyu Deng Xiao-ping waijiao sixiang yanjiu de jidiansikao [Some reflection on the study of Deng Xiao-ping's diplomatic thought]. *Suzhou kejixueyuan xuebao (Journal of University of Science and Technology of Suzhou)*, 22(2), 10-12, p10.

⁸²⁰ Yi, X. (1995). China's Korea policy: from 'One Korea' to 'Two Koreas'. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 22(2), 119-140, p123.

⁸²¹ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p26-p27.

⁸²² Zhang, Ying-qing. (1995). Zhongguo de gaigekai fang zhengce yu zhongri, zhonghan guanxi [On China's "Opening and Reform Policy" and the diplomacies with Japan, South Korea]. *Guoji zhengzhi yanjiu (The Journal of International Studies)*, (2), 113-120, p119.

⁸²³ Zhang, Ting-yan. & Tan, Jing. (2007). Yongyuan de jiyi [Eternal memory]. *Shangdong daxue chubanshe (Shandong University Publishing House)*, p38.

where they could learn experience about South Korea's cooperation with western states.⁸²⁴ Park emphasizes that China realized the necessity of bringing in South Korea's capital and technology to boost China's economy.⁸²⁵ Zhou indicates that South Korea had invested more than 205 million dollars in China ahead of the 1992 formal normalization relationship.⁸²⁶ Yi therefore concludes that the Chinese reformists became aware of the importance of promoting economic relations with South Korea, which helped to explain China's secret trading connection with South Korea in the 1980s.⁸²⁷ Even though these scholars describe China's increasingly deeper economic relations with South Korea, they do not explain why China insisted on the "Non-Policy" in the reforming era.

In spite of the increasing trading volume, China and South Korea did not normalize the bilateral relations in the context of the South Korean-Taiwanese relations. Deng Xiao-ping insists that only the People's Republic of China represents China, and the Chinese Communist Party as well as the Chinese Nationalist Party should pave a way for the common goal of peaceful unification.⁸²⁸ Liu argues that China and South Korea did not reach consensus on the issue of Taiwan, which constituted an obstacle to both sides' diplomatic recognition in the end of the Cold War period.⁸²⁹ On one hand, Zhang and Tan indicate that South Korea still remained its official relations with Taiwan in the 1980s, even though Roh Tae-woo who was the former South Korean president did not cease to seek for opportunity to improve as well as normalize the Sino-South Korean

⁸²⁴ Lin, Sheng-ai. (2014). Gaigekaifang zhichu zhongguo dui hanguo "guanminfenli" zhengce chutan [Exploration on China's policy of "Separation of the Official and the People" to Republic of Korea in the beginning of the reforming age]. *Dangdai zhongguoshi yanjiu (Contemporary China History Studies)*, 21(2), 68-73, p70.

⁸²⁵ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p87.

⁸²⁶ Zhou, Yuan. (1992). Pact to protect trade with South Korea. *China Daily*, (4), p1.

⁸²⁷ Yi, X. (1995). China's Korea policy: from 'One Korea' to 'Two Koreas'. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 22(2), 119-140, 123-124.

⁸²⁸ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1993). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the third volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p30.

⁸²⁹ Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094, p1088.

relations.⁸³⁰ On the other hand, Kissinger signifies that the United States did not completely break off with Taiwan, but promise to provide military equipment after the 1979 Sino-United States relationship normalization.⁸³¹ Park concludes that China had a graver concern about its security protection, even though Deng Xiao-ping persisted in flexible diplomatic thinking that contributed to China's "Two-Koreas Policy" in the post-Cold War period.⁸³² These scholars emphasize that South Korea continued to play the "Taiwan card", which means that China must calculate its relationship with these states that had diplomacies with Taiwan in the Cold War period. However, they do not explain why China still advocated a changing attitude towards South Korea in the context of South Korea's "pro-Taipei approach".

China's economic construction under the leadership of Deng Xiao-ping influenced China's policy calculation over the Korean peninsula, which helped to understand China's newly separate thinking on the two Koreas. According to Zhang and Tan, Deng Xiao-ping visited North Korea ahead of the significant Third Plenum of the Eleventh Chinese Communist Party Central Committee, and expressed the determination to promote China's economy so as to maintain the superiority of socialism.⁸³³ Park on one hand insists that North Korea considered the Chinese pragmatic reformists' changing diplomacy as well as modernization programme as a grave damage to Mao's doctrine and to North Korea's development, on the other hand, China's policy towards the Korean peninsula changed after China had realized North Korea as such a state that possibly had an unfavourable effect on China's economic reform.⁸³⁴ However, Deng Xiao-ping argues that China should create a comparatively stable environment that could serve as a pre-requisite for China's modernization construction since China aimed to improve people's living standard and increase China's national strength.⁸³⁵ Liu argues that China's leverage over the Korean peninsula had been restricted, even

⁸³⁰ Zhang, Ting-yan. & Tan, Jing. (2007). Yongyuan de jiyi [Eternal memory]. *Shangdong daxue chubanshe (Shandong University Publishing House)*, 43-44.

⁸³¹ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. *Penguin Press*, p381.

⁸³² Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p90.

⁸³³ Zhang, Ting-yan. & Tan, Jing. (2007). Yongyuan de jiyi [Eternal memory]. *Shangdong daxue chubanshe (Shandong University Publishing House)*, p29.

⁸³⁴ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p54 & p96.

⁸³⁵ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1993). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the third volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p244.

though China had a concern over South Korea's role in China's economic development.⁸³⁶ Yi thereby concludes that China did neither cease to provide North Korea with economic aid in the 1980s, nor terminate the Sino-North Korean traditional alliance relationship.⁸³⁷ These scholars mention that China's policy towards North Korea underwent a significant change in the context of China's "Opening and Reform Policy", whereas, they do not elaborate the influence of China's changing attitude towards North Korea on China's policy towards South Korea.

The Soviet Union's relations with North Korea influenced China's policy towards South Korea, even though China aimed to preserve its national interest and to re-build its regional role through the "Four Modernization Programme". Smith argues that both China and the Soviet Union that provided North Korea with a large amount of assistance significantly influenced North Korea's economy in the Cold War period.⁸³⁸ However, Ahn argues that North Korea's attitude became more and more important when the escalating Sino-Soviet confrontation had an increasing influence on the Korean peninsula.⁸³⁹ Yi indicates that China insisted on the "pro-Pyongyang approach" and China considered North Korea as its traditional ally: North Korea served as a strategic area that protected China from being invaded by the Soviet Union.⁸⁴⁰ Liu considers China's concern about North Korea's influence on security protection as the main factor that postponed the Sino-South Korean diplomacy normalization, which meant that China could not afford the price of breaking the traditional alliance relationship with North Korea.⁸⁴¹ Park concludes that the Chinese leadership paid an

⁸³⁶ Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094, p1086.

⁸³⁷ Yi, X. (1995). China's Korea policy: from 'One Korea' to 'Two Koreas'. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 22(2), 119-140, p122.

⁸³⁸ Smith, Hazel. (2005). Hungry for peace: international security, humanitarian assistance, and social change in North Korea. Washington, D. C.: *United States Institute of Peace Press*, p184.

⁸³⁹ Ahn, Byung-joon. (1980). South Korea and the communist countries. *Asian Survey*, 20(11), 1098-1107, p1101.

⁸⁴⁰ Yi, X. (1995). China's Korea policy: from 'One Korea' to 'Two Koreas'. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 22(2), 119-140, p122.

⁸⁴¹ Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094, p1084.

attention to the Sino-North Korean relations through mutual visits in the early 1980s.⁸⁴² These scholars analyze North Korea's role in China's policy calculation, whereas, they do not elaborate China's policy thinking over South Korea in the background of the Sino-Soviet Union conflict.

The Chinese pragmatists played an active role in curbing the development of the Sino-Soviet split, which affected China's diplomatic policy and security concern in the end of the Cold War period. According to Deng Xiao-ping, the Chinese government became more eager to improve the Sino-Soviet Union relations, which meant that China planned to decrease its political discontent and ideological disparity with the Soviet Union for the sake of economic construction.⁸⁴³ Kissinger argues that China did not have an opportunity to initiate more dynamic approaches until China repaired relations with the Soviet Union.⁸⁴⁴ On one hand, Park demonstrates that the Chinese reformists continued remaining in power after the Thirteenth National Party Congress held in October 1987.⁸⁴⁵ On the other hand, Segal indicates that China decided to promote the Sino-Soviet Union détente and shift the "Anti-revisionism Policy" after the Chinese pragmatists came to power.⁸⁴⁶ Trofimenko emphasizes that the Soviet Union did not withdraw its military force from Mongolia until the 1980s, which served as a stimulus to the Soviet Union's foreseeable peaceful agreement with other states.⁸⁴⁷ Lankov describes that the Sino-Soviet confrontation that emerged from the 1950s came to an end after Gorbachev's ascent to the paramount leader of the Soviet Union and his decision to launch reform.⁸⁴⁸ Gong highlights that Gorbachev's approach towards China came into a determining point when the Soviet

⁸⁴² Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p83.

⁸⁴³ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1993). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the third volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p291.

⁸⁴⁴ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. *Penguin Press*, p389.

⁸⁴⁵ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p96.

⁸⁴⁶ Segal, Gerald. (1980). China and the great power triangle. *The China Quarterly*, (83), 490-509, p502.

⁸⁴⁷ Trofimenko, Henry. (1989). Long-term trends in the Asia-Pacific region: a Soviet evaluation. *Asian Survey*, 29(3), 237-251, p242.

⁸⁴⁸ Lankov, Andrei. (2015). The real North Korea: life and politics in the failed Stalinist utopia. *Oxford University Press*, 77-78.

Union decided to repair the Sino-Soviet relations in May 1989, both states agreed to plunge into economic relations, set aside ideological dispute and cut down the Soviet Union's troops from the Sino-Soviet border.⁸⁴⁹ Liu concludes that the Sino-Soviet Union conflict did not terminate until Gorbachev initiated a state-visit to China in 1989.⁸⁵⁰ Although these scholars mention the Sino-Soviet détente, they did not tell the influence of the Soviet Union's dynamic approach towards China on China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea.

South Korea boldly put forward the "Northern Policy" in order to develop its relations with communist states, which meant that both the Soviet Union and China had an opportunity to increase economic inter-dependence with South Korea. Smith argues that both Beijing and Moscow on one hand improved their relations with Seoul by establishing trading connection, on the other hand decreased their assistance provided for Pyongyang.⁸⁵¹ Zhang and Tan signify that the Roh Tae-woo government clearly aimed to stabilize the Korean peninsula and realize reconciliation with communist states with the "Northern Policy", which contributed to South Korea's pragmatic policy thinking.⁸⁵² In return, Liu indicates that the Gorbachev administration took a more flexible approach towards South Korea, and the Soviet Union viewed its economic ties with South Korea as a more important one than its traditional alliance relationship with North Korea.⁸⁵³ Gong emphasizes that the two paramount leaders from the Soviet Union and South Korea held talks in 1990, and reached agreement about Roh Tae-woo's historic state-visit to Moscow, which meant that South Korea formally normalized relations with the Soviet Union.⁸⁵⁴ Kim concludes that both Beijing and Moscow

⁸⁴⁹ Gong, W. Gerrit. (1991). China and the dynamics of unification in northeast Asia. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 38(2), 95-106, 101-102.

⁸⁵⁰ Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094, p1084.

⁸⁵¹ Smith, Hazel. (2005). Hungry for peace: international security, humanitarian assistance, and social change in North Korea. Washington, D. C.: *United States Institute of Peace Press*, p184.

⁸⁵² Zhang, Ting-yan. & Tan, Jing. (2007). Yongyuan de jiyi [Eternal memory]. *Shangdong daxue chubanshe (Shangdong University Publishing House)*, p43.

⁸⁵³ Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094, p1086.

⁸⁵⁴ Gong, W. Gerrit. (1991). China and the dynamics of unification in northeast Asia. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 38(2), 95-106, p102.

downplayed Pyongyang's role, and pursued economic relations with South Korea in the 1980s.⁸⁵⁵ These scholars explain why North Korea's influence became weaker in the context of the Soviet Union's pragmatic approach and South Korea's "Northern Policy", whereas, they did not analyze the influence on China's changing policy towards South Korea.

China formally normalized its relations with the United States after the Chinese reformists came to power, which had a controversial influence on South Korea's relations with communist states. According to Liu, the leading states' attitudes towards China influenced China's policy towards South Korea, which should be understood in the context of the United States' distinct definitions between ally and enemy.⁸⁵⁶ Ahn argues that South Korea had an intention of improving relations and increasing interests with communist states by adopting a more conciliatory approach after the United States changed its policy towards China.⁸⁵⁷ Park notes that the United States and South Korea formally reached consensus on the opening of traffic rights in April 1980, which further promoted China's trading volume with South Korea.⁸⁵⁸ However, Trofimenko argues that the United States cemented its military relations with its traditional allies in northeast Asia, such as South Korea and Japan.⁸⁵⁹ Han indicates that South Korea attempted to preserve the United States' military influence on the Korean peninsula and to initiate the independent defence policy.⁸⁶⁰ Kim concludes that the United States remained a large amount of military presence in northeast Asia, which acted as a stimulus to regional security disputes.⁸⁶¹ These scholars explain how the Sino-United States relations

⁸⁵⁵ Kim, Nack-hong. (1989). Sino-Soviet rapprochement and its implications for South Korea's "Northern Policy". *Korea & World Affairs*. 13(2), p314.

⁸⁵⁶ Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094, p1085.

⁸⁵⁷ Ahn, Byung-joon. (1980). South Korea and the communist countries. *Asian Survey*, 20(11), 1098-1107, p1102.

⁸⁵⁸ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, 81-82.

⁸⁵⁹ Trofimenko, Henry. (1989). Long-term trends in the Asia-Pacific region: a Soviet evaluation. *Asian Survey*, 29(3), 237-251, p240.

⁸⁶⁰ Han, Sung-joo. (1980). South Korea and the United States: the alliance survives. *Asian Survey*, 20(11), 1075-1086, p1078.

⁸⁶¹ Kim, Byong-hong. (1991). Korean reunification. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 38(2),

influenced South Korea's policy towards communist states, whereas, they do not explain China's perspective on the United States-South Korean military relations and on the ramification of China's policy towards South Korea. Having looked at literature on China's foreign policy, economic strategy and factional struggle in the aftermath of Mao Ze-dong's demise, this thesis will go on with explanation of China's security policy towards South Korea in the period of Deng Xiao-ping.

115-119, p116.

China's security policy towards South Korea in the Deng era: the rational actor explanation

China's security policies

The United States and the Soviet Union still played a crucial role in China's security policy decision-making process, even though Deng Xiao-ping who rose as the paramount leader attempted to utilize a more pragmatic approach. According to Pollack, Deng Xiao-ping aimed to maximize China's national security interest after he was re-appointed as one member of the Chinese Communist Party Politburo in 1977.⁸⁶² Segal argues that the United States, the Soviet Union and China were recognized as members of the "triangle politics" in the Cold War period.⁸⁶³ In other words, China must take the two leading states' leverage into account, and China should be fully aware of how to not be the common opponent in the triangular relations. On one hand, Sneider indicates that the United States signed a series of military treaties with its allies from northeast Asia to southeast Asia, which helped to establish the First Military Island Defence Chain and to maintain its military presence.⁸⁶⁴ In brief, the United States and its allies imposed harsh restrictions on China in the context of the Cold War pattern, including security consideration, foreign approach, economic development and so on. On the other hand, Deng and Qian emphasize that the Soviet Union strengthened its military force along the Sino-Soviet border, which conversely meant that China could hardly relieve pressure.⁸⁶⁵ In contrast, it was important for the newly-born Deng Xiao-ping administration to work out solutions to decrease China's security threats to the lowest rate.

China did not lessen its security burden until Deng Xiao-ping strategically maneuvered the triangular relations. According to Zhang, China on one hand considered the Soviet Union as the gravest security threat, on the other, viewed the United States as the only state that had capability to contain the Soviet Union.⁸⁶⁶

⁸⁶² Pollack, D. Jonathan. (1993). China between the superpowers: in search of a security strategy (Available from the book: China in the era of Deng Xiao-ping: a decade of reform). *An East Gate Book*, p357.

⁸⁶³ Segal, Gerald. (1980). China and the great power triangle. *The China Quarterly*, (83), 490-509, p490.

⁸⁶⁴ Sneider, L. Richard. (1986). United States security interests. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 36(1), 76-87, p78.

⁸⁶⁵ Deng, Rong. (2004). Wode fuqin: Deng Xiao-ping - zhongjuan [My father: Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. *Zhongyang wenxian chubanshe (Central Party Literature Press)*, p303. & Qian, Qi-chen. (2003). Waijiao shiji [Ten episodes in China's diplomacy]. Beijing: *Shijie zhishi chubanshe (World Affairs Press)*, p3.

⁸⁶⁶ Zhang, Yong-jin. (2013). China's security problematique: critical reflections. *ANU Press*, p256.

Kissinger argues that the Chinese leadership had a more profound knowledge of how to respond as well as react in such a triangular relations than many other states.⁸⁶⁷ Viewed in this vein, China was seen as such a know-how state that aimed to grab interests, which influenced China's changing attitudes towards the two leading states. Simultaneously, Pollack argues that the only scenario was to adopt a more flexible approach towards China instead of the aggressive one if the two leading states intended to strengthen their roles in northeast Asia.⁸⁶⁸ In contrast, China placed itself as such a strategic position that would influence the two leading states' global strategies. Westad insists that China had openly criticized the Soviet Union as an aggressively hostile nation to itself, China also had realized the United States as such a power that was not prepared to be dreadfully aggressive as similar as the Soviet Union.⁸⁶⁹ Segal highlights that Deng Xiao-ping boldly decided to shift China's policy towards the United States and to escalate the Sino-United States détente into the formal normalized relations in 1978.⁸⁷⁰ In other words, Deng Xiao-ping did not mean to shift the "One United Front Approach" that helped China bring force to contain the Soviet Union.⁸⁷¹

China formally entered the reforming era after the Deng Xiao-ping administration decided to pursue economic growth, which had important impact on China's security policies. Cheng and Zhang argue that the Chinese leadership considered economic development and stable environment as the main goals in the Deng Xiao-ping era.⁸⁷² Deng Xiao-ping argues that the Chinese leadership paid extensive attention to China's economic reform that would help China to accomplish the second revolution since the establishment of

⁸⁶⁷ Kissinger, Henry. (1979). The White House Years. Boston: *Little, Brown*.

⁸⁶⁸ Pollack, D. Jonathan. (1993). China between the superpowers: in search of a security strategy (Available from the book: China in the era of Deng Xiao-ping: a decade of reform). *An East Gate Book*, p358.

⁸⁶⁹ Westad, Arne. Odd. (2013). Restless empire: China and the world since 1750. London: *Vintage Books*, p357.

⁸⁷⁰ Segal, Gerald. (1980). China and the great power triangle. *The China Quarterly*, (83), 490-509, p498.

⁸⁷¹ Zhu, Fang. (2014). Zhongguo "Lianmeikangsu" wajiao zhanlve yanjiu [On China's strategy of "Uniting the United States against the Soviet Union" diplomatic strategy. *Neimenggu daxue (Inter Mongolia University)*.

⁸⁷² Cheng, Yu-sheck, J. & Zhang, Wankun, F. (1999). Chinese foreign relations strategies under Mao and Deng: a systematic and comparative analysis. *Philippine Journal of Third World Studies*, 14(3), 91-114, p103.

China.⁸⁷³ However, Marti argues that Deng Xiao-ping realized China's modernization programme as a failure if China could not terminate the Sino-Soviet Union friction and normalize the Sino-United States relations.⁸⁷⁴ In contrast, the Chinese government must carefully re-estimate both leading powers' profound influence on China after China shifted state work from factional struggle to economic construction, including security calculation, ideological concern and economic interest. On one hand, Kissinger highlights that the Carter administration (1977-1981) considered the formal normalization of the Sino-United States relations as the United States' priority.⁸⁷⁵ On the other hand, Pollack indicates that the Gorbachev government boldly propelled the Sino-Soviet relations that had deteriorated for ages, which brought an incentive to lessen tensions.⁸⁷⁶ In other words, China totally understood the importance of how to develop its relations with the two leading states, which meant that the Deng Xiao-ping administration was on a risky way to building peace for China's economic construction.

The two leading states' relations with other states in northeast Asia was an inseparable part in China's security policy and China's policy towards South Korea. According to Liu, five different triangle relations were combined to understand the Chinese leadership's changing approaches towards the Korean peninsula, including Beijing-Moscow-Pyongyang, Beijing-Moscow-Washington, Beijing-Pyongyang-Seoul, Beijing-Seoul-Taipei, Beijing-Tokyo-Seoul.⁸⁷⁷ On one hand, Hinton and Westad argue that China aimed not only to enhance the Sino-North Korean alliance relationship, but also to discourage North Korea from leaning towards the Soviet Union in the course of the Sino-Soviet dispute.⁸⁷⁸ In other words, it would have become

⁸⁷³ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1993). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the third volume]. Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House), p113.

⁸⁷⁴ Mati, E. Michael. (2002). China and the legacy of Deng Xiao-ping: from communist revolution to capitalist evolution. Washington D.C.: Brassey's, Inc., p10.

⁸⁷⁵ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. Penguin Press, p349.

⁸⁷⁶ Pollack, D. Jonathan. (1993). China between the superpowers: in search of a security strategy (Available from the book: China in the era of Deng Xiao-ping: a decade of reform). *An East Gate Book*, p370.

⁸⁷⁷ Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094, p1083.

⁸⁷⁸ Hinton, C. Harold. (1981). The United States and extended security commitments: east Asia. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 457, 88-108, p92. & Westad, Arne. Odd. (2013). Restless empire: China and the world since 1750. London: *Vintage Books*, p405.

a more serious threat to Beijing if Moscow had expanded its presence in the Korean peninsula in the background of the Sino-Soviet rift. On the other hand, Sneider argues that the United States established alliance relationship with South Korea as a result of the Korean War.⁸⁷⁹ Kihl notes that the Seoul government concentrated on how to deter Pyongyang's sudden invasion.⁸⁸⁰ Han suggests that the United States provided South Korea with a great deal of military and financial aid in the Cold War period, which meant that South Korea accomplished economic construction under the United States' tutelage.⁸⁸¹ In contrast, the United States strove to sustain its presence in South Korea even to keep the Korean peninsula from sliding into the Soviet dominance. Besides, both Seoul and Taipei could hardly take no notice of the two sides' comprehensive diplomacy in the context of the "Anti-communism Policy".⁸⁸² All in all, China should accurately respond to northeast Asia's political development that influenced China's security interest and China's changing approach towards South Korea in the Deng era.

⁸⁷⁹ Sneider, L. Richard. (1986). United States security interests. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 36(1), 76-87, p79.

⁸⁸⁰ Kihl, Yong-whan. (1977). Korea's future: Seoul's perspective. *Asian Survey*, 17(11), 1064-1076, p1064.

⁸⁸¹ Han, Sung-joo. (1980). South Korea and the United States: the alliance survives. *Asian Survey*, 20(11), 1075-1086, p1075.

⁸⁸² Xia, Fei. (2012). Chaoxianzhazheng qijian de jiangjieshi [Chiang Kai-shek in the period of the Korean War]. *Dangshi zongheng (Over the Party History)*, (1), 8-11. & Heo, Uk. & Kim, Hayam. (2012). Private-sector networks, democracy, and interstate relations: a case study of South Korea and Taiwan. *Asian Perspective*, (36), 71-93, p71.

The Sino-Soviet Union split

The Soviet Union continued building its military presence in northeast Asia from the 1960s to the 1980s, which posed a grave threat to China's security interest calculation and imposed a severe restriction on China's economic development programme. According to Westad, the Mongolian administration did not demand the Soviet Union to dispatch military troops and expand military presence until Mongolia became anxious about the historic turmoil – the Cultural Revolution, which further deteriorated the Sino-Soviet Union relations.⁸⁸³ Sneider insists that the Soviet Union aimed to increase its leverage from northeast Asia to southeast Asia, and to develop a solid military industry from independent military system to nuclear weapon programme after the year of 1978.⁸⁸⁴ On one hand, Hao argues that the Soviet expansionism seemed to escalated into an albatross that discouraged China from escaping from its serious security situation.⁸⁸⁵ In other words, the Soviet Union's growing presence aroused more and more suspicions about inequality and instability in northeast Asia, which played a crucial role in China's security policy thinking in the reforming era. On the other hand, Marti argues that Deng Xiao-ping did not only emphasize China's "Four Modernization Programme" (agriculture, industry, science and technology), but also China's national defence construction after the Soviet Union strengthened its armed forces along the Sino-Soviet border.⁸⁸⁶ In contrast, China became conscious of the importance of the Sino-Soviet Union relations to China's economic construction in the context of the long-term Sino-Soviet dispute.

Apart from the Soviet military build-up, the Soviet Union developed intimate relations with Vietnam and North Korea after Deng Xiao-ping became the paramount leader in the Chinese Communist Party, which meant that the Chinese government should cautiously respond to the Soviet Union's containment plan from northeast Asia to southeast Asia. On one hand, Spence argues that the Sino-Soviet Union relations became tenser after the Soviet Union expanded its military presence around Vietnam by strengthening diplomacy

⁸⁸³ Westad, Arne. Odd. (2013). Restless empire: China and the world since 1750. London: *Vintage Books*, p357.

⁸⁸⁴ Sneider, L. Richard. (1986). United States security interests. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 36(1), 76-87, p84.

⁸⁸⁵ Hao, Yu-fan. (1987). China and the Korean peninsula: a Chinese view. *Asian Survey*, 27(8), 862-884, p864.

⁸⁸⁶ Mati, E. Michael. (2002). China and the legacy of Deng Xiao-ping: from communist revolution to capitalist evolution. Washington D.C.: *Brassey's, Inc.*, 10-11.

and offering assistance.⁸⁸⁷ Whiting emphasizes that the Hanoi administration adopted an aggressive approach towards China and aroused a bloody clash in February 1979, which should be explained in the background of the 1978 Soviet-Vietnam friendly cooperation treaty.⁸⁸⁸ From the perspective of China, the Soviet Union reached a military alliance relationship with Vietnam in order to maintain its role around southeast Asia as well as to deter China. On the other hand, Hao argues that North Korea played a considerably important part in the Soviet Union's security policy, and the Soviet Union viewed its influence on North Korea as its interest in northeast Asia.⁸⁸⁹ Zagoria indicates that the Soviet Union took advantage of its largest economic inter-dependence with North Korea to stop North Korea from leaning towards China.⁸⁹⁰ In contrast, the Soviet Union aimed to contain China by strengthening the Soviet-North Korean relations.

In the context of the Soviet Union's growing military presence, the Chinese government decided to elevate North Korea's role by offering economic supplies and enhancing political trust. Lee argues that China had a weaker capability to equip North Korea with assistance than the Soviet Union, even though North Korea played a more strategic role in the triangular relations among the Soviet Union, North Korea and China.⁸⁹¹ However, Hao argues that security situation in northeast Asia influenced China's relations with the Korean peninsula, and the Soviet-North Korean alliance relationship improved after the Soviet Union supported North Korea's stance in the Rangoon Bombing Incident and the Korean Airline Incident.⁸⁹² Pyongyang had an opportunity to play the "Moscow card", which conversely meant that Beijing must seek for tactics to discourage Pyongyang from utterly sliding into the Soviet Union's control. Economically, Chung signifies that China provided North Korea with an extensive amount of financial support of 100 million dollars in

⁸⁸⁷ Spence, D. Johnathan. (1990). The search for modern China. Norton, p654.

⁸⁸⁸ Whiting, S. Allen. (2001). China's use of force, 1950-96, and Taiwan. *International Security*, 26(2), 103-131, p119.

⁸⁸⁹ Hao, Yu-fan. (1987). China and the Korean peninsula: a Chinese view. *Asian Survey*, 27(8), 862-884, p866.

⁸⁹⁰ Zagoria, S. Donald. (1977). Korea's future: Moscow's perspective. *Asian Survey*, 17(11), 1103-1112, p1106.

⁸⁹¹ Lee, Yung-hong. (1977). Korea's future: Pecking's perspective. *Asian Survey*, 17(11), 1088-1102, p1092.

⁸⁹² Hao, Yu-fan. (1987). China and the Korean peninsula: a Chinese view. *Asian Survey*, 27(8), 862-884, p866.

1982.⁸⁹³ Politically, Park denotes that the Chinese leadership decided to call at Pyongyang in order to repair the Sino-North Korean relations, including Deng Xiao-ping, Hu Yao-bang and Zhao Zi-yang.⁸⁹⁴ Besides, Chu indicates that Deng Xiao-ping strategically agreed to consider Kim Il-Sung's heir – Kim Il-Jong as the next supreme leader of North Korea.⁸⁹⁵ In contrast, China could not under-estimate every possible consequence in case of North Korea's changing attitude towards China, which suggested China's vulnerability on the North Korea issue for the sake of China's national security and social stability.

The Deng Xiao-ping administration did not shift the "One-Korea Policy" in the context of the Beijing-Pyongyang alliance relationship, which did not mean that China ceased to contact South Korea in the reforming age. Park argues that the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Trade officially denied that China had an intention of promoting the "Two-Koreas Policy", even though China's secret trading volume with South Korea was not a secret any more in the early 1980s.⁸⁹⁶ In other words, Beijing slightly altered its economic policy towards the United States-backed Seoul administration as a result of its domestic development. However, Liu argues that the Chinese leadership on one hand realized North Korea's increasing concern about the development of the Sino-South Korean relations; on the other hand, became more and more confident about China's influence over North Korea while China still remained as North Korea's ally, which helped to explain why China equipped North Korea with financial and military support to discourage North Korea from collapse.⁸⁹⁷ Westad emphasizes that the Kim regime did hesitate to establish a solid alliance relationship with China in the Cold War period, which strategically hampered China from posing a challenge to the Soviet Union's image as a regional power on Korean affairs.⁸⁹⁸ In contrast, China could not under-

⁸⁹³ Chung, Chin-wee. (1983). North Korea in the Sino-Soviet dispute. *Journal of Northeast Asian Studies*, II(3), p72.

⁸⁹⁴ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p57.

⁸⁹⁵ Chu, Sung-po. (1986). Beijing's relations with South and North Korea in the 1980s. *Issues & Studies*, 22(11), p75.

⁸⁹⁶ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p82.

⁸⁹⁷ Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094, p1086.

⁸⁹⁸ Westad, Arne. Odd. (2013). Restless empire: China and the world since 1750. London: *Vintage Books*, p410.

estimate the Soviet Union's relations with North Korea and North Korea's role in deterring the Southern Triangle's containment plan, which prolonged China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea in the Deng Xiaoping era.

The establishment of Sino-United States diplomatic relations

China's policies towards the United States and the Soviet Union underwent immense changes after Deng Xiao-ping utilized the growing Soviet-United States contradiction. From the perspective of China, Segal argues that there were three different options after the demise of Mao, including to normalize the Sino-United States relations, to continue the no-peace-no-war scenario, to repair the Sino-Soviet friction.⁸⁹⁹ However, Kissinger argues that the Soviet Union's increasing military presence in Africa and Middle East meant a stimulus to the Carter government's decision to establish formal relations with China.⁹⁰⁰ In contrast, the United States felt more and more stressful in the wake of the Soviet Union's military build-up throughout the globe, which meant that the United States would have to undertake more serious consequence in the context of the increasing hostility with two communist nations. On one hand, it became more obvious that the Soviet Union was recognized as the gravest threat by the United States in the background of the United States military troop's withdrawal from Vietnam and the escalation of the Sino-Soviet dispute.⁹⁰¹ On the other hand, Deng Xiao-ping agreed to reject the Soviet Union's military build-up in Middle East for the sake of China's economic relations with the United States.⁹⁰² In other words, the continuing confrontation between the two leading states did not only mean an opportunity to develop the Sino-United States relations, but also explain China's significance in the United States' global strategy as well as containment plan.

Both Beijing and Washington played the "Moscow card" towards each other and took advantage of the 'Soviet threat', which contributed to the realization of the Sino-United States formal diplomacy. According to Deng Xiao-ping, both Beijing and Washington should push forward the the Sino-United States relations that should not have been stagnated for several decades.⁹⁰³ On one hand, Marti argues that Hua Guo-feng refused to improve the deteriorated Sino-Soviet relations ahead of the Fifth National People's Congress in February 1978, which gave rise to China's security threat and posed challenge to China's economic

⁸⁹⁹ Segal, Gerald. (1980). China and the great power triangle. *The China Quarterly*, (83), 490-509, p497.

⁹⁰⁰ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. *Penguin Press*, p350.

⁹⁰¹ Sneider, L. Richard. (1986). United States security interests. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 36(1), 76-87, p77.

⁹⁰² Mati, E. Michael. (2002). China and the legacy of Deng Xiao-ping: from communist revolution to capitalist evolution. Washington D.C.: *Brassey's, Inc.*, p11.

⁹⁰³ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1983). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – dierjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p378.

construction.⁹⁰⁴ In contrast, the Chinese leadership did not reach any agreement about the Sino-Soviet détente in the eve of the “Four Modernization Programme”, which conversely enabled the United States to play a more significant role in China’s risky gamble of triangle relations. On the other hand, Westad argues that China attempted to persuade the United States to reach consensus on such a truth that China strove to deter the Soviet Union, and the United States aimed to convince the Soviet Union to realize such a reality that China had a stronger capability to contain the Soviet Union, which helped to explain why the United States reached cooperation with China on technology transfer and military equipment.⁹⁰⁵ In other words, the United States grasped an opportunity to impose restriction on the Soviet Union by participating in China’s modernization programme, which constituted the controversy of the ‘Soviet threat’ in the process of the Sino-United States relations normalization.

China seized an opportunity to reverse its isolated security environment and decrease hostility from capitalist states in the context of the historic transition – the Sino-United States diplomacy normalization, which helped China to act as a security collaborator as well as an economic co-operator. According to Hinton, it was necessary for China to reach reciprocal relations with the United States and to reach consensus about the ‘Soviet threat’ with Asian countries.⁹⁰⁶ On one hand, Segal argues that China would have to undertake more horrible losses if both the United States and the Soviet Union continued to insist on an aggressive approach towards China.⁹⁰⁷ In contrast, the Soviet Union was turned into the weakest party in the triangular relations after China and the United States established diplomatic relations, which meant that China flexibly changed its role into the United States’ collaborator against the Soviet Union. On the other hand, Park argues that Beijing’s formal relations normalization with Tokyo and Washington at the end of the 1970s suggested Beijing’s focus had been shifted from ideological concern to economic development, which acted as the emergence of rational diplomacy towards northeast Asia.⁹⁰⁸ Deng Xiao-ping emphasizes that China aimed

⁹⁰⁴ Mati, E. Michael. (2002). China and the legacy of Deng Xiao-ping: from communist revolution to capitalist evolution. Washington D.C.: Brassey’s, Inc., p11.

⁹⁰⁵ Westad, Arne. Odd. (2013). Restless empire: China and the world since 1750. London: *Vintage Books*, 374-375.

⁹⁰⁶ Hinton, C. Harold. (1981). The United States and extended security commitments: east Asia. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 457, 88-108, p92.

⁹⁰⁷ Segal, Gerald. (1980). China and the great power triangle. *The China Quarterly*, (83), 490-509, p500.

⁹⁰⁸ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China’s policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p59.

not only to enhance its business contact with Europe, but also to attract investment from Japan.⁹⁰⁹ In other words, the United States-led industrial states reduced political tension as well as expanded economic ties with China in the background of the Sino-United States diplomacy normalization, which meant that China strategically used the ‘Soviet threat’ to re-build its role in the United States-led capitalist states’ plan to dam up the Soviet Union and used the pragmatic diplomatic approach to promote commercial cooperation with the international market.

The Sino-United States relationship normalization enabled China to decrease confrontation with the United States’ allies in northeast Asia, which meant that China terminated its aggressive approach towards South Korea in the context of China’s new policy thinking – pragmatism. Kim Il-Sung emphasizes that all socialist states should persist in the hard-line stance towards imperialist states: imperialist states would never change the “anti-socialism” principle, even though some countries took advantage of a new foreign policy approach in order to protect their own national interests.⁹¹⁰ Park argues that the Pyongyang administration became anxious about the normalized ties between Beijing and Washington, even though Pyongyang did not express obvious discontent about Beijing’s changing approach towards Washington.⁹¹¹ In contrast, the Sino-United States relationship normalization suggested China’s distinct attitudes towards the United States-led imperialist states, which conversely meant that the Deng Xiao-ping administration paid less attention to ideological concern. On one hand, Beijing changed its policy towards the Seoul administration in the 1980s, which contributed to Beijing’s flexible approach of “Guanmen bushang suo” (the door is closed, but not locked).⁹¹² In the background of China’s official relations with the United States, China ceased to describe South Korea as “the United States-backed puppet government” as well as the United States’ aggressive ally. On the other hand, the Seoul government realized how to promote its relations with developing states as an imperative, which indicated that South Korea aimed to expand economic cooperation and enhance political

⁹⁰⁹ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1993). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the third volume]. *Renmin chubanshe* (People’s Publishing House), p53, p119.

⁹¹⁰ Kim, Il-Sung. (1982). On Juche in our revolution. Pyongyang: *Foreign Languages Publishing House*, p442.

⁹¹¹ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China’s policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p54.

⁹¹² Chu, Sung-po. (1986). Beijing’s relations with South and North Korea in the 1980s. *Issues & Studies*, 22(11), 70-71. & Keum, Hieyeon. (1989). Recent Seoul-Beijing relations: process, prospects, and limitations. *Issues & Studies*, 25(3), p101.

influence.⁹¹³ In other words, South Korea gradually eased tensions with communist states, which suggested that China had an opportunity to reach reconciliation with the United States and its allies.

⁹¹³ Shen, Ding-chang. (2002). Hanguo waijiaozhengce de fazhanguocheng jiqi bianqianyuanyin [On developmental process and influential factors of South Korea's foreign policy]. *Hanguo xuelun wenji* (Collected Papers of Study of Korea), (00), 296-308, p300.

China's perspective on the United States' relations with Taiwan

China grasped an opportunity to discourage Taiwan from achieving its goal to contain China in the context of the Sino-United States formal diplomacy normalization, which conversely decreased Taiwan's role in the United States' global strategic calculation. According to Deng Xiao-ping, China should strive to promote socialist economic modernization, achieve national unification with Taiwan and create peace for the world.⁹¹⁴ On one hand, the Taiwan Strait, lying off the south-eastern coast of China, vitally influences China's security interest, which means that China would be involved in security crisis if Taiwan is under other countries' tutelage.⁹¹⁵ In contrast, China has realized that itself hardly gets rid of such a serious security dilemma, which means that China would have to face a nightmare scenario if the situation on Taiwan continues to deteriorate. On the other hand, Deng Xiao-ping and other Chinese reformists aimed to build peace and stability in order to realize economic increase, which varied from the Maoist revolution theory.⁹¹⁶ In other words, China shifted the Maoist hostile approach towards Taiwan, and considered economic construction as a tactic to narrow the gap with Taiwan. Kissinger highlights that Washington decided to withdraw the American Embassy from Taipei in the aftermath of the establishment of its diplomatic ties with Beijing.⁹¹⁷ With the development of the Sino-United States relations, China did not only receive recognition from the United States and other capitalist states, but also decrease political tension with Taiwan.

Beijing's recognition from Washington did not mean that the demise of the Washington-Taipei relations, which meant that Washington continued playing off the "Taipei card" in the reforming era. According to Deng Xiao-ping, China should insist on the "One Country, Two Systems" policy in order to reach the peaceful solution of unification with Taiwan, and foreign states should not involve in China's internal affairs.⁹¹⁸ Hinton argues that Beijing shifted the term "liberation with Taiwan", instead, pledged to allow

⁹¹⁴ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1993). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the third volume]. Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House), p3.

⁹¹⁵ Lasater, L. Martin. & Yu, Kien-hong, Peter. (2000). Taiwan's security in the post-Deng Xiao-ping era. London: Frank Cass, p7.

⁹¹⁶ Cheng, Yu-sheck, J. & Zhang, Wankun, F. (1999). Chinese foreign relations strategies under Mao and Deng: a systematic and comparative analysis. *Philippine Journal of Third World Studies*, 14(3), 91-114, p103.

⁹¹⁷ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. Penguin Press, p356.

⁹¹⁸ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1993). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the third volume]. Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House), p31.

Taiwan to remain a comprehensively high degree of autonomy and keep its existing social system unchanged.⁹¹⁹ In other words, China has considered Taiwan as a part of China, and has attempted to discourage other countries from imposing influence on Taiwan: China has seen the “One Country, Two Systems” policy as a strategy to decrease isolation from as well as develop connection with Taiwan. However, Lasater and Yu consider the Taiwan Strait issue as one of the potential factors that would lead to a war between China and the United States.⁹²⁰ Kissinger signifies that Deng Xiao-ping gave implicit consent in relation to the United States’ arms sales to Taiwan, which was not contrary to the United States’ agreement with China about the peaceful settlement of unification with Taiwan.⁹²¹ There has been some discrepancy between Washington and Beijing on Taiwan since Washington has concerned about China’s plan to initiate the “One Country, Two Systems” policy towards Taiwan. In contrast, both sides kept an eye on each other’s increasing leverage over Taiwan, which imposed restriction on the realization of China’s “One Country, Two Systems” policy towards Taiwan in the reforming age.

The United States’ military relations with Taiwan meant that the United States still promised to protect Taiwan, which prolonged South Korea’s “pro-Taipei approach”. On one hand, Hinton argues that Taiwan did not prepare to undertake the adverse consequence of losing its ally – the United States after the formal relations normalization between China and the United States.⁹²² Taipei had grave dependence on Washington since Washington considered Taipei as a military base, which meant that Washington still remained as the finest party in the triangular relations among Taipei-Washington-Beijing. On the other hand, Yoo argues that Seoul became anxious about Washington’ policy calculation over Seoul after Beijing received formal recognition from Washington in place of Taipei.⁹²³ Piao signifies that South Korea saw its deepening security

⁹¹⁹ Hinton, C. Harold. (1981). The United States and extended security commitments: east Asia. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 457, 88-108, p94.

⁹²⁰ Lasater, L. Martin. & Yu, Kien-hong, Peter. (2000). Taiwan’s security in the post-Deng Xiao-ping era. London: *Frank Cass*, p4.

⁹²¹ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. *Penguin Press*, 355-356.

⁹²² Hinton, C. Harold. (1981). The United States and extended security commitments: east Asia. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 457, 88-108, p94.

⁹²³ Yoo, Hyon-joo. (2014). Reluctant flexibility caused by abandonment fears: a theoretical analysis of South Korea’s approach towards China in the 1970s and the early 1980s. *The Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, 26(2), 225-242, 233-234.

relations with the United States as a tactic to secure itself from attack in the 1980s.⁹²⁴ Similar to Taipei, it turned into a serious blow to Seoul that Washington changed its attitudes towards Beijing while Beijing still emphasized its military alliance relationship with Pyongyang. However, Liu argues that the Seoul administration did not shift its policy towards Taipei and Beijing in the 1980s.⁹²⁵ Sneider indicates that the United States continued to facilitate the development of Taiwan's military strength in the aftermath of the Sino-United States diplomacy normalization.⁹²⁶ Washington did not cease to lower the importance of Taipei in Washington's policy towards northeast Asia. Viewed in this vein, the Seoul government recognized Taipei as an important ally after Washington's pledge to protect Taipei's security, which also meant that Beijing still undertook the severe security burden from the confrontational military island chain from South Korea to Taiwan.

⁹²⁴ Piao, Rui-lin. (1999). Hanguo waijiaozhengce de fazhanguocheng [On the developmental process of South Korea's foreign policy decision]. *Hanguo yanjiu luncong* (Collected Papers for Korean Studies), (00), 23-38, p30.

⁹²⁵ Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094, p1088.

⁹²⁶ Sneider, L. Richard. (1986). United States security interests. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 36(1), 76-87, p80.

China's perspective on the United States military force on South Korea

China's attitude towards the United States' military force in South Korea became complicated in the wake of the Sino-United States formal diplomacy. Sneider argues that South Korea considered the United States' troops in South Korea as a security shield against North Korea's sudden invasion.⁹²⁷ However, the Carter administration had an intention of calling American troops back from South Korea.⁹²⁸ The United States' decision to withdraw its armed forces from the Korean peninsula would influence neighbouring states' calculation on security gains and losses, including China. On one hand, Hinton argues that China did not reject the preservation of the United States' military troops in South Korea.⁹²⁹ Ahn additionally argues that the Soviet Union went on expanding its military build-up in the 1980s, which helped to understand China's anxiety of the Soviet Union as well as its attempt to keep the United States' military presence in South Korea.⁹³⁰ In other words, China realized the importance of letting American troops remain in South Korea in the wake of the Soviet Union's increasing leverage. On the other hand, China and North Korea did not reach consensus about the United States' military troops on the Korean peninsula after China and the United States formally normalized the bilateral relations.⁹³¹ Apart from the deterrent effect on the Soviet Union, China must take North Korea's attitude into account, which meant that North Korea continued playing a strategic role in China's security thinking in the aftermath of China's full diplomacy with the United States.

China's hesitation to reach agreement on American presence in South Korea suggested China's fret over the Soviet Union's policy thinking over Korea, which conversely meant that China could not under-estimate North Korea's role in the context of the Sino-Soviet rift. According to Yoo, China did neither stop providing

⁹²⁷ Sneider, L. Richard. (1986). United States security interests. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 36(1), 76-87, p79.

⁹²⁸ Han, Sung-joo. (1980). South Korea and the United States: the alliance survives. *Asian Survey*, 20(11), 1075-1086, p1079.

⁹²⁹ Hinton, C. Harold. (1981). The United States and extended security commitments: east Asia. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 457, 88-108, p93.

⁹³⁰ Ahn, Byung-joon. (1980). South Korea and the communist countries. *Asian Survey*, 20(11), 1098-1107, p1103.

⁹³¹ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p55.

North Korea with foreign aid, nor establish its formal diplomacy with South Korea in the 1980s.⁹³² In detail, China did not prepare to undertake the consequence of losing the ‘buffer zone’ – North Korea while developing economic connection with South Korea. Gong argues that Pyongyang was not considered as a security threat by Moscow in the Cold War period, but the Soviet Union saw a unified Korea as a strategy to deter Japan and China instead.⁹³³ However, Liu argues that Pyongyang made use of both the “Moscow card” towards Beijing and the “Beijing card” towards Moscow in the Cold War period.⁹³⁴ In contrast, it would be the worst scenario to Beijing if Beijing confronted with both Pyongyang and Moscow in the background of the Sino-Soviet Union friction. Besides, Park argues that China was afraid of the Soviet’s expanding influence on North Korea, China thereby decided to adopt a hard-line stance towards the United States’ troops in South Korea.⁹³⁵ In other words, China cautiously responded to the United States’ military presence after predicted North Korea’s reaction, which meant that China did not prepare to be trapped into military tension in the Korean peninsula.

The United States did not withdraw military presence from South Korea, which meant that South Korea was significantly composed of the United States’ northeast Asia strategy. According to Kissinger, the current order in Asia depends on leading powers’ recognition and pursuit of national interests.⁹³⁶ Han argues that the Carter government decided to postpone the plan to withdraw American troops from South Korea.⁹³⁷ Sneider argues that the United States preserved 40,000 army members in South Korea in order to deter North Korea,

⁹³² Yoo, Hyon-joo. (2014). Reluctant flexibility caused by abandonment fears: a theoretical analysis of South Korea’s approach towards China in the 1970s and the early 1980s. *The Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, 26(2), 225-242, p234.

⁹³³ Gong, W. Gerrit. (1991). China and the dynamics of unification in northeast Asia. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 38(2), 95-106, p102.

⁹³⁴ Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094, p1084.

⁹³⁵ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China’s policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p58.

⁹³⁶ Kissinger, Henry. (2015). Shijie zhixu [World order]. Beijing: *Zhongxin chubanjituan (China Citic Press)*, p276.

⁹³⁷ Han, Sung-joo. (1980). South Korea and the United States: the alliance survives. *Asian Survey*, 20(11), 1075-1086, p1080.

which conversely meant that its enemies in northeast Asia might feel relieved from the Carter administration's plan to withdraw troops from South Korea.⁹³⁸ In contrast, Washington did not prepare to under-estimate Seoul's leverage in northeast Asia with a comprehensive analysis of its rivals' reaction to its decision to withdraw troops from the Korean peninsula, which meant that Washington still played the "Seoul card" to preserve its national interests. Piao emphasizes that the Chun Doo-hwan administration (1980-1988) and Washington reached consensus on American armed forces in the Korean peninsula in 1983, which meant that both sides did not mean to downplay the security alliance relationship.⁹³⁹ In other words, South Korea continued to act as a role in the United States' containment plan, which meant that its neighbouring states still faced with the threat in the context of the United States-South Korean military alliance relationship.

North Korea's provocative acts prolonged the United States' military presence in South Korea, which helped to explain South Korea's increasing investment in military expenditure. Han argues that South Korea aimed to reach reconciliation with socialist states with the "Northern Policy", especially the Soviet Union and China.⁹⁴⁰ However, Park argues that North Korea's terrorist action on the 1983 Rangoon Bombing Incident embarrassed China's attempt to stabilize the Korean peninsula.⁹⁴¹ Piao additionally argues that terrorists from North Korea took part in the 1987 Korean Air Flight Bombing Incident, which turned into a lethal blow to the inter-Korean relations.⁹⁴² In spite of the "Northern Policy", Shen indicates that South Korea still emphasized the development of the Southern Triangle relations that included the United States, South Korea and Japan in the 1980s, which meant that South Korea did not cease to cement its security cooperation with

⁹³⁸ Sneider, L. Richard. (1986). United States security interests. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 36(1), 76-87, 78-79.

⁹³⁹ Piao, Rui-lin. (1999). Hanguo wajiaozhengce de fazhanguocheng [On the developmental process of South Korea's foreign policy decision]. *Hanguo yanjiu luncong (Collected Papers for Korean Studies)*, (00), 23-38, p31.

⁹⁴⁰ Han, Xian-dong. (2012). Hanguo de wajiao kunjing: yige gaikuoxing kuangjia de jiedu [South Korea's diplomacy dilemma: a general framework of analysis]. *Dongbeiyaluntan (Northeast Asia Forum)*, (3), 62-38, p64.

⁹⁴¹ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p70.

⁹⁴² Piao, Rui-lin. (1999). Hanguo wajiaozhengce de fazhanguocheng [On the developmental process of South Korea's foreign policy decision]. *Hanguo yanjiu luncong (Collected Papers for Korean Studies)*, (00), 23-38, p32.

its allies.⁹⁴³ In other words, South Korea was more determined to see its military relations with the United States as a guarantee for its security in the background of the deteriorated inter-Korean relations, which was in contrast to China's attitude towards the United States' military presence in the Korean peninsula. Hao additionally signifies that the increasing economic gap between North Korea and South Korea influenced both states' national military strength, and South Korea devoted more than six percents of its gross domestic product.⁹⁴⁴ Viewed in this vein, China on one hand could neither under-estimate South Korea's economic take-off, nor the influence of South Korea's growing devotion to military build-up on China's security. Having analyzed the influence of China's new security tactics on China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea, the next section aims to explain China's pragmatic diplomatic approach and China's changing attitude towards South Korea in the reforming era.

⁹⁴³ Shen, Ding-chang. (2002). Hanguo waijiaozhengce de fazhanguocheng jiqi bianqianyuanyin [On developmental process and influential factors of South Korea's foreign policy]. *Hanguo xuelun wenji (Collected Papers of Study of Korea)*, (00), 296-308, p300.

⁹⁴⁴ Hao, Yu-fan. (1987). China and the Korean peninsula: a Chinese view. *Asian Survey*, 27(8), 862-884, p872.

China's diplomatic policy towards South Korea in the Deng era: the rational actor explanation

The “Independent foreign policy of peace”

The two leading states still imposed influence on China's foreign policy, which helped to explain China's “Anti-hegemonism Policy”. According to Deng Xiao-ping, China insisted that hegemonism and power politics constituted the two biggest challenges to stability, and China advised not to take advantage of the “Washington card”, the “Moscow card” and the “Beijing card” for the sake of peace.⁹⁴⁵ Deng Xiao-ping emphasized Mao Ze-dong's theory of the “Three Worlds” and affirmed China's attitude towards hegemonism,⁹⁴⁶ which helped to explain China's plan to establish equal as well as reciprocal relations with developing countries.⁹⁴⁷ In other words, China considered the “Anti-hegemonism Policy” and the “Third World” philosophy as strategies to build independence and peace. However, Pollack argues that the static Sino-United States relations possibly became a new threat towards China, and both sides had difficulty in realizing formal diplomacy normalization.⁹⁴⁸ Deng additionally argues that China became fully aware of the Soviet Union's containment policy after the Soviet Union endorsed the Vietnamese government's aggression on Cambodia in 1978 and dispatched troops to Afghanistan in 1979.⁹⁴⁹ In brief, China on one hand had more doubt about the development of China's relations with the two leading states, on the other hand, seized an opportunity to promote the “Anti-hegemonism Policy” in developing countries.

The Chinese government confirmed economic construction as the main focus of state work in the 1978 Third

⁹⁴⁵ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1993). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the third volume]. Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House), 56-57.

⁹⁴⁶ Deng, Rong. (2004). Wode fuqin: Deng Xiao-ping - zhongjuan [My father: Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. Zhongyang wenxian chubanshe (Central Party Literature Press), p143.

⁹⁴⁷ Yi, Yan-xia. & Chen, Yu-hua. (2006). Lun Deng Xiao-ping dui Mao Ze-dong waijiao sixiang de fazhan [On Deng Xiao-ping's role in the development of Mao Ze-dong's diplomatic thinking]. Zhonggong Yunnan shengwei dangxiao xuebao (The Journal of Yunnan Provincial Committee School of the Chinese Communist Party), 7(2), 39-41, p40.

⁹⁴⁸ Pollack, D. Jonathan. (1993). China between the superpowers: in search of a security strategy (Available from the book: China in the era of Deng Xiao-ping: a decade of reform). An East Gate Book, p359.

⁹⁴⁹ Deng, Rong. (2004). Wode fuqin: Deng Xiao-ping - zhongjuan [My father: Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. Zhongyang wenxian chubanshe (Central Party Literature Press), p303.

Plenum of the Eleventh Chinese Communist Party Central Committee, which escalated into a stimulus to China's flexible diplomacy in the Deng era. According to Deng Xiao-ping, China on one hand strove for the long-term peace building, on the other hand, concentrated on the realization of the "Four Modernization Programme".⁹⁵⁰ Yahuda argues that the most important task for the Deng Xiao-ping administration was to utilize a more appropriate diplomacy that could realize China's goals of national economic increase and global market connection.⁹⁵¹ In other words, China had deeply understood that the Maoist diplomacy would not serve China's economic open-up ahead of Deng Xiao-ping's rise to power. Park additionally argues that Deng Xiao-ping and other Chinese reformists viewed stability as the main factor that would contribute to China's economic construction, which helped to explain that the Chinese leadership reached consensus on the significance of peaceful diplomacy.⁹⁵² Gao highlights that China's economic construction would be doomed to be a failure if China could not reach reconciliation with the international society, even though China had shifted Mao's "Fighting-with Two Fists Strategy" and "Left-leaning Line" ("左倾"路线 – zuoqing luxian).⁹⁵³ In contrast, the Chinese government did not decide to adopt a more dynamic approach towards foreign countries until the declaration of the "Four Modernization Programme".

Chinese diplomacy did not come into a newly historic stage until the opening of the 1982 Twelfth National Congress of the Communist Party of China, which helped to explain China's persistence in the independent diplomacy. According to Deng Xiao-ping, China shall insist on the "Non-alliance Policy" ("不结盟"政策 – bujiemeng zhengce) and adhere to the peaceful diplomacy of independence.⁹⁵⁴ On one hand, Han argues that China has aimed to pursue independence since the beginning of China's revolution, which would contribute

⁹⁵⁰ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1993). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the third volume]. *Renmin chubanshe* (People's Publishing House), p57.

⁹⁵¹ Yahuda, Michael. (1995). Deng Xiao-ping: the statesman (Available from the book: Deng Xiao-ping: portrait of a Chinese statesman). Oxford: *Clarendon Press*, p144. & Yahuda, Michael. (1995). Deng Xiao-ping: the statesman. *The China Quarterly*, (135), 551-572, p552.

⁹⁵² Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p47.

⁹⁵³ Gao, Yi. (1996). Deng Xiao-ping xinshiqi de waijiao zhanlve sixiang lunshu [On Deng Xiao-ping's diplomatic strategy thought in the newly reforming era]. *Dang de wenxian* (Literature of Chinese Communist Party), (2), 13-20, p13.

⁹⁵⁴ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1993). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the third volume]. *Renmin chubanshe* (People's Publishing House), p57.

to understanding China's diplomacy.⁹⁵⁵ In brief, China has focused on ways to promote its relations with the global community under the premise of independent diplomacy.⁹⁵⁶ On the other hand, Deng Xiao-ping explicitly clarified the "Independent Foreign Policy of Peace" in the Twelfth National Congress of the Communist Party of China (September of 1982).⁹⁵⁷ Deng Xiao-ping emphasizes that the Chinese shall have the full authority of taking charge of Chinese domestic politics as well as foreign affairs, and the Chinese government shall totally show respect for foreign countries' sovereignty and territorial integrity while developing friendly diplomacies as well as enhancing cooperative relations.⁹⁵⁸ In other words, the Deng Xiao-ping administration was determined to consider independence as a strategy to protect China from foreign countries' interference.

However, China's diplomacy was under huge pressure in the context of the Tiananmen Square Incident, which meant that the Deng Xiao-ping administration should come up with a new strategy - the "Low-profile" strategy ("韬光养晦"策略 – taoguangyanghui celve) to re-build its soured relations with the international community. According to Deng Xiao-ping, the Chinese government should react to the Tiananmen Square Incident in a more rational manner, and should concentrate on ways of how to stabilize China's diplomatic environment and promote China's economic reform.⁹⁵⁹ On one hand, Park argues that China and other countries in northeast Asia were dragged into political instability at the end of the 1980s.⁹⁶⁰ In other words,

⁹⁵⁵ Han, Nian-long. (1988). Dangdai zhongguo waijiao [Diplomacy of contemporary China]. Beijing: Zhongguo shehuikexue chubanshe (*Chinese Social Sciences Press*), p4.

⁹⁵⁶ Wang, Guo-hong. & Wang, Ke-na. (2007). Zhou En-lai yu Deng Xiao-ping waijiao sixiang zhi bijiao fenxi [A comparative analysis of Zhou En-lai's and Deng Xiao-ping's diplomatic thought]. *Shijiqiao* (*Shijiqiao*), (2), 3-5, p3.

⁹⁵⁷ Cheng, Yu-shek, Joseph. & Zhang, Wan-kun, Franklin. (1999). Chinese foreign relation strategies under Mao and Deng: a systematic and comparative analysis. *Philippine Journal of Third World Studies*, 14(3), 91-114, p99.

⁹⁵⁸ Maxwell, Robert. (1987). Deng Xiao-ping: speeches and writings. (The second edition). Oxford & New York: Pergamon Press, p86.

⁹⁵⁹ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1993). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the third volume]. *Renmin chubanshe* (*People's Publishing House*), p304.

⁹⁶⁰ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p157.

it was necessary for the Chinese government to protect national interests from damage in the context of a series of international affairs. On the other hand, Cheng and Zhang argue that China decided to adopt the “Low-profile” strategy to ensure China’s trading connection with the international community in the wake of the United States and other capitalist states’ economic sanction.⁹⁶¹ Peng signifies that China immediately implemented the “Low-profile” strategy in order to reverse the volatile international situation, which reflected Deng Xiao-ping’s pragmatic attitude towards China’s relations with the west.⁹⁶² In contrast, the Deng Xiao-ping administration saw the flexible approach as a means to create an environment to repair diplomacies and re-start cooperation with western nations.

China’s foreign policy in the Deng Xiao-ping era should be taken into the analysis of China’s changing policy towards South Korea, which includes the notion of “anti-hegemonism”, the practice of flexible diplomacy, the pursuit of independence and the implementation of the “Low-profile” strategy. Liu argues that Seoul’s relations with Taipei meant that the Seoul government insisted on the “One China, One Taiwan” policy (“一中一台”政策 – yizhongyitai zhengce), which was in contrast to Beijing’s “One China” policy (“一中”政策 – yizhong zhengce).⁹⁶³ In brief, Seoul played a risky game that severely damaged Beijing’s status in the international community. However, Park argues that Deng Xiao-ping and other Chinese pragmatists’ rise to power influenced China’s policy towards the Korean peninsula.⁹⁶⁴ In contrast, Beijing still insisted on the “pro-Pyongyang approach” in the Deng period, which did not mean that Beijing put an end to contact with Seoul. Besides, Hinton argues that Beijing did not realize the necessity of building the secret trading connection with the United States-backed Seoul administration until the early 1980s.⁹⁶⁵ In

⁹⁶¹ Cheng, Yu-shek, Joseph. & Zhang, Wan-kun, Franklin. (1999). Chinese foreign relation strategies under Mao and Deng: a systematic and comparative analysis. *Philippine Journal of Third World Studies*, 14(3), 91-114, p101.

⁹⁶² Peng, Hong-zhi. (2003). Deng Xiao-ping waijiao lilun de lilun jichu, zhuti yu celve [On the bases, themes and tactics of the theory of Deng Xiao-ping’s diplomacy]. *Guizhou daxue xuebao (Journal of Guizhou University)*, 21(1), 8-13, p13.

⁹⁶³ Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094, p1088.

⁹⁶⁴ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China’s policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, 43-49.

⁹⁶⁵ Hinton, C. Harold. (1993). Re-orienting China’s foreign policy: China and the world (Available from the book: China in the era of Deng Xiao-ping: a decade of reform). *An East Gate Book*, 394-395.

other words, both sides grasped an opportunity to develop relations through increasing economic interdependence in the background of China's pragmatic diplomacy towards neighbouring states. It laid a hard foundation for Seoul's "Northern Policy" at the end of the 1980s and Beijing's "dual-track" policy towards the Korean peninsula in the aftermath of the Tiananmen Square Incident.

The policy of “Separation the Officials from the People” towards South Korea

China shifted its hostile approach towards neighbouring countries in order to create stability, which conversely meant that China had calculated every possible gain and loss in relation to its serious internal and external situation ahead of the reforming era. According to Deng Xiao-ping, China’s persistence in the peaceful diplomacy and the “Anti-hegemonism Policy” would contribute to the world’s stability.⁹⁶⁶ Chen argues that China’s diplomacy came into a ‘semi-isolation’ state in the context of the Sino-Soviet friction, the Sino-Indian border dispute, the Sino-Vietnamese War and so on.⁹⁶⁷ In other words, China had difficulties in developing friendly relations with its neighbouring countries that posed grave threats to China’s security. However, Wang argues that China realized the significance of utilizing a strategic peaceful diplomacy towards neighbouring nations after China declared its “Opening and Reform Policy”.⁹⁶⁸ On one hand, Park highlights that China’s economic depression in the Mao era meant a grave challenge towards Deng Xiao-ping and other Chinese reformists, even though Deng Xiao-ping had a comprehensive understanding of the influence of such a long-term stagnation on the Chinese Communist Party.⁹⁶⁹ On the other hand, Yahuda indicates that the Deng Xiao-ping administration considered the pursuit of material interests as the primary task, and China must implement a more rational foreign policy approach that would serve both national economic development and international trading connection.⁹⁷⁰ In contrast, China’s determination to promote a flexible diplomacy should be explained in the background of the declaration of the “Four Modernization Programme”.

China could not under-estimate the influence of peaceful environment on China’s economic construction in the reforming era, which acted as a stimulus to China’s changing policy thinking on the Korean peninsula.

⁹⁶⁶ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1993). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the third volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People’s Publishing House)*, p158.

⁹⁶⁷ Chen, Hui-ying. (2005). Lun Deng Xiao-ping waijiao sixiang de xianshixing [On the reality of Deng Xiao-ping’s diplomatic thinking]. *Qianghua daxue xuebao (Journal of Tsinghua University)*, (3), 8-11.

⁹⁶⁸ Wang, Gang. (2007). Deng Xiao-ping mulin waijiao sixiang yu dongya quyue hezuo [On Deng Xiao-ping’s friendly diplomatic thinking and regional cooperation in east Asia]. *Dongnanya zongheng (Around Southeast Asia)*, (5), 8-12, p9.

⁹⁶⁹ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China’s policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p45.

⁹⁷⁰ Yahuda, Michael. (1995). Deng Xiao-ping: the statesman (Available from the book: Deng Xiao-ping: portrait of a Chinese statesman). Oxford: *Clarendon Press*, p143.

According to Deng Xiao-ping, China should view stability as a pre-requisite for these states that aim to realize economic growth, and China should prepare to maintain peace for fifty years at least for the sake of China's modernization programme.⁹⁷¹ Park argues that the Chinese Communist Party elites on one hand deeply realized the importance of peace and stability to China's economic development, on the other hand, slightly decreased the amount of financial and military supplies to North Korea.⁹⁷² In other words, China had a more serious concern about every possible irritaion from North Korea at the end of the 1970s, which conversely meant that China planned to dissuade North Korea from provocative acts. Instead, Kwak argues that China aimed to stop military conflicts and aggression wars from the Korean peninsula.⁹⁷³ Shi highlights that China made a slight change in the strategy towards South Korea in the 1980s, which meant that China set out to repair relations and reach reconciliation with South Korea.⁹⁷⁴ In contrast, Beijing realized the importance of decreasing hostility towards the Seoul administration in the context of China's modernization programme, even though Beijing insisted on the "pro-Pyongyang approach".

The Deng Xiao-ping government decided to establish secret trading connection with South Korea that had achieved miraculous economic gain, which contributed to China's policy of "Separation the Officials from the People" towards South Korea. According to Deng Xiao-ping, China should not take little notice of the developmental model from the Four Asian Dragons that consists of South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore.⁹⁷⁵ On one hand, Chang and Chung argue that Beijing did not consider the Seoul administration as a politically hostile regime, but as an important potential economic partner that would contribute to China's modernization programme.⁹⁷⁶ Zhang emphasizes that the annual economic growth rate that the Four

⁹⁷¹ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1983). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – dierjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p417.

⁹⁷² Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p50.

⁹⁷³ Kwak, Tae-hwan. (1980). China and the Korean peninsula in the 1980s. *Korea & World Affairs*, 4(1), p114.

⁹⁷⁴ Shi, Yuan-hua. (2003). Zhongguo gaigekai fang yihou de dui han zhengce ji chaoxianhe wenti [On China's policy towards South Korea in the post-"Opening and Reform" era and the North Korean nuclear issue]. *Hanguo yanjiu conglin (Collected Papers for Korean Studies)*, (0), 18-28, p18.

⁹⁷⁵ Deng Xiao-ping. (2004). Deng Xiao-ping nianpu: 1975-1997 [The biographical chronicle of Deng Xiao-ping: 1975-1997]. *Zhongyang wenxian chubanshe (Central Party Literature Press)*, p320.

⁹⁷⁶ Chang, H. Parris. (1993). Beijing's policy towards Korea and PRC-ROK normalization of relations. The

Asian Dragons reached was in excess of nine percents from 1970 to 1980.⁹⁷⁷ In other words, China did not only set up new recognition of South Korea, but also embark on analysis of South Korea's economic development. On the other hand, Lin argues that China aimed to decrease deterioration and develop cooperation with South Korea, which contributed to China's policy of "Separation the Officials from the People" towards South Korea.⁹⁷⁸ In contrast, the Deng Xiao-ping government implemented such a diplomacy that enabled China to establish business contact with South Korea, which meant that China formally re-valued its foreign policy approach towards the newly Asian economic hub – South Korea.

China's policy of "Separation the Officials from the People" towards South Korea did not mean that China planned to boldly normalize relations with South Korea in the reforming era. According to Zhang and Tan, it was still necessary for China to utilize some tactics to tackle with its alliance relationship with North Korea for the sake of the situation on the Korean peninsula, even though China had set out to consider the plan to terminate the long-term hostile approach towards South Korea.⁹⁷⁹ In the context of China's pragmatic approach towards South Korea, Cai and Park emphasize that both sides actively promoted the "Sports Diplomacy" in order to expand exchanges, strengthen mutual-trust, and enhance relations.⁹⁸⁰ However, Liu

changing order in northeast Asia and the Korean peninsula, edited by Lee, Manwoo. & Mansbach, W. Richard. Seoul (Kyungnam University): *The Institute for Far Eastern Studies*, 159-160. & Chung, Chin-wee. (1983). North Korea in the Sino-Soviet dispute. *Journal of northeast Asian Studies*, II(3), p72.

⁹⁷⁷ Zhang, Ying-qing. (1995). Zhongguo de gaigekaihang zhengce yu zhongri, zhonghan guanxi [On China's "Opening and Reform Policy" and the diplomacies with Japan, South Korea]. *Guoji zhengzhi yanjiu* (*The Journal of International Studies*), (2), 113-120, p116.

⁹⁷⁸ Lin, Sheng-ai. (2014). Gaigekaihang zhichu zhongguo dui hanguo "guanminfenli" zhengce chutan [Exploration on China's policy of "Separation of the Official and the People" to Republic of Korea in the beginning of the reforming age]. *Dangdai zhongguoshi yanjiu* (*Contemporary China History Studies*), 21(2), 68-73, p68.

⁹⁷⁹ Zhang, Ting-yan. & Tan, Jing. (2007). Yongyuan de jiyi [Eternal memory]. *Shangdong daxue chubanshe* (*Shandong University Publishing House*), 32-33.

⁹⁸⁰ Cai, Liang. (2007). Jianjiao qian tiyujiailiu dui zhonghan guanxi yingxiang chutan [The influence of sport communication on the Sino-South Korean relationship in the pre-normalization period]. *Hanguo yanjiu conglin* (*Collected Papers for Korean Studies*), (3), 429-447, p434. & Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p63.

argues that Beijing had no intention to put an end to its “pro-Pyongyang approach”, and Beijing would have possibly been the biggest enemy if Pyongyang had decided to use military force against Beijing.⁹⁸¹ In other words, China on one hand desperately preserved its alliance relationship with North Korea, on the other hand carefully re-calculated every possible gain and loss of its changing approach towards South Korea. Instead, Park notes that the Chinese Communist Party elites did not only frequently visit Pyongyang in order to strengthen relations with the Kim Il-Sung administration, but also to inform Pyongyang of the impossibility of the full diplomacy between Beijing and Seoul.⁹⁸² In contrast, China aimed to decrease North Korea’s suspicions about the Sino-South Korean relations, which suggested that China had a deep concern about North Korea’s attitude towards China’s changing policy towards South Korea.

⁹⁸¹ Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094, 1086-1087.

⁹⁸² Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China’s policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p51, p57.

China's perspective on the South Korean government's "Northern Policy"

The Park Chung-hee government put forward the "Northern Policy" in the early 1970s, which did not only reflect South Korea's increasing anxiety about the Sino-United States rapprochement and the Sino-Soviet Union dispute, but also suggest South Korea's flexible diplomacy towards the Soviet Union-led socialist states. According to Yoo, Seoul had an intention of decreasing antagonism with Beijing after Nixon's visit to Beijing, even though Beijing still insisted on the "pro-Pyongyang approach" that exerted great pressure on the Seoul administration.⁹⁸³ Zhang argues that the Park Chung-hee regime immediately felt threatened after the United States' decision to withdraw military troops from Vietnam.⁹⁸⁴ In other words, South Korea had a concern about ways to dissuade the United States' military troops from leaving the Korean peninsula, and ways to protect South Korea from wars similar to Vietnam. Besides, Hao argues that the Soviet Union gradually expanded its military build-up in northeast Asia in order to contain China, and strategically improved its relations with North Korea in the aftermath of the Sino-Soviet border clash.⁹⁸⁵ Yu emphasizes that South Korea expected to improve its relations with socialist states in the 1970s, which meant that South Korea planned to pay less attention to ideological differences.⁹⁸⁶ In contrast, the Seoul government did not realize the necessity of shifting its aggressive approach towards communist nations until Seoul had difficulty in reversing the volatile international situation.

China did not formally respond to South Korea's "Northern Policy" until Gorbachev and Roh Tae-woo came to power at the end of the 1980s. According to Zhang and Tan, Qian Qi-chen, the former Chinese Foreign Minister, was invited to attend a meeting with Roh Tae-woo in November 1991; both of them did not only have a deep concern about the development of the Sino-South Korean relations, but also about peace and stability on the Korean peninsula.⁹⁸⁷ Liu argues that Gorbachev's visit to China did not only mean an

⁹⁸³ Yoo, Hyon-joo. (2014). Reluctant flexibility caused by abandonment fears: a theoretical analysis of South Korea's approach towards China in the 1970s and the early 1980s. *The Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, 26(2), 225-242, p225.

⁹⁸⁴ Zhang, Lian-gui. (1990). Nanchaoxian de "beifangzhengce" [South Korea's "Northern Policy"]. *Lilun qianyan (Theory Front)*, (1), 18-20, p18.

⁹⁸⁵ Hao, Yu-fan. (1987). China and the Korean peninsula: a Chinese view. *Asian Survey*, 27(8), 862-884, p864, p866.

⁹⁸⁶ Yu, bing-yong. (1995). Hanguo de beifangzhengce [South Korea's "Northern Policy"]. *Dangdai hanguo (Contemporary Korea)*, (3), 14-17, p14.

⁹⁸⁷ Zhang, Ting-yan. & Tan, Jing. (2004). Chushi hanguo [Serving as a diplomat in South Korea]. *Shangdong*

opportunity to reduce the influence of the long-term Soviet military threat on China, but also to weaken North Korea's status in the aftermath of the Sino-Soviet détente.⁹⁸⁸ Deng highlights that Beijing did not receive the Soviet Union's promise to withdraw its military force from Mongolia until the 1989 Deng Xiaoping-Gorbachev summit.⁹⁸⁹ In other words, North Korea's diminishing leverage among the Northern Triangle enabled China to constitute a significant part of Korean affairs, which became a stimulus to China's changing policy towards the Korean peninsula. An additionally argues that the Roh Tae-woo administration considered the "Northern Policy" as a strategy to improve relations with the Soviet Union and China as well as to protect South Korea from North Korea's aggressive military actions.⁹⁹⁰ In contrast, South Korea aimed to erode North Korea's role in the Communist Camp by increasing unofficial relations with communist states.

Seoul's increasing economic inter-dependence with Moscow and Beijing contributed to the "Northern Policy", which tactically exerted pressure on Pyongyang. According to Park, South Korea developed trading relations with communist countries in the late 1980s, and these countries' expanding trading volume with South Korea acted as a stimulus to the termination of the "pro-Pyongyang approach".⁹⁹¹ Gong argues that the Gorbachev government on one hand attempted to develop trading relations with South Korea and Japan, on the other hand, intended to enable both states to be economic rivals while penetrating in the Soviet market.⁹⁹² Gorbachev emphasizes that the Soviet Union clarified the significance of adjusting economic

daxue chubanshe (Shandong University Publishing House), p33. & Zhang, Ting-yan. & Tan, Jing. (2007). *Yongyuan de jiyi [Eternal memory]*. *Shandong daxue chubanshe (Shandong University Publishing House)*, p44.

⁹⁸⁸ Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094, p1084.

⁹⁸⁹ Deng, Rong. (2004). Wode fuqin: Deng Xiao-ping - zhongjuan [My father: Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. *Zhongyang wenxian chubanshe (Central Party Literature Press)*, p143.

⁹⁹⁰ An, Bing-jun. & Hui, Shu. (1993). Beifang zhengce he nanbeihan guanxi [On the "Northern Policy" and the relationship between the two states on the Korean peninsula]. *Guoji zhengzhi yanjiu (The Journal of International Studies)*, (1), 90-97, p91.

⁹⁹¹ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p163.

⁹⁹² Gong, W. Gerrit. (1991). China and the dynamics of unification in northeast Asia. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 38(2), 95-106, p104.

system and embracing economic change in 1986, which meant that the Gorbachev administration aimed to accelerate the Soviet Union's business contact with the international community.⁹⁹³ In brief, Moscow did not plan to improve its trading ties until Gorbachev came to power, which suggested Moscow's interest-oriented policy thinking. Liu signifies that the Soviet Union and South Korea formally normalized diplomacy on 30th September 1990.⁹⁹⁴ In contrast, Moscow paid less attention to ideology, which further isolated Pyongyang in the Northern Triangle. Besides, Keum argues that the Roh Tae-woo administration strove to strengthen South Korea's economic contact with China and planned to enable China to exert influence on stability on the Korean peninsula.⁹⁹⁵ Zhang and Tan indicate that Beijing reached agreement with Seoul on the establishment of the mutual trade offices in Beijing and Seoul after the mutual trading volume had reached two billion dollars by October 1990.⁹⁹⁶ In other words, Seoul realized that Beijing played an important role in South Korea's economy in the 1980s, which suggested that Beijing caught an opportunity to build its political leverage in the context of the changing geo-political climate around northeast Asia.

Both China and South Korea focused on the development of the bilateral economic relations, which did not mean that China ignored its political relations with North Korea in the context of the "Northern Policy". Zhang argues China established constructive economic ties with states around the Asia Pacific in the wake of China's declaration of "Four Modernization Programme", which helped to explain that China became aware of the changes in the Sino-South Korean relations.⁹⁹⁷ The trading volume between China and South Korea laid a hard foundation for the Roh Tae-woo administration's "Northern Policy".⁹⁹⁸ In contrast, South

⁹⁹³ Gorbachev, Mikhail. (1995). Memoirs. Bantam Books, p609.

⁹⁹⁴ Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094, p1084.

⁹⁹⁵ Keum, Hieyeon. (1989). Recent Seoul-Beijing relations: process, prospects, and limitations. *Issues & Studies*, 25(3), p104.

⁹⁹⁶ Zhang, Ting-yan. & Tan, Jing. (2004). Chushi hanguo [Serving as a diplomat in South Korea]. *Shangdong daxue chubanshe (Shandong University Publishing House)*, p14.

⁹⁹⁷ Zhang, Ying-qing. (1995). Zhongguo de gaige kaifang zhengce yu zhongri, zhonghan guanxi [On China's "Opening and Reform Policy" and the diplomacies with Japan, South Korea]. *Guoji zhengzhi yanjiu (The Journal of International Studies)*, (2), 113-120, p113.

⁹⁹⁸ Eggleston, Karen. (1990). The political economy of Sino-South Korean relations: an exploratory analysis. *Korea Observer*, 21(3), p323.

Korea grasped an opportunity to promote business cooperation with China, which gradually decreased political hostility and increased economic inter-dependence. However, Deng emphasizes that China shall be mindful of peaceful evolution towards capitalism, and China shall have little doubts about the pursuit of socialism.⁹⁹⁹ Zhang and Tan argue that Deng Xiao-ping and Kim Il-Sung strengthened political relations through state-visits while China developed trading connection with South Korea and participated in the 1988 Seoul Olympic Games.¹⁰⁰⁰ Kim Il-Sung was invited to attend the Fifth Plenary Session of the Thirteenth Chinese Communist Party Central Committee ahead of the 1989 collapse of the Berlin Wall.¹⁰⁰¹ In other words, China on one hand carefully calculated the influence of east European communist states' political change on China, on the other hand, strategically treated the Sino-North Korean relations so as to diminish North Korea's anxiety about South Korea's trading connection with China.

⁹⁹⁹ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1993). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the third volume]. *Renmin chubanshe* (People's Publishing House), p344.

¹⁰⁰⁰ Zhang, Ting-yan. & Tan, Jing. (2007). Yongyuan de jiyi [Eternal memory]. *Shangdong daxue chubanshe* (Shangdong University Publishing House), 36-37.

¹⁰⁰¹ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p162.

China's perspective on Seoul's decision to remain relations with Taipei

China put an end to the bombardment of Jinmen (more commonly known as Kinmen) ahead of a letter to the Chinese compatriots in Taiwan, which reflected China's new policy thinking over Taiwan. According to Deng Xiao-ping, China was determined to realize its unification with Taiwan while China endeavoured to pursue economic increase in the 1980s.¹⁰⁰² On one hand, the Chinese government has emphasized peace and development since Deng Xiao-ping shifted state work, which became the premise of China's pragmatic approach towards Taiwan.¹⁰⁰³ In contrast, China did not terminate its aggressive approach towards Taiwan until Deng Xiao-ping became the paramount leader, which meant that the Deng Xiao-ping administration aimed to use a more strategic way for the settlement of its peaceful unification with Taiwan. On the other hand, Deng Xiao-ping had an intention to solve the questions on Hong Kong, Macao and Taiwan with more flexible means, which contributed to the "One Country, Two Systems" policy.¹⁰⁰⁴ From Taipei's perspective, Liu argues that Taipei recognized Beijing's pledge not to wage aggression wars against Taiwan as an essential to initiate talk with Beijing on the "One Country, Two Systems" policy.¹⁰⁰⁵ However, Deng Xiao-ping additionally emphasized that China strove for the peaceful settlement of the Taiwan question, which did not mean that China promised to renounce the use of force.¹⁰⁰⁶ In contrast, Beijing did not manage to reach agreement with Taipei on the unification with Taiwan in the context of Beijing's flexible diplomacy, which exerted pressure on Beijing in the international community.

South Korea still developed relations with Taiwan in the context of the United States' weak acknowledgement of the "One China" policy, which contributed to China's "Non-Policy" towards South

¹⁰⁰² Deng, Xiao-ping. (1983). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – dierjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p240.

¹⁰⁰³ Ruan, Xiao-jing. (2011). Dui Tai heping tongyi celve yanjiu [On China's peaceful unification strategy towards Taiwan]. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Fujian shifan daxue (Fujian Normal University)*, p1.

¹⁰⁰⁴ Deng, Rong. (2004). Wode fuqin: Deng Xiao-ping - zhongjuan [My father: Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. *Zhongyang wenxian chubanshe (Central Party Literature Press)*, p308.

¹⁰⁰⁵ Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094, p1089.

¹⁰⁰⁶ Ji, Chao-zhu. (2012). Cong hongqiang fanyi dao waijiaoguang: Ji Chao-zhu koushu huiyilu [From being a communist translator to being a diplomat: oral memoir by Ji Chao-zhu]. *Shanxi renmin chubanshe (Shanxi People's Publishing House)*, p120.

Korea. According to Kissinger and Roy, the Carter administration on one hand decided to advance the Sino-United States relations to a newly historic stage of development, on the other hand, put forward the Taiwan Relations Act that aimed to preserve the United States' influence on Taiwan.¹⁰⁰⁷ Huang argues that China viewed the Taiwan Relations Act as a violation of the Sino-United States full diplomacy as well as a continuum of the United States' defence treaty with Taiwan, which meant that the United States intervened in China's internal affairs.¹⁰⁰⁸ However, Liu argues that Beijing attempted to convince every state to admit the "One China" policy ahead of formal diplomatic relationship normalization, which aimed to weaken Taipei's role in the international community.¹⁰⁰⁹ In Beijing's view, these states that acknowledged Taipei equally helped Taipei to damage Beijing's legitimacy. Zhang and Tan highlight that Beijing had a serious concern about Seoul's long-term relations with Taipei, which increased Beijing's suspicion whether or not Seoul would put an end to its relations with Taipei.¹⁰¹⁰ China did not only consider the South Korean-Taiwanese relations as an obstacle to the normalization of the Sino-South Korean relations, but also to the peaceful settlement of the Taiwan question.

¹⁰⁰⁷ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. Penguin Press, p381. & Roy, Denny. (2003). Taiwan: a political history. Cornell University Press, p139.

¹⁰⁰⁸ Huang, Hua. (2007). Qinli yu Qinwen – HuangHua huiyilu [Qinli yu Qinwen – Memoir of HuangHua]. Shijie zhishi chubanshe (World Affairs Press), p257.

¹⁰⁰⁹ Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094, p1089.

¹⁰¹⁰ Zhang, Ting-yan. & Tan, Jing. (2004). Chushi hanguo [Serving as a diplomat in South Korea]. Shangdong daxue chubanshe (Shandong University Publishing House), p11.

China's economic policy towards South Korea in the Deng era: the rational actor explanation

The “Opening and Reform Policy”

The stagnated economic situation in the Mao era severely impeded the development of Chinese socialism, which constituted Deng Xiao-ping's “Opening and Reform Policy”. According to Deng Xiao-ping, China shall not cease to implement reform that would contribute to China's modernization programme and socialist cause.¹⁰¹¹ Dikotter argues that Mao struggled to build a strong socialist Chinese society and narrow the gap with advanced western countries through the “Great Leap Forward Movement” (1958-1962).¹⁰¹² However, Park argues that China suffered from economic crisis, and China's national strength fell into the lowest among socialist nations, even had difficulty in catching up with Taiwan and Hong Kong.¹⁰¹³ In other words, China's economic situation became more serious as a result of Mao's inappropriate economic practice, which imposed restriction on China's economic contact with the Socialist Camp and became an obstacle to China's status in the international community. Han and Ji emphasize that China would not speed up China's modernization construction and build up China's national strength without the “Opening and Reform Policy”.¹⁰¹⁴ Wu indicates that China's modernization programme would benefit little from the “Self-reliance” economic policy.¹⁰¹⁵ In contrast, the Deng Xiao-ping administration deeply understood the significance of shifting Mao's “Self-reliance” economic policy, which meant that China considered the “Opening and Reform Policy” as a strategy to serve China's socialist cause.

China underwent long-term un-development in the Mao era, which contributed to Deng Xiao-ping's “Four

¹⁰¹¹ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1983). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – di'erjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House), p150.

¹⁰¹² Dikotter, Frank. (2010). Mao's Great Famine – the history of China's most devastating catastrophe, 1958-1962. Bloomsbury Paperbacks, pxi.

¹⁰¹³ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) Durham University, Department of Politics, p45.

¹⁰¹⁴ Han, Zhen-feng. & Ji, Shu-yun. (2008). Deng Xiao-ping kaichuang gaigekaihang lishiweiye de yuanyin jianxi [On Deng Xiao-ping's determination to initiate the historic great cause – the “Opening and Reform Policy”]. Dalian ganbu xuekan (Journal of Dalian Official), 23(10), 4-7, p5.

¹⁰¹⁵ Wu, W. Y. Friedrich. (1981). From self-reliance to inter-dependence? Developmental strategy and foreign economic policy in post-Mao China. Modern China, 7(4), 445-482, p467.

Modernization Programme”. According to Deng Xiao-ping, China should pay attention to advanced nations’ economic developmental model that would help China to make progress, rather than continue to promote improper economic practice with the “Closed-door” policy.¹⁰¹⁶ Wu argues that Mao carried out the “Self-reliance” economic policy in order to develop China’s economy and strengthen China’s diplomacies with other socialist states after the Soviet Union had withdrawn assistance from China.¹⁰¹⁷ However, Park on one hand argues that China’s economy was on the brink of collapse in the context of Mao’s “Self-reliance” strategy, on the other hand, the Deng Xiao-ping administration considered the grave backwardness as a stimulus to China’s new economic policy.¹⁰¹⁸ Due to China’s serious economic recession, China had been isolated from the international community. Deng highlights that China’s economic decrease in the period of the Great Cultural Revolution enabled more and more people to realize the necessity of launching economic reform as well as restoring social order.¹⁰¹⁹ In contrast, Deng Xiao-ping on one hand had little doubt about that China’s economic situation would get worse in the context of Mao’s “Self-reliance” strategy, on the other hand, decided to utilize a newly practical economic strategy – the “Opening and Reform Policy” to boost China’s economy.

The Deng Xiao-ping administration corrected the principle of economic practice, which laid a hard foundation for China’s “Opening and Reform Policy”. According to Deng Xiao-ping, China should have a flexible attitude towards the principle of ‘seeking truth from facts’ for the sake of the realization of the “Four Modernization Programme”.¹⁰²⁰ Evans argues that Deng Xiao-ping decided to consider the principle of ‘seeking truth from practice’ as the central part of Mao Ze-dong’s thought.¹⁰²¹ Although China underwent

¹⁰¹⁶ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1983). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – dierjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. Renmin chubanshe (People’s Publishing House), p132.

¹⁰¹⁷ Wu, W. Y. Friedrich. (1981). From self-reliance to inter-dependence? Developmental strategy and foreign economic policy in post-Mao China. *Modern China*, 7(4), 445-482, p446.

¹⁰¹⁸ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China’s policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p45.

¹⁰¹⁹ Deng, Rong. (2004). Wode fuqin: Deng Xiao-ping - zhongjuan [My father: Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. *Zhongyang wenxian chubanshe (Central Party Literature Press)*, p271.

¹⁰²⁰ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1983). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – dierjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. Renmin chubanshe (People’s Publishing House), p143.

¹⁰²¹ Evans, Richard. (1995). Deng Xiao-ping and the making of modern China. *Penguin Book*, p229.

serious economic depression from the Great Leap Forward Movement (1958-1960) to the Great Cultural Revolution (1966-1976), Deng Xiao-ping and other Chinese reformists reached consensus on China's economic routine in the reforming era. Besides, Gao argues that 'practice' did not become the sole criteria for testing truth until the year of 1978, which meant that the Chinese government launched a new revolution of emancipating people's thinking.¹⁰²² In other words, the Chinese government utilized the principle of 'seeking truth from practice' to cater to China's economic increase. Deng indicates that the Chinese government decidedly put an end to the slogan of 'taking class struggle as the central task', and immediately paid much attention to the expansion of the productive forces after the 1978 Third Plenum of the Eleventh Chinese Communist Party Central Committee.¹⁰²³ In contrast, China formally shifted the focus of state work from political struggle to economic construction.

China caught an opportunity to establish full diplomacy with the United States and other capitalist states, which enabled China to have access to economic inter-dependence with the overseas market. According to Deng Xiao-ping, Chinese enterprises should view their endeavour to acquire advanced management and introduce leading technology as devotion to the realization of national development.¹⁰²⁴ On one hand, it was an earnest request for China's economic construction that China should spare no effort to increase internal steadiness and international supplies.¹⁰²⁵ In brief, China strove to meet all requirements that would contribute to the maximization of China's material interests. On the other hand, it was a significant breakthrough that China achieved its full diplomacies with the United States and Japan.¹⁰²⁶ Sutter argues that the Sino-United States relationship normalization provided China with an opportunity to introduce foreign investment and absorb advanced technologies from western states.¹⁰²⁷ Zhang emphasizes that the development of China's

¹⁰²² Gao, Yong. (2016). Wo gei Hu Yao-bang dang mishu [Record of being a secretary of Hu Yao-bang]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p229.

¹⁰²³ Deng, Rong. (2004). Wode fuqin: Deng Xiao-ping - zhongjuan [My father: Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. *Zhongyang wenxian chubanshe (Central Party Literature Press)*, 271-272.

¹⁰²⁴ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1983). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – dierjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p150.

¹⁰²⁵ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University, Department of Politics*, p59.

¹⁰²⁶ Evans, Richard. (1995). Deng Xiao-ping and the making of modern China. *Penguin Book*, p228.

¹⁰²⁷ Sutter, G. Rober. (1984). Relations of international power and China's independence in foreign affairs, 1981-1984. *Journal of Northeast Asian Studies*, III(4), 3-28, p5.

relations with the United States-led western states enabled China to ease security tension and boost economic growth.¹⁰²⁸ In other words, China endeavoured to improve its relations with the United States, which meant an opportunity to concentrate on China's socialist modernization.

However, China's relations with the United States-led western states worsened in the context of the Tiananmen Square Incident, which imposed harsh restrictions on China's modernization programme. According to Deng Xiao-ping, every country that aims to develop long-term business ties with the emerging market - China should pay attention to the long-term strategic interests and show respect for each other's interest, including the United States.¹⁰²⁹ Barry argues that the Deng Xiao-ping administration had a more obvious intention of achieving economic increase after the 1982 Twelfth Chinese Communist Party Central Committee.¹⁰³⁰ However, Park argues that China had difficulty in reversing the unstable international situation in the aftermath of the Tiananmen Square Incident that western countries described as crackdown on democracy.¹⁰³¹ Kim indicates that China's economic situation underwent serious changes after the Tiananmen Square Incident, especially, the United States and other capitalist countries ceased to make investment in China.¹⁰³² In contrast, it was a heavy blow to China's economy that western countries withdrew capital and technology from the Chinese market, which suggested that these conglomerates from Europe and America had a grave concern about economic instability in the wake of the political chaos. Liu additionally argues that the demise of western European socialist countries enabled the Chinese leadership to deeply believe the significance of China's economic increase to the survival of the socialist government.¹⁰³³ In other

¹⁰²⁸ Zhang, Ying-qing. (1995). Zhongguo de gaigekaifang zhengce yu zhongri, zhonghan guanxi [On China's "Opening and Reform Policy" and the diplomacies with Japan, South Korea]. *Guoji zhengzhi yanjiu* (*The Journal of International Studies*), (2), 113-120, p115.

¹⁰²⁹ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1993). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the third volume]. *Renmin chubanshe* (*People's Publishing House*), p330, p332.

¹⁰³⁰ Naughton, Barry. (1995). Deng Xiao-ping: the economist (Available from the book: Deng Xiao-ping: portrait of a Chinese statesman). Oxford: *Clarendon Press*, p97.

¹⁰³¹ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p200.

¹⁰³² Kim, Bae-won. (1991). Yellow Sea economic zone: vision or reality?. *Journal of Northeast Asian Studies*, X(1), p41.

¹⁰³³ Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11),

words, it did not become a nightmare to China until China realized the consequence of China's slow economic growth in the wake of the Tiananmen Square Incident, which helped to understand the Chinese leadership's determination to insist on the "Opening and Reform Policy".

The Chinese government endeavoured to transfer China into a modern socialist economic country, which imposed incentive on China's changing policy towards South Korea. According to Deng, China decided to build a well-off society in an all-around way after the 1978 Third Plenum of the Eleventh Chinese Communist Party Central Committee.¹⁰³⁴ On one hand, Kissinger argues that Deng Xiao-ping emphasized the urgency of bringing in advanced western states' investment and experience during his visit to the United States.¹⁰³⁵ Zhang considers China's "Opening and Reform Policy" as a strategy to achieve economic prosperity and accomplish social stability.¹⁰³⁶ On the other hand, Park argues that China realized the significance of South Korea's favourable economic advantages to China's pursuit of economic increase.¹⁰³⁷ From China's perspective, China should have a comprehensive understanding of foreign investment's role in China's economic modernization.¹⁰³⁸ From South Korea's aspect, South Korea had difficulty in developing its narrow domestic market, even though South Korea had achieved economic take-off ahead of the 1980s. Both sides realized the importance of mutual complementarity to each other's economic development, especially, South Korea has aimed to seek for new overseas market since South Korea expanded as one of the Four Asian Dragons.¹⁰³⁹ Viewed in this vein, it was necessary to adopt a more flexible

1083-1094, p1093.

¹⁰³⁴ Deng, Rong. (2004). Wode fuqin: Deng Xiao-ping - zhongjuan [My father: Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. *Zhongyang wenxian chubanshe* (Central Party Literature Press), p284.

¹⁰³⁵ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. Penguin Press, p361.

¹⁰³⁶ Zhang, Ying-qing. (1995). Zhongguo de gaigekaifang zhengce yu zhongri, zhonghan guanxi [On China's "Opening and Reform Policy" and the diplomacies with Japan, South Korea]. *Guoji zhengzhi yanjiu* (The Journal of International Studies), (2), 113-120, p115.

¹⁰³⁷ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p63.

¹⁰³⁸ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1983). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – dierjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. *Renmin chubanshe* (People's Publishing House), p156.

¹⁰³⁹ Shi, Yuan-hua. (2003). Zhongguo gaigekaifang yihou de dui han zhengce ji chaoxianhe wenti [On China's policy towards South Korea in the post-"Opening and Reform" era and the North Korean nuclear

approach towards South Korea that had capability to provide China with capital and technology.

South Korea and Taiwan did not become opponents until China aimed to attract direct investment and managerial experience from the overseas market, which meant that the “Opening and Reform Policy” was a strategy to weaken the Seoul-Taipei economic partnership. According to Zhang and Tan, China aimed to create a peaceful environment for China’s economic modernization in the reforming era, which helped to understand China’s attempt to reach cooperative relations with neighbouring states.¹⁰⁴⁰ On one hand, Deng argues that Deng Xiao-ping set up Four Special Economic Zones in order to expand economic connection and increase diplomatic leverage.¹⁰⁴¹ In contrast, China realized the imperative to enhance China’s role in the international community with the “Opening and Reform Policy”. On the other hand, Rubinstein argues that Taiwan’s ongoing economic increase helped to build its economic connection with the Chinese market in the 1980s.¹⁰⁴² Liu emphasizes that both South Korea and Taiwan realized the advantage of the newly emerging market – China, which meant that China grasped an opportunity to influence the development of the South Korean-Taiwanese relations while expanding economic cooperation with South Korea.¹⁰⁴³ Gong highlights that Taiwan attempted to impose restriction on Taiwanese companies’ investment in China in order to decrease China’s leverage.¹⁰⁴⁴ In other words, neither South Korea nor Taiwan would choose to give up the newly emerging market – China, which helped China to realize its increasing economic inter-dependence with South Korea as a tactic to weaken Taiwan’s role in South Korea’s policy thinking.

South Korea could not ignore its economic relations with Taiwan in the context of Taiwan’s rapid economic growth, which also prolonged China’s “Non-Policy” towards South Korea in the reforming era. According

issue]. *Hanguo yanjiu congjun (Collected Papers for Korean Studies)*, (0), 18-28, p20.

¹⁰⁴⁰ Zhang, Ting-yan. & Tan, Jing. (2004). Chushi hanguo [Serving as a diplomat in South Korea]. *Shangdong daxue chubanshe (Shandong University Publishing House)*, p10.

¹⁰⁴¹ Deng, Rong. (2004). Wode fuqin: Deng Xiao-ping - zhongjuan [My father: Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. *Zhongyang wenxian chubanshe (Central Party Literature Press)*, p281.

¹⁰⁴² Rubinstein, A. Murray. (1994). The other Taiwan: 1945 to the present. *An East Gate Book*, p11.

¹⁰⁴³ Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094, p1090.

¹⁰⁴⁴ Gong, W. Gerrit. (1991). China and the dynamics of unification in northeast Asia. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 38(2), 95-106, p101.

to Rubinstein, Taiwan adopted the “Export-oriented policy” and realized a historic economic take-off in the beginning of the 1970s, which helped citizens in the island to develop into businessmen.¹⁰⁴⁵ On one hand, Park argues that China decided to distinguish its business with South Korea from its diplomacy with South Korea, and the trading volume between China and South Korea reached 280 million dollars in 1981.¹⁰⁴⁶ On the other hand, Gong argues that China’s policy towards the Korean peninsula progressively changed in the context of the Roh Tae-woo administration’s “Northern Policy”, especially the Soviet Union fully normalized diplomacy with South Korea in 1990.¹⁰⁴⁷ In other words, South Korea boldly improved diplomatic relations and promoted trading connection with socialist states in the 1980s, which became a stimulus to the increasing economic inter-dependence between China and South Korea. However, Liu argues that Seoul regarded Taipei as a more important economic partner than Beijing, especially Taiwan remained the highest volume of foreign currency in the world.¹⁰⁴⁸ Heo and Kim indicate that both Seoul and Taipei understood the importance of the bilateral economic relations and established official contact for the convenience of regular talks.¹⁰⁴⁹ South Korea decided not to undermine its trading relations with Taiwan in order to develop its economy, which meant that Taiwan played a more vital role in South Korea’s economic policy calculation than China. Having looked at China’s economic relations with South Korea in the background of Deng Xiao-ping’s “Opening and Reform Policy”, the thesis will continue to explain the factional struggle between the Chinese reformists and the Chinese redicals and China’s changing attitude towards South Korea.

¹⁰⁴⁵ Rubinstein, A. Murray. (1994). The other Taiwan: 1945 to the present. *An East Gate Book*, p10.

¹⁰⁴⁶ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China’s policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p81.

¹⁰⁴⁷ Gong, W. Gerrit. (1991). China and the dynamics of unification in northeast Asia. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 38(2), 95-106, p98.

¹⁰⁴⁸ Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094, p1089.

¹⁰⁴⁹ Heo, Uk. & Kim, Hayam. (2012). Private-sector networks, democracy, and interstate relations: a case study of South Korea and Taiwan. *Asian Perspective*, (36), 71-93, p77.

China's policy towards South Korea in the Deng era: the bureaucratic approach explanation

The factional struggle between the Chinese reformists and the Chinese radicals

Deng Xiao-ping did not have a chance to put an end to his exile in Jiangxi province until the year of 1973, which accelerated the race for power between the reformists and the radicals in the Chinese Communist Party. According to Dillon and Deng, the Jiangxi leadership (Huang Zhi-zhen) received Zhou En-lai's instruction that Deng Xiao-ping had been agreed to return to the Chinese central government as soon as possible.¹⁰⁵⁰ In contrast, Deng Xiao-ping's ascent reflected the Chinese top leadership's complicated attitude towards the radicals in the catastrophic Cultural Revolution period. Spence indicates that the "anti-Lin Biao" movement prevailed in the year of 1974, which brought massive suspicions about the Chinese Communist Party's routines.¹⁰⁵¹ On one hand, Kissinger argues that Mao Ze-dong recognized Deng Xiao-ping as a significant role in the campaign of "anti-radicals" within the Chinese Communist Party Politburo.¹⁰⁵² Deng Xiao-ping's political career would not come into a newly crucial moment without Mao Ze-dong's permission. On the other hand, Evans argues that the "Gang of Four" had some doubts about whether or not they could continue to preserve their positions if Deng Xiao-ping became the paramount political figure after Mao Ze-dong, including Jiang Qing, Wang Hong-wen, Zhang Chun-qiao, Yao Wen-yuan.¹⁰⁵³ In other words, the "Gang of Four" had anxiety about the development of Chinese politics in the post-Mao era, which hinted the beginning of Deng Xiao-ping's risky road to be the survivor in the fierce factional struggle.

Deng Xiao-ping seized an opportunity to implement a small scale of reforms after his return to Beijing, which did not mean that Deng Xiao-ping received full support from the cabinet. Deng Xiao-ping was considered as the main foe by Jiang Qing who was Mao Ze-dong's wife after Deng Xiao-ping took charge of Chinese domestic and foreign affairs.¹⁰⁵⁴ In other words, the "Gang of Four" who had stronger uncertainty

¹⁰⁵⁰ Dillon, Michael. (2015). Deng Xiao-ping: the man who made modern China. *Ibtauris*, p199. & Deng, Rong. (2004). Wode fuqin: Deng Xiao-ping - zhongjuan [My father: Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. *Zhongyang wenxian chubanshe (Central Party Literature Press)*, p123.

¹⁰⁵¹ Spence, D. Johnathan. (1990). The search for modern China. *Norton*, p636.

¹⁰⁵² Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. *Penguin Press*, p322.

¹⁰⁵³ Evans, Richard. (1995). Deng Xiao-ping and the making of modern China. *Penguin Book*, p193.

¹⁰⁵⁴ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. *Penguin Press*, p322. & Ji, Chao-zhu. (2012). Cong hongqiang fanyi dao waijiaoguang: Ji Chao-zhu koushu huiyilu [From being a communist translator to being a diplomat: oral memoir by Ji Chao-zhu]. *Shanxi renmin chubanshe (Shanxi People's Publishing House)*, p109. & Deng,

about their political career did not cease to launch campaigns against the Chinese reformists. Instead, Wang Hong-wen, a typical radical representative, attempted to impose harsh restrictions on the Chinese reformists' political activities through a set of new rules and regulations.¹⁰⁵⁵ However, Dillon argues that Deng Xiao-ping had no alternative but to persuade these political elites who played an important role but persisted in Marxism to support his reform.¹⁰⁵⁶ In contrast, Deng Xiao-ping launched his reform in the context of the radicals' hostility and the opponents' suspicion. In spite of that, Deng Xiao-ping emphasized the importance of military discipline, economic development, scientific research and so on.¹⁰⁵⁷ In the wake of Deng Xiao-ping's pragmatism, the "anti-Deng" movement took place in the end of 1975.¹⁰⁵⁸ Viewed in this vein, Deng Xiao-ping's political struggle did not come to an end, which meant that Deng Xiao-ping did not achieve his economic reform in the Mao era.

The competition between the Chinese reformists and the Chinese radicals came into a decisive stage after Mao Ze-dong and Zhou En-lai passed away in the year of 1976, which impeded China's political stability. According to Vogel, both Mao Ze-dong and Zhou En-lai deeply understood the significance of reaching common sense of vital candidates of the next administration in the year of 1974.¹⁰⁵⁹ Kissinger argues that Mao Ze-dong on one hand considered some cadres who lost their political positions as candidates, on the

Rong. (2004). Wode fuqin: Deng Xiao-ping - zhongjuan [My father: Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. *Zhongyang wenxian chubanshe* (Central Party Literature Press), p129. & Zhao, Xiao-guang. & Liu, Jie. (2011). Deng Xiao-ping de sanluosanqi [The three falls and three rises of Deng Xiao-ping]. *Shenyang: Liaoning renmin chubanshe* (Liaoning People's Press), p198.

¹⁰⁵⁵ Evans, Richard. (1995). Deng Xiao-ping and the making of modern China. *Penguin Book*, p196.

¹⁰⁵⁶ Dillon, Michael. (2015). Deng Xiao-ping: the man who made modern China. *Ibtauris*, p204.

¹⁰⁵⁷ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1983). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – dierjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. *Renmin chubanshe* (People's Publishing House), 1-37. & Zhao, Xiao-guang. & Liu, Jie. (2011). Deng Xiao-ping de sanluosanqi [The three falls and three rises of Deng Xiao-ping]. *Shenyang: Liaoning renmin chubanshe* (Liaoning People's Press), p201.

¹⁰⁵⁸ Spence, D. Johnathan. (1990). The search for modern China. *Norton*, p649. & Deng, Rong. (2004). Wode fuqin: Deng Xiao-ping - zhongjuan [My father: Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. *Zhongyang wenxian chubanshe* (Central Party Literature Press), p219.

¹⁰⁵⁹ Vogel, F. Ezra. (2011). Deng Xiaoping and the transformation of China. *The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press*, p91.

other hand, realized Deng Xiao-ping as the sole political elite who had the capability to govern the state.¹⁰⁶⁰ Zhao and Liu argue that Mao Ze-dong had a grave concern about Deng Xiao-ping's attitude towards the Cultural Revolution, even though Deng Xiao-ping played an important role after Zhou En-lai had a serious disease.¹⁰⁶¹ However, plenty of senior officials' positions were immediately deprived once they were recognized as the one that pursued incorrect ideology in the period of the Cultural Revolution, and some elites were treated as "anti-party clique" after Mao Ze-dong died.¹⁰⁶² In brief, political instability immensely increased, which suggested the race for power among different factions in the Chinese Communist Party. Besides, Ji describes the political struggle as 'darkness', which suggested that many Chinese officials undertook huge pressure.¹⁰⁶³ In contrast, the fierce political struggle did not reach a peak until the demise of Mao Ze-dong, and an emerging number of Chinese officials were inevitably involved in the historic political struggle.

The Chinese pragmatists did not initiate the historic campaign against the "Gang of Four" until the death of Mao Ze-dong, which swept a key obstacle to the rise of the Chinese pragmatists. According to Kissinger and Deng Rong, the "Gang of Four's" main opponent – Deng Xiao-ping was removed from all his political positions after he delivered a eulogy at Zhou En-lai's funeral.¹⁰⁶⁴ In contrast, the "Gang of Four" was not content with Deng Xiao-ping's homage paid to Zhou En-lai, which resulted in a larger scale of the "anti-Deng" movement in the beginning of 1976.¹⁰⁶⁵ Vogel signifies that Mao Ze-dong considered Hua Guo-feng as his heir to cope with domestic and foreign affairs, and the "Gang of Four" did not voice any

¹⁰⁶⁰ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. Penguin Press, p323.

¹⁰⁶¹ Zhao, Xiao-guang. & Liu, Jie. (2011). Deng Xiao-ping de sanluosanqi [The three falls and three rises of Deng Xiao-ping]. Shengyang: Liaoning renmin chubanshe (Liaoning People's Press), 209-210.

¹⁰⁶² Ch'i, His-sheng. (1991). Politics disillusionment: the Chinese Communist Party under Deng Xiao-ping, 1978-1989 (Studies on contemporary China). Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe, Inc., An East Great Book: p3.

¹⁰⁶³ Ji, Chao-zhu. (2012). Cong hongqiang fanyi dao waijiaoguang: Ji Chao-zhu koushu huiyilu [From being a communist translator to being a diplomat: oral memoir by Ji Chao-zhu]. Shanxi renmin chubanshe (Shanxi People's Publishing House), p110.

¹⁰⁶⁴ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. Penguin Press, p327.

¹⁰⁶⁵ Deng, Rong. (2004). Wode fuqin: Deng Xiao-ping - zhongjuan [My father: Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. Zhongyang wenxian chubanshe (Central Party Literature Press), p227.

disagreement.¹⁰⁶⁶ Besides, Ji indicates that the Chinese Foreign Ministry was involved with a drastic political struggle, and some cadres were expelled from their offices in May 1976.¹⁰⁶⁷ In other words, Mao Ze-dong's demise accelerated the political struggle between the Chinese pragmatists and the Chinese radicals. However, Evans argues that the "Gang of Four" reached an agreement that Hua Guo-feng should not be recognized as Mao Ze-dong's heir after Mao passed away in September 1976, which helped to explain why Hua Guo-feng agreed to overthrow the "Gang of Four".¹⁰⁶⁸ Instead, the "Gang of Four's" ambition of replacing Hua Guo-feng's position as the Chairman buried the "Gang of Four's" political lives.

The downfall of the "Gang of Four" did not mean that the Chinese pragmatists achieved full success, which prolonged the progress of China's economic reform. Ji considers Deng Xiao-ping as the rare political member who strove to protect China from tending toward the Left.¹⁰⁶⁹ However, Kissinger argues that Deng Xiao-ping faced with his second political crisis ahead of China's full-scale modernization programme.¹⁰⁷⁰ Ch'i additionally argues that Hua Guo-feng, the heir to Mao Ze-dong, completely endorsed Mao's practice after the "Gang of Four" was defeated.¹⁰⁷¹ In other words, the ramification of the Cultural Revolution did not completely diminish in the post-Mao era, even though Chinese political development entered into a new stage. On one hand, Vogel indicates that Hua Guo-feng whole-heartedly followed Mao Ze-dong's revolutionary routine, which partly explained why Hua Guo-feng was immune from political struggle and

¹⁰⁶⁶ Vogel, F. Ezra. (2011). Deng Xiaoping and the transformation of China. *The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press*, p162.

¹⁰⁶⁷ Ji, Chao-zhu. (2012). Cong hongqiang fanyi dao waijiaoguang: Ji Chao-zhu koushu huiyilu [From being a communist translator to being a diplomat: oral memoir by Ji Chao-zhu]. *Shanxi renmin chubanshe (Shanxi People's Publishing House)*, p118.

¹⁰⁶⁸ Evans, Richard. (1995). Deng Xiao-ping and the making of modern China. *Penguin Book*, p215-216.

¹⁰⁶⁹ Ji, Chao-zhu. (2012). Cong hongqiang fanyi dao waijiaoguang: Ji Chao-zhu koushu huiyilu [From being a communist translator to being a diplomat: oral memoir by Ji Chao-zhu]. *Shanxi renmin chubanshe (Shanxi People's Publishing House)*, p122.

¹⁰⁷⁰ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. *Penguin Press*, p327.

¹⁰⁷¹ Ch'i, His-sheng. (1991). Politics disillusionment: the Chinese Communist Party under Deng Xiao-ping, 1978-1989 (Studies on contemporary China). Armonl, New York: *M.E. Sharpe, Inc.*, An East Great Book: p3.

his position was elevated quickly in the Mao era.¹⁰⁷² On the other hand, the “Two Whatevers” viewpoint meant that the Hua Guo-feng administration was determined to implement policies and to maintain instructions made by Mao Ze-dong.¹⁰⁷³ In contrast, Hua Guo-feng did not make a deep and profound reflection of Maoist economic strategy and foreign policy, but adhere to Mao’s perspective without any slightest change – the “Two Whatevers” viewpoint.

The Chinese pragmatists did not seize an opportunity to correct Mao’s economic practice until Deng Xiaoping’s second rise, which put an end to Maoist routine. According to Liu, Hua Guo-feng still insisted on the “Two Whatevers” viewpoint while the Chinese Communist Party aimed to rectify improper political and ideological lines, which meant a new obstacle to the Chinese pragmatists.¹⁰⁷⁴ Spence argues that the Chinese leadership could not reach a consensus of China’s diplomatic approach and economic routine until 1978, even though Deng Xiaoping had revived as the vice-premier in July 1977.¹⁰⁷⁵ In contrast, the cabinet still had doubts about how to govern the socialist state in the post-Mao era, which should be viewed as such a choice full of difficulty and uncertainty. However, Deng Xiaoping on one hand clarifies that the “Two Whatevers” viewpoint should not be recognized as a part of Marxism, on the other hand indicates that “Mao Ze-dong Thought” should be correctly comprehended.¹⁰⁷⁶ Besides, Zang notes that Hua Guo-feng agreed to

¹⁰⁷² Vogel, F. Ezra. (2011). Deng Xiaoping and the transformation of China. *The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press*, p161.

¹⁰⁷³ Zang, Ru-yue. (2017). Hua Guo-feng yu “liangge fanshi” [Hua Guo-feng and the “Two whatevers” viewpoint]. *Tianjin daxue (Tianjin University)*, p61. & Salisbury, E. Harrison. (1993). The new emperors: Mao and Deng. *HarperCollins Publisher*: p378. & Deng, Rong. (2004). Wode fuqin: Deng Xiao-ping - zhongjuan [My father: Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. *Zhongyang wenxian chubanshe (Central Party Literature Press)*, p265. & Gao, Yong. (2016). Wo gei Hu Yao-bang dang mishu [Record of being a secretary of Hu Yao-bang]. *Renmin chubanshe (People’s Publishing House)*, p227.

¹⁰⁷⁴ Liu Gui-jun. (2016). Lishi shi zheyang zhuanzhede – lun Deng Xiao-ping, Chen Yun yu shishi qiushi sixiangluxian de chongxin queli [The historical turning point – on the re-confirmation of Deng Xiao-ping’s, Chen Yun’s thought – “seeking truth from facts”]. *Deng Xiao-ping yanjiu (Deng Xiao-ping Research)*, (3), 63-71.

¹⁰⁷⁵ Spence, D. Johnathan. (1990). The search for modern China. *Norton*, p653.

¹⁰⁷⁶ Deng, Rong. (2004). Wode fuqin: Deng Xiao-ping - zhongjuan [My father: Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. *Zhongyang wenxian chubanshe (Central Party Literature Press)*, p270. & Deng, Xiao-ping. (1983). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – dierjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People’s Publishing House)*, p38-40. & Zhao, Xiao-guang. & Liu, Jie. (2011). Deng Xiao-ping

see “Mao Ze-dong Thought” as guidance of the Chinese Communist Party in the 1977 Third Plenum of the Tenth Chinese Communist Party Central Committee, which formally terminated the “Two Whatevers” viewpoint.¹⁰⁷⁷ In other words, the majority of Chinese cadres did not recognize Hua Guo-feng’s “Two Whatevers” viewpoint, which meant that the Chinese government prepared to utilize new policy thinking in the Deng Xiao-ping era.

China’s economic policy did not utterly change until the 1978 Third Plenum of the Eleventh Chinese Communist Party Central Committee, which meant that the Chinese reformists paved a way for China’s “Four Modernization Programme”. According to Ji, Deng Xiao-ping’s second rise in the Chinese Communist Party helped to terminate the long-term political instability, which meant that the Chinese government decided not to continue with the “ultra-leftist” routine at the 1978 Third Plenum of the Eleventh Chinese Communist Party Central Committee.¹⁰⁷⁸ Kissinger argues that Hua Guo-feng and Deng Xiao-ping put forward different perspectives on China’s modernization: Hua embraced the Soviet economic development model, but Deng emphasized the necessity of livelihood economy.¹⁰⁷⁹ In contrast, the Chinese leadership had rejected Hua Guo-feng’s “Two Whatevers” viewpoint, which did not mean that they reached consensus about which way to follow. However, Deng argues that the Chinese leadership should ‘seek truth from facts’ and ‘set free from old ideas’ in December 1978, which suggested that the Chinese government aimed to set a rational attitude towards China’s economic reform.¹⁰⁸⁰ Spence emphasizes that the Chinese government decided to achieve the “Four Modernization Programme”, rather than pay attention to such a

de sanluosanqi [The three falls and three rises of Deng Xiao-ping]. Shengyang: Liaoning renmin chubanshe (Liaoning People’s Press), 218-219. & Gao, Yong. (2016). Wo gei Hu Yao-bang dang mishu [Record of being a secretary of Hu Yao-bang]. Renmin chubanshe (People’s Publishing House), p227.

¹⁰⁷⁷ Zang, Ru-yue. (2017). Hua Guo-feng yu “liangge fanshi” [Hua Guo-feng and the “Two whatevers” viewpoint]. Tianjin daxue (Tianjin University), p61.

¹⁰⁷⁸ Ji, Chao-zhu. (2012). Cong hongqiang fanyi dao waijiaoguang: Ji Chao-zhu koushu huiyilu [From being a communist translator to being a diplomat: oral memoir by Ji Chao-zhu]. Shanxi renmin chubanshe (Shanxi People’s Publishing House), p110, 122.

¹⁰⁷⁹ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. Penguin Press, p330.

¹⁰⁸⁰ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1983). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – dierjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. Renmin chubanshe (People’s Publishing House), p140. & Zhao, Xiao-guang. & Liu, Jie. (2011). Deng Xiao-ping de sanluosanqi [The three falls and three rises of Deng Xiao-ping]. Shengyang: Liaoning renmin chubanshe (Liaoning People’s Press), p225.

small number of critics who attempted to damage China's economic reform.¹⁰⁸¹ In other words, the Chinese government formally confirmed Deng Xiao-ping's economic routine at the Third Plenum of the Eleventh Chinese Communist Party Central Committee, which directly consolidated the Chinese pragmatists' political status as well as governing principles.

The Chinese pragmatists who aimed to realize China's "Four Modernization Programme" formally came into power in 1978, which suggested the Chinese government recognized these reformists' role in the cause of China's economic modernization. According to Park, the Deng Xiao-ping administration considered the "Four Modernization Programme" as the most vital part of China's state work, which served as a stimulus to the promotion of China's economic development with the "Opening and Reform Policy".¹⁰⁸² Kissinger argues that the idea of "Opening and Reform" prevailed at the 1978 Third Plenum of the Eleventh Chinese Communist Party Central Committee, which meant that the Chinese leadership decided to abolish Mao Ze-dong's "Self-reliance" strategy and to adopt Zhou En-lai's "Four Modernization Programme".¹⁰⁸³ In contrast, the Chinese government did not realize the importance of using pragmatic economic policy to pursue economic interest until the Chinese reformists returned to the Central Committee. On one hand, Spence indicates that the 1978 Third Plenum hinted a thorough change of personnel in the Chinese political arena: the Chinese government was determined to clear away the obstacles to China's "Four Modernization Programme".¹⁰⁸⁴ On the other hand, Deng Xiao-ping viewed Chinese cadres' courage to do exploration and innovation as a contribution to China's socialist modernization career, which meant that the Deng Xiao-ping government attempted to lead China to the reforming age.¹⁰⁸⁵ In other words, Deng Xiao-ping tactically raised these political members' positions who supported China's pragmatic economic practice in order to ensure the historic "Four Modernization Programme".

China's foreign policy came into a new stage in the context of China's "Four Modernization Programme", which meant that the Chinese reformists adopted a more flexible approach towards overseas states.

¹⁰⁸¹ Spence, D. Johnathan. (1990). The search for modern China. Norton, p657.

¹⁰⁸² Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) Durham University, Department of Politics, p43.

¹⁰⁸³ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. Penguin Press, p335.

¹⁰⁸⁴ Spence, D. Johnathan. (1990). The search for modern China. Norton, p657.

¹⁰⁸⁵ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1983). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – dierjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House), p143.

According to Deng Xiao-ping, the history of the PRC did not enter into a great turning point until China decided to promote the economic modernization programme in a comprehensive manner.¹⁰⁸⁶ Shambaugh argues that Deng Xiao-ping planned to bring China into the reforming era after Deng Xiao-ping's second purge, rather than continue to use Mao Ze-dong's strategies.¹⁰⁸⁷ Besides, Park argues that Chinese foreign policy in the Deng Xiao-ping era was a combination of a small group of Chinese political elites' recognition of China's national interests as well as their own pursuits, and Deng Xiao-ping played an important role in the foreign policy decision-making process.¹⁰⁸⁸ In contrast, the Chinese pragmatists came into power and re-adjusted China's policies, which hinted that the Chinese reformists' rise in the fierce factional struggle with the Chinese radicals. On one hand, Westad suggests that the United States had a deep concern about the economic race with advanced states in the 1980s, including Europe and Japan.¹⁰⁸⁹ In contrast, the competition resulted in the United States' trading frictions with Europe and Japan, which helped to stimulate these developed nations' economic relations with new markets. On the other hand, Marti indicates that the Chinese government considered its formal normalization relationship with western states as a necessity to China's economic construction.¹⁰⁹⁰ In other words, the Chinese government strove to adopt a more flexible approach towards western nations in the context of the Chinese reformists' return to power, which suggested that the Chinese pragmatists paid more attention to economic interest than ideological concern.

The Chinese reformists who played an active role in the "Opening and Reform Policy" boldly initiated China's economic policy towards South Korea. According to Kim, it was certain that China carefully re-estimated its interest on the Korean peninsula after the declaration of the "Four Modernization Programme".¹⁰⁹¹ Park argues that China's foreign policy and its policy towards the Korean peninsula did not

¹⁰⁸⁶ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1983). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – dierjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p159.

¹⁰⁸⁷ Shambaugh, David. (1995). Deng Xiao-ping: portrait of a Chinese statesman. *Oxford University Press*, p1.

¹⁰⁸⁸ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p46.

¹⁰⁸⁹ Westad, Arne. Odd. (2013). Restless empire: China and the world since 1750. London: *Vintage Books*, p378.

¹⁰⁹⁰ Mati, E. Michael. (2002). China and the legacy of Deng Xiao-ping: from communist revolution to capitalist evolution. Washington D.C.: *Brassey's, Inc.*, p10.

¹⁰⁹¹ Kim, Hak-joon. (1991). China's Korea policy since the Tiananmen Square Incident. *The China Challenge*:

change until the Chinese pragmatists seized an opportunity to wield political power in the competition with the Chinese radicals.¹⁰⁹² In contrast, China would possibly continue with Mao's policy towards the Korean peninsula once the Chinese reformists failed to overthrow the "Gang of Four". Besides, Lee argues that both Beijing and Seoul on one hand considered each other as a threat from the 1950s to the 1970s, on the other hand, expected to improve such a long-term tense bilateral relations without annoying Pyongyang and Taipei.¹⁰⁹³ Both China and South Korea must carefully calculate every possible gain and loss if both states decided to adopt a more flexible approach to develop economic relations. Chung indicates that the trading volume between China and South Korea in 1979 reached 19 million dollars.¹⁰⁹⁴ In other words, China intended to change its hostile approach towards South Korea and developed secret economic relations in the background of the Chinese reformists' dynamic diplomatic approach and pragmatic economic construction, even though China remained its alliance relationship with North Korea.

South Korea caught an opportunity to enhance the trading connection with China in the aftermath of the Tiananmen Square Incident, which further contributed to China's pragmatic approach towards South Korea. According to Deng Xiao-ping, China should rationally consider the development of its friendly diplomacy, rather than ignore the development of China's relations with the United States and western countries that imposed sanctions on China's economy in the late 1980s.¹⁰⁹⁵ Liu argues that China attempted to improve China's economy by repairing foreign relations, which persuaded the Chinese government to adopt a more flexible approach towards the outer world.¹⁰⁹⁶ In contrast, the Chinese leadership did not only completely realize the influence of the United States' and other western states' influence on China's economy, but also consider ways to promote more favourable foreign relations for China economic increase as the most

American Policies in East Asia, *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 38(2), 107-114, p107.

¹⁰⁹² Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p44.

¹⁰⁹³ Lee, Chae-jin. (1996). China and Korea: dynamic relations. Stanford: *The Hoover Press*.

¹⁰⁹⁴ Chung, Jae-ho. (2003/2004). From a special relationship to a normal partnership: interpreting the "garlic battle" in Sino-South Korean relations. *Pacific Affairs*, 76(4), 549-568, p549.

¹⁰⁹⁵ Deng, Xiao-ping. (1993). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the third volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p359.

¹⁰⁹⁶ Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094, p1093.

significant part of Chinese diplomacy. Besides, Kim argues that both China's domestic changes and the Korean peninsula situation played an active role in China's economic policy towards South Korea.¹⁰⁹⁷ On one hand, Park highlights that South Korea showed little hesitation to develop economic relations with China, which was in contrast to the United States that imposed pressure on China after the Tiananmen Square Incident.¹⁰⁹⁸ On the other hand, Zhang indicates that China formally became the fourth largest economic partnership of South Korea in 1991.¹⁰⁹⁹ In other words, Beijing and Seoul pragmatically re-confirmed the significance of developing bilateral economic cooperative relations as a result of the increasing trading volume, which meant that both sides agreed to set aside political ideology.

¹⁰⁹⁷ Kim, Hak-joon. (1991). China's Korea policy since the Tiananmen Square Incident. The China Challenge: American Policies in East Asia, *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 38(2), 107-114, p108.

¹⁰⁹⁸ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p202.

¹⁰⁹⁹ Zhang, Ying-qing. (1995). Zhongguo de gaigekaifang zhengce yu zhongri, zhonghan guanxi [On China's "Opening and Reform Policy" and the diplomacies with Japan, South Korea]. *Guoji zhengzhi yanjiu* (*The Journal of International Studies*), (2), 113-120, p119.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I explained China's newly policy calculation towards South Korea in the reforming era. China's foreign and economic policies towards South Korea underwent significant changes in the context of China's complex relations with the two leading states. On one hand, China developed friendly relations with and attracted foreign investment from capitalist countries in the aftermath of the Sino-United States relationship normalization, which stimulated China's secret trading connection with South Korea in the 1980s. In contrast, the United States and other capitalist states grasped an opportunity to impose influence on China's economy, which conversely promoted China's business relations with South Korea as a result of the Tiananmen Square Incident. In brief, the increasing economic inter-dependence laid a hard foundation for the 1992 full diplomacy between China and South Korea. On the other hand, Beijing insisted on the "pro-Pyongyang approach" in order to protect Pyongyang from leaning towards Moscow, which meant that Beijing had a serious concern on the Moscow-Pyongyang relations. In spite of Gorbachev's visit to China, the Chinese leadership considered economic increase as a strategy to keep China from economic crisis as well as stop socialism from sudden collapse, which suggested that the Chinese leadership became cautious about the political chaos in eastern European socialist states. In other words, China insisted on the policy of "Separation of Diplomacy and Economy" towards South Korea in order to decrease security threat and enhance economic inter-dependence in the Deng era.

In the meantime, China's political struggle reached a peak in the wake of Mao's demise, which contributed to explanation of the impact of Deng Xiao-ping's and other Chinese reformists' rise on China's diplomatic and economic policies. On one hand, the competition between the Chinese radicals and the Chinese reformists significantly influenced China's political development. In contrast, the smash on the "Gang of Four" and the Chinese reformists' return to power put an end to Mao's improper economic practice. On the other hand, Deng Xiao-ping did not become the paramount leader until the 1978 Third Plenum of the Eleventh Chinese Communist Party Central Committee, which meant that Chinese political elites did not agree on Hua Guo-Feng's viewpoint of "Two-Whatevers". In other words, the Chinese reformists considered economic development as state work and declared the "Opening and Reform Policy", which reflected that Deng Xiao-ping and other Chinese reformists achieved a success in the fierce political struggle with the "Gang of Four". In brief, China did not utilize a more flexible diplomacy to enhance economic relations with the overseas market until the Chinese reformists took power, which meant that these reformists viewed the pursuit of material interests as an element in Chinese foreign policy decision-making process. Based on the interest-driven policy principle, the Chinese government emphasized the significance of economic construction that could help to prevent the Chinese from losing confidence on the ruling party – the Chinese Communist Party. Viewed in this vein, the Chinese pragmatists played an active role in the "Four Modernization Programme", which served as a stimulus to China's secret trading connection with South Korea in the reforming era.

Chapter Three: China's policy towards South Korea in the post-Deng era

Introduction

In accordance with the theoretical framework, the chapter will continue using the rational actor approach to analyze China's policy towards South Korea in the post-Cold War period. The third chapter aims to explain factors that constituted China's "Two-Koreas Policy", which should be viewed as a combination of China's new policy calculation over security, diplomacy and economy in the post-Deng era. In this chapter, I will illustrate the impact of the dissolution of the Soviet Union on China's changing policy thinking over South Korea. In brief, China did not adopt the "Two-Koreas Policy" until the Gorbachev administration announced the demise of the Soviet empire, which helped to understand China's decision to establish a full diplomacy with South Korea. In other words, I will analyze the impact of the implosion of the Soviet Union on China's role in the Korean peninsula and on its security policy towards South Korea. Both China and the United States have increased presence in the Korean peninsula since the break-up of the Soviet Union, I will thereby interpret the United States' role in the Korean peninsula and its leverage in South Korea, which has been also an inseparable apparatus of China's post-war policy concern on the Korean peninsula. Simultaneously, I will introduce China's foreign policy as well as economic strategy that contributed to China's rise, which had a complex influence on China's security interest and economic development. In other words, I will explain the influence of China's economic rise on China's policy concern on China's "Two-Koreas Policy".

In 1992, both China and South Korea agreed to accelerate the secret trading relations into the formal normalized diplomacy. It meant that China put an end to the long-term "One-Korea Policy" that reflected China's policy priority on North Korea.¹¹⁰⁰ In contrast, China's "Two-Koreas Policy" signified China's new policy consideration on South Korea in the post-Cold War era. In the first section, I will argue that the purpose of this chapter is to explain factors that constituted China's changing policy towards South Korea, even though there has been plenty of scholarship on China's "Two-Koreas Policy" in the context of China's peace-oriented diplomatic relationship and interest-driven economic partnership with South Korea. In the second section, I will summarize factors that influenced China's security policy thinking in the background of China's expanding role in northeast Asia, including the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the United States' military presence in South Korea. In the third section, I will identify China's "Two-Koreas Policy" in the context of China's peaceful diplomacy and South Korea's "Northern Policy" ("北方政策" – beifang zhengce), and clarify the importance of China's pursuit of stability to China's changing calculation on South Korea in the post-Deng era. In the fourth section, I will argue that China's economic rise and its impact on China's "Two-Koreas Policy" in the context of China's "Opening and Reform Policy", which aims to identify the increasing economic inter-dependence's multiple roles in China's policy thinking on South

¹¹⁰⁰ Yi, X. (1995). China's Korea policy: from 'One Korea' to 'Two Koreas'. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 22(2), 119-140, p119.

Korea.

Background

It has been difficult to tell advantages and disadvantages that China maintained in the post-Deng Xiao-ping era. China's uneasy relations with the two leading states came into a newly historic stage in the context of the fall of the Soviet Union, which plainly suggested that China must react to political changes with a different strategy to ensure China's security protection, diplomatic achievement and economic construction. China did not boldly change its policy towards South Korea until the demise the Soviet Union, which brought new opportunity and challenge on the Korean peninsula in the post-Cold War period. On one hand, the break-up of the Soviet Union further enabled China to play a more active role in the Korean peninsula, which meant that China did not have a chance to downgrade the leverage of the Soviet Union and North Korea on China's security until the end of the Cold War.¹¹⁰¹ Although the Soviet Union had withdrawn troops from the Sino-Soviet border, North Korea was entirely deprived of the playing of the 'Soviet threat' towards China in the background of the dissolution of the Soviet Union. From Beijing's aspect, it was necessary to consider both Moscow and Pyongyang as factors that could not under-estimate in the course of the realization of full diplomacy between China and South Korea. On the other hand, China realized the urgency of accomplishing its modernization programme in case of the collapse of the Chinese Communist Party regime after the Soviet Union was separated into fifteen nations, which meant that China undertook heavier economic development burden. Seoul was turned into a more important trading partner to Beijing after Beijing had been faced with economic sanction and pressure. With the increasing economic inter-dependence, China thereby reached agreement with South Korea on the establishment of diplomatic relations, and the Chinese leadership decided to view the development of the Sino-South Korean relations as a typical example of China's flexible diplomatic thinking over other capitalist states in the aftermath of the Tiananmen Square Incident. In other words, China formally adopted the "double strategy" in order to maintain its traditional alliance relationship with North Korea and develop its newly economic partnership with South Korea, which suggested that China's rational policy thinking enabled to equalize security interest and commercial benefit.

Simultaneously, China has been the largest economic partner of North Korea that relied on the Soviet Union's financial assistance and military supplies in the Cold War period, which suggested North Korea's declining leverage on China's calculation on China's policy towards the Korean peninsula. In detail, North Korea did not only turn into the weakest party among the Moscow-Pyongyang-Beijing triangle relations, but also slide into a hermit kingdom that has been largely restricted with diplomatic hostility and economic stagnation.¹¹⁰²

¹¹⁰¹ Qian, Qi-chen. (2003). Waijiao shiji [Ten episodes in China's diplomacy]. Beijing: *Shijie zhishi chubanshe (World Affairs Press)*, p33. & Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094, p1084.

¹¹⁰² Lankov, Andrei. (2015). The real North Korea: life and politics in the failed Stalinist utopia. Oxford University Press, p78.

In the background of the split-up of the Soviet Union, North Korea was immediately deprived of such an absolute favourable position that both the Soviet Union and China must take North Korea's attitude into account while the Soviet Union had a rift with China. In the context of the collapse of the Soviet empire, both Russia and China strove to concentrate on solutions of national development, which conversely suggested North Korea's decreasing capability of attracting attention from its former allies.¹¹⁰³ With China's increasing economic development, China has aimed to act as a more influential role in North Korea's economy. Instead, North Korea's increasing economic inter-dependence with China provided China with more leverage on its changing approach towards South Korea. China agreed on South Korea's bid to be a member of the United Nations, which suggested China's efforts to encourage both states in the Korean peninsula to decrease tensions. In spite of that, North Korea's desperate pursuit of being a nuclear power has been a burden to China's policy towards the Korean peninsula, which has distracted China's attention from a more peaceful and stable environment for its economic growth.

However, the demise of the Soviet Union suggested that China could not play the "Soviet card" towards the United States, which contributed to China's new strategic calculation towards South Korea in the post-1990s. The United States formerly became the sole hegemonic superpower that maintained military presence as well as expanded economic growth in the aftermath of the break-up of the Soviet Union. Besides, the leading state's attitude towards China influenced China's reaction to global affairs. China has been an emerging threat to the United States since the division of the Soviet Union, which has been a vital drive to China that must properly deal with the Sino-United States relationship. In contrast, the Chinese government has paid huge attention to the United States that has played a crucial role in China's overall policy calculation since the demise of the Cold War, which means that China could not under-estimate the United States' global economic influence and military presence. Therefore, the Chinese leadership persisted that China expected to build peace and stability in the context of China's "Low-profile" strategy ("韬光养晦"策略 – taoguangyanghui celve), which aimed to decrease the United States' suspicion of whether or not China could expand into a new powerful state similar to the Soviet Union that competed with the United States in the Cold War period. In other words, China endeavoured to decrease possible impacts of the United States' changing approach towards China in the post-1990s, and China's peaceful approach towards overseas states stimulated the process of the Sino-South Korean relationship normalization. In the context of China's "Good-neighbour" policy ("睦邻友好"政策 – mulinyouhao zhengce), China decided to take part in multi-diplomacy and regional cooperation in order to sustain peace.¹¹⁰⁴

¹¹⁰³ Smith, Hazel. (2015). North Korea: markets and military rule. Cambridge University Press, p197.

¹¹⁰⁴ Liu, Chang. & Hao, Xiang-yang. (2009). Qianxi zhongguo mulinzhengce de xianzhuang yu fazhan [On current situation and later tendency of China's "Good-neighbour" policy]. *Keji xinxi (Science & Technology Information)*, (19), 524.

The Bush administration (2001-2009) did not declare the “anti-terrorist” strategy until the 911 Terrorist Attacks broke out, which suddenly changed the United States’ foreign policy thinking over international affairs. The United States immediately shifted its focus from east Asia to the Middle East and devoted to the War on Terror in order to contain the “Axis of Evil”, which helped China to relieve from the Bush government’s persistence in labelling China as a key foe.¹¹⁰⁵ Viewed in this aspect, China did not prepare to confront with the United States, but decide to further strengthen its relations with the United States. In the context of the progressing Sino-United States relations, China caught an opportunity to enhance its relations with the United States and other industrial states and strengthen its economic relations with the international market. In addition, South Korea changed its attitude towards North Korea after Kim Dae-jung and other South Korean progressives came to power, which eased tensions in the Korean peninsula in the context of South Korea’s “Sunshine Policy”.¹¹⁰⁶ In other words, the situation on northeast Asia came into a new phase, which further influenced China’s policy calculation on the Korean peninsula. On one hand, China strove for a more active role in regional affairs, and China helped North Korea to promote the “Six-Party Talk”. On the other hand, China endeavoured to pursue economic development in the post-2000s, which further built the increasing economic inter-dependence and constituted the strategic cooperative partnership with South Korea. The United States and its ally in northeast Asia – South Korea maintained friendly relations with China, which helped China to relieve from the strategic dilemma posed by the First Military Island Chain.

With the rapid economic development, China has become the second largest economic entity in the world, which helped to explain the imperative of strengthening its military capacity and building its overseas military base. According to Reuters, it was reported that Djibouti was selected as the first naval base by China.¹¹⁰⁷ However, it has been such a controversy to describe the influence of China’s rise on China’s policy towards South Korea. From Seoul’s perspective, the best scenario tends to develop its commercial relations with Beijing and enhance its military alliance with Washington, which conversely means that Seoul must be

¹¹⁰⁵ Westad, Arne. Odd. (2013). Restless empire: China and the world since 1750. London: *Vintage Books*, p401.

¹¹⁰⁶ Zheng, Cheng-hong. (2017). Jindazhong de “yangguangzhengce” jiqi xianshiyiyi [Kim Dae-jung’s “Sunshine Policy” and its practical significance]. *Haerbin gongyedaxue xuebao (Journal of Harbin Institute of Technology)*, 19(3), 18-25.

¹¹⁰⁷ Reuters. (2011). China formally opens first overseas military base in Djibouti. Available from: <https://uk.reuters.com/article/uk-china-djibouti/china-formally-opens-first-overseas-military-base-in-djibouti-idUKKBN1AH3E1> (Viewed on 14th, August 2019).

fully aware of the threat posed by the unstable Beijing-Washington triangle relations.¹¹⁰⁸ In detail, the Sino-South Korean relations has come into a new era as well since the United States realized China's ascent as a critical adversary to its national interests and its global presence.¹¹⁰⁹ In other words, China's relations with South Korea can be viewed as a combination of cooperative one as well as competitive one, even though the increasing economic inter-dependence forged the comprehensive strategic partnership between China and South Korea. With the United States' "Pivot-to-Asia" strategy, the United States aimed to re-balance its presence and re-confirm its order in northeast Asia after seeing China as an aggressive rising power.¹¹¹⁰ The situation in northeast Asia has been more volatile in the context of the growing divergence and distrust between China and the United States, which also means that China has faced new challenges on security and economy. South Korea did not prepare for tactics to react with the United States' "Pivot-to-Asia" strategy, which meant that South Korea also had to undertake the consequence of China's retaliatory measures in the context of China's increasing leverage on the Korean peninsula. Having briefly described China's situation in the aftermath of the demise of the Soviet empire, the next section aims to look at literature on China's "Two-Koreas Policy".

¹¹⁰⁸ Chung, Jae-ho. (2007). Between ally and partner: Korea-China relations and the United States. New York: *Columbia University Press*, p2.

¹¹⁰⁹ Snyder, Scott. (2009). China's rise and the Two Koreas: politics, economics, security. London: *Boulder*, p15. & Chung, Jae-ho. (2007). Between ally and partner: Korea-China relations and the United States. New York: *Columbia University Press*, p6.

¹¹¹⁰ Shang, Hong. (2009). Aobama gaodiao "chongfanyazhou" [On the Obama government's focus on the "Pivot-to-Asia" strategy]. *Liaowang (Outlook)*, (47), 60-61.

Literature on China's policy to South Korea in the post-Deng era

The dissolution of the Soviet Union influenced China's security policy thinking,¹¹¹¹ which stimulated China's "Two-Koreas Policy" in the post-Cold War era. According to Chen, the downfall of east European communist states, the re-unification of East and West Germany and the implosion of the Soviet Union terminated the Cold War period, which increased the world's instability in the context of such a historic political and social upheaval.¹¹¹² Qian argues that the Soviet Union failed to ease people's anxiety about social development, which accelerated the collapse of communism and quickened the independence of Russia.¹¹¹³ On one hand, Gorbachev illustrates that the Soviet politics imposed harsh restrictions on its economic reform, even though the Soviet Union had an intense desire to decrease economic backwardness.¹¹¹⁴ On the other hand, Liu supposes that the Soviet Union had a graver concern in the wake of Gorbachev's reform, even though the Soviet Union's long-term economic stagnation and military confrontation with the United States and other capitalist states had laid a basis for the historic political upheaval.¹¹¹⁵ However, Park argues that China paid a higher attention to modernization construction and adopted a bolder policy towards South Korea in the aftermath of the disintegration of the Soviet Union, which meant that China aimed to concentrate on peace dividend and relieve from security burden.¹¹¹⁶ These scholars explain reasons of the fall of the Soviet Union and its influence on China's policy towards South

¹¹¹¹ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). *On China*. Penguin Press, p217. & Deng, Rong. (2004). *Wode fuqin: Deng Xiao-ping - zhongjuan* [My father: Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. Zhongyang wenxian chubanshe (Central Party Literature Press), p143.

¹¹¹² Chen, Qi-mao. (1993). *New approaches in China's foreign policy: the post-Cold War era*. Asian Surveys, 33(3), 237-251, p237.

¹¹¹³ Qian, Qi-chen. (2003). *Waijiao shiji* [Ten episodes in China's diplomacy]. Beijing: Shijie zhishi chubanshe (World Affairs Press), p209, p212, p214.

¹¹¹⁴ Gorbachev, Mikhail. (1995). *Memoirs*. Bantam Books, p638.

¹¹¹⁵ Liu, Shu-huai. (2017). *Shi ping Geerbaqiaofu duiwaizhanlve de "xinsiwei" – jianlun sulian jieti de yuanti* [On Gorbachev's new diplomatic thinking and causes of the collapse of the Soviet Union]. *Fazhi bolan* (Legality, Vision), (35), p249.

¹¹¹⁶ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). *China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000*. (Doctoral Dissertation) Durham University, Department of Politics, p227.

Korea, whereas, they do not mention China's new challenge on the Korean peninsula in the aftermath of the break-up of the Soviet Union.

The disintegration of the Soviet Union strengthened the Chinese government's determination on economic development, which further promoted China's economic open-up to the international community. According to Jiang Ze-min, the Chinese government aimed to build confidence on socialism and speed up economic construction, which helped to explain China's persistence in the "Independent foreign policy of peace" ("独立自主和平外交"政策 – *dulizizhu de heping waijiao zhengce*).¹¹¹⁷ Zhang argues that China has considered its stable and rapid economic growth as the paramount state work since China entered into the reforming age.¹¹¹⁸ However, Chen argues that the historic upheaval in east European communist states and the Soviet Union caused grave damage to the long-standing development of global socialism, which constituted a severe blow to the Chinese government and the Chinese society in the context of the expanding influence of capitalism from the west world.¹¹¹⁹ Park indicates that economic interest has been realized as the most significant national interest that every country has striven for since the post-bipolar system eras.¹¹²⁰ He concludes that the Chinese government should consistently view the development of socialism with Chinese characteristics as the primary goal, and should continuously make every effort to preserve the status of socialism as a superiority.¹¹²¹ These scholars do not analyze China's changing policy towards South Korea in the background of the declining influence of socialism, even though they explain the influence of the collapse of communism in east Europe on China's pursuit of economic interest.

¹¹¹⁷ Jiang, Ze-min. (2006). *Jiang, Ze-min wenxuan – diyijuan* [Selected works of Jiang Ze-min – the first volume]. *Renmin chubanshe* (People's Publishing House), p135.

¹¹¹⁸ Zhang, Bai-jia. (2009). *The evolution of China's diplomacy and foreign relations in the era of reform, 1976-2005*. (Available from the book: Challenges to China's foreign policy). *The University Press of Kentucky*, p15.

¹¹¹⁹ Chen, Qi-mao. (1993). *New approaches in China's foreign policy: the post-Cold War era*. *Asian Surveys*, 33(3), 237-251, p238.

¹¹²⁰ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). *China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000*. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p157.

¹¹²¹ He, Chun-long. (2013). *"Hepingyanbian" yu guoji gongchanzhuyi yundong boyi* [On the gamble between "peaceful evolution" and international communism movement]. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Jilin daxue* (Jilin University).

The downfall of the Soviet Union did not terminate historical disputes and regional tensions, but increase economic competition, which also quickened China's post-war development. According to Chen, every country obviously pays more attention to building economic advantage in order to strengthen the competitiveness in the international market than expanding military presence.¹¹²² Zhang argues that the Chinese government must react responsibly and rationally in the context of the abrupt demise of the Soviet empire and the fast development of globalization, even though Chinese elites had realized the political upheaval in east European communist states as a historic catastrophe.¹¹²³ On one hand, Liu emphasizes that a new tendency emerged in the post-Cold War period – the United States did not maintain fast economic growth while new rising powers achieved rapid development.¹¹²⁴ On the other hand, Park highlights that economic cooperation among nations has obviously been the most vital part of building and enhancing reciprocal relations since the end of the bipolar system.¹¹²⁵ Zhang concludes that the Chinese government persisted in the idea of building socialism with Chinese characteristics and of involving in the international market, which meant that China aimed to find out ways to realize socialist modernization and increase economic competitiveness.¹¹²⁶ These scholars emphasize the increasing role of economic competition in the global market, whereas, they do not explain how the new economic tendency influenced China's changing policy towards South Korea in the post-Cold War period.

The division of the Soviet Union meant that China was deprived of the “Soviet card”, which increased the United States' concern on China's rising status. According to Zhao, China's diplomatic approach and economic strategy did not undergo significant changes until China did not need to fight against Soviet

¹¹²² Chen, Qi-mao. (1993). New approaches in China's foreign policy: the post-Cold War era. *Asian Surveys*, 33(3), 237-251, p237.

¹¹²³ Zhang, Bai-jia. (2009). The evolution of China's diplomacy and foreign relations in the era of reform, 1976-2005. (Available from the book: Challenges to China's foreign policy). *The University Press of Kentucky*, p21.

¹¹²⁴ Liu, Tao. (2013). Lengzhan hou meiguo dongya anquan zhanlve yanjiu [On the United States' security strategy towards east Asia in the post-Cold War era]. (Doctoral Dissertation), *Jilindaxue (Jilin University)*.

¹¹²⁵ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p157.

¹¹²⁶ Zhang, Ying-qing. (1995). Zhongguo de gaigekaifang zhengce yu zhongri, zhonghan guanxi [On China's "Opening and Reform Policy" and the diplomacies with Japan, South Korea]. *Guoji zhengzhi yanjiu (The Journal of International Studies)*, (2), 113-120, p113.

hegemonism.¹¹²⁷ Due to China's anxiety of Soviet aggression, China gradually realized the significance of re-adjusting its role in the United States' global strategy.¹¹²⁸ Kissinger argues that the Nixon administration did not only recognize China as a vital partner in the context of the escalating military confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States, but also persuade Japan to cooperate on China's modernization programme in order to help China to serve as one main force to contain the Soviet Union.¹¹²⁹ However, Chen argues that the United States that became the most important political, military and economic entity gradually realized China's growing influence as its threat similar to the Soviet Union in the Cold War period.¹¹³⁰ On one hand, Yi indicates that the triangular relations among Beijing, Moscow and Washington came into a new age, which became the main factor that contributed to Washington's changing approach towards Beijing in the early 1990s.¹¹³¹ On the other hand, Jin emphasizes that China had a graver concern on the continuous development of the United States' relations with Japan while China endeavoured to promote peaceful development in the post-Cold War era.¹¹³² These scholars emphasize the detrimental effect of the end of the Cold War on the Sino-United States relations, whereas, they do not analyze China's policy towards South Korea in the context of the United States' significant changing attitude towards China.

The demise of the Soviet Union put an end to Beijing's competition with Moscow over Pyongyang, which meant that North Korea did not remain its role in China's security policy thinking as same as in the Cold War period. According to Park, Pyongyang attempted to persuade Beijing not to normalize relations with Seoul, but Beijing convinced Pyongyang that Pyongyang also had an opportunity to have relationship with

¹¹²⁷ Zhao, Quan-sheng. (2001). Chinese foreign policy in the post-Cold War era. *World Affairs*, 159(3), 114-129, p124.

¹¹²⁸ Westad, Arne. Odd. (2013). Restless empire: China and the world since 1750. London: *Vintage Books*, p367.

¹¹²⁹ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. *Penguin Press*, p393.

¹¹³⁰ Chen, Qi-mao. (1993). New approaches in China's foreign policy: the post-Cold War era. *Asian Surveys*, 33(3), 237-251, p238.

¹¹³¹ Yi, X. (1995). China's Korea policy: from 'One Korea' to 'Two Koreas'. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 22(2), 119-140, p120.

¹¹³² Jin, Ming-de. (2015). Lengzhan jieshuhou meiritongmeng de tiaozheng ji dui zhongguo de yingxiang [The United States-Japanese alliance relationship adjustment in the post-Cold War era and the influence of on China]. (A Master's Thesis) *Yanbiandaxue (Yanbian University)*.

Washington and Tokyo.¹¹³³ Qian argues that the Yeltsin administration (1991-1999) promised China that Russia abided by the two joint communiques, which meant that Russia planned to adopt a comparably friendly approach towards China.¹¹³⁴ However, Smith argues that both Russia and China did not maintain an intimate relationship with North Korea: the Yeltsin government adopted a hostile approach towards the Kim regime and China began to decrease its attention to North Korea.¹¹³⁵ On one hand, Xu signifies that Russia aimed to deepen business contact with economic entities, which helped to understand the promotion of Russia's cooperative relations with Japan, South Korea and other economically advanced states in the post-Cold War period.¹¹³⁶ On the other hand, Zhao indicates that South Korea has played a more significant role in China's overseas trade development since the post-Cold War era.¹¹³⁷ In spite of extensive sanctions from the international community, Oberdorfer concludes that Pyongyang had new understanding of its role in neighbouring powers' security calculation and decided to embark on nuclear development.¹¹³⁸ These scholars do not explain the influence of Pyongyang's diminishing role in Moscow's policy calculation on Beijing's "Two-Koreas Policy", even though they mention Seoul's relations with Moscow as well as Beijing in the post-war period.

North Korea quickened its pace of developing into a nation with nuclear weapons in the background of its two largest sponsors' abandonment, which had a controversial influence on the development of China's "Two-Koreas Policy". According to Shi, China has aimed to restrain North Korea from pouring resources into nuclear weapon programme since China realized such a fact that China would probably be compelled

¹¹³³ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p235.

¹¹³⁴ Qian, Qi-chen. (2003). Waijiao shiji [Ten episodes in China's diplomacy]. Beijing: *Shijie zhishi chubanshe (World Affairs Press)*, p228.

¹¹³⁵ Smith, Hazel. (2005). Hungry for peace: international security, humanitarian assistance, and social change in North Korea. Washington, D. C.: *United States Institute of Peace Press*, 184-185.

¹¹³⁶ Xu, Wen-ji. (2005). Eluosi de chaoxianbandao zhengce tiaozheng jiqi mubiao [Russia's changing policy towards the Korean peninsula and its purposes]. *Eluosi zhongya dongou yanjiu (East European Russian & Central Asian Studies)*, (3), 57-61, p57.

¹¹³⁷ Zhao, Quan-sheng. (2001). Chinese foreign policy in the post-Cold War era. *World Affairs*, 159(3), 114-129, p119.

¹¹³⁸ Oberdorfer, Don. (2001). The Two Koreas: a contemporary history. *Basic Books*, p248.

to choose from security calculation or from other priorities.¹¹³⁹ On one hand, Lankov argues that Moscow's decision not to prolong its assistance to Pyongyang turned into an obstacle to Pyongyang's development in the wake of the demise of the Soviet empire, which meant that Pyongyang underwent formidable challenges after losing its largest sponsor – Moscow.¹¹⁴⁰ On the other hand, Smith argues that it was a fatal blow to North Korea that both Russia and China did not continue the special strong business relations similar to the Cold War period, which further acted as a stimulus to North Korea's attempt to devote into nuclear activities.¹¹⁴¹ However, Yi argues that both Washington and Beijing gradually realized the importance of cooperation on de-nuclearization and other important international affairs, which was considered as a new direction in the age of 'non-Soviet threat'.¹¹⁴² Yan concludes that China has served as an important role in Korean affairs since North Korea announced its pursuit of being a nuclear weapon state, even though nations in northeast Asia had tremendous difficulties in the realization of de-nuclearization of the Korean peninsula.¹¹⁴³ These scholars emphasize China's reaction towards North Korea's nuclear programme, whereas, they do not analyze the influence of the development of nuclear programme on the Korean peninsula on China's changing perspectives on South Korea.

China's "Two-Koreas Policy" described China's pursuit of pragmatic diplomacy, which meant that China grasped an opportunity to adopt flexible approach towards South Korea. According to Jiang Ze-min, China should consider the promotion of its friendly relations with surrounding countries as a key step to build a peaceful environment for China's economic construction and achieve the great cause of China's national reunification.¹¹⁴⁴ On one hand, Chen argues that China did not only insist on the "Independent Foreign Policy

¹¹³⁹ Shi, Yin-hong. (2009). China's dilemma over the North Korean nuclear problem. (Available from the book: Challenges to China's foreign policy). *The University Press of Kentucky*, p173.

¹¹⁴⁰ Lankov, Andrei. (2015). The real North Korea: life and politics in the failed Stalinist utopia. *Oxford University Press*, p77.

¹¹⁴¹ Smith, Hazel. (2005). Hungry for peace: international security, humanitarian assistance, and social change in North Korea. Washington, D. C.: *United States Institute of Peace Press*, p184.

¹¹⁴² Yi, X. (1995). China's Korea policy: from 'One Korea' to 'Two Koreas'. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 22(2), 119-140, p120.

¹¹⁴³ Yan, Xue-zhe. (2014). Zhongguo chaoxianbandao zhengce mianlin de jiuy yu tiaozhan [Opportunity and challenge of China's policy towards the Korean peninsula]. *Liaoning daxue xuebao – Zhexue shehui kexueban (Journal of Liaoning University – Philosophy and Social Science)*, 16(5), 17-22, p18 & p20.

¹¹⁴⁴ Jiang, Ze-min. (2006). Jiang, Ze-min wenxuan – diyijuan [Selected works of Jiang Ze-min – the first

of Peace”, but also realize peaceful relations with neighbouring states as a vital part of China’s foreign policy thinking.¹¹⁴⁵ On the other hand, Yan argues that China should strive to stabilize its surrounding environment and realize its peaceful development, which helped to explain China’s concern on the situation on the Korean peninsula.¹¹⁴⁶ Park indicates that Moscow’s new perspective on the Korean peninsula and its normalization with Seoul signalled a new pattern in northeast Asia, which helped to explain Beijing’s changing approach towards Seoul.¹¹⁴⁷ Hua signifies that both North Korea and South Korea formally became members in the United Nations in the context of China’s agreement with other states, which accelerated the Sino-South Korean relations normalization.¹¹⁴⁸ Zhang concludes that China and South Korea achieved an impressive progress, which symbolically set an example for constructive diplomacy in east Asia.¹¹⁴⁹ Although these scholars emphasize the influence of China’s dynamic diplomacy on the Sino-South Korean relationship development, they do not explain China’s perspective on the “dual-strategy” and China’s perception of the “pro-Pyongyang approach”.

China’s “Two-Koreas Policy” explained China’s determination on economic development, which meant that China recognized South Korea’s role in China’s modernization programme. According to Deng Xiao-ping, China should realize socialism with Chinese characteristics as a priority, and should constantly endeavour to promote social productivity and peaceful progress.¹¹⁵⁰ On one hand, Cheng and Zhang argue that China

volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People’s Publishing House)*, p314.

¹¹⁴⁵ Chen, Qi-mao. (1993). New approaches in China’s foreign policy: the post-Cold War era. *Asian Surveys*, 33(3), 237-251, p241.

¹¹⁴⁶ Yan, Xue-zhe. (2014). Zhongguo chaoxianbandao zhengce mianlin de jiuyu yu tiaozhan [Opportunity and challenge of China’s policy towards the Korean peninsula]. *Liaoning daxue xuebao – Zhexue shehui kexueban (Journal of Liaoning University – Philosophy and Social Science)*, 16(5), 17-22, p18 & p20.

¹¹⁴⁷ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China’s policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p180.

¹¹⁴⁸ Hua, Chuang-ming. (2007). Shi fenxi lengzhan hou de zhonghan guanxi [On the relations between China and South Korea in the post-Cold War period]. *Changchun daxue xuebao (Journal of Chang Chun University)*, 17(3), 53-56, p54.

¹¹⁴⁹ Zhang, Yu-shan. (2010). Zhonghan guanxi de huigu yu zhanwang [A review and outlook of Sino-South Korean relationship]. *Dangdai hanguo (Contemporary South Korea)*, 2010 (Spring), 1-9.

¹¹⁵⁰ Qian, Qi-chen. (2003). Waijiao shiji [Ten episodes in China's diplomacy]. Beijing: *Shijie zhishi*

has considered establishing and enhancing economic cooperative partnership with overseas states as a main focus to strive for a more active role in the international community since the 1990s.¹¹⁵¹ On the other hand, Kim argues that China's policy towards the Korean peninsula underwent a significant change after China had re-calculated its national interests.¹¹⁵² Snyder suggests that the increasing trading volume soared in the context of the Sino-South Korean diplomacy normalization.¹¹⁵³ Besides, Hua indicates that foreign states' investment would give a help to achieve China's modernization construction, and China and South Korea should pay attention to both sides' business cooperation: China aimed to bring in advanced technologies and management experience while South Korea considered cheap overseas labour market as an imperative to its economic growth.¹¹⁵⁴ Guo concludes that the realization of the Sino-South Korean full diplomacy further enriched both sides' mutual understanding, including political trust, economic cooperation and culture communication, which helped to explain the immense impact of the development of business dealings on the bilateral relations.¹¹⁵⁵ These scholars explain the correlation between China's interest-driven policy and China's "Two-Koreas Policy", whereas, they do not analyze the complete influence of China's economic rise on the Sino-South Korean relations.

China's "Two-Koreas Policy" terminated China's "pro-Pyongyang approach", which meant that China shifted its traditional thinking and downgraded its ideological concern on the Korean peninsula. Kim argues that the Chinese leadership persisted that China shall enhance alliance relationship with North Korea, even

chubanshe (World Affairs Press), p227.

¹¹⁵¹ Cheng, Yu-sheck, J. & Zhang, Wankun, F. (1999). Chinese foreign relations strategies under Mao and Deng: a systematic and comparative analysis. *Philippine Journal of Third World Studies*, 14(3), 91-114, p101.

¹¹⁵² Kim, Hak-joon. (1991). China's Korea policy since the Tiananmen Square Incident. *The China Challenge: American Policies in East Asia, Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 38(2), 107-114, p108.

¹¹⁵³ Snyder, Scott. (2009). China's rise and the Two Koreas: politics, economics, and security. London: Boulder, p49.

¹¹⁵⁴ Hua, Chuang-ming. (2007). Shi fenxi lengzhan hou de zhonghan guanxi [On the relations between China and South Korea in the post-Cold War period]. *Changchun daxue xuebao (Journal of Chang Chun University)*, 17(3), 53-56, p55.

¹¹⁵⁵ Guo, Rui. (2013). Zhongguo de chaoxianbandao zhengce pinggu – lishijingyan dangqianchengguo yu ruoganbuzu [On the evaluation of China's policy towards the Korean peninsula – historic experience, present achievement and certain weaknesses]. *Dangdai hanguo (Contemporary Korea)*, (2), 22-31, p28.

though some of them retired from the political arena, which meant that China recognized North Korea as an inseparable part in its security policy calculation over the Korean peninsula.¹¹⁵⁶ Yi indicates that Beijing insisted on the “pro-Pyongyang approach”, which meant that Beijing had little plan to recognize the Seoul administration in the Cold War period.¹¹⁵⁷ However, Zhang emphasizes that China planned to establish the market-oriented economic system in order to promote economic modernization in 1992, which suggested that China was determined to involve in global economic development and insist on the “Opening and Reform Policy”.¹¹⁵⁸ Qian highlights that both states in the Korean peninsula received formal recognition from more than one hundred countries, which laid a hard foundation for China’s “Two-Koreas Policy”.¹¹⁵⁹ Park thereby concludes that China adopted a “dual-track” policy of maintaining traditional alliance with North Korea and of promoting economic relations with South Korea in order to provide China’s modernization construction with more favourable conditions.¹¹⁶⁰ Although these scholars explain factors that contributed to China’s policy shift from the “One-Korea Policy” to the “Two-Koreas Policy”, they do not analyze the controversial impact of China’s flexible approach towards the Korean peninsula on the development of China’s relations with Korea.

China’s “Two-Koreas Policy” revealed China’s strategic aim to isolate Taiwan, which meant that Seoul was deprived of the “Taipei card” in the wake of the Sino-South Korean relations normalization. According to Deng Xiao-ping, Beijing should consider the expanding business dealings with Seoul as an opportunity to sever the South Korean-Taiwanese relations, which suggested that Beijing aimed to maneuver the Beijing-Seoul-Taipei triangle relations and promote trading relations with the international market.¹¹⁶¹ On one hand,

¹¹⁵⁶ Kim, Hak-joon. (1991). China's Korea policy since the Tiananmen Square Incident. *The China Challenge: American Policies in East Asia, Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 38(2), 107-114, p109.

¹¹⁵⁷ Yi, X. (1995). China's Korea policy: from 'One Korea' to 'Two Koreas'. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 22(2), 119-140, p119.

¹¹⁵⁸ Zhang, Ying-qing. (1995). Zhongguo de gaigekai fang zheng ce yu zhong ri, zhong han guan xi [On China's "Opening and Reform Policy" and the diplomacies with Japan, South Korea]. *Guoji zheng zhi yan jiu (The Journal of International Studies)*, (2), 113-120, p116.

¹¹⁵⁹ Qian, Qi-chen. (2003). Waijiao shiji [Ten episodes in China's diplomacy]. Beijing: *Shijie zhishi chubanshe (World Affairs Press)*, p155.

¹¹⁶⁰ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, 226-227.

¹¹⁶¹ Qian, Qi-chen. (2003). Waijiao shiji [Ten episodes in China's diplomacy]. Beijing: *Shijie zhishi*

Yi argues that the full diplomacy between China and South Korea did not only terminate the long-term antagonistic relations that resulted from the Korean War, but also prolong the increasingly close trading connection.¹¹⁶² On the other hand, Jia and Zhuang argue that the normalized relations between China and South Korea severely damaged Taiwan's overall interest, which became an obstacle to Taiwan's image-building in the international community.¹¹⁶³ From Beijing's perspective, Seoul's recognition of Beijing helped to impose pressure on Taipei's plan to promote the "One China, One Taiwan" policy ("一中一台" 政策 – yizhongyitai zhengce).¹¹⁶⁴ Viewed in this vein, South Korea decided not to remain its diplomacy with Taiwan and not to preserve its embassy in Taiwan,¹¹⁶⁵ which meant that South Korea emphasized more its increasing trading inter-dependence with China than its traditional alliance relationship with Taiwan.¹¹⁶⁶ Park concludes that the Roh Tae-woo government firmly refused to negotiate over Taiwan's request of coming up with an alternative solution to maintain Taiwan's relations with South Korea, which meant that South Korea had promised no longer to acknowledge the "One China, One Taiwan" policy ahead of the formal normalization of the Sino-South Korean relations.¹¹⁶⁷ These scholars emphasize Seoul's changing attitude towards Beijing and Taipei in the post-Cold War era, whereas, they do not explain the influence of Seoul's "pro-Beijing approach" on Beijing's new perspectives on Pyongyang and Seoul.

chubanshe (World Affairs Press), p151.

¹¹⁶² Yi, X. (1995). China's Korea policy: from 'One Korea' to 'Two Koreas'. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 22(2), 119-140, p127.

¹¹⁶³ Jia, Hao. & Zhuang, Qu-bing. (1992). China's policy towards the Korean peninsula. *Asian Survey*, 32(12), 1137-1156, p1148.

¹¹⁶⁴ Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094, 1089-1090.

¹¹⁶⁵ Zhang, Ting-yan. & Tan, Jing. (2004). Chushi hanguo [Serving as a diplomat in South Korea]. *Shangdong daxue chubanshe (Shangdong University Publishing House)*, p33.

¹¹⁶⁶ Chung, Jae-ho. (2007). Between ally and partner: Korea-China relations and the United States. New York: *Columbia University Press*, p55.

¹¹⁶⁷ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p233.

China's "Two-Koreas Policy" did not only mean an irreplaceable opportunity to maximize China's national interests through developing relations with both Koreas, but also hint an emerging challenge to China's policy thinking on its relations with both Koreas. According to Hundt, it has been difficult to describe as an opportunity or a challenge since China's determination to initiate the "Two-Koreas Policy" and to develop relations with both Koreas.¹¹⁶⁸ On one hand, Kim argues that the Sino-South Korean diplomacy normalization clearly reflected China's fundamental diplomacy principle of maximizing national interest and China's extensive flexibility of responding to international affairs.¹¹⁶⁹ On the other hand, Guo argues that China's full diplomay with South Korea imposed restriction on the Sino-North Korean relations, which did not mean that China ceased to strengthen its relations with North Korea.¹¹⁷⁰ However, China had difficulty in dealing with the traditional but asymmetric alliance relationship with North Korea, and China was wary of being involved in confrontation with other countries in the context of the unstable situation on the Korean peninsula, even though both China and North Korea could not worsen the relations abruptly in case of the United States-backed South Korea's sudden invasion.¹¹⁷¹ North Korea's desperate pursuit of nuclear power capability did not only enable China to play a more active role in the Korean peninsula,¹¹⁷² but also bring China into an escalating military tension with the United States.¹¹⁷³ Apart from North Korea, it was disturbing for China that the Lee Myung-bak government (2008-2013) adopted the "pro-Washington

¹¹⁶⁸ Hundt, David. (2010). China's "Two-Koreas Policy": achievements and contradictions. *Political Science*, 62(2), 132-145, p132.

¹¹⁶⁹ Kim, Samuel. (1994). The dialectics of China's North Korea policy in a changing post-Cold War period. *Asian Perspective*, 18(2), p15. & Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p238.

¹¹⁷⁰ Guo, Rui. (2013). Zhongguo de chaoxianbandao zhengce pinggu – lishijingyan dangqianchengguo yu ruoganbuzu [On the evaluation of China's policy towards the Korean peninsula – historic experience, present achievement and certain weaknesses]. *Dangdai hanguo (Contemporary Korea)*, (2), 22-31, p28.

¹¹⁷¹ Nam, Jong-ho. & Choo, Jae-woo. & Lee, Jang-won. (2013). China's dilemma on the Korean peninsula: not an alliance but a security dilemma. *The Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, 25(3), 385-398, p385.

¹¹⁷² Snyder, Scott. (2009). China's rise and the Two Koreas: politics, economics, and security. London: *Boulder*, p142.

¹¹⁷³ Yi, X. (1995). China's Korea policy: from 'One Korea' to 'Two Koreas'. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 22(2), 119-140, p128.

approach” and enhanced military relations with the United States.¹¹⁷⁴ These scholars mention China’s fear of dilemma on the Korean peninsula, whereas, they do not analyze the influence of China’s calculation on China’s security policy towards South Korea.

China’s “Two-Koreas Policy” suggested China’s perspective on China’s new thinking on its relations with major powers and neighbouring states. According to Yi, China realized its relations with surrounding states as a main focus of China’s diplomacy after China’s relations with the United States had reached a nadir, China then decided to re-affirm the necessity of insisting on a “Low-profile” strategy as well as peaceful approach.¹¹⁷⁵ On one hand, Chen argues that China could no longer take advantage of the Soviet-United States confrontation in the post-Cold War era.¹¹⁷⁶ In spite of that, Jia and Zhuang emphasize that Russia’s role in the Korean peninsula would not continue as the one similar to the Cold War period.¹¹⁷⁷ On the other hand, Hao argues that China has obviously considered its relations with the United States as the main focus as well as the trickiest question of its overall diplomatic thinking.¹¹⁷⁸ Qian indicates that the Sino-United States relations slid into the lowest point in 1999, and more and more American people set out to foresee contradiction as well as divergence between China and the United States after the philosophy of ‘China threat’ prevailed in the United States.¹¹⁷⁹ Cheng and Zhang conclude that the Chinese leadership considered ways to develop constructive relations with leading states as a priority to Chinese foreign affairs, which meant that China aimed to protect itself from being involved in confrontations.¹¹⁸⁰ These scholars emphasize

¹¹⁷⁴ Gong, Ky-yu. (2012). The Korea-United States alliance: from a Chinese perspective. *Asian Perspicive*, (36), 309-330, p309.

¹¹⁷⁵ Yi, X. (1995). China's Korea policy: from 'One Korea' to 'Two Koreas'. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 22(2), 119-140, p121.

¹¹⁷⁶ Chen, Qi-mao. (1993). New approaches in China’s foreign policy: the post-Cold War era. *Asian Surveys*, 33(3), 237-251, p238.

¹¹⁷⁷ Jia, Hao. & Zhuang, Qu-bing. (1992). China’s policy towards the Korean peninsula. *Asian Survey*, 32(12), 1137-1156, p1138.

¹¹⁷⁸ Hao, Yu-fan. (2009). Introduction. (Available from the book: Challenges to China’s foreign policy). *The University Press of Kentucky*, p6.

¹¹⁷⁹ Qian, Qi-chen. (2003). Waijiao shiji [Ten episodes in China's diplomacy]. Beijing: *Shijie zhishi chubanshe (World Affairs Press)*, p371 & p395.

¹¹⁸⁰ Cheng, Yu-sheck, J. & Zhang, Wankun, F. (1999). Chinese foreign relations strategies under Mao and

China's pragmatic approach towards major powers in the context of the cooperative relations with Russia and the vulnerable relations with the United States, whereas, they do not explain the possible influence on China's policy towards South Korea.

China strove for a rapid growth in the post-1990s, which helped to explain the Chinese leadership's ambitious plan to expand into a more active economic entity in the context of the United States' changing attitude towards China. According to Westad, the trading connection between China and the United States became deeper after the United States' permission to allow China to be a member of the World Trade Organization, which did not help to decrease both sides' divergence.¹¹⁸¹ On one hand, Jia and Zhuang argue that China did not have the capability to play a role similar to the United States and Japan in the region of northeast Asia, and China did have to come up with ways to repair the deteriorated relations with the United States-led western states in the beginning of the 1990s.¹¹⁸² On the other hand, Kissinger argues that Beijing realized the Clinton administration's (1993-2001) strategic use of human rights as a tactic to further decrease communist party regimes on the earth to the minimum, even though western states considered the United States' approach towards China as a means to hamper China from development and to meddle in China's internal affairs.¹¹⁸³ However, Park argues that Jiang Ze-min (1992-2002) and other Chinese pragmatists reached an agreement on China's follow-up economic reform and decided to see China's economic growth as a priority.¹¹⁸⁴ Wang indicates that the Chinese leadership endeavoured to build an economically prosperous society.¹¹⁸⁵ These scholars mention the Chinese leadership's struggle over the United States'

Deng: a systematic and comparative analysis. *Philippine Journal of Third World Studies*, 14(3), 91-114, p102.

¹¹⁸¹ Westad, Arne. Odd. (2013). Restless empire: China and the world since 1750. London: *Vintage Books*, p397.

¹¹⁸² Jia, Hao. & Zhuang, Qu-bing. (1992). China's policy towards the Korean peninsula. *Asian Survey*, 32(12), 1137-1156, p1139.

¹¹⁸³ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. *Penguin Press*, p462.

¹¹⁸⁴ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p315.

¹¹⁸⁵ Wang, Jin-shu. (1998). Zhuhua xiaokang jianshe bao jingji fazhan [On the importance of building a well-off society to China's economic development]. *Zhongguo nongcun xiaokang keji (Chinese Countryside Well-off Technology)*, (4), p6.

intervention and China's determination to pursue economic growth. However, they do not explain how China's economic development plan influenced China's policy towards South Korea.

The United States gradually changed its approach towards China and realized China as a partner against global terror, which decreased the Chinese leadership's anxiety about being confronted with the United States – South Korea's largest sponsor. According to Westad, it was an immense relief to China that the United States temporarily ceased to accuse China of its damage to human rights after China supported the United States' crackdown on Taliban terrorists.¹¹⁸⁶ On one hand, Jia and Zhuang indicate that states in northeast Asia did not intend to emphasize the importance of the stability on the Korean peninsula and ease tensions within this region until the demise of the Soviet empire had shifted regional order.¹¹⁸⁷ On the other hand, Kissinger highlights that the United States had a deep concern about whether or not China would rise up as similar as the Soviet Union, which imposed restriction on the United States' diplomacy with China in the post-Cold War era.¹¹⁸⁸ However, Qian argues that the 911 Terrorist Attacks enabled China and Russia to change its role as the United States' co-operator in resistance against terrorist attack, which meant that the United States realized the significance of reaching reconciliation and decreasing contradiction with its potential rivals.¹¹⁸⁹ Deng notes that the United States did not re-think of its foreign policy approach until the United States participated in the two anti-terrorist battles, even though the Bush administration had taken an aggressive policy towards China in order to maintain the United States' status in the international community.¹¹⁹⁰ Even though these scholars explain the United States' changing policy towards China after the Terrorist Attacks, they do not analyze the influence on China's policy towards South Korea.

¹¹⁸⁶ Westad, Arne. Odd. (2013). Restless empire: China and the world since 1750. London: *Vintage Books*, p401.

¹¹⁸⁷ Jia, Hao. & Zhuang, Qu-bing. (1992). China's policy towards the Korean peninsula. *Asian Survey*, 32(12), 1137-1156, p1138.

¹¹⁸⁸ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. *Penguin Press*, 392-393.

¹¹⁸⁹ Qian, Qi-chen. (2003). Waijiao shiji [Ten episodes in China's diplomacy]. Beijing: *Shijie zhishi chubanshe (World Affairs Press)*, p409.

¹¹⁹⁰ Deng, Fan. (2013). Hou "jiuyiyi" shidai de meiguo duihua zhengce (2001-2011) [On the United States' policy towards China in the aftermath of the "Eleventh of September Incident"]. (Doctoral Dissertation), *Shanghai jiaotong daxue (Shanghai Jiaotong University)*.

China has emerged as an influential economic entity in the international community, which shaped the economic order in the global market as well as the political pattern (power configuration). According to Hu Jin-tao, the Chinese government must conform to the trend of global economic order's great adjustment, keep abreast of the trend of scientific and technological as well as industrial revolution that were brought about by international financial crisis, quicken the steps of China's economic structure re-adjustment, lay a foundation for China's long-term economic development in order to strive for the very initiative in the new round of international economic competition.¹¹⁹¹ On one hand, Shambaugh argues that China has not been such a world-wide influential power that China aims to present, even though China has attempted to strengthen its role since China's "open-up" to the global market.¹¹⁹² On the other hand, Cheng argues that China has aimed to undertake more responsibility in the international arena since China achieved rapid economic rise, whereas, the United States and other western nations realized difficulty in preserving leverage in international affairs in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis.¹¹⁹³ Zhao indicates that China's peaceful rise has constituted a vital part of China's policy thinking over how to interact with the international community, which helps to explain that China has prepared to actively participate in global affairs and to creatively foster an image of "a peaceful and responsible power" in order to build a more stable environment.¹¹⁹⁴ Ho concludes that China has insisted that China develops in a more considerably harmonious way since the discussion of China's ascent prevailed in the globe, rather than aim to be an aggressive state that plays competitive zero-sum games at the cost of other nations.¹¹⁹⁵ These scholars explain how China thinks of its benevolent development, whereas, they do not analyze the influence of China's policy towards South Korea in the background of China's ascent.

¹¹⁹¹ Hu, Jin-tao. (2016). Hu Jin-tao wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Hu Jin-tao – the third volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p276.

¹¹⁹² Shambaugh, David. (2013). China goes global: the partial power. Oxford: *Oxford University Press*, 5-8.

¹¹⁹³ Cheng, Fang. (2017). 21shiji zhongmei daguoguanxi yanjiu – zouxiang hezuogongying zhilu [Research on the two major states' relations between the United States and China in the 21st century – moving towards win-win cooperation]. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Jilin daxue (Jilin University)*, p4.

¹¹⁹⁴ Zhao, Shi-yang. (2008). Zhongguo hepingjueqi yu meiguo yataizhanlve de tiaozheng [On China's peaceful rise and the United States' policy adjustment towards the Asia-Pacific region]. (A Master's Thesis) *Xiangtandaxue (Xiangtan University)*.

¹¹⁹⁵ Ho, Benjamin. (2014). Understanding Chinese exceptionalism: China's rise, its goodness, and greatness. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political.*, 39(3), 164-176, p170.

China further enhanced its national defence building in the post-2000s, which increased doubts of China's aggressive rise and changed political order in northeast Asia. According to Hu Jin-tao, China should pay attention to national defence and army building that could contribute to the cause of socialism with Chinese characteristics.¹¹⁹⁶ Acharya argues that the demise of the Soviet Union and the ascent of China have been considerably recognized as controversial elements that would re-shape Asia's development.¹¹⁹⁷ Ho recognizes China as an economic rising power that plays a more important role, which means that China has been an inseparable part in international affairs.¹¹⁹⁸ However, Ross argues that China's increasing role has not been moving towards 'the threshold of consistency' in relation to the fast speed of China's economic growth and the long-run performance of China's influence in northeast Asia.¹¹⁹⁹ Besides, Navarro and Autry argue that China has striven for large-scale strong army building and powerful weapons modernization, and the United States should be more aware of the purpose of China's defence programme.¹²⁰⁰ Shambaugh highlights that China's plan to firmly strengthen military capacity and to frequently launch military exercise have been seen as a graver concern by states around northeast Asia, which has considerably damaged China's 'peaceful' role in the international community.¹²⁰¹ Even though these scholars describe China's rising military input in the background of China's economic growth, they do not explain the impact of China's increasing input into national defence on China's policy towards South Korea.

The United States did not re-consider its global strategy until China became a more booming economic entity, which increased tensions in northeast Asia in the context of the Obama government's (2009-2017) "Pivot-to-Asia" strategy. According to Hu Jin-tao, China and the United States are the biggest developing

¹¹⁹⁶ Hu, Jin-tao. (2016). Hu Jin-tao wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Hu Jin-tao – the third volume]. Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House), p35.

¹¹⁹⁷ Acharya, Amitav. (2014). Power shift or paradigm shift? China's rise and Asia's emerging security order. *International Studies Quarterly*, (58), 158-173, p158.

¹¹⁹⁸ Ho, Benjamin. (2014). Understanding Chinese exceptionalism: China's rise, its goodness, and greatness. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political.*, 39(3), 164-176, p164.

¹¹⁹⁹ Ross, S. Robert. (2010). The rise of Chinese power and the implications for the regional security order. *Orbis*, 54(4), 525-545, p525.

¹²⁰⁰ Navarro, Peter. & Autry, Greg. (2011). Death by China: confronting the dragon – a global call to action. Pearson Education, Inc., p111.

¹²⁰¹ Shambaugh, David. (2013). China goes global: the partial power. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p11.

state and the largest advanced nation respectively, and both nations should come up with ways to strengthen the cooperative relations in order to lead the world to prosperity and stability.¹²⁰² Qian argues that the United States had an intention to build constructive relations with China, which meant that China had an opportunity to relieve from the United States' aggressive approach.¹²⁰³ However, Ho argues that the various perspectives of China's ascent has convinced the United States to re-think of strategies of dealing with China in order to maintain the order in the globe, which has brought about more foreseeable confrontation between the two states.¹²⁰⁴ Shang highlights that the Obama administration re-calculated the United States' role in Asia and realized the United States' relations with its allies in northeast Asia as a focus, which meant that the United States decided to implement the "Pivot-to-Asia" strategy.¹²⁰⁵ Yuan concludes that Asia's affairs did not constitute the most significant part in the United States' all-round foreign strategy until the Obama government was determined to re-confirm the United States' status in Asia.¹²⁰⁶ These scholars emphasize how China's rise shaped the United States' foreign policy approach towards northeast Asia, whereas, they do not analyze the influence of the United States' aggressive opinion on China's rise on China's policy towards South Korea.

The Sino-United States relations has developed into a more fluctuating period, which means that the United States has an ambivalent attitude towards a rising China. According to Xi Jin-ping, China and the United States should pay attention to ways to enhance constructive dialogue, strengthen mutual trust and expand win-win cooperation, therefore, both sides should jointly accelerate the progress of the new model of major-state relationship.¹²⁰⁷ Acharya argues that a new hierarchical power order has obviously appeared since

¹²⁰² Hu, Jin-tao. (2016). Hu Jin-tao wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Hu Jin-tao – the third volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p584.

¹²⁰³ Qian, Qi-chen. (2003). Waijiao shiji [Ten episodes in China's diplomacy]. Beijing: *Shijie zhishi chubanshe (World Affairs Press)*, p396.

¹²⁰⁴ Ho, Benjamin. (2014). Understanding Chinese exceptionalism: China's rise, its goodness, and greatness. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political.*, 39(3), 164-176, p165.

¹²⁰⁵ Shang, Hong. (2009). Aobama gaodiao "chongfanyazhou" [On the Obama government's focus on the "Pivot-to-Asia" strategy]. *Liaowang (Outlook)*, (47), 60-61.

¹²⁰⁶ Yuan, Zheng. (2010). "Chongfanyanzhou" – aobama zhengfu dongya zhengce pingxi [An evaluation of the Obama government's policy towards east Asia – the "Pivot-to-Asia" strategy]. *Dangdai shijie (Contemporary World)*, (1), 49-52.

¹²⁰⁷ Xi, Jin-ping. (2014). Xi Jin-ping tan zhiguolizheng [Xi Jin-ping's discussion on how to manage state

China became the second largest economic entity, which suggests that both the United States and China have been recognized as the major leading states that influence global affairs and the world has been into the era of G-2.¹²⁰⁸ On one hand, Ross indicates that China has paid attention to economic and military development that are recognized as the two key criteria of a rising state that ambitiously strives for a more active role in the international community, which has vitally influenced the development of the Sino-United States relations and the upcoming political pattern in northeast Asia.¹²⁰⁹ On the other hand, He and Feng highlight that there has been a graver concern about whether or not China and the United States would confront with each other in the context of China's rise.¹²¹⁰ Besides, Zhao argues that the United States has considered ways to maintain its leading status as the primary task since China put forward the "One Belt, One Road" programme, which helped to explain the United States changed its policy thinking over China.¹²¹¹ These scholars mention the United States' thinking of China's ambitious plan to build a new order – G-2, whereas, they do not explain the impact of the inevitable confrontation between two great powers on China's policy towards South Korea. Having looked at literature on China's policy in the post-Cold War period, the next section aims to explore China's security strategies and China's changing approach towards South Korea.

affairs and govern the country]. *Waiwen chubanshe (Foreign Languages Press)*, p280.

¹²⁰⁸ Acharya, Amitav. (2014). Power shift or paradigm shift? China's rise and Asia's emerging security order. *International Studies Quarterly*, (58), 158-173, p158.

¹²⁰⁹ Ross, S. Robert. (2010). The rise of Chinese power and the implications for the regional security order. *Orbis*, 54(4), 525-545, p525.

¹²¹⁰ He, Kai. & Feng, Hui-yun. (2014). China's bargaining strategies for a peaceful rise: successes and challenges. *Asian security*, 10(2), 168-187, p169.

¹²¹¹ Zhao, Ming-hao. (2018). Daguo jingzheng beijingxia meiguo dui "yidaiyilu" de zhiheng taishi fenxi [An analysis of the United States' strategy to contain the "One Belt, One Road" programme in the context of the competition among major powers]. *Shijie jingji yu zhengzhi (World Economics and Politics)*, (12), 4-31.

China's security policy towards South Korea in the post-Deng era: the rational actor explanation

China's security policies

The international situation became increasingly volatile, and the world pattern gradually changed into a multi-polar direction as a result of the disintegration of the Soviet Union, which helped to explain the unstable situation in northeast Asia. Qian argues that the two leading states did not cease to confront with each other until the demise of the Soviet empire, which equally put an end to the bipolar system.¹²¹² Kissinger indicates that the Gorbachev administration did overrate the superiority of the Soviet Union's socialist system, which meant that the Soviet Union did not have sufficient capability to maintain the status quo – the Soviet Union had devoted massive resources to military exercise in order to contain the United States.¹²¹³ The Gorbachev administration could neither reach consensus with all states in the Soviet empire on embrace of new thinking in global affairs – perestroika,¹²¹⁴ nor persuade these nations to maintain the Soviet economic developmental model to promote business connection.¹²¹⁵ In other words, the shift in the balance of power did not come into a newly historic era until the Soviet Union could not sustain its advantageous status, which laid a basis for the world pattern in the post-Cold War period. However, Chen argues that the termination of the Soviet-United States confrontation did not bring all sorts of complex contradictions to an end, but mean the new beginning of existed conflicts.¹²¹⁶ On one hand, the inter-Korean relations has been viewed as a legacy of the Cold War, which means that the two states on the Korean peninsula have difficulty in realizing peace.¹²¹⁷ On the other hand, Taiwan has been composed of the trickiest part of the 'uneasy' Sino-United States diplomacy, and Taiwan still remains as a stimulus to new crisis between China and the

¹²¹² Qian, Qi-chen. (2003). Waijiao shiji [Ten episodes in China's diplomacy]. Beijing: *Shijie zhishi chubanshe (World Affairs Press)*, p224.

¹²¹³ Kissinger, Henry. (2015). Shijie zhixu [World order]. Beijing: *Zhongxin chubanshe (China CITIC Publishing Group)*, p410.

¹²¹⁴ Gorbachev, Mikhail. (1995). Memoirs. Bantam Books, p601.

¹²¹⁵ Gorbachev, Mikhail. (1995). Memoirs. Bantam Books, p609.

¹²¹⁶ Chen, Qi-mao. (1993). New approaches in China's foreign policy: the post-Cold War era. *Asian Surveys*, 33(3), 237-251, p237.

¹²¹⁷ Jia, Hao. & Zhuang, Qu-bing. (1992). China's policy towards the Korean peninsula. *Asian Survey*, 32(12), 1137-1156, p1139.

United States.¹²¹⁸ Viewed in this vein, the ongoing tensions in northeast Asia prolonged some existing challenges to its overall development, which imposed restriction on China's security policy calculation.

China's relations with Russia and the United States came into a newly complex phase, which helped to explain China's conservative security strategies in the post-Cold War period. According to Glaser, the collapse of the Soviet empire meant the beginning of China's declining role in the triangular relations among the United States, the Soviet Union and China, which influenced China's status in the international arena.¹²¹⁹ On one hand, Meyer argues that the Yeltsin government considered Russia's relations with the United States-led western states as a priority in order to develop Russia's economy, which increased China's security frustration.¹²²⁰ In other words, it was a severe blow to China that Russia insisted on the "pro-Western stance" in the absence of the 'Soviet threat'. On the other hand, Westad argues that the United States gradually changed its attitude towards China in the wake of the demise of the Cold War, which meant that China should make full preparation against the United States' provocation.¹²²¹ Yu emphasizes that some leading countries could not take little notice of the philosophy of 'China threat', which contributed to the aggressive policy thinking over China.¹²²² From Beijing's perspective, it turned into a security challenge that both Moscow and Washington did not develop reciprocal relations with Beijing, which conversely constituted Beijing's defensive security policy: building deeper cooperative relations with Moscow and Washington in order to protect Beijing from being involved in similar cold-war confrontation with both sides.

China's rise had a controversial influence on China's security relations with Russia and the United States, which meant that China's security strategies should be understood in the background of the two leading states' controversial attitudes towards China. According to Jacques, China's rise is laying a foundation for

¹²¹⁸ Westad, Arne. Odd. (2013). Restless empire: China and the world since 1750. London: *Vintage Books*, p389.

¹²¹⁹ Glaser, S. Bonnie. (1993). China's security perceptions: interests and ambitions. *Asian Survey*, 33(3), 252-271, p253.

¹²²⁰ Meyer, Falkenheim, Peggy. (1994-1995). Russia's post-Cold War security policy in northeast Asia. *Pacific Affairs*, 67(4), 495-512, p500.

¹²²¹ Westad, Arne. Odd. (2013). Restless empire: China and the world since 1750. London: *Vintage Books*, p395.

¹²²² Yu, Sui. (2012). Sulianjietai dui zhongguo de sidianyingxiang [The four main effects of the collapse of the Soviet Union on China]. *Juece yu xinxi (Decision & Information)*, (2), p46.

China's leading role in a new status quo, even though there has been some uncertainty about the forthcoming political pattern.¹²²³ On one hand, Russia did not only have a willingness to develop its diplomacy with China, but also promise not to initiate pre-emptive nuclear strike against China.¹²²⁴ On the other hand, China had little hesitation in promoting strategic cooperative partnership with the United States for the sake of China's modernization programme.¹²²⁵ In other words, China's stable relations with Russia and the United States played an active role in realizing China's security protection and economic ascent. However, Westad argues that China turned into an increasingly influential power that ranked behind the United States in the context of China's economic ascent, which changed the power equation and the security situation in northeast Asia.¹²²⁶ Yu emphasizes that China did not have difficulty in purchasing advanced military equipment until Russia's ban on arms sales to China, which meant that Russia aimed to impose restriction on the development of China's weapon technology modernization.¹²²⁷ Besides, Chen highlights that China must think of ways not to be trapped into security conflicts with neighbouring nations that continued to remain as the United States' allies, which meant that the United States did not cease to undermine China's national interests by enhancing its strategic role in northeast Asia.¹²²⁸ In brief, both Moscow and Washington had a grave concern on Beijing's economic rise, which explained China's security dilemma from northeast Asia to southeast Asia in the wake of China's rise.

Apart from the United States and Russia, China's relations with other states in northeast Asia influenced China's overall security thinking and China's complex attitudes towards South Korea. Wang argues that the

¹²²³ Jacques, Martin. (2009). When China rules the world: the rise of the middle kingdom and the end of the western world. Penguin Books, p318.

¹²²⁴ Meyer, Falkenheim, Peggy. (1994-1995). Russia's post-Cold War security policy in northeast Asia. *Pacific Affairs*, 67(4), 495-512, p500, p502.

¹²²⁵ Goldstein, Avery. (2005). Rising to the challenge: China's grand strategy and international security. Stanford University Press, p143.

¹²²⁶ Westad, Arne. Odd. (2013). Restless empire: China and the world since 1750. London: *Vintage Books*, p393.

¹²²⁷ Yu, Bin. (2009). Sino-Russian relations in the 'post'-Putin era. (Available from the book: *Rising China – power and reassurance*). ANU Press, p87.

¹²²⁸ Chen, Xiang. (2015). Zhongguo zhoubianwaijiao de zhangaixing yinsu fenxi [On the obstructive factor of China's peripheral diplomacy]. *Heping yu fazhan (Peace and Development)*, (3), 25-39, p29.

multi-relations among Washington, Tokyo, Moscow and Beijing have been considered as the key factor that widely influences the security structure in northeast Asia.¹²²⁹ From Beijing's perspective, it has been necessary to keep a more cautious attitude towards the development of its relations with neighbouring countries since regional conflicts and disputes still remain. Glaser highlights that Japan aimed to develop into a more vivid player in northeast Asia, which increased China's anxiety about the threat of Japan's resurgence of militarization.¹²³⁰ Roy indicates that China became anxious about Lee Deng-hui's visit to the United States and described Lee as a 'separatist' who aimed to seek for 'independence', which meant that China had a grave concern on Taiwan's relations with the United States.¹²³¹ Yoo emphasizes that South Korea has seen its deepening military alliance relationship with the United States as an imperative, even though South Korea's relations with China has achieved a great progress.¹²³² Viewed in this respect, China's security policy towards South Korea should be explained as a combination of regional nations' security relations with China.

¹²²⁹ Wang, Fei-ling. (1999). Joining the major powers for the status quo: China's views and policy on the Korean re-unification. *Pacific Affairs*, 72(2), 167-185, p167.

¹²³⁰ Glaser, S. Bonnie. (1993). China's security perceptions: interests and ambitions. *Asian Survey*, 33(3), 252-271, 256-257.

¹²³¹ Roy, Denny. (2003). Taiwan: a political history. *Cornell University Press*, p197.

¹²³² Yoo, Hyon-joo. (2012). The Korea-United States alliance as a source of creeping tension: a Korean perspective. *Asian Perspective*, (36), 331-351, p331.

The dissolution of the Soviet Union

China developed its relations with Russia in the context of the development of geo-politics, which contributed to China's deepening relations with Russia. Shambaugh argues that the downfall of the Gorbachev administration, the collapse of the Soviet empire and the dissolution of the Soviet Communist Party became a thrilling shock to the Chinese leadership.¹²³³ In contrast, China had a grave concern on 'northern threat' and became more struggled about the upcoming security order, even though China strove to resume its relations with the Soviet Union in the late 1980s. However, Qian argues that China agreed to settle the Sino-Russian border issue in a dynamic and flexible way in order to attain peace, which meant that China recognized the significance of securing the reciprocal relations with Russia.¹²³⁴ On one hand, Goldstein indicates that the Yelstin government paid attention to the development of the Sino-Russian relations, which helped to build the bilateral diplomacy as a formal constructive partnership.¹²³⁵ On the other hand, Dittmer emphasizes that the United States further enhanced its military relations with its ally in northeast Asia – Japan, which helped to elevate the Sino-Russian relations into strategic cooperative partnership.¹²³⁶ Viewed in this vein, it was important for China to stabilize its relations with Russia that shares a long border, which meant that both China and Russia reached a common perspective on the United States' rising influence in northeast Asia.

China's strategic cooperative partnership with Russia did not mean that Russia had a willingness to help China to contain the United States, even though both China and Russia remained cautious about the United States' international dominance. On one hand, the United States has been recognized as the only country that could play the most active role in the so-called 'unipolar' structure since the end of the Cold War.¹²³⁷ In other words, neither China nor Russia could under-estimate the influence of the United States' global trading

¹²³³ Shambaugh, David. (2013). China goes global: the partial power. Oxford University Press, p79.

¹²³⁴ Qian, Qi-chen. (2003). Waijiao shiji [Ten episodes in China's diplomacy]. Beijing: *Shijie zhishi chubanshe (World Affairs Press)*, 228-229.

¹²³⁵ Goldstein, Avery. (2005). Rising to the challenge: China's grand strategy and international security. Stanford University Press, p136.

¹²³⁶ Dittmer, Lowell. (2009). The Sino-Russian strategic relationship: ghost of the "strategic triangle"? (Available from the book: Challenges to China's foreign policy). The University Press of Kentucky, p94.

¹²³⁷ Young, Whan-kihl. (2002). Security on the Korean peninsula: continuity and change. Sage Publications: 33(1), 59-79.

connection and military presence. On the other hand, the strategic relations between China and Russia meant that both sides paid attention to the development of the bilateral diplomacy.¹²³⁸ Meyer emphasizes that Russia's security situation did not come into a dilemma until the United States and Japan enhanced presence near the Sea of Okhotsk.¹²³⁹ Viewed in this instance, it was an imperative to prepare for such a scenario that both China and Russia should continue with accommodation as well as cooperation in the context of the current security equation in northeast Asia. However, Goldstein argues that Russia did not intend to enable China to have an access to advanced military equipment that could bolster China's military capacity to contain the United States.¹²⁴⁰ From China's aspect, Russia's serious concern on China's desire of purchasing excessive Russian military technology protected the United States' leading role in military industry, which meant that Russia did not expect China to develop into a rising power.

Russia's new consideration over security was combined to understand its distinctive attitudes towards the two states on the Korean peninsula, which contributed to the Sino-South Korean relations normalization. According to Joo, Russia considered its stable relations with South Korea as a strategy to maximize its national interests and protect its regional role.¹²⁴¹ On one hand, Lankov argues that both Beijing and Moscow did not continue to see Pyongyang as a significant partner that could help to contain Washington or to play the "Moscow card" and the "Beijing card", which meant that Pyongyang lost its two largest sponsors in the context of the demise of the Cold War.¹²⁴² On the other hand, Meyer argues that Russia had a growing concern on its economic development, which constituted a significant part of Russia's security relations with other states.¹²⁴³ Xu emphasizes that the Yeltsin government declared Russia's constructive partnership with

¹²³⁸ Yu, Bin. (2009). Sino-Russian relations in the 'post'-Putin era (Available from the book: Rising China – power and reassurance). *ANU Press*, p81.

¹²³⁹ Meyer, Falkenheim, Peggy. (1994-1995). Russia's post-Cold War security policy in northeast Asia. *Pacific Affairs*, 67(4), 495-512, 496-497.

¹²⁴⁰ Goldstein, Avery. (2005). Rising to the challenge: China's grand strategy and international security. *Stanford University Press*, 136-137.

¹²⁴¹ Joo, Seung-ho. (1996). Russian policy on Korean unification in the post-Cold War era. *Pacific Affairs*, 69(1), 32-48, p34.

¹²⁴² Lankov, Andrei. (2015). The real North Korea: life and politics in the failed Stalinist utopia. *Oxford University Press*, p78.

¹²⁴³ Meyer, Falkenheim, Peggy. (1994-1995). Russia's post-Cold War security policy in northeast Asia. *Pacific Affairs*, 67(4), 495-512, p495.

South Korea during Kim Yong-sam's state visit to Russia in June 1994.¹²⁴⁴ Viewed in this aspect, Russia's policy towards the Korean peninsula underwent significant changes in the context of Russia's diminishing role, which meant that Russia aimed to lure investment from South Korea. Liu argues that Russia's relations with South Korea came into a new phase, which helped to explain China's greater efforts to promote its trading cooperation with South Korea.¹²⁴⁵ In contrast, China boldly shifted its approach towards South Korea in the context of Russia's cooperative partnership with South Korea, which meant that South Korea caught an opportunity to quicken the formation of the Sino-South Korean diplomacy.

Russia aimed to re-build its status and decided to elevate its relations with North Korea, which also helped to understand China's controversial policy thinking over the Korean peninsula. According to Xu, Russia had difficulty in acting as a vivid player in Korean affairs after Russia had the full recognition that South Korea was not a reliable business partner to Russia, even though Russia maintained an apathetic attitude towards North Korea.¹²⁴⁶ On one hand, Meyer argues that Russia's relations with North Korea deteriorated in the wake of Russia's constructive diplomacy with South Korea, which increased Russia's fear of losing its role in North Korea.¹²⁴⁷ On the other hand, Joo argues that Russia considered North Korea's determination to be a nuclear power as a main factor that would influence Russia's national interests, which helped to explain the repairment of Russia's relations with North Korea.¹²⁴⁸ In other words, Russia had a deep concern on the ramification of North Korea's nuclear programme on Russia's economic development and social stability, which conversely meant Russia realized its relations with North Korea as a means to influence regional

¹²⁴⁴ Xu, Wen-ji. (2005). Eluosi de chaoxianbandao zhengce tiaozheng jiqi mubiao [Russia's changing policy towards the Korean peninsula and its purposes]. *Eluosi zhongya dongou yanjiu (East European Russian & Central Asian Studies)*, (3), 57-61, p57.

¹²⁴⁵ Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094, 1084-1085.

¹²⁴⁶ Xu, Wen-ji. (2005). Eluosi de chaoxianbandao zhengce tiaozheng jiqi mubiao [Russia's changing policy towards the Korean peninsula and its purposes]. *Eluosi zhongya dongou yanjiu (East European Russian & Central Asian Studies)*, (3), 57-61, p57.

¹²⁴⁷ Meyer, Falkenheim, Peggy. (1994-1995). Russia's post-Cold War security policy in northeast Asia. *Pacific Affairs*, 67(4), 495-512, p509.

¹²⁴⁸ Joo, Seung-ho. (1996). Russian policy on Korean unification in the post-Cold War era. *Pacific Affairs*, 69(1), 32-48, p39.

affairs in the context of Russia's anxiety on its declining leverage over North Korea. Shi argues that China realized North Korea's growing nuclear capability as a heavy 'burden' that would not stop itself from being involved in conflicts around North Korea, which suggested that North Korea constituted a part of China's security dilemma that would cause damage to China's security interest and regional role.¹²⁴⁹ From Beijing's perspective, strengthening its relations with Pyongyang meant a strategic means to impose pressure over Pyongyang and to prevent Pyongyang from sudden collapse, which meant that Beijing aimed to discourage Pyongyang from expanding into a hostile power to Beijing.

¹²⁴⁹ Shi, Yin-hong. (2009). China's dilemma over the North Korean nuclear problem. (Available from the book: Challenges to China's foreign policy). *The University Press of Kentucky*, p174.

The development of the Sino-United States relations in the post-Cold War period

The United States re-evaluated China's role in its global strategy in the absence of the 'Soviet threat', which meant that the Sino-United States relations came into an unstable period. According to Glaser, the United States ceased to support China's role in global politics, but had a plan to take all measures to impose restriction on China.¹²⁵⁰ Qian argues that the Chinese government had a willingness to develop foreign and economic relations with Russia, which would give a help to settle the bilateral border issue and the troop reduction plan.¹²⁵¹ However, Harding argues that the Chinese leadership must properly deal with the Sino-United States relations after the demise of the Soviet empire helped to elevate the United States' role in international affairs.¹²⁵² Viewed in this aspect, Beijing must take necessary precautions to prevent Washington from damaging Beijing's overall development since Washington did not continue to play the "Beijing card" against Moscow in the post-Cold War period. Besides, Langdon argues that the collapse of the Soviet empire on one hand put an end to China's gravest security threat; on the other hand, meant an abolishment of the strategic plan to contain the Soviet Union with the United States.¹²⁵³ In other words, China's security tension with Russia decreased in the wake of the development of the Sino-Russian relations, which did not mean that China completely reached a breakthrough on its security matters. Wang emphasizes that the Clinton government showed little intention of China's pursuit of developing a strategic cooperative partnership with leading states in the post-Cold War period.¹²⁵⁴ Westad indicates that the Chinese Embassy Bomb Incident at Serbia persuaded the Chinese leadership to realize the deterioration in the Sino-United States relations, which suggested that China criticized the United States' 'hegemony' in the international arena.¹²⁵⁵ In contrast, China was seen as a threat to the United States' global presence, which meant that the

¹²⁵⁰ Glaser, S. Bonnie. (1993). China's security perceptions: interests and ambitions. *Asian Survey*, 33(3), 252-271, p260.

¹²⁵¹ Qian, Qi-chen. (2003). Waijiao shiji [Ten episodes in China's diplomacy]. Beijing: *Shijie zhishi chubanshe (World Affairs Press)*, 230-231.

¹²⁵² Harding, Harry. (1992). China's American dilemma. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 519, 12-25, p12.

¹²⁵³ Langdon, Frank. (2001). American northeast Asian strategy. *Pacific Affairs*, 74(2), 167-184, 174-175.

¹²⁵⁴ Wang, Jian-wei. (2009). Building a new conceptual framework for U.S.-China relations. (Available from the book: Challenges to China's foreign policy). *The University Press of Kentucky*, p38.

¹²⁵⁵ Westad, Arne. Odd. (2013). Restless empire: China and the world since 1750. London: *Vintage Books*, p397.

United States aimed to discourage China from expanding into a regional power.

China strove to improve its relations with the United States in order to not be viewed as a strategic adversary, which did not mean that the United States' anxiety about China came to a halt. According to Westad, it has been apparent to see that the Sino-United States relations fluctuates with a series of challenges: both sides have realized more and more disparity, and could not reach consensus on global affairs.¹²⁵⁶ The Chinese leadership persisted that the Sino-United States relations would critically influence China's overall policy calculation, which helped to explain China's determination to escalate the Sino-United States diplomacy into a strategic one.¹²⁵⁷ From China's perspective, it was important to properly deal with the Sino-United States relations in order to protect China's national interests from painful repercussions. However, Wang argues that the United States aimed to preserve its role as the world leader in the international community since the United States realized China as the sole nation that would have such a potential to replace the United States.¹²⁵⁸ In brief, the United States has felt annoyed since China's rise became a warning signal, which equally imposed a burden on China's peaceful development. Binnendijk emphasizes that China has been considered as a rival that would undermine the United States' national interests, even though Asia's ascent has symbolically promoted the United States' commercial development.¹²⁵⁹ In other words, China's rise has obviously been acknowledged as a *fait accompli* so that the United States attempted to maintain its presence by discouraging China from expanding into a global power, which meant that China should prepare not to be trapped into the United States' containment plan.

China's relations with South Korea established formal diplomatic relations in the context of the United States' changing approach towards China, which meant that China aimed to deter South Korea from cooperation with the United States to contain China along the First Military Island Chain. Zhang and Tan argue that both

¹²⁵⁶ Westad, Arne. Odd. (2013). Restless empire: China and the world since 1750. London: *Vintage Books*, p396.

¹²⁵⁷ Jia, Qing-guo. (2009). China's new leadership and strategic relations with the United States. (Available from the book: Challenges to China's foreign policy). *The University Press of Kentucky*, p57.

¹²⁵⁸ Wang, Jian-wei. (2009). Building a new conceptual framework for U.S.-China relations. (Available from the book: Challenges to China's foreign policy). *The University Press of Kentucky*, 39-40.

¹²⁵⁹ Binnendijk, Hans. (2016). Asian partners and inadequate security structures. (Available from the book: Friends, foes, and future directions - the United States partnerships in a turbulent world: strategic rethink). *RAND Corporation*, 98-99.

Chinese State President Yang Shang-kun and Chinese Premier Li Peng met with South Korean Foreign Minister Lee Sang-ock (1990-1993) after China and South Korea formally reached normalization on 24th August 1992, which marked a newly historic beginning for the relationship between China and South Korea.¹²⁶⁰ On one hand, China decided not to see the triangular relations among China, Russia, and the United States as the most significant factor that influenced China's policy towards the Korean peninsula after China realized the importance of building its role in northeast Asia.¹²⁶¹ On the other hand, South Korean Foreign Minister Lee Sang-ock expressed South Korean President Roh Tae-woo's strong desire to normalize the Sino-South Korean relations while Lee had a meeting with the Chinese leadership in China.¹²⁶² In other words, both sides firmly supported the realization of the Sino-South Korean formal diplomacy in the context of China's new thinking over geo-politics. However, Snyder argues that the normalized relations between China and South Korea meant a new page to the triangular relations among China, South Korea and the United States.¹²⁶³ It would have been more disturbing to China if the United States had asked South Korea to get China more stressed in the aftermath of the Tiananmen Square Incident, which conversely meant that the Sino-South Korean diplomacy normalization played a role in easing tensions with its land neighbours.

The United States and South Korea did not decide to re-strengthen the military alliance relationship until China sought to establish an image of an emerging great power in the Asia-Pacific region, which meant that South Korea and the United States had a concern on China's expanding influence on the Korean peninsula with its "Two-Koreas Policy". According to Tan and Li, the Obama administration considered the deepening relations between the United States and South Korea as a strategy to maintain the United States' leading status in regional affairs, which provided South Korea with an opportunity to play a more active role in the United States' "Pivot-to-Asia" strategy.¹²⁶⁴ Zhang argues that the United States became annoyed after China

¹²⁶⁰ Zhang, Ting-yan. & Tan, Jing. (2007). Yongyuan de jiyi [Eternal memory]. *Shangdong daxue chubanshe (Shandong University Publishing House)*, p53.

¹²⁶¹ Yi, X. (1995). China's Korea policy: from 'One Korea' to 'Two Koreas'. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 22(2), 119-140, p121.

¹²⁶² Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p232.

¹²⁶³ Snyder, Scott. (2009). China's rise and the Two Koreas: politics, economics, and security. London: *Boulder*, p163.

¹²⁶⁴ Tan, Hong-mei. & Li, Jun. (2014), Meiguo dongya zhengce pinggu yu zhanwang – yatai zaipingheng zhanlve yu dongya zhixu de chonggou [On the United States' policy towards east Asia – the strategy of re-balancing the Asia-Pacific region and the reconstruction of the order in east Asia]. *Liaodong xueyuan xuebao*

and South Korea agreed to enhance bilateral relations and strove to realize inter-Korean reconciliation, which suggested the United States' concern about whether or not its role would be gradually eroded in regional affairs.¹²⁶⁵ Young emphasizes that the United States still aimed to preserve its presence in world affairs and had a strategic security calculation in northeast Asia.¹²⁶⁶ In contrast, the development of the Sino-South Korean relations imposed a restriction on the United States' strategic interests in northeast Asia. However, Han argues that both Lee Myung-bak and Park Geun-hye, the two representatives of the South Korean conservatives, agreed with the United States on its "Pivot-to-Asia" strategy, which meant that South Korea had an intention to impose pressure on China's development with the United States.¹²⁶⁷ In contrast, South Korea's military relations with the United States suggested some changes in the Sino-South Korean relations in the context of the "Pivot-to-Asia" strategy, which increased China's suspicion of sliding into the weakest party among the China-South Korea-the United States triangle security relations.

(*Journal of Eastern Liaoning University*), 16(4), 23-28, p28.

¹²⁶⁵ Zhang, Yu-shan. (2010). Zhonghan guanxi de huigu yu zhanwang [A review and outlook of Sino-South Korean relationship]. *Dangdai hanguo (Contemporary South Korea)*, 2010 (Spring), 1-9, p7.

¹²⁶⁶ Young, Whan-kihl. (2002). Security on the Korean peninsula: continuity and change. *Sage Publications*: 33(1), 59-79, p60.

¹²⁶⁷ Han, Xian-dong. (2015). Meiguo "yataizaipingheng" beijingxia hanguo de waijiao anquan zhanlve [On South Korea's diplomatic and security strategies in the context of the United States' "Pivot-to-Asia" strategy]. *Xiandai guoji guanxi (Contemporary International Relations)*, (3), 9-15, p11.

China's perspective on the United States' relations with Taiwan

The United States' relations with Taiwan came into a new stage after China could not continue to take advantage of the 'Soviet threat', which meant that China must re-think the relations between the Clinton administration and the Lee Teng-hui regime (1988-2000). According to Jiang Ze-min, both China and the United States did not reach an agreement on the settlement of peaceful unification with Taiwan, which constituted an obstacle to the development of the Sino-United States relationship.¹²⁶⁸ On one hand, Kissinger argues that Taiwan boldly put forward a plan to build its image as an independent state and to obtain recognition from the international community, even though the Clinton administration acknowledged the "One China" policy ("一中"政策 – yizhong zhengce).¹²⁶⁹ On the other hand, Sha argues that China's leverage in global affairs was greatly restricted as a result of the United States-led western states' philosophy of 'China threat', which turned into a stumbling block to China's diplomacy development.¹²⁷⁰ In other words, the situation regarding Taiwan and 'China threat' theory helped to explain the United States' new security thinking of China. However, Langdon argues that the Lee Teng-hui regime re-calculated the triangular relations among Washington, Taipei and Beijing in the post-Cold War period, and attempted to re-confirm Taipei's role in Washington's security strategy towards northeast Asia.¹²⁷¹ China had a rather obvious awareness that the United States paid great attention to its strategic interest around the western Pacific, even though China aimed to prevent the United States from meddling in China's internal affairs.¹²⁷² Glasier emphasizes that Taiwan continued to develop military relations and expand arms sale with the United States.¹²⁷³ Viewed in this vein, the United States considered Taiwan as a part of its plan to discourage China from rising as a regional power, which conversely meant that China still had to come up with solutions for the nightmare – the unstable triangular relations among China, the United States and Taiwan.

¹²⁶⁸ Jiang, Ze-min. (2006) Jiang, Ze-min wenxuan – dierjuan [Selected works of Jiang Ze-min – the second volume]. *Renmin chubanshe* (People's Publishing House), p152.

¹²⁶⁹ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. *Penguin Press*, p473.

¹²⁷⁰ Sha, Qi-guang. (2000). Dui xifangmeiti sanbu "zhongguoweixielun" de pingxi [On western media's description of 'China threat' theory]. *Guojizhengzhiyanjiu* (*The Journal of International Studies*), (3), p113.

¹²⁷¹ Langdon, Frank. (2001). American northeast Asian strategy. *Pacific Affairs*, 74(2), 167-184, p175.

¹²⁷² Westad, Arne. Odd. (2013). Restless empire: China and the world since 1750. London: *Vintage Books*, p392.

¹²⁷³ Glaser, S. Bonnie. (1993). China's security perceptions: interests and ambitions. *Asian Survey*, 33(3), 252-271, p259.

South Korea reached an agreement with China over breaking its diplomacy with Taiwan as the price for the achievement of the Sino-South Korean formal diplomacy, which meant a setback for the United States' plan to contain China with the confrontational military island chain from South Korea to Taiwan. According to Liu, China saw the termination of the South Korean-Taiwanese relations as an important step to isolate Taiwan, even though Niger had granted its recognition to Taiwan.¹²⁷⁴ On one hand, Park argues that Taipei did not become the weakest party in the Beijing-Seoul-Taipei triangle relations until Beijing established relations with the Seoul administration, even though Taipei had negotiated with Seoul over the possibility of keeping the Seoul-Taipei relations.¹²⁷⁵ In other words, South Korea put an end to its relations with Taiwan, which meant that South Korea's determination to normalize the Sino-South Korean relations at the cost of the "Taiwan card". On the other hand, Zhang and Tan argue that Taipei had a full idea of Seoul's changing policy towards Beijing and declared the termination of the Taipei-Seoul relations ahead of 24th August 1992.¹²⁷⁶ Chung emphasizes that Taipei denounced Seoul's decision to normalize relations with Beijing, which turned into a serious blow to Taipei's legitimacy.¹²⁷⁷ From Taiwan's perspective, South Korea was no longer a reliable ally that could help to deter communism and offer recognition in the international arena. However, Westad argues that the United States issued the Taiwan Relations Act aiming at helping the United States to preserve its strategic position along the First Military Island.¹²⁷⁸ Harding indicates that Beijing became more fearful of the progress of the settlement of peaceful unification in the context of Washington's relations with Taipei, even though Beijing attempted to use the "Washington card" to impose restriction on Taipei's bid to promote independence.¹²⁷⁹ Viewed in this instance, the cross-strait relations among Beijing,

¹²⁷⁴ Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094, p1089.

¹²⁷⁵ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p233.

¹²⁷⁶ Zhang, Ting-yan. & Tan, Jing. (2007). Yongyuan de jiyi [Eternal memory]. *Shangdong daxue chubanshe (Shangdong University Publishing House)*, p53.

¹²⁷⁷ Chung, Jae-ho. (2007). Between ally and partner: Korea-China relations and the United States. New York: *Columbia University Press*, p54.

¹²⁷⁸ Westad, Arne. Odd. (2013). Restless empire: China and the world since 1750. London: *Vintage Books*, p391.

¹²⁷⁹ Harding, Harry. (1992). China's American dilemma. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 519, 12-25, p23.

Taipei and Washington went into deeper deterioration in the background of Washington's re-estimation on Taipei, which consisted of Taipei's diminishing recognition and Washington's increasing leverage in Taipei's security thinking in the wake of Seoul's shift of recognition from Taipei to Beijing.

China's perspective on the United States' force on South Korea

South Korea reached an agreement with the United States on the deployment of the Terminal High Altitude Area Defence (more commonly known as THAAD) system in order to protect itself from North Korea's missile threat, which suggested that South Korea considered the United States' military presence in the Korean peninsula as a guarantee for South Korea's security. According to Binnendijk, the United States strove to re-enhance its leverage in Asia: the United States on one hand shifted its focus from Europe and the Middle East to Asia after the Obama government viewed Asia as an emerging area that provided the United States with great potential, on the other hand, realized the danger of North Korea's progress in nuclear capability to the United States and its allies in northeast Asia.¹²⁸⁰ Young argues that the United States reached consensus with South Korea about the significance of a comparatively stable inter-Korean relations to the whole peaceful development on the Korean peninsula.¹²⁸¹ However, Wang and Zhang argue that the United States aimed not only to prevent North Korea from rising as a nuclear power that would have the capability to initiate nuclear strikes, but also to take advantage of the North Korean nuclear issue in order to strengthen its primacy with the "Pivot-to-Asia" strategy.¹²⁸² In contrast, North Korea's determination to grow into a nuclear power further deteriorated its relations with South Korea, and the United States did not seize an opportunity to further enhance its role until the situation on the Korean peninsula escalated into military tension.

The United States' military relations with South Korea increased China's anxiety that South Korea would prefer the United States' troops staying in the Korean peninsula in the context of the North Korean nuclear crisis, which brought about a vehement condemnation from China and resulted in a new nadir of the Sino-South Korean relations. According to Snyder, it has been clear to see the complexity of the China-South Korea-the United States security triangle relations since these three nations respectively attempted to come up with one possibly acceptable scenario for the increasingly tricky Korean peninsula situation – North

¹²⁸⁰ Binnendijk, Hans. (2016). Asian partners and inadequate security structures. (Available from the book: Friends, foes, and future directions - the United States partnerships in a turbulent world: strategic rethink). RAND Corporation, 97-99.

¹²⁸¹ Young, Whan-kihl. (2002). Security on the Korean peninsula: continuity and change. Sage Publications: 33(1), 59-79, p60.

¹²⁸² Wang, Hui. & Zhang, Yu-shan. (2014). Meiguo "chongfanyazhou" zhanlve dui chaoxianbandao jushi de yingxiang [The influence of the United States' "Pivot-to-Asia" strategy on the Korean peninsula situation]. *Shehui kexue zhanxian (Social Science Front)*, (7), 165-170, p166.

Korean nuclear crisis.¹²⁸³ Wang and Zhang highlight that the Obama administration strengthened the United States' military relations with South Korea and staged joint military exercise in the context of North Korea's nuclear tests.¹²⁸⁴ In contrast, South Korea realized the United States' military intervention in inter-Korean affairs as a deterrent to North Korea. However, Han argues that South Korea's expanding military dependence on the United States equally encouraged the United States to promote the "Pivot-to-Asia" strategy and to contain China, which would further escalate into a newly historic confrontation between China and the United States.¹²⁸⁵ In other words, China saw South Korea's military relations with the United States as a means to expand the United States' military presence in the Korean peninsula while the Obama government aimed to preserve its strategic position, which helped to explain China's lower common security interest with South Korea.

The intensifying tension around the Korean peninsula would increase the possibility of being involved in a new unwanted war, which means that China must make full preparation for the United States' sudden strike against North Korea in case of the United States-led Korean peninsula. According to Jun and Kim, China has been afraid of the growing influence of the United States-South Korean military relations on the Korean peninsula, which means that China has considered the United States-controlled Korea as a threat.¹²⁸⁶ Binnendijk argues that China did not intend to undertake the possible consequence of the collapse of the Kim regime as a result of the United States' military involvement.¹²⁸⁷ In other words, the United States' military presence in the Korean peninsula has been an intractable problem, and it would turn into a security

¹²⁸³ Snyder, Scott. (2009). China's rise and the Two Koreas: politics, economics, and security. London: Boulder, p167.

¹²⁸⁴ Wang, Hui. & Zhang, Yu-shan. (2014). Meiguo "chongfanyazhou" zhanlve dui chaoxianbandao jushi de yingxiang [The influence of the United States' "Pivot-to-Asia" strategy on the Korean peninsula situation]. *Shehui kexue zhanxian (Social Science Front)*, (7), 165-170, p166.

¹²⁸⁵ Han, Xian-dong. (2015). Meiguo "yataizaipingheng" beijingxia hanguo de waijiao anquan zhanlve [On South Korea's diplomatic and security strategies in the context of the United States' "Pivot-to-Asia" strategy]. *Xiandai guoji guanxi (Contemporary International Relations)*, (3), 9-15, p14.

¹²⁸⁶ Jun, Byoung-kon. & Kim, Jang-ho. (2013). China's role and perception of a united Korea. *Korean Journal of Defense Analysis: Korea Institute for Defense Analyses*, 25(3), 369-383, p377.

¹²⁸⁷ Binnendijk, Hans. (2016). Asian partners and inadequate security structures. (Available from the book: *Friends, foes, and future directions - the United States partnerships in a turbulent world: strategic rethink*). RAND Corporation, p104.

burden to China if the Korean peninsula becomes more unstable and unpeaceful. Nam, Choo and Lee highlight that the scenario that China would dispatch military troops to the Korean peninsula only happens if North Korea slides into an occupied area.¹²⁸⁸ In contrast, China has realized the imperative of decreasing North Korea's nuclear threat in order to discourage itself from being entrapped into a more serious relations with the United States, which means that China's fear of an unstable Korean peninsula would arouse if the United States continues to strengthen its relations with South Korea and its presence in the Korean peninsula.

South Korea's intimate military relations with the United States would destroy China's security interest while China aims to attain stability, which helps to explain China's hard stance on South Korea and China's security vulnerability in the context of North Korea's possible collapse. According to Shi, China on one hand strives to realize peaceful denuclearization in the Korean peninsula in order to stabilize its geo-strategic relations with North Korea and to prevent a influx of North Korean refugees from entering into northern China via the Yalu river, on the other hand, attempts to build more leverage on the Korean peninsula by playing a mediating role for the United States and North Korea.¹²⁸⁹ Nam, Choo and Lee argue that China should not only pay attention to South Korea's dealing with North Korea, but also keep North Korea from being an ally of its adversary, such as the United States and South Korea.¹²⁹⁰ In other words, China has a grave concern on South Korea's attitude towards North Korea, which conversely means that China may have to undertake consequence of the changing inter-Korean relations. Han emphasizes that the situation of North Korea's nuclear crisis has been more serious in the wake of the United States' attempt to elevate its security relations with South Korea to a new high, which would weaken the basis of the security cooperation between China and South Korea.¹²⁹¹ In other words, the United States-South Korean military relations demonstrated the disparity between China and South Korea while China did not mean to be entrapped into security dilemma aroused by North Korea. Having looked at China's security policy towards South Korea in the post-Deng

¹²⁸⁸ Nam, Jong-ho. & Choo, Jae-woo. & Lee, Jang-won. (2013). China's dilemma on the Korean peninsula: not an alliance but a security dilemma. *The Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, 25(3), 385-398, p386.

¹²⁸⁹ Shi, Yin-hong. (2009). China's dilemma over the North Korean nuclear problem. (Available from the book: Challenges to China's foreign policy). *The University Press of Kentucky*, 174-175.

¹²⁹⁰ Nam, Jong-ho. & Choo, Jae-woo. & Lee, Jang-won. (2013). China's dilemma on the Korean peninsula: not an alliance but a security dilemma. *The Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, 25(3), 385-398, 389-390.

¹²⁹¹ Han, Xian-dong. (2015). Meiguo "yataizaipingheng" beijingxia hanguo de waijiao anquan zhanlve [On South Korea's diplomatic and security strategies in the context of the United States' "Pivot-to-Asia" strategy]. *Xiandai guoji guanxi (Contemporary International Relations)*, (3), 9-15, p14.

Xiao-ping era, the next section will analyze the influence of the China's changing foreign policy approaches on China's "Two-Koreas Policy".

China's diplomatic policy towards South Korea in the post-Deng era: the rational actor explanation

The “Independent Foreign Policy of Peace”

China's diplomatic policy in the post-Deng Xiaoping era was composed of three different main elements, including the “Low-profile” strategy, the “Good-neighbour” policy and the “Independent-defence” principle. According to Hsiung, China set out to modify its diplomatic measures in order to adapt itself to the post-Cold War setting.¹²⁹² Zhao argues that the Chinese government had a grave concern on these economic sanctions imposed by the United States and other western European nations, which helped to explain why Deng Xiaoping put forward the “Low-profile” strategy that contributed to understanding a new feature of China's foreign policy behaviour in the post-Deng era.¹²⁹³ In contrast, the Chinese leadership should come up with a solution to prevent China from being involved in confrontation with these advanced countries. China further realized ways to strengthen friendly relations with states in the Asia Pacific as an imperative, which meant that China adopted the “Good-neighbour” policy.¹²⁹⁴ In contrast, the Chinese government did not pay excessive attention to the so-called omni-direction relations with its neighbouring states until the demise of the Soviet Union, which conversely meant that China regarded its peace-oriented approach as an instrument in response to the newly unipolar world order. Besides, Chen argues that China has aimed to establish and enhance existing ties with countries from the Third World, which should be viewed as one indispensable principle of China's new diplomatic strategy in the post-Cold War period.¹²⁹⁵ Although China advocated peace as well as development, China attempted to see its solidarity and friendship with the Third World as a shield to protect itself from the United States-led industrial states' interference in its independence.

The Chinese leadership must restore the Sino-United States relations and escape from the United States and other capitalist states' hostility in the aftermath of the Tiananmen Square Incident, which helped to

¹²⁹² Hsiung, C. James. (1995). China's omni-directional diplomacy: realignment to cope with monopolar United States' power. *Asian Survey*, 35(6), 573-586, p573.

¹²⁹³ Zhao, Quan-sheng. (2001). Chinese foreign policy in the post-Cold War era. *World Affairs*, 159(3), 114-129, p114.

¹²⁹⁴ Xiong, Kun-xin. (2004). Cong zhongguo chuantongwenhua de shijiao kan zhongguo yu zhoubianguojia de mulinyouhan zhengce [On China's friendly approach towards neighbouring states from the perspective of Chinese conventional culture]. *Guoji zhengzhi yanjiu (Studies of International Politics)*, (2), 17-27, p17.

¹²⁹⁵ Chen, Qi-mao. (1993). New approaches in China's foreign policy: the post-Cold War era. *Asian Surveys*, 33(3), 237-251, p241.

understand China's "Low-profile" strategy in the post-Deng era. According to Fenby, the Chinese government's strong stance on the Tiananmen Square Incident provided a basic suspicion of what decisions to be made by Chinese political leaders or set a landmark example for how Chinese political leaders to react, which significantly influenced China's policy thinking in the post-Deng era.¹²⁹⁶ Fewsmith argues that there had been an emerging idea of the possible split of the Chinese Communist Party regime following the Tiananmen Square Incident.¹²⁹⁷ However, Li highlights that China did not overcome some difficulties until Deng Xiao-ping implemented the "Low-profile" strategy.¹²⁹⁸ In other words, the Chinese government undertook enormous pressure of diplomatic dilemma and economic instability, which conversely turned into a drive to shift foreign strategy in order to discourage the United States and other east European states from further imposing influence on China's diplomacy. Liu indicates that China managed to restore its relations with the United States in the context of the "Low-profile" strategy, which enabled China to build a peaceful environment for China's friendly diplomacy and economic modernization in the post-Cold War period.¹²⁹⁹ In contrast, China adopted the "Low-profile" strategy for the sake of diplomatic calculation and economic concern, which suggested that China could not under-estimate the significance of the United States.

China did not endeavour to strengthen an image of pursuing peace until the dissolution of the Soviet Union, which suggested that China aimed to see friendly diplomacy towards neighbouring states as a tactic to reduce the impact of the new world order led by the United States. According to Jiang Ze-min, China played an increasingly important role in stabilizing regional peace and development as well as promoting regional economic prosperity and cooperation, and China should build a role of 'friendly co-operator' in order to decrease neighbouring states' concern on the philosophy of 'China threat'.¹³⁰⁰ Kissinger argues that China

¹²⁹⁶ Fenby, Jonathan. (2008). History of modern China: the fall and rise of a great power, 1850-2008. Penguin Books, p639.

¹²⁹⁷ Fewsmith, Joseph. (2008). China since Tiananmen (second edition). Cambridge University Press, p1.

¹²⁹⁸ Li, You-shen. (2012). Guojialiyi shijiaoxia de "taoguangyanghui" zhengyi [On the controversy of the "Low-profile" strategy from the aspect of national interest]. *Guojizhanwang (Global Review)*, (3), 27-40, p27.

¹²⁹⁹ Liu, Jian-fei. (2019). Xinshidai zhongguowaijiao jixu taoguangyanghui yeyao fenfayouwei [On the necessity of pursuing the "Low-profile" strategy as well as the "achievement-oriented" principle in the new era]. *Zhongguo dangzheng ganbu luntan (Chinese Cadres Tribune)*, (1), 46-48.

¹³⁰⁰ Jiang, Ze-min. (2006). Jiang, Ze-min wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Jiang Ze-min – the third volume]. Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House), 314-315.

and America immediately realized that the implosion of the Soviet Union meant the end of both sides' strategic cooperation to contain the Soviet Union, which conversely meant a beginning of each other's deepening contradiction and divergence.¹³⁰¹ In other words, China did neither enable to play the 'Soviet threat' towards the United States nor manage to lift the United States-led industrial states' sanctions on its economy, which helped to explain China's struggle of new diplomatic dilemma in the post-Cold War period. Hsuing argues that China did not realize the imperative of the "Good-neighbour" policy until the United States and other western states launched a more hostile approach towards China following the Tiananmen Square Incident.¹³⁰² Chen indicates that China decided to see the normalization of foreign relations with neighbouring countries as a matter of primary importance.¹³⁰³ In contrast, the Chinese leadership aimed to establish friendly cooperative relationship, which suggested the decreasing role of socialist ideology in China's diplomacy.

China's pragmatic foreign policy did not mean that China had an intention of sacrificing its pursuit of independence as well as sovereignty, which suggested China's concern on the United States' ascent to the unique monopolar superpower and its role as new threat to China in the post-Cold War period. According to Jiang Ze-min, China should not only have a willingness to promote friendly relations with foreign countries, but also emphasize the importance of the basis of the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence.¹³⁰⁴ Li argues that China should see the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence as a hard foundation for China's diplomacy, which means that China does not hesitate to develop foreign relations with these countries that would show respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, insist on non-interference in domestic affairs, refrain from waging aggression wars, adhere to equality and reciprocity and strive for peaceful co-existence.¹³⁰⁵ In short, China aims to protect its national interests, even though China promises to narrow

¹³⁰¹ Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. Penguin Press, p458.

¹³⁰² Hsiung, C. James. (1995). China's omni-directional diplomacy: realignment to cope with monopolar United States' power. *Asian Survey*, 35(6), 573-586, p573.

¹³⁰³ Chen, Qi-mao. (1993). New approaches in China's foreign policy: the post-Cold War era. *Asian Surveys*, 33(3), 237-251, p242.

¹³⁰⁴ Jiang, Ze-min. (2006). Jiang, Ze-min wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Jiang Ze-min – the third volume]. Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House), p315.

¹³⁰⁵ Li, Dong. (2018). Hepinggongchuwuxiangyuanze – goujian xinxingguojiguanxi de jishi [On the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence – the basis for establishing newly type of international relations]. Heilongjiangsheng shehuizhuyixueyuan xuebao (*Journal of Heilongjiang Institute of Socialism*), (3), 41-43, p41.

difference. Hsiung argues that China on one hand aimed to promote its peaceful approach towards the Third World in order to decrease the unfavourable influence imposed by the United States, on the other hand, reached consensus with 49 developing states over these advanced industrial states' non-intervention in developing nations' internal affairs.¹³⁰⁶ In contrast, China endeavoured to maintain its relations with the Third World, which reflected that China considered independence as a key element of its diplomacy. Chen indicates that China strove to establish and develop friendly cooperative relations with states in Asia, Africa, and Latin America in the aftermath of the Soviet empire's collapse.¹³⁰⁷ In other words, China immediately realized the urgency of utilizing a friendly approach towards the outer world, which conversely meant China's struggle of its new diplomatic dilemma in the context of the United States' hostility.

¹³⁰⁶ Hsiung, C. James. (1995). China's omni-directional diplomacy: realignment to cope with monopolar United States' power. *Asian Survey*, 35(6), 573-586, p573.

¹³⁰⁷ Chen, Qi-mao. (1993). New approaches in China's foreign policy: the post-Cold War era. *Asian Surveys*, 33(3), 237-251, p241.

China's "Two-Koreas Policy"

China's relations with South Korea did not come into a new phase until China made a series of significant adjustment in foreign strategies, which meant that China's new diplomatic calculation as well as recognition promoted China's "Two-Koreas Policy". On one hand, Park argues that China's relations with the global community seriously deteriorated in the context of the Tiananmen Square Incident, which dragged China into extensive hostility from the industrial nations.¹³⁰⁸ On the other hand, Snyder argues that the Tiananmen Square Incident constituted an obstacle to the normalization of the Sino-South Korean relations in the 1980s.¹³⁰⁹ However, Cheng and Zhang argue that China was determined to embrace the "Low-profile" strategy, which aimed to decrease political tensions and realize reciprocal relations with all states.¹³¹⁰ In contrast, the Tiananmen Square Incident did not put an end to China's pragmatic diplomacy thinking and China's flexible approach towards South Korea, but mean a beginning of China's stronger willingness to repair its relations with the international society. Wang emphasizes that China adopted a comparatively pragmatic attitude towards South Korea's "Northern Policy" that aimed to establish formal relations with socialist states, which meant that China recognized the diminishing factor of ideological concern.¹³¹¹ In contrast, China decided to set aside the self-imposed restriction about ideology and to continue to use a bolder foreign policy approach towards South Korea, which suggested that China set out to see rationalism as an important foreign policy element.

China did not formally implement its "Good-neighbour" policy until the Soviet Union announced its division into 15 states, which controversially helped to explain China's friendly diplomacy and China's changing policy towards South Korea. Snyder argues that China realized the disappeared diplomatic pressure from the influence of the Soviet-North Korean relations after the Gorbachev government declared the demise of the

¹³⁰⁸ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p217.

¹³⁰⁹ Snyder, Scott. (2009). China's rise and the Two Koreas: politics, economics, and security. London: *Boulder*, p29.

¹³¹⁰ Cheng, Yu-sheck, J. & Zhang, Wankun, F. (1999). Chinese foreign relations strategies under Mao and Deng: a systematic and comparative analysis. *Philippine Journal of Third World Studies*, 14(3), 91-114, p101.

¹³¹¹ Wang, Yu-xuan. (2015). Zhongguo waijiao zhanlve tiaozheng dui chaoxianbandao zhengce de yingxiang huigu [The influence of China's diplomatic strategy adjustment on its policy towards the Korean peninsula]. *Shenyang gongcheng xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Shenyang Institute of Engineering)*, 11(1), 73-76, p74.

Soviet empire.¹³¹² However, Hsiung argues that the United States-led western advanced countries still insisted on a hostile approach towards China after the implosion of the Soviet Union, which helped to explain China's intention to further pursue peaceful development and promote closer relations with neighbouring states.¹³¹³ In other words, China obviously needed to strive for a more favourable diplomatic position in the international community and to find out a more pragmatic solution for the diplomatic dilemma. Wang on one hand argues that China decided to embrace a more dynamic foreign policy approach, on the other hand, the formally normalized Sino-South Korean relations on 24th August 1992 put an end to the long-term political hostility and isolation, which meant that China decided to adopt the "double-strategy" that enabled China to flexibly develop its balanced position on the Korean peninsula.¹³¹⁴ In other words, China began to make adjustment about its diplomatic policy and to develop friendly cooperative relations with the two states on the Korean peninsula, which helped to explain Beijing's formal acknowledgment of the Seoul government as a new legitimate state in the context of the "Two-Koreas Policy".

South Korea's acknowledgement of the "One China" policy ("一中"政策 – yizhong zhengce) convinced China to balance its strategy in the Korean peninsula, which enabled both sides to move towards the normalization of foreign relations. According to Jiang Ze-min and Hu Jin-tao, Taiwan is a part of China, and the People's Republic of China is the sole legitimate government in the community, which is the fundamental principle of developing foreign relations with every overseas nation.¹³¹⁵ Snyder argues that China attempted to see the realization of the Sino-South Korean relations as an important tactic that would sever South Korea's diplomacy with Taiwan, which meant that the Chinese leadership aimed to isolate Taiwan from the

¹³¹² Snyder, Scott. (2009). China's rise and the Two Koreas: politics, economics, and security. London: Boulder, p31.

¹³¹³ Hsiung, C. James. (1995). China's omni-directional diplomacy: realignment to cope with monopolar United States' power. *Asian Survey*, 35(6), 573-586, p573.

¹³¹⁴ Wang, Yu-xuan. (2015). Zhongguo waijiao zhanlve tiaozheng dui chaoxianbandao zhengce de yingxiang huigu [The influence of China's diplomatic strategy adjustment on its policy towards the Korean peninsula]. *Shenyang gongcheng xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Shenyang Institute of Engineering)*, 11(1), 73-76, p74.

¹³¹⁵ Jiang, Ze-min. (2006) Jiang, Ze-min wenxuan – di'erjuan [Selected works of Jiang Ze-min – the second volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p128. & Hu, Jin-tao. (2016). Hu Jin-tao wenxuan – di'erjuan [Selected works of Hu Jin-tao – the second volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, 301-302. & Hu, Jin-tao. (2016). Hu Jin-tao wenxuan – di-san-juan [Selected works of Hu Jin-tao – the third volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p190.

international community with the “Two-Koreas Policy”.¹³¹⁶ In contrast, China regarded the normalization with South Korea as a significant part of its plan to expand leverage in the international arena and to realize the settlement of its peaceful unification with Taiwan. Zhang and Tan additionally highlight that China did not enable to prevent Japan’s development, decrease Taiwan’s legitimacy and promote stable relations with neighbouring nations until the establishment of the Sino-South Korean relations, which meant that China aimed to achieve both Koreas’ peace and to facilitate China’s global diplomatic setting.¹³¹⁷ Park insists that South Korea acknowledged the “One China” policy that both the United States and Japan also did ahead of formal diplomacy.¹³¹⁸ In other words, South Korea’s endorsement of the “One China” policy overthrew the cornerstone of China’s “Pro-North Korea Policy” and became the instrument to constitute China’s “double-strategy” on the Korean peninsula.

The United States attempted to meddle in China’s diplomacy with neighbouring nations in the wake of the Sino-South Korean relations development, which suggested that the United States imposed diplomatic pressure on China’s “Good-neighbour” policy and “Two-Koreas Policy”. Chou argues that China has emphasized the significance of the “Good-neighbour” policy that would help China to build peaceful relations with peripheral states and promote economic cooperation with the overseas market.¹³¹⁹ Besides, Hundt argues that the Sino-South Korean relations achieved impressive development, and both sides realized the imperative of further expanding cooperation in other realms.¹³²⁰ In other words, China and South Korea did not enable to elevate the bilateral relations into a new phase of development until China adopted a friendly approach towards neighbouring states, which forged the strategic cooperative relations. However, Chen argues that the United States did neither put an end to the plan to contain China, nor cease to intervene

¹³¹⁶ Snyder, Scott. (2009). China’s rise and the Two Koreas: politics, economics, and security. London: Boulder, p37.

¹³¹⁷ Zhang, Ting-yan. & Tan, Jing. (2004). Chushi hanguo [Serving as a diplomat in South Korea]. Shangdong daxue chubanshe (Shangdong University Publishing House), p17.

¹³¹⁸ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China’s policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) Durham University, Department of Politics, p234.

¹³¹⁹ Chou, Hua-fei. (2014). Guoji geju yanbian zhong de dangdai zhongguo zhoubian waijiao huanjing [On contemporary China’s neighbouring diplomatic environment under the transition of the international order]. Tongji daxue xuebao (Journal of Tongji University), 25(6), 27-35, p27.

¹³²⁰ Hundt, David. (2010). China’s “Two-Koreas Policy”: achievements and contradictions. *Political Science*, 62(2), 132-145, p138.

in China's diplomacy with neighbouring states, which suggested that China could hardly escape from pressure imposed by the United States in the context of China's ascent.¹³²¹ Shambaugh highlights that China's relations with its peripheral states worsened after the United States took advantage of the "Pivot-to-Asia" strategy to re-build the United States' role from east Asia to south Asia, including Australia, ASEAN, India, Japan, the Philippines, South Korea and Vietnam.¹³²² In contrast, China's flexible approach towards neighbouring states did not turn into an instrument to decrease the United States' hostility, but result in the United States' aggressive plan to deter China by bringing China into a serious diplomatic setting around its periphery, which conversely meant that China's "circumference diplomacy" and "Two-Koreas Policy" were trapped into an unstable stage. Having elaborated China's diplomatic policy concern and China's "Two-Koreas-Policy", the thesis will move to an explanation of China's policy towards South Korea in the context of China's "Opening and Reform Policy" and "Going-global" strategy ("走出去" 战略 – zouchuqu zhanlve).

¹³²¹ Chen, Xiang. (2015). Zhongguo zhoubianwaijiao de zhangaixing yinsu fenxi [On the obstructive factor of China's peripheral diplomacy]. *Heping yu fazhan (Peace and Development)*, (3), 25-39, p25.

¹³²² Shambaugh, David. (2013). China goes global: the partial power. Oxford: *Oxford University Press*, p77.

China's economic policy towards South Korea in the post-Deng era: the rational actor explanation

China's "Opening and Reform Policy" and "Going-global" strategy

China had the intention of decreasing its economic dependence on the United States-led industrial states after the Tiananmen Square Incident, which provided South Korea with an opportunity to further strengthen its trading connection with China. According to Jiang Ze-min, China should insist on Deng Xiao-ping's "three-step" development strategy and continue to see stable economic development as state work.¹³²³ Park argues that China's economic relations with the international community came into a critically serious period after the Tiananmen Square Incident had diminished the United States and other western states' participation in China's modernization programme, even though these advanced states played an active role in bringing capital and technology to China in the 1980s.¹³²⁴ It was a heavy blow to the Chinese leadership that these advanced capitalist states imposed economic sanction on China and threatened to withdraw from the Chinese market. However, Yi argues that South Korea was determined to promote economic cooperation with China while the Tiananmen Square Incident resulted in the United States-led industrial states' aggressive trade approach towards China.¹³²⁵ Jia and Zhuang highlight that the Chinese government paid higher attention to South Korea's investment than the early 1980s after China had realized the United States-led developed nations' destructive impact on China's modernization programme, which suggested that China considered the active business connection with the overseas market as a significant part of China's material interests.¹³²⁶ Zhang and Tan indicate that Qian Qi-chen, the then Chinese Foreign Minister, flew to Seoul and participated in the Third APEC Ministerial Conference in November 1991, which enabled South Korea to continue repairing its relations with China.¹³²⁷ In other words, the economic inter-dependence between China and South Korea immensely increased in the wake of the Tiananmen Square Incident, which meant that China

¹³²³ Jiang, Ze-min. (2006). Jiang, Ze-min wenxuan – diyijuan [Selected works of Jiang Ze-min – the first volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p59.

¹³²⁴ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p200.

¹³²⁵ Yi, X. (1995). China's Korea policy: from 'One Korea' to 'Two Koreas'. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 22(2), 119-140, p124.

¹³²⁶ Jia, Hao. & Zhuang, Qu-bing. (1992). China's policy towards the Korean peninsula. *Asian Survey*, 32(12), 1137-1156, p1147.

¹³²⁷ Zhang, Ting-yan. & Tan, Jing. (2007). Yongyuan de jiyi [Eternal memory]. *Shangdong daxue chubanshe (Shandong University Publishing House)*, 41-42.

decreased political discontent and confirmed business ties with South Korea in the context of the growing trading volume.

China became more determined to insist on the “Opening and Reform Policy” in the wake of the disintegration of the Soviet Union, which further contributed to the increasing economic inter-dependence with South Korea. According to Jiang Ze-min, China was meant to quicken the pace of accomplishing modernization programme in order to achieve a greater success of the cause of socialism with Chinese characteristics and protect Chinese socialist system from new historic changes.¹³²⁸ Shambaugh argues that the Chinese government considered the fall of the Soviet empire as a disastrous failure in the development of socialism while the Chinese leadership endeavoured to prevent China from being drawn into the similar path.¹³²⁹ In other words, the upheaval in east European states, the re-unification of Germany and the Tiananmen Square Incident had greatly frustrated China, and China undertook heavier burden of the decreasing confidence on the promotion of socialist construction. However, Park argues that the Chinese leadership deeply believed that the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the demise of communism in east European nations originally resulted from the long-term economic instability in these nations, which helped to explain the significance of material interests in China’s foreign policy and its approach towards South Korea.¹³³⁰ Hsiung emphasizes that China decided to consider the expanding economic interest as an indispensable element in China’s foreign strategy and to downgrade ideological concern – socialism, which contributed to the Sino-South Korean diplomacy normalization.¹³³¹ China became more anxious about the escalating impact of the Soviet empire’s collapse on China’s overall development, and became more eager to promote economic connection with South Korea.

Beijing’s “double strategy” did not only sever the Seoul-Taipei diplomacy, but also weaken Taipei’s economic inter-dependence with Seoul by enabling both sides to compete in the Chinese market. According to Zhang and Tan, the Roh Tae-woo government aimed to achieve the normalization of the Sino-South

¹³²⁸ Jiang, Ze-min. (2006). Jiang, Ze-min wenxuan – diyijuan [Selected works of Jiang Ze-min – the first volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People’s Publishing House)*, 210-211.

¹³²⁹ Shambaugh, David. (2013). China goes global: the partial power. *Oxford University Press*, p79.

¹³³⁰ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China’s policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p201.

¹³³¹ Hsiung, C. James. (1995). China’s omni-directional diplomacy: realignment to cope with monopolar United States’ power. *Asian Survey*, 35(6), 573-586, p574.

Korean diplomacy, even though Seoul had maintained a long-term comprehensive relations with Taipei.¹³³² Park argues that Taipei on one hand intended to provide Seoul with a specialized economic preferential condition in order to prolong its relations with Seoul, on the other hand, threatened to develop trading connection with Pyongyang in case of Seoul's decision to establish diplomacy with Beijing.¹³³³ In other words, it was a fatal blow to Taipei that the Seoul administration normalized its relations with Beijing, which suggested that Seoul paid a higher attention to its economic relations with Beijing in comparison with Taipei. Besides, Jia and Zhuang argue that Seoul's formal foreign relations with Beijing had a comprehensive influence on Taipei: Taipei's status in the international community and its role in Seoul's policy calculation were greatly diminished, and Taipei's participation in the Chinese market was also restricted as a result of Seoul's competition.¹³³⁴ Snyder emphasizes that Beijing required Seoul to terminate its political as well as commercial relations with Taipei.¹³³⁵ In contrast, Seoul's determination to cut off relations with Taipei helped to explain Beijing's decision to initiate the "Two-Koreas Policy", which further shaped the complex triangle economic relations among Beijing, Seoul and Taipei in the post-Cold War period.

China and South Korea decided to establish formal diplomacy, which further helped to understand the bilateral economic inter-dependence's role in China's "Two-Koreas Policy". According to Zhang and Tan, the Sino-South Korean relations normalization was viewed as a combination of a historic development of China's "Opening and Reform" diplomacy and a significant achievement of Roh Tae-woo's "Northern Policy", which symbolized a new era of peace and stability in northeast Asia.¹³³⁶ Zhang argues that the commercial relations between China and South Korea and the end of the Cold War contributed to China's diplomacy normalization with South Korea, which removed the self-imposed restriction on both sides'

¹³³² Zhang, Ting-yan. & Tan, Jing. (2007). Yongyuan de jiyi [Eternal memory]. *Shangdong daxue chubanshe (Shandong University Publishing House)*, 45-46.

¹³³³ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics, p233.

¹³³⁴ Jia, Hao. & Zhuang, Qu-bing. (1992). China's policy towards the Korean peninsula. *Asian Survey*, 32(12), 1137-1156, p1148.

¹³³⁵ Snyder, Scott. (2009). China's rise and the Two Koreas: politics, economics, and security. London: *Boulder*, p39.

¹³³⁶ Zhang, Ting-yan. & Tan, Jing. (2007). Yongyuan de jiyi [Eternal memory]. *Shangdong daxue chubanshe (Shandong University Publishing House)*, p54.

economic development.¹³³⁷ Jia and Zhuang highlight that South Korea on one hand was compelled to undertake the consequence of international trade frictions as a result of protectionists' policies; on the other hand, realized the urgency of establishing trading connection with overseas states that could help South Korea to save cost and make profit, which helped to explain South Korea's endeavour to promote economic cooperation with China.¹³³⁸ In other words, China and South Korea have fully understood the importance of the increasing trading volume to the bilateral trading relations since the 1980s. Snyder emphasizes that the trading volume between Beijing and Seoul had greatly increased since the middle 1980s, even though both sides did not normalize diplomacy until 1992.¹³³⁹ In contrast, it was both sides' pursuit of economic interdependence that provided Beijing and Seoul with an opportunity to estimate the role of the bilateral economic cooperation in each other's overall policy thinking.

China became more determined to promote economic cooperation in the 2000s, which constituted a more practical intimate economic partnership with South Korea in the context of the "Two-Koreas Policy". According to Hu Jin-tao, the Chinese government should continue promoting the socialist cause with Chinese characteristics, enhancing China's overall national strength and raising China's status in the international community, which means that China should insist on the basic state policy – the "Opening and Reform Policy" and participate in the international cooperation as well as competition with a more active role.¹³⁴⁰ Park argues that China's "Two-Koreas Policy" should be viewed as a pragmatic strategy that mainly aims to enlarge China's strategic increase as well as diminish China's diplomatic damage in the Korean peninsula.¹³⁴¹ Yi emphasizes that China has maintained a friendly cooperative partnership with South Korea

¹³³⁷ Zhang, Ying-qing. (1995). Zhongguo de gaigekaifang zhengce yu zhongri, zhonghan guanxi [On China's "Opening and Reform Policy" and the diplomacies with Japan, South Korea]. *International Politics Research*, p119.

¹³³⁸ Jia, Hao. & Zhuang, Qu-bing. (1992). China's policy towards the Korean peninsula. *Asian Survey*, 32(12), 1137-1156, 1145-1146.

¹³³⁹ Snyder, Scott. (2009). China's rise and the Two Koreas: politics, economics, and security. London: Boulder, 41-42.

¹³⁴⁰ Hu, Jin-tao. (2016). Hu Jin-tao wenxuan – diyijuan [Selected works of Hu Jin-tao – the first volume]. Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House), p415.

¹³⁴¹ Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (Doctoral Dissertation) Durham University, Department of Politics, p395.

in order to cater to economic development.¹³⁴² In other words, China has considered South Korea as a significant player in advancing China's national socialist modernization cause, which suggested China's persistence in the "Opening and Reform Policy" and the "Two-Koreas Policy". Apart from mutual political support, Zhang and Wang argue that both sides' business cooperation as well as economic inter-dependence have crucially served to strengthen the Sino-South Korean relations.¹³⁴³ Guo indicates that the trading volume between China and South Korea reached more than 168 billion dollars in 2008, which effectively enabled both states to promote mutual development and common prosperity.¹³⁴⁴ In contrast, both Beijing and Seoul could not downplay the enhancing commercial relations, which further helped to understand China's pursuit of maximizing national interest and China's "double strategy" towards the Korean peninsula.

China's rise did not only work for economic cooperation with South Korea, but also turn into economic competition with South Korea, which constituted a complex understanding of China's "Two-Koreas Policy". According to Hu Jin-tao, China should not only insist on the "bringing-in" strategy, but also integrate into the international market with the "Going-global" strategy: China has realized the significance of encouraging local companies to expand into global corporations since the 2000s.¹³⁴⁵ Zhang argues that the development of the Sino-South Korean relations did not only help to diminish the adverse effect of the Cold War pattern in northeast Asia, but also help to explain the obvious phenomenon of China's peaceful rise.¹³⁴⁶ Guo indicates that China has emerged as South Korea's largest trading partner as well as largest source of foreign investment while the bilateral trading volume climbed into 240 billion dollars, which has significantly

¹³⁴² Yi, X. (1995). China's Korea policy: from 'One Korea' to 'Two Koreas'. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 22(2), 119-140, p134.

¹³⁴³ Zhang, Hui-zhi. & Wang, Xiao-ke. (2013). Zhonghan guanxi ershinian: chengjiu yu wenti [On achievements as well as contradictions of the Sino-South Korean relationship in the last two decades]. *Xiandai guoji guanxi (Contemporary International Relations)*, (1), 20-27, p21.

¹³⁴⁴ Guo, Rui. (2013). Zhongguo de chaoxianbandao zhengce pinggu – lishijingyan dangqianchengguo yu ruoganbuzu [On the evaluation of China's policy towards the Korean peninsula – historic experience, present achievement and certain weaknesses]. *Dangdai hanguo (Contemporary Korea)*, (2), 22-31, p27.

¹³⁴⁵ Hu, Jin-tao. (2016). Hu Jin-tao wenxuan – diyijuan [Selected works of Hu Jin-tao – the first volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House)*, p418.

¹³⁴⁶ Zhang, Yu-shan. (2010). Zhonghan guanxi de huigu yu zhanwang [A review and outlook of Sino-South Korean relationship]. *Dangdai hanguo (Contemporary South Korea)*, 2010 (Spring), 1-9, p1.

influenced regional economic development.¹³⁴⁷ In other words, China's economic rise served to forge the strategic cooperative partnership between China and South Korea, which symbolized the Chinese leadership's pursuit of economic growth. However, Kim argues that Koreans have a complex idea of the specific impact of China's economic strength on the development in the Korean peninsula, even though South Korea has been viewed as such a nation that has received the biggest economic interest from a rising China.¹³⁴⁸ Shan highlights that both China and South Korea have strategic advantage of labour intensive commodity, which conversely means that China competes with South Korea for these capital as well as technology products.¹³⁴⁹ Viewed in this vein, both sides have become more concerned on the unavoidable competition with each other in the international market, which increased such an anxiety of being exceeded and replaced by each other.

The United States has been fully conscious of China's expanding economic inter-dependence with the international market, even though China's rise has been viewed as a part of Asia's ascent since China escalated into the second largest entity. According to Xi Jin-ping, China pursues domestic growth as well as emphasizes international contribution as a responsible state in the international community: the Chinese government insists on the win-win open-up strategy and the realization of 'China dream' means an opportunity to the world.¹³⁵⁰ Shambaugh argues that China has been acknowledged as an emerging giant power since China achieved a prosperous economy.¹³⁵¹ In other words, China's economic increase has attracted global attention, which explained the importance of China to the world. However, Tan and Li argue that the Obama government actively promoted the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement with Asian states in

¹³⁴⁷ Guo, Rui. (2013). Zhongguo de chaoxianbandao zhengce pinggu – lishijingyan dangqianchengguo yu ruoganbuzu [On the evaluation of China's policy towards the Korean peninsula – historic experience, present achievement and certain weaknesses]. *Dangdai hanguo (Contemporary Korea)*, (2), 22-31, p27.

¹³⁴⁸ Kim, Heungkyu. (2012). Enemy, homager or equal partner? Evolving Korea-China relations. *Journal of National and Area Studies*, Seoul National University, 19(2), 47-62, 49-50.

¹³⁴⁹ Shan, Shi-ying. (2013). Zhonghan maoyi de hubuxing yu jingzhengxing fenxi [On complementarity as well as competitiveness of the Sino-South Korean trading relations]. *Zhongguo shanmao (China Journal of Commerce)*, (20), 129-130, p130.

¹³⁵⁰ Xi, Jin-ping. (2014). Xi Jin-ping tan zhiguolizheng [Xi Jin-ping's discussion on how to manage state affairs and govern the country]. *Waiwen chubanshe (Foreign Languages Press)*, p57.

¹³⁵¹ Shambaugh, David. (2013). China goes global: the partial power. Oxford: *Oxford University Press*, p4.

order to re-build its role in east Asia's economy.¹³⁵² Snyder emphasizes that states in northeast Asia could not ignore China's tremendous economic development, which means that China's rise should be considered as a factor that has increasingly influenced the Korean peninsula as well.¹³⁵³ Although the United States realized the significance of continuing cooperation with a rising China, the United States gradually shifted its attitude towards China after China expanded as a globally economic giant, which conversely stimulated neighbouring states' newly complex thinking on China and explained the potential implications for the Korean peninsula.

China's economic ascent stimulated the United States' changing approach of "Pivot-to-Asia", which conversely cast a challenge for China's "Two-Koreas Policy". According to Snyder, the increase in the Sino-United States friction and China's national growth may raise the possibility that South Korea would be compelled to evaluate the influence of its trading relations with China and its alliance relationship with the United States on South Korea's overall interests' calculation.¹³⁵⁴ Shambaugh argues that China and the United States, the two largest economic powers on one hand play a vital role in the international arena; on the other hand, have been into a comprehensively competitive stage.¹³⁵⁵ In other words, the United States had a grave concern about whether or not China would surpass the United States as the world's largest economic entity, which constituted the United States' increasing anxiety of China's economic leverage. However, Clinton argues that the Obama government should pay more attention to Asia's economic increase that would help the United States to preserve strategic economic interest.¹³⁵⁶ Shi and Wen emphasize that South Korea's approach towards China should be understood in the background of South Korea's relations

¹³⁵² Tan, Hong-mei. & Li, Jun. (2014), Meiguo dongya zhengce pinggu yu zhanwang – yatai zaipingheng zhanlve yu dongya zhixu de chonggou [On the United States' policy towards east Asia – the strategy of re-balancing the Asia-Pacific region and the reconstruction of the order in east Asia]. *Liaodong xueyuan xuebao* (*Journal of Eastern Liaoning University*), 16(4), 23-28, p26.

¹³⁵³ Snyder, Scott. (2009). China's rise and the Two Koreas: politics, economics, security. London: *Boulder*, p1.

¹³⁵⁴ Snyder, Scott. (2009). China's rise and the Two Koreas: politics, economics, security. London: *Boulder*, p15.

¹³⁵⁵ Shambaugh, David. (2013). China goes global: the partial power. Oxford: *Oxford University Press*, 73-74.

¹³⁵⁶ Clinton, Hillary. (2011). America's pacific century. *Foreign Policy*, Available from: <https://foreignpolicy.com/2011/10/11/americas-pacific-century/> (Viewed on 24th, May 2019).

with the United States.¹³⁵⁷ In contrast, the United States' participation in Asia-Pacific affairs with the "Pivot-to-Asia" strategy shaped China's economic relations with South Korea, which helped to explain the controversy about the Lotte Incident: Lotte Corporation, one of the largest South Korean multi-national retail conglomerates, immediately realized itself the target of a boycott campaign after the decision to approve its golf course in Seoul for the United States' Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (more commonly known as THAAD missile deployment). In spite of the economic inter-dependence between China and South Korea, China has built a capability to impose restriction on South Korean companies' development in the context of the Sino-United States tension, which soured South Korea's trading relations with an economically rising China.

¹³⁵⁷ Shi, Yuan-hua. & Wen, En-xi. (2012). Shilun zhonghan zhanlve hezuo huoban zhong de meiguo yinsu [On the United States' role in the strategic cooperative partnership between China and South Korea]. *Dongbeiyi luntan (Northeast Asia Forum)*, (5). 15-22.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I clarified factors why China formally adopted the “Two-Koreas Policy” in the post-Cold War period. Due to geographical concern and historical factor, China’s policy towards South Korea should be realized as a product of the development of China’s relations with these states that also considered the Korean peninsula as a part of strategic interests, including the Soviet Union, the United States and North Korea. On one hand, China’s relations with the Soviet Union influenced China’s diplomatic policy calculation as well as economic strategy thinking, which helped to understand China’s determination to use the “double strategy” to maximize China’s national interests in the Korean peninsula. In other words, the demise of the Soviet empire did not only decrease China’s political tension with South Korea, but also increase China’s economic inter-dependence with South Korea: North Korea could not take advantage of the Sino-Soviet split to impose restriction on China’s trading relations with South Korea, and China realized economic growth as a means to protect China’s socialism from collapse. On the other hand, the United States became the sole leading state after the Gorbachev government acknowledged the division of the Soviet empire into fifteen states, which conversely influenced the United States’ policy calculation over China in the post-Cold War period. Due to the United States’ changing attitude towards China, China quickened its “Low-profile” strategy in order to remove political hostility and lift economic sanction from the United States and other western nations. China decided to normalize diplomacies with neighbouring states in order to decrease economic reliance on industrial nations and establish a peaceful environment for China’s economic modernization, which constituted China’s formal diplomacy with South Korea.

In the meantime, it has been controversial to define the influence of China’s rise on China’s “Two-Koreas Policy”. South Korea has been viewed as such a nation that has greatly benefited from China’s economic rise, and both sides’ increasing economic inter-dependence contributed to the strategic cooperative partnership. However, China has not only carried out the “Bringing-in” strategy, but also embarked on the “Going-global” strategy. In other words, China aimed to expand its economic influence in the overseas market, which suggested the Chinese leadership’s new policy thinking in the context of China’s modernization development. It conversely meant that China had to prepare to compete with South Korea and other overseas states, which indicated the international community’s complex attitude towards China’s rise. With China’s soaring economic growth, the United States gradually realized China as a potential threat to its role in Asia. The United States decided to use the “Pivot-to-Asia” strategy to re-build its military presence and re-gain its economic strength in northeast Asia, which imposed restriction on South Korea’s overall policy calculation on China. Although the Sino-South Korean relations made historic progress in the background of China’s “Two-Koreas Policy”, the strategic cooperative partnership between China and South Korea also encountered the most serious diplomatic as well as economic crisis after South Korea reached agreement with the United States on the Lotte Corporation’s decision to provide the United States’ deployment of the Terminal High Altitude Area Defence system. In contrast, it has been hard to predict the influence of the Sino-United States friction on China’s “double-strategy” on the Korean peninsula where

China has seen as a part of its core interest.

Conclusion

Main findings

China's policy towards South Korea from the early 1960s to the late 2010s should be viewed as a combination of China's national interest calculation, the Chinese leadership's foreign approach thinking and China's political faction struggle. In other words, it was the three main policy elements in China's foreign policy decision-making process that contributed to China's changing attitudes towards South Korea from an 'enemy-hostile' one to a 'neighbour-friendly' one. However, the three policy apparatuses played different roles at different ages, which helped to build a basic understanding of China's diplomatic situation and economic condition. China's national interest calculation has undergone significant shifts since the establishment of the PRC, which helped to explain China's reactions to these changes in domestic and foreign affairs from the late Mao era to the early Xi era. In contrast, China implemented a variety of strategies for the sake of national interest maximization and national damage minimization, which conversely meant that China considered ways of how to discourage other nations from jeopardizing national interests as the policy priority. China aimed to reverse its situation that concluded security dilemma, ideological concern, diplomatic dispute and economic depression. In brief, security protection, communism expansion, diplomatic leverage and economic development have controversially influenced China's policy towards South Korea, which suggested the criteria for China's policy thinking over other nations as well. Viewed in this aspect, China has been seriously concerned about national interests, which served as a catalyst for China's policy switch from the "Non-Policy" to the "Two-Koreas Policy".

It has not been sufficiently persuasive that the principle of national interest maximization played a decisive role in China's foreign policy decision-making process. In other words, China's diplomatic behaviour can not be only explained from how China thought of its long-standing objectives, but also from how Chinese paramount leaders and other cadres interacted with other nations. Although both Mao Ze-dong and Deng Xiao-ping aimed to achieve socialist prosperity, Mao and Deng strove to maintain China's leverage in the international arena with different means. Due to Mao Ze-dong's pursuit of 'pure' socialism, it has been important to consider the paramount political leader's opinion on capitalism as well as imperialism as a part of understanding of China's "Non-Policy" towards South Korea. In contrast, China's aggressive policy towards South Korea suggested Mao Ze-dong's policy criteria, such as the "anti-imperialism" principle and the "anti-capitalism" rhetoric, which helped to analyze why China maintained a deteriorated relationship with the United States-backed South Korea. Apart from the Chinese leadership's policy thinking, it has been necessary to evaluate the influence of the factional conflicts on China's peace-oriented diplomatic approach and interest-driven economic policy towards South Korea. The Chinese Communist Party consists of a variety of political factions that serve different interests, whereas, the Chinese reformists who came to power in the aftermath of the "anti-radicals" campaign took advantage of China's pragmatic policy towards South Korea. Viewed in this vein, China's flexible approach towards South Korea indicated that the Chinese

reformists grasped an opportunity to expand political leverage as well as obtain economic interest with the “Opening and Reform Policy”.

In the meantime, China’s policy towards South Korea from the 1960s to the 2010s should be also explained from other three factors that included geographic concern, security menace and economic dependence. In other words, South Korea has been typically viewed as such a character that could help to explain China’s perspective on neighbouring nations, which means that there remains some similarities between China’s calculations on South Korea and China’s considerations on other lands that share geographic links. China has a grave concern on these peripheral states that could act as security threat as well as economic partner, which have some implications for the consequent development of China’s foreign policy decision-making process. The essence of Chinese foreign policy is to seek strategies to realize national interest increase, which concludes rationalism and pragmatism. However, South Korea has played a complex role, which contributed to China’s evaluation of South Korea. On one hand, China’s behaviour in the early Cold War period can be explained as an attempt to survive in the context of the confrontation with the two leading powers, which meant that both the United States and the Soviet Union seriously damaged China’s security interest in the wake of conflicts and disputes. In contrast, the two giant powers imposed harsh restrictions on China’s security policy, which helped to understand China’s “Fighting-with Two Fists Strategy” in the 1960s. On an account of possible geo-strategic dilemma, China considered the United States-backed South Korea as an adversary, which suggested China’s sensitive attitude towards these neighbouring nations that would be possibly swifted into an ‘invasion corridor’.

On the other hand, China’s behaviour since the end of the 1970s has suggested China’s pragmatic policy thinking over diplomatic and economic affairs, which conversely contributed to China’s flexible approach towards the international community. In other words, China attempted to reach reconciliation with the United States and other capitalist nations for the sake of security concern and economic development. In the context of the full diplomacy between China and the United States, China caught an opportunity to establish diplomatic and economic relations with other industrial countries, which conversely meant that China had access to capital and technology. In contrast, China undertook immense pressure after these states decided to withdraw investment from China, which indicated that China had a full awareness of the adverse effect of economic dependence on other states. However, the collapse of the Soviet Union and the demise of socialism controversially influenced China’s security, diplomatic and economic relations with the outer world, which quickened China’s step to promote China’s modernization. In brief, China immediately adopted a friendly foreign policy approach towards its Asian neighbours in the background of China’s goal-fulfilling behaviour, which laid a basis for China’s strategic use of economic dependence. South Korea has benefited from China’s foreign policy objectives to realize stability and prosperity since South Korea received formal diplomatic recognition from China, which did not decrease South Korea’s concern on economic dependence on China. Although the geographic links enabled both China and South Korea to conveniently expand the trading volume that was considered as one significant factor in the process of the

Sino-South Korean relations normalization, the increasing economic inter-dependence has also aroused anxiety about China's retaliatory measures in the wake of China's economic rise.

Recommendations

Firstly, China should persist in the “Two-Koreas Policy”, which would enable China to act as a flexible player in Korean affairs. On an account of security protection and ideological concern, China insisted on the “One-Korea Policy” in the Cold War period. In other words, China considered North Korea as the sole legitimate government in the Korean peninsula in order to minimize China’s security damage and maximize China’s role in the international socialist movement. North Korea conversely seized an opportunity to strengthen its role in China’s security policy calculation, and China endeavoured to promote the Sino-North Korean relations. While China attempted to obtain security guarantee from North Korea in the context of the Sino-Soviet rift, China did not pay attention to its relations with South Korea. In contrast, China did not build its diplomatic leverage and economic inter-dependence with South Korea in the early Cold War period, which increased China’s anxiety about the deteriorated Sino-South Korean relations. China had a full understanding of the painful effect of the United States-backed South Korea’s aggressive approach towards China on China’s security, diplomacy and economy, which helped to understand why China emphasized the “dual-track” policy of remaining diplomatic relations with the two states on the Korean peninsula. In addition, China could not under-estimate the other two factors of North Korea and the United States. On one hand, North Korea did not sign the 1953 Armistice Agreement, which means that the situation on the Korean peninsula has been highly volatile since the Korean War. In order not to be trapped into security conflicts around the Korean peninsula, China could hold talks with South Korea and reach consensus on peace and stability on the Korean peninsula in the context of the strategic cooperative partnership with South Korea. In brief, China could take advantage of the “Two-Koreas Policy” to persuade North Korea to remain calm and rational, which would decrease the risk of being involved in regional disputes. On the other hand, the United States – South Korea’s largest ally has constituted a part of South Korea’s foreign policy thinking, which means that the United States has recognized the Korean peninsula as its strategic interest. In order not to be slid into the most unfavourable party, China could make use of the “Two-Koreas Policy” to expand its position in the triangular relations among the United States, South Korea and China.

Secondly, China should insist on the “Opening and Reform Policy”, which would enable China to remain as South Korea’s leading partner. The comparably stable relations between nations tends to be ties of common interest, which means that the growing economic inter-dependence would further advance friendly cooperative relations. In detail, the economic inter-dependence between nations could be switched into a strategic catalyst for pragmatic diplomacy, which suggests the significance of promoting economic cooperation. China underwent economic stagnation in the late Mao era, which decreased the Chinese people’s confidence on socialism and weakened China’s image in the international arena. In other words, China did not have an opportunity to establish business relations with the global market, which had some hugely detrimental impact on the development of China’s domestic and foreign affairs. China shifted state work from class struggles to economic development at the end of the 1970s, which contributed to China’s interest-driven policy thinking over economic modernization. In contrast, China has seen its economic

leverage as a part of its diplomatic objectives since China aimed to establish economic cooperation with the global market, which helped to explain why China re-evaluated its relations with the Korean peninsula in the wake of the declaration of the “Opening and Reform Policy”. On one hand, both China and South Korea showed great willingness to decrease hostility in the context of the increasing trading volume, which acted as a catalyst for regional stability and peace. The deepening economic inter-dependence helped China and South Korea to realize the urgency of the Sino-South Korean relationship normalization, which meant that both sides had a full understanding of the significance of the commercial relations to the improvement of the Sino-South Korean diplomacy. Viewed in this aspect, it was the trading volume between China and South Korea that laid a foundation for China’s flexible foreign approach towards South Korea. On the other hand, China gradually took advantage of the widening economic relations with South Korea to enhance its role in South Korea’s foreign policy decision-making process, which conversely meant that South Korea could not under-estimate the economic benefit from cooperation with China. Despite South Korea’s concern on economic dependence on China, China has considered its strategic cooperative partnership with South Korea as a tactic to serve China’s national interests. In order to escalate into an influential character around the Korean peninsula, China could continue strengthening its commercial ties with South Korea.

Thirdly, China should stick to the “Independent Foreign Policy of Peace”, which would enable China to behave as a pragmatic power. Foreign policy should cater to national interests to the greatest extent, which suggests the significance of taking advantage of correct diplomatic strategies. In brief, inappropriate and improper foreign policy approaches would cause grave damage to security interest and economic cooperation, which means a fatal blow to national developmental plan. In the early beginning of the Cold War period, China immediately declared the “Leaning-to One Side Policy” in order to obtain political recognition and economic support from the Soviet Union, which conversely provided the Soviet Union with an opportunity to expand its diplomatic leverage. In this regard, the Soviet Union placed immense pressure on China’s socialist economic construction after the Soviet Union decided to withdraw assistance from China, which further imposed harsh restrictions on China’s overall policy thinking in the late Mao era. China was shifted into the weakest party in the Northern Triangle relations in the background of China’s escalating confrontation with the two giant powers, which helped to explain why China paid tribute to North Korea. Viewed in this aspect, China’s policy towards the Korean peninsula should be understood in the context of China’s relations with these nations that also aim to expand presence around northeast Asia, and China’s friendly relations with these nations contributes to peace as well as stability. On one hand, China had difficulty in reducing frictions with neighbouring nations in the Cold War period, which created a comparatively hostile environment for the progress of China’s changing policy towards South Korea. On the other hand, China decided to implement a flexible foreign policy after the Chinese reformists realized economic increase as a priority, which became a turning point for China’s diplomatic reconciliation with the international community. In other words, China endeavoured to enhance bilateral communication with South Korea after China was determined to create a favourable environment for China’s modernization construction, which revealed a new feature of China’s diplomatic policy – pragmatism. In the context of

China's dynamic foreign policy approach, China gradually improved its relations with South Korea through people-to-people contacts and exchanges, which laid a solid foundation for mutual understanding and friendship and played a more profound role in securing both sides' security benefit and economic prosperity. In contrast, the Sino-South Korean full diplomacy helped China to set an example for how China's friendly cooperative relations with South Korea promoted China's new image as such a nation that strove to realize harmonious coexistence with the outer world.

Limitations

The thesis of mine only pays attention to factors that influenced China's changing policy towards South Korea from the 1960s to the 2010s while there has been emerging literature on China's "Two-Koreas Policy" since the 1992 Sino-South Korean full diplomacy. However, I have realized two main limitations: one is imperfect research method, the other one is insufficient academic communication. On one hand, a mixed research that includes qualitative and quantitative explanation of China's policy thinking would build deeper understanding of China's changing attitudes towards South Korea from the late Mao era to the early Xi era. In detail, credible state-owned newspapers that represent the organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and explicitly communicate China's major policy decisions should be taken into account, such as Xinhua News and the People's Daily. These newspapers that described South Korea as both "the United States-puppet regime" and a friendly cooperative partner should be used as a basis for quantitative analysis as well. In the wider project, it is realistic to spend abundant time in doing analysis of these Chinese newspapers and having discussion on the development of China's policy towards South Korea. On the other hand, a variety of discussion on Chinese foreign policy would broaden horizons and enrich experience, which means that research students should take part in academic conferences as much as possible. In other words, I should have joined a number of conversations with research students from other universities, whereas, I missed out on such opportunities to gain knowledge. The nature of undertaking a research is not only to focus on reading and analyzing literature, but also to engage in deeper talks with scholars outside of campus. Although I attended every supervisory meeting, it is still important to meet with other specialists and students who could share different opinions on China's foreign policy.

Further research

On an account of China's economic rise, China aims to present as an active player that could have capability to shape both regional and international affairs, which would have profound implications for China's policy thinking over South Korea. In other words, China would boldly take some radical diplomatic approach and take retaliatory measures if other nations jeopardize China's national interests, even though China emphasizes the importance of peace and development in the international community. It would be likely that the way that China's interaction with the international society has been slightly changed, which means that China's diplomatic behaviour would be a combination of assertiveness and cooperativeness. China on one hand adheres to the diplomatic principle of "Non-interference", on the other hand, insists on the economic strategy of "Going-global", which has critically produced new ramifications. In brief, China's foreign policy objectives would impose complex influence on the development of China's security, diplomatic and economic relations with the outer world, which conversely means that China's diplomatic thinking has come into a newly challenging phase. Although China aims to promote its economic relations as well as strengthen its diplomatic leverage, there have been some suspicions about whether or not China intends to re-evaluate South Korea's role in China's overall developmental programme. In contrast, South Korea has set an example of how difficult to interact with China that attempts to build status in the global arena with diplomatic strength and economic growth since China recognized South Korea as a cooperator as well as a competitor.

As mentioned above, further research thereby should investigate China's policy towards South Korea in the context of China's goal-fulfilling behaviour while the thesis focuses on China's policy shift from the "One-Korea Policy" to the "Two-Koreas Policy". On one hand, there have been an expanding number of discussions on China's assertive diplomacy since China achieved economic prosperity and increased diplomatic leverage. On the other hand, researches on the United States – South Korea's largest ally have suggested the United States' changing policy thinking over China. In other words, the United States' re-evaluation of China would have some complex implications for China's policy calculation over the Korean peninsula while South Korea faces with new policy opportunity as well as challenge. The research will aim to build deeper understanding of China's foreign policy approach in the Xi Jin-ping period, which would contribute to the study of modern Chinese foreign policy. Since the United States has a grave concern on China's role in the international society, China has been recognized as a potential enemy by the United States. In brief, the United States has realized the possibility that the original world order would be replaced, which conversely helps to understand the Trump government's aggressive approach towards China. Although China has grown as the second largest economic entity, the ongoing trade friction between the United States and China would shape political and economic pattern around northeast Asia. Viewed in this aspect, this research will serve as an explanation of China's "Two-Koreas Policy" in the background of regional unrest that originates from the disparity between the United States and China, which would be considered as an analysis of how China's unresolved dispute set limits on China's policy calculation.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Deng, Rong. (2004). Wode fuqin: Deng Xiao-ping - zhongjuan [My father: Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. *Zhongyang wenxian chubanshe* (Central Party Literature Press).

Deng, Xiao-ping. (1983). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – dierjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the second volume]. *Renmin chubanshe* (People's Publishing House).

Deng, Xiao-ping. (1984). Our greatest object and China's modernization. *Deng Xiao-ping Wenxuan*, 3, 65-69.

Deng, Xiao-ping. (1987). The establishment of the Chinese characteristic socialism. Beijing: *Public Publishing*, 1-5.

Deng, Xiao-ping. (1989). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – diyijuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the first volume]. *Renmin chubanshe* (People's Publishing House).

Deng, Xiao-ping. (1993). The maintenance of world peace and the development of the internal construction. Beijing: *Public Publishing*.

Deng, Xiao-ping. (1993). Deng Xiao-ping wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Deng Xiao-ping – the third volume]. *Renmin chubanshe* (People's Publishing House).

Gao, Yong. (2016). Wo gei Hu Yao-bang dang mishu [Record of being a secretary of Hu Yao-bang]. *Renmin chubanshe* (People's Publishing House).

Gu, Mu. (2009). Gu Mu huiyilu [Gu Mu's memoir]. *Zhongyang wenxian chubanshe* (Central Party Literature Press).

Hu, Jin-tao. (2016). Hu Jin-tao wenxuan – diyijuan [Selected works of Hu Jin-tao – the first volume]. *Renmin chubanshe* (People's Publishing House).

Hu, Jin-tao. (2016). Hu Jin-tao wenxuan – dierjuan [Selected works of Hu Jin-tao – the second volume]. *Renmin chubanshe* (People's Publishing House).

Hu, Jin-tao. (2016). Hu Jin-tao wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Hu Jin-tao – the third volume].

Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House).

Huang, Hua. (2007). Qinli yu Qinwen – HuangHua huiyilu [Qinli yu Qinwen – Memoir of HuangHua]. *Shijie zhishi chubanshe (World Affairs Press).*

Ji, Chao-zhu. (2012). Cong hongqiang fanyi dao waijiaoguang: Ji Chao-zhu koushu huiyilu [From being a communist translator to being a diplomat: oral memoir by Ji Chao-zhu]. *Shanxi renmin chubanshe (Shanxi People's Publishing House).*

Jiang, Ze-min. (2006). Jiang, Ze-min wenxuan – diyijuan [Selected works of Jiang Ze-min – the first volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House).*

Jiang, Ze-min. (2006) Jiang, Ze-min wenxuan – dierjuan [Selected works of Jiang Ze-min – the second volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House).*

Jiang, Ze-min. (2006). Jiang, Ze-min wenxuan – disanjuan [Selected works of Jiang Ze-min – the third volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House).*

Mao, Ze-dong. Mao Ze-dong xuanji – diyijuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the first volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House).*

Mao, Ze-dong. (1944). Mao Ze-dong xuanji – dierjuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the second volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House).*

Mao, Ze-dong. Mao Ze-dong xuanji – disanjuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the third volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House).*

Mao, Ze-dong. Mao Ze-dong xuanji – disijuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the fourth volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House).*

Mao, Ze-dong. (1977). Mao Ze-dong xuanji – diwujuan [Selected works of Mao Ze-dong – the fifth volume]. *Renmin chubanshe (People's Publishing House).*

Mao, Ze-dong. (1961). On the People's Democratic Dictatorship. Selected works of Mao Ze-dong. IV, Pecking: *Foreign Languages Press.*

Mao, Ze-dong. (1993). Mao Ze-dong nianpu – diwujuan [The chronicle of Mao Ze-dong – the fifth volume]. *Zhongyang wenxian chubanshe (Central Party Literature Press).*

Qian, Qi-chen. (2003). Waijiao shiji [Ten episodes in China's diplomacy]. Beijing: *Shijie zhishi chubanshe (World Affairs Press)*.

Qiao, Song-du. (2008). Qiao Guang-hua yu Gong Peng: wode fuqin muqin [Qiao Guang-hua and Gong Peng: my father and mother]. *Zhonghua shuju (Zhonghua Book Company)*.

Wu, Xin-quan. (1985). Eight years in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (January 1950 – October 1958)-Memoirs of a Diplomat. Beijing: *New World Press*.

Xi, Jin-ping. (2014). Xi Jin-ping tan zhiguolizheng [Xi Jin-ping's discussion on how to manage state affairs and govern the country]. *Waiwen chubanshe (Foreign Languages Press)*.

Zhang, Ting-yan. & Tan, Jing. (2004). Chushi hanguo [Serving as a diplomat in South Korea]. *Shangdong daxue chubanshe (Shangdong University Publishing House)*.

Zhang, Ting-yan. & Tan, Jing. (2007). Yongyuan de jiyi [Eternal memory]. *Shangdong daxue chubanshe (Shangdong University Publishing House)*.

Secondary sources

Ahn, Byung-joon. (1980). South Korea and the communist countries. *Asian Survey*, 20(11), 1098-1107.

Ahn, Byung-joon. (1992). China's modernization and the political economy. Seoul: *Parkyong Company*.

Alden, Chris. & Aran, Amnon. (2012). Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Abingdon: *Routledge*.

Allen, Whiting. (1960). China crosses the Yalu: the decision to enter the Korean War. Stanford: *Stanford University Press*.

Allison, Graham. T. (1969). Conceptual models and the Cuban missile crisis. *American Political Science Review*, 63(3), 689-718.

Althaus, C. (2008). Calculating political risk. Sydney: *University of New South Wales Press*.

An, Bing-jun. & Hui, Shu. (1993). Beifang zhengce he nanbeihan guanxi [On the "Northern Policy" and the relationship between the two states on the Korean peninsula]. *Guoji zhengzhi yanjiu (The Journal of International Studies)*, (1), 90-97.

An, Cheng-ri. & Liu, Yan. (2011). Riezhanzheng yu dongya guojitixi de chonggou [On the Russo-Japanese War and the new order in east Asia]. *Haerbin gongyedaxue xuebao (Journal of Harbin Institute of Technology)*, (2), 1-2.

Andrew, N. & Ross, R. (1997). The great wall and the empty fortress: China's search for security. New York: *W.W. Norton*.

Acharya, Amitav. (2014). Power shift or paradigm shift? China's rise and Asia's emerging security order. *International Studies Quarterly*, (58), 158-173.

Art, R. J. (1973). Bureaucratic politics and American foreign policy. *Policy Science*, 4, 467-490.

Asian Survey: <https://www.jstor.org/journal/asiansurvey>

Barnds, J.W. (1976). The Two Koreas in east Asian affairs. New York: *New York University Press*.

Bary, de Theodore. & Lufrano, Richard. (2000). From "the dictatorship of the People's Democracy": on Leaning-to One Side (Speech, July, 1, 1949). 2nd Edition, New York: *Columbia University Press*, 452-453.

Barnouim, Barbara. & Yu, Chang-gen. (1998). Chinese foreign policy during the cultural revolution. Columbia University Press.

Baumann, Rainer. & Stengel. A. Frank (2014). Foreign policy analysis, globalization and non-state actors: state-centric after all?. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 17(4), 489-521.

Bi, Yuan-hui. (2008). Hanguo dui yuezhhan wenti chutan [On South Korea's participation in the Vietnamese War]. *Qixue jikan (Collected Papers of History Studies)*, (6), 78-84.

Binnendijk, Hans. (2016). Asian partners and inadequate security structures. (Available from the book: Friends, foes, and future directions - the United States partnerships in a turbulent world: strategic rethink). RAND Corporation.

Blackkburn, M. R. (1994). Mercenaries and Lyndon Johnson's "more flags": the hiring of Korean, Filipino, and Thai soldiers in the Vietnam War. *Jefferson, N. C.*

Boulding, Kenneth. (1959). National images and international systems. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 3(2), 120-131.

Boulding, K. E. (1956). The image. Ann Arbor: Michigan University Press.

Brown, G. R. (1976). Chinese politics and American policy: a new look at the triangle. *Foreign Policy*, 23, 3-23.

Brugger, B. (1990). Chinese marxism in the post-Mao era. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bryman, Alan. (2001). Social research methods. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burr, W. (1999). The Kissinger transcripts: the top secret talks with Beijing and Moscow. New York: The New Press.

Burr, W. (2001). Sino-American relations, 1969: the Sino-Soviet border war and steps towards rapprochement. *Cold War History*, 1(3), 73-112.

Buss, A. Claude. (1988). Reviewed work(s): Truman's "Two China" policy. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 47(2), 346-347.

Cai, Jian. (2006). Chaoxianzhanzheng dui zhongguo yu chaoxianbandao guanxi de yingxiang [The influence of the Korean War on the relationship between China and the Korean peninsula]. *Hanguo yanjiu conglun* (Collected Papers for Korean Studies), (00), 79-90.

Cai, Liang. (2007). Jianjiao qian tiyujioliu dui zhonghan guanxi yingxiang chutan [The influence of sport communication on the Sino-South Korean relationship in the pre-normalization period]. *Hanguo yanjiu conglun* (Collected Papers for Korean Studies), (3), 429-447.

Cai, Yu-zhi. & Li, Qi. (2001). Lun chaoxianzhanzheng yu zhonggong duitai zhengce de zhuanbian [On the Korean War and the Chinese Communist Party's policy shift towards Taiwan]. *Yangzhou jiaoyu xueyuan xuebao* (Journal of Yangzhou College of Education), 19(4), 29-33.

Cao, Zhong-ping. (2005). Dangdai hanguo shi [Modern and contemporary South Korean history]. *Nankai daxue chubanshe* (Nankai University Press).

Ch'i, His-sheng. (1991). Politics disillusionment: the Chinese Communist Party under Deng Xiao-ping, 1978-1989 (Studies on contemporary China). Armonk, New York: *M.E. Sharpe, Inc.*, An East Great Book.

Chang, G. (1990). Friends and enemies: the United States, China and the Soviet Union, 1948-1972. Stanford: *Stanford University Press*, 7-75.

Chang, H. Parris. (1993). Beijing's policy towards Korea and PRC-ROK normalization of relations. The changing order in northeast Asia and the Korean peninsula, edited by Lee, Manwoo. & Mansbach, W. Richard. Seoul (Kyungnam University): *The Institute for Far Eastern Studies*, 159-160.

Chen, C. King. (1977). Peking's attitude towards Taiwan. *Asian Survey*, 17(10), 903-918.

Chen, Hui-ying. (2005). Lun Deng Xiao-ping waijiao sixiang de xianshixing [On the reality of Deng Xiao-ping's diplomatic thinking]. *Qianghua daxue xuebao* (Journal of Tsinghua University), (3), 8-11.

Chen, Jian. (1994). China's road to the Korean War: the making of the Sino-American confrontation. New York: *Columbia University Press*.

Chen, Jian. (1995). China's involvement in the Vietnam War, 1964-69. *The China Quarterly*, (142), 356-387.

Chen, Jian. (2001). Mao's China and the Cold War. Chapel Hill: *The University of North Carolina Press*.

Chen, Jian. (2002). Review works: Mao's generals remember Korea by Xiao-bing Li, Allan R. Millet and

Bin Yu. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 61(2), 704-705.

Chen, Jian. (2003). A response: how to pursue a critical history of Mao's foreign policy. *The China Journal*, (49), 137-142.

Chen, Jian. & Wilson, L. David. (1998-1999). All under the heaven is great chaos: Beijing, the Sino-Soviet border clashes and the turn towards Sino-American rapprochement, 1968-1969. *CWIHPB II*, 155-175.

Chen, Qi-miao. (1993). New approaches in China's foreign policy: the post-Cold War era. *Asian Surveys*, 33 (3), 237-251.

Chen, Qi-miao. (1996). The Taiwan Strait crisis: its crux and solutions. *Asian Survey*, 36(11), 1055-1066.

Chen, Shao-ming. (2013). [Ershishiji wushiniandai xingzhongguo waijiaozhengce de tiaozheng [On the newly established PRC's diplomatic policy adjustment in the 1950s]. *Zhonggong dangshi yanjiu (Journal of Chinese Communist Party History Studies)*, (12), 82-90.

Chen, Xiang. (2015). Zhongguo zhoubianwaijiao de zhangaixing yinsu fenxi [On the obstructive factor of China's peripheral diplomacy]. *Heping yu fazhan (Peace and Development)*, (3), 25-39.

Chen, Yi-xin. (2009). Cold war competition and food production in China, 1957-1962. *Agricultural History*, 83(1), 51-78.

Chen, Yu-yu. & Zhou, Li-an. (2007). The long-term health and economic consequences of the 1959-1961 famine in China. *Journal of Health Economics*, 26, 659-681.

Cheng, A. G. (1997). Vietnamese communists' relations with China and the second Indochina conflict, 1956-1962. Jefferson, N. C.: *McFarlan*.

Cheng, Fang. (2017). 21shiji zhongmei daguoguanxi yanjiu – zouxiang hezuogongying zhilu [Research on the two major states' relations between the United States and China in the 21st century – moving towards win-win cooperation]. (A Doctoral Dissertation) *Jilin daxue (Jilin University)*.

Cheng, Yu-shek, Joseph. & Zhang, Wan-kun, Franklin. (1999). Chinese foreign relation strategies under Mao and Deng: a systematic and comparative analysis. *Philippine Journal of Third World Studies*, 14(3), 91-114.

China Perspectives: <https://www.jstor.org/journal/chinaperspective>

Chinese Communist Party History Research and Teaching (Dangshi yanjiu jiaoxue):
<http://www.cnki.com.cn/Journal/G-G1-DSYJ.htm>

Chou, Hua-fei. (2014). Guoji geju yanbian zhong de dangdai zhongguo zhoubian waijiao huanjing [On contemporary China's neighbouring diplomatic environment under the transition of the international order]. *Tongji daxue xuebao (Journal of Tongji University)*, 25(6), 27-35.

Chu, Sung-po. (1986). Beijing's relations with South and North Korea in the 1980s, *Issues & Studies*, 25(3), 70-71.

Chung, Chin-wee. (1983). North Korea in the Sino-Soviet dispute. *Journal of Northeast Asian Studies*, II(3).

Chung, Jae-ho. (2003/2004). From a special relationship to a normal partnership: interpreting the "garlic battle" in Sino-South Korean relations. *Pacific Affairs*, 76(4), 549-568.

Chung, Jae-ho. (2007). Between ally and partner: Korea-China relations and the United States. New York: *Columbia University Press*.

Cieslik, T. (2010). Scott Snyder, ed. China's rise and the Two Koreas: Politics, economics, security. *Journal of Chinese Political Science*, 15(3), 345-346.

Clarke, Michael. & White, Brian. (1989). Understanding foreign policy: the foreign policy systems approach. Cheltenham: *Edward Elgar*.

Clinton, Hillary. (2011). America's pacific century. *Foreign Policy*, Available from: <https://foreignpolicy.com/2011/10/11/americas-pacific-century/> (Viewed on 24th, May 2019).

Collected Papers for Korean Studies (Hanguo yanjiu zhongxin):
<http://mall.cnki.net/magazine/magadetail/HGYL201301.htm>

Cotterell, Arthur. (1993). East Asia: from Chinese predominance to the rise of the pacific rim. New York: *Oxford University Press*.

Cumings, Bruce. (1990). The origins of the Korean War. Princeton, N.J.: *Princeton University Press*.

Cumings, Bruce. (2005). Korea's place in the sun: a modern history. New York & London: W. W. North.

Cumings, Bruce. (2010). The Korean War: a history. *Modern Library*.

- Crinicion, Joseph. (2000). The Asian nuclear reaction chain. *Foreign Policy*, (118), 120-136.
- Crozier, Michael. (1964). The bureaucratic phenomenon. Chicago, IL: *University of Chicago Press*.
- Daekwon, Son. (2017). What does North Korea think of China's 'dual freeze' proposal? Available from: <https://thediplomat.com/2017/07/what-does-north-korea-think-of-chinas-dual-freeze-proposal/> (Viewed on 21st, September 2019).
- Davin, Delia. (2013). Mao: a very short introduction. *Oxford University Press*.
- Deng, Fan. (2013). Hou "jiuyiyi" shidai de meiguo duihua zhengce (2001-2011) [On the United States' policy towards China in the aftermath of the 'Eleventh of September Incident']. (A Doctoral Dissertation), *Shanghai jiaotong daxue (Shanghai Jiaotong University)*.
- Dikotter, Frank. (2010). Mao's Great Famine – the history of China's most devastating catastrophe, 1958-1962. *Bloomsbury Paperbacks*.
- Dillon, Michael. (2015). Deng Xiao-ping: the man who made modern China. *Ibtauris*, 229-230.
- Ding, Ming. (2003). Zhanhou guojiguanxi yu woguo jianguochu "yibiandao" fangzheng de xingcheng [The influence of international relations in the post-war era on the formation of the "Leaning-to One Side Policy" in the early days of the newly established PRC]. *Dangdai zhongguoshi yanjiu (Contemporary China History Studies)*, 10(2), 92-99.
- Dittmer, Lowell. (2006). Pitfalls of charisma. *The China Journal*, (55), 119-128.
- Dittmer, Lowell. (2009). The Sino-Russian strategic relationship: ghost of the "strategic triangle"? (Available from the book: *Challenges to China's foreign policy*). *The University Press of Kentucky*.
- Dong, Jie. (2014). Zhongsu fenlie hou zhongguo dui chaoxian de yuanzhu 1961-1965 [On China's financial aid to North Korea in the aftermath of the Sino-Soviet dispute 1961-1965]. *Waijiao pinglun (Foreign Affairs Review)*, (4), 41-58.
- Dong, Zhen-rui. (2015). Shinianlai guonei xuesujie guanyu "yibiandao" waijiaofangzheng yanjiu shuping [On the national academic community's review of the "Leaning-to One Side Policy" within the decade]. *Dang de wenxian (Literature of CPC)*, (6), 98-105.

Dong, Zhi-kai. (2001). Chaoxian zhanzheng yu xinzhongguo jingxi [On the Korean War and the newly established PRC's economy]. *Zhonggong Ningboshi changweixiao xuebao (Journal of the Party School of Chinese Communist Party Ningbo Municipal Committee)*, 23(5), 5-13.

Donnelly, Jack. (2013). Realism. (Available from the book: Theories of international relations, fifth edition). *Palgrave Macmillan*.

Du, Yong-xin. (2001). Meiguo jieru chaoxianzhanzheng de yuanyin ji yingxiang [On factors and consequences of the United States' involvement in the Korean War]. *Xi-an waiguoyu xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Xi-an Foreign Languages University)*, 9(1), 111-115.

Eckert, J. Carter. & Lee, Ki-baik. & Lew, Young-ick. & Robinson, Michael. & Wagner, W. Edward. (1990). Korea old and new: a history. Korea Institute: *Harvard University*.

Edmons, Robin. (1975). Soviet foreign policy: 1962-1973. London: *Oxford University Press*.

Eggleston, Karen. (1990). The political economy of Sino-South Korean relations: an exploratory analysis. *Korea Observer*, 21(3).

Evans, Richard. (1995). Deng Xiao-ping and the making of modern China. *Penguin Book*.

Fang, Xiu-yu. (2011). Zhanhou hanguo waijiao yu zhongguo – lilun yu zhengce fenxi [On South Korea's diplomacy and China in the post-war eras – an analysis based on theory and policy]. *Shanghai cishu chubanshe (Shanghai Lexicographic Publishing House)*.

Fang, Xiu-yu. (2013). Zhongguo juanru chaoxianzhanzheng de kaoliang [On China's calculation of involvement in the Korean War]. *Dongfang zaobao (The Oriental Morning Post)*.

Fenby, Jonathan. (2008). History of modern China: the fall and rise of a great power, 1850-2008. *Penguin Books*.

Fewsmith, Joseph. (2008). China since Tiananmen (second edition). *Cambridge University Press*.

Fisher, A. Charles. (1954). The role of Korea in the Far East. *The Geographical Journal*, 120(3), 282-298.

Foster, Rhea. Dulles. (1972). American foreign policy toward the communist China. New York: *Thomas Crowell Co*.

Frankel, J. (1963). The making of foreign policy. London: *Oxford University Press*.

Freedom, Lawrence. (1976). Logic, politics and foreign policy processes: a critique of the bureaucratic politics model. *International Affairs*, 52(3), 434-449.

Friedman, Edward. (1979). On Maoist conceptualisations of the capitalist world system. *The China Quarterly*, (80), 806-837.

Fu, Chang-qing. (2001). Chaoxianzhanzheng dui wodang jieju Taiwanweni de yingxiang [The influence of the Korean War on the Chinese Communist Party's settlement of the Taiwan question]. *Xi-an waiguoyu xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Xi-an Foreign Languages University)*, 9(1), 111-115.

Fu, Yao-zu. (2004). Zhongguo waijiao sixiang de youyici lishixing feiyue – zaixue Deng Xiao-ping waijiao sixiang [On another historic leap of China's diplomatic thinking– reflections on Deng Xiao-ping's foreign strategies]. *Waijiao xueyuan xuebao (Journal of China Foreign Affairs University)*, (77), 25-30.

Gaddis, J. (1980). The strategic perspective: the rise and fall of the 'defense perimeter' concept, 1949-1951. New York: *Columbia University Press*, 61-118.

Gao, Xian-chao. (2009). Xinzhongguo chengli chuqi "yibian dao" waijiaozhengce shi zhengque de xianshi xuanze [The newly established PRC's "Leaning-to One Side Policy" was the correct as well as practical choice]. *Sheke zongheng (Social Sciences Review)*, 24(9), 112-113.

Gao, Yi. (1996). Deng Xiao-ping xinshiqi de waijiao zhanlve sixiang lunshu [On Deng Xiao-ping's diplomatic strategy thought in the newly reforming era]. *Dang de wenxian (Literature of Chinese Communist Party)*, (2), 13-20.

Garver, John. (1982). China's decision for rapprochement with the United States, 1969-1971. Boulder, CO: *Westview Press*.

Garver, W. John. (2003). The opportunity costs of Mao's foreign policy choices. *The China Journal*, (49), 127-136.

Gavin, J. Francis. (2004/2005). Blasts from the past: proliferation lessons from the 1960s. *International Security*, 29(3), 100-135.

Glaser, S. Bonnie. (1993). China's security perceptions: interests and ambitions. *Asian Survey*, 33(3), 252-271.

Gittings, John. (1974). New light on Mao 1. his view of the world. *The China Quarterly*, (60), 750-766.

Goldstein, Avery. (2005). Rising to the challenge: China's grand strategy and international security. *Stanford University Press*.

Gong, Ky-yu. (2012). The Korea-United States alliance: from a Chinese perspective. *Asian Perspicive*, (36), 309-330.

Gong, Li. (2013). Mao Ze-dong yu dakai zhongmeiguanxi damen de zhanlue juece [On Mao Ze-dong and the strategic decision to open the gate of the Sino-United States relations]. *Lishi yanjiu (Historical Research)*, 6, 14-18.

Gong, W. Gerrit. (1991). China and the dynamics of unification in northeast Asia. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 38(2), 95-106.

Gorbachev, Mikhall. (1995). Memoirs. *Bantam Books*.

Gordon, Leonard. (1969). Communist China's foreign policy in history perspective. *The History Teacher*, 2(4), 45-51.

Graham, T. Allison. (1969). Conceptual models and the Cuban missile crisis. *American Political Science Review*, 63(3), 689-718.

Graham, T. Allison. & Philip, Zelikow. (1999). Essence of decision: explaining the Cuban missile crisis. New York: *Longman*.

Grow, R. F. (1974). Soviet economic penetration of China, 1945-1960: 'imperialism' as a level of analysis problem. In Steven Rosen and James Kruth (eds.) *Testing theories of imperialism*, Lexington: *Heath*.

Guo, Mei-lan. (2001). Meiguo de fanhua zhengce yu xinzhongguo "yibiandao" de waijiaozhengce [On the United States' "anti-China" policy and the new established PRC's "Leaning-to One Side Policy"]. *Xinyang shifan xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Xinyang Teachers College)*, 21(3), 118-121.

Guo, Qiong. (1999). Shi xi zhonggong jianguo chuqi "yibiandao" waijiao zhengce xingcheng de lishi yuanyin [On the historical reasons of the formation of the "Leaning-to One Side Policy" in the early stage of the newly established PRC]. *Gansu shehui kexue (Gansu Social Sciences)*, (S1), 42-43.

Guo, Rui. (2013). Zhongguo de chaoxianbandao zhengce pinggu – lishijingyan dangqianchengguo yu ruoganbuzu [On the evaluation of China's policy towards the Korean peninsula – historic experience, present achievement and certain weaknesses]. *Dangdai hanguo (Contemporary Korea)*, (2), 22-31.

Gurley, G. John. (1978). The dialectics of development: USSR versus China. *Modern China*, 4(2), 123-156.

Gurtov, Melvin. (1976). The Taiwan Strait crisis revisited: politics and foreign policy in Chinese motives. *Modern China*, 2(1), 49-103.

Halpern, M. A. (1962). Communist China's foreign policy: the recent phase. *The China Quarterly*, (11), 89-104.

Han Kwan-soo. (2015). Discussion on whether the Korean peninsula will be included in China's core interests. *Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, 27(1), 57-69.

Han, Nian-long. (1988). Dangdai zhongguo waijiao [Diplomacy of contemporary China]. Beijing: Zhongguo shehuikexue chubanshe (*Chinese Social Sciences Press*).

Han, Sung-joo. (1980). South Korea and the United States: the alliance survives. *Asian Survey*, 20(11), 1075-1086.

Han, Xian-dong. (2012). Hanguo de waijiao kunjing: yige gaikuoxing kuangjia de jiedu [South Korea's diplomacy dilemma: a general framework of analysis]. *Dongbeiyaluntan (Northeast Asia Forum)*, (3), 62-38.

Han, Xian-dong. (2015). Meiguo "yataizaipingheng" beijingxia hanguo de waijiao anquan zhanlve [On South Korea's diplomatic and security strategies in the context of the United States' "Pivot-to-Asia" strategy]. *Xiandai guoji guanxi (Contemporary International Relations)*, (3), 9-15.

Han, Zhen-feng. & Ji, Shu-yun. (2008). Deng Xiao-ping kaichuang gaigekaifang lishiweiye de yuanyin jianxi [On Deng Xiao-ping's determination to initiate the historic great cause – the "Opening and Reform Policy"]. *Dalian ganbu xuekan (Journal of Dalian Official)*, 23(10), 4-7.

Hane, Mikiso. (2000). Japan – a short history. *Oneworld*.

Hang, Fu-zhen. (2011). Chaoxianzhanzheng yu meiguo duihuazhengce de zuizhongxingcheng [On the Korean War and the formation of the United States' policy towards China]. *Nanjing gongcheng xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Nanjing Institute of Technology)*, 11(2), 1-6.

Hao, Yu-fan. (1987). China and the Korean peninsula: a Chinese perspective. *Asian Survey*, 27(8), 862-884.

Hao, Yu-fan. (2009). Introduction. (Available from the book: Challenges to China's foreign policy). *The University Press of Kentucky*.

Hao, Yu-fan. (2009). The Korean peninsula: a Chinese view on the North Korean nuclear Issue. (Available from the book: Challenges to China's foreign policy). *The University Press of Kentucky*.

Hao, Yu-fan. & Zhai, Zhi-lai. (1990). China's decision to enter the Korean War: history revisited. *The China Quarterly*, 121, 94-115.

Harding, Harry. (1987). China's second revolution: reform after Mao. Washington, D.C., *the Brookings Institution*.

Harding, Harry. (1992). China's American dilemma. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 519, 12-25.

Harold, Sprout. & Margaret, Sprout. (1956). Man-milieu relationship hypotheses in the context of international politics. Princeton, NJ: *Princeton University Press*.

He, Chun-long. (2013). "Hepingyanbian" yu guoji gongchanzhuyi yundong boyi [On the gamble between "peaceful evolution" and international communism movement]. (A Doctoral Dissertation) *Jilin daxue (Jilin University)*.

He, Di. (1994). The most respected enemy: Mao Ze-dong's perception of the United States. *The China Quarterly*, 144-158.

He, Kai. & Feng, Hui-yun. (2014). China's bargaining strategies for a peaceful rise: successes and challenges. *Asian security*, 10(2), 168-187.

He, Tong-mei. (2008). Zhonghan zhengzhi waijiao guanxi yanjiu [On the political and diplomatic relations between China and South Korea]. (A Doctoral Dissertation) *Yan Bian University*.

Heo, Uk. & Kim, Hayam. (2012). Private-sector networks, democracy, and interstate relations: a case study of South Korea and Taiwan. *Asian Perspective*, (36), 71-93.

Herbert, Simon. Cited in Hill, Christopher. (1981). Public opinion and British foreign policy. *Millennium*,

15(4), 33-59.

Hermann, G. Margaret. (2001). How decision units shape foreign policy: a theoretical framework. *International Studies Review*, 3(2).

Hildebrandt, Timothy. (2003). Uneasy allies: fifty years of China-North Korea relations. Washington, DC.: *Woodrow Wilson International Centre*, Asia Program Special Report, (115), 1-3.

Hill, Christopher. (2003). The changing politics of foreign policy. Basingstoke: *Palgrave Macmillan*.

Hinton, C. Harold. (1981). The United States and extended security commitments: east Asia. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 457, 88-108.

Hinton, C. Harold. (1993). Re-orienting China's foreign policy: China and the world (Available from the book: China in the era of Deng Xiao-ping: a decade of reform). *An East Gate Book*, 394-395.

Ho, Benjamin. (2014). Understanding Chinese exceptionalism: China's rise, its goodness, and greatness. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political.*, 39(3), 164-176.

Hobbes, Thomas. (1996). Leviathan, revised student edition. *Cambridge University Press*.

Holsti, Ole. (1970). The operational code approach to the study of political leaders: John Foster Dulles' philosophical and instrumental beliefs. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 3(1), 123-157.

Holsti, O. R. (1972). Crisis, escalation, war. Montreal: *McGill-Queens University Press*.

Hou, X. S. (2014). Dissecting China's rise: controversies over the China model. *China Perspectives*, 2014(2), 61-67.

Hsiung, C. James. (1995). China's omni-directional diplomacy: realignment to cope with monopolar United States' power. *Asian Survey*, 35(6), 573-586.

Hsueh, Chun-tu. (1981). Modernization and diplomacy of China. Ed. Liao, Kuang-sheng. *The Chinese University of Hong Kong*.

Hua, Chuang-ming. (2007). Shi fenxi lengzhan hou de zhonghan guanxi [On the relations between China and South Korea in the post-Cold War period]. *Changchun daxue xuebao (Journal of Chang Chun University)*, 17(3), 53-56.

- Hua, Qi. & Meng, Fan-ming. (2014). Chaoxianzhanzheng yu zhongsutongmengguanxi de yanbian [The Korean War and the evolution of the Sino-Soviet Union alliance relationship]. *Shijiqiao (Bridge of Century)*, (3), 63-64.
- Huang, Zhao-qun. & Yang, Guo-mei. (2001). Piao Zheng-xi yu hanguo [Park Chung-hee and South Korea]. *Yantai shifan xueyuan xuebao (Yantai Teachers University Journal)*, 18(3), 29-35.
- Hudson, Geoffrey. (1969). Paper tigers and nuclear teeth. *The China Quarterly*, (39), 64-75.
- Hudson, M. Valerie. (2007). Foreign policy analysis: classic and contemporary theory. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Hundt, David. (2010). China's "Two-Koreas Policy": achievements and contradictions. *Political Science*, 62(2), 132-145.
- Ing, Ch'ing-yao. (1973). Chinese foreign policy and diplomatic relations. Taipei: *International Relations Research Institute*.
- Jacques, Martin. (2009). When China rules the world: the rise of the middle kingdom and the end of the western world. *Penguin Books*.
- Jackson, Robert. & Sorensen, Georg. (2016). Introduction to international relations: theories and approaches, sixth edition. *Oxford University Press*.
- Jervis, Robert. (1976). Perception and misperception in international politics. Princeton, NJ: *Princeton University*.
- Ji, Yan-jun. (2015). Chaoxianzhanzheng dui zhanhou guojiguanxi de yinxiang [On the Korean War and the development of international relations in the post-war eras]. *Shang (Business)*, (1), 71.
- Jia, Hao. & Zhuang, Qu-bing. (1992). China's policy towards the Korean peninsula. *Asian Survey*, 32(12), 1137-1156.
- Jia, Qing-guo. (2009). China's new leadership and strategic relations with the United States. (Available from the book: Challenges to China's foreign policy). *The University Press of Kentucky*.

Jiang, Da-yang. & Yang, Ying-chao. (2013). Zhanhou hanguo duiwai jingjizhanlve de yanjin jiqi pingjia [On South Korea's foreign economic strategy in the post-war eras]. *Dangdai jingji guanli (Contemporary Economy & Management)*, 35(10), 72-78.

Jin, Guang-xi. & Hao, Xin. (2010). Yuenanzhanzheng "Texu" he piaozhenxi de "kaifaducui" [On South Korea's "special demands" in the course of the Vietnamese War and the development of Park Chung-hee's "autarchy"]. *Yanbian daxue xuebao (Journal of Yanbian Universtiy)*, 43(1), 83-88.

Jin, Jing-yi. (2002). Qianlun chaoxianzhazheng qian Jiang Jie-shi yu Li Cheng-wan guanxi de hexinxiansuo [On the core clue of the relationship between Chiang Kai-shek and Syngman Rhee ahead of the Korean War]. *Guoji zhengzhi yanjiu (Studies of International Politics)*, (4), 127-130.

Jin, Ming-de. (2015). Lengzhan jieshuhou meiritongmeng de tiaozheng ji dui zhongguo de yingxiang [The United States-Japanese alliance relationship adjustment in the post-Cold War era and the influence of on China]. (A Master's Thesis) *Yanbiandaxue (Yanbian University)*.

Johnson, I. Alastair. & Evans, Paul. (1999). China and multilateral security institutions. London: *Routledge*.

Joo, Seung-ho. (1996). Russian policy on Korean unification in the post-Cold War era. *Pacific Affairs*, 69(1), 32-48.

Journal of Chinese Communist Party History Studies (Zhonggong dangshi yanjiu): <http://www.cnki.com.cn/Journal/G-G1-ZGDS.htm>

Journal of Northeast Asian Studies: <https://www.jstor.org/journal/jeastasianstudie?decade=2000>

Jr. Hummel. W. Arthur. (1989). China's changing relations with the United States and the Soviet Union. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 133(1), 75-83.

Jun, Byoung-kon. & Kim, Jang-ho. (2013). China's role and perception of a united Korea. *Korean Journal of Defense Analysis: Korea Institute for Defense Analyses*, 25(3), 369-383.

Kahler, Miles. (2006). Strategic uses of economic inter-dependence: engagement policies on the Korean peninsula and across the Taiwan Strait. *Journal of Peace Research*, 43(5), 523-541.

Katzenstein, Peter. (1976). International relations and domestic structures: foreign economic policies of advanced industrial states. *International Organizations*, 30(1), 1-45.

Keum, Hieyeon. (1989). Recent Seoul-Beijing relations: process, prospects, and limitations. *Issues & Studies*, 25(3).

Kharas, H. & Makino, K. & Jung, W. (2011) Overview: an agenda for the Busan high-level forum on aid effectiveness. in H. Kharas, K. Makino and W. Jung (eds) *Catalyzing Development: A New Vision for Aid*, Washington, DC: *The Brookings Institution Press*, 1–37.

Khoo, Nicholas. (2005). Realism redux: investigating the causes and effects of Sino-US rapprochement. *Cold War History*, 5(4), 529-549.

Kihl, Yong-whan. (1977). Korea's future: Seoul's perspective. *Asian Survey*, 17(11), 1064-1076.

Kim, Bae-won. (1991). Yellow Sea economic zone: vision or reality?. *Journal of Northeast Asian Studies*, X(1).

Kim, Byong-hong. (1991). Korean reunification. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 38(2), 115-119.

Kim, Byung-kook. & Vogel, F. Ezra. (2013). The Park Chung-hee era: the transformation of South Korea. *Harvard University Press*.

Kim, Dalchoong. (1986). China's relations with the Two Koreas: continuity and adjustment. *Journal of East and West Studies*, 15(1), Spring-Summer.

Kim, Hak-joon. (1991). China's Korea policy since the Tiananmen Square Incident. *The China Challenge: American Policies in East Asia*, *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 38(2), 107-114.

Kim, Heungkyu. (2009). China's partnership diplomacy: concept, process, and implications. *Korean Political Science Review*, 43(2), 287-305.

Kim, Heungkyu. (2012). Enemy, homager or equal partner? Evolving Korea-China relations. *Journal of National and Area Studies*, Seoul National University, 19(2), 47-62.

Kim, M. E. & Kim, H. P. & Kim, J. (2013). From development to development cooperation: foreign aid, country ownership, and the developmental state in South Korea. *The pacific review*, 26(3), 313-336.

Kim, Nack-hong. (1989). Sino-Soviet rapprochement and its implications for South Korea's "Northern Policy". *Korea & World Affairs*. 13(2).

Kim, S. Samuel. (1982). Focus on: the Sino-American collaboration and Cold War II. *Journal of Peace Research*, 19(1), 11-20.

Kim, Samuel. (1994). The dialectics of China's North Korea policy in a changing post-Cold War period. *Asian Perspective*, 18(2).

Kim, S. Samuel. (1997). The future of China and Sino-ROK relations, the future of China and northeast Asia. Edited by Tae-Hwan Kwak and Melvin Gurtov, *The Institute for Far Eastern Studies*, Kyungnam University.

Kim, Il-Sung. (1982). On Juche in our revolution. Pyongyang: *Foreign Languages Publishing House*.

Kissinger, Henry. (1979). The White House Years. Boston: *Little, Brown*.

Kissinger, Henry. (1994). Diplomacy. *Simon & Schuster Paperbacks*.

Kissinger, Henry. (2011). On China. *Penguin Press*.

Kissinger, Henry. (2011). White House Years: the first volume of his classic memoirs. *Simon & Schuster*.

Kissinger, Henry. (2015). Shijie zhixu [World order]. Beijing: *Zhongxin chubanshe (China CITIC Publishing Group)*.

Kochavi, Noam. (2002). A conflict perpetuated: China's policy during the Kennedy Years. Westport, Conn.: *Praeger*.

Koh, Byung-chul. (1969). North Korea and the Sino-Soviet schism. *Western Political Quarterly*, 22(4), 940-962.

Koh, Byung-chul. (1985). China and the Korean peninsula. *Korea & World Affairs*, 9(2), Summer.

Kong, Han-bing. (2003). Bingfei yifang xuanze de jieguo – lun xinzhongguo chuqi “yibiandao” waijiao zhengce de chansheng [On the creation of the “Leaning-to One Side Policy” in the early days of the newly established PRC]. *Eluosi yanjiu (Russian Studies)*, (3), 81-87.

Kraus, Curt. Richard. (2012). The Cultural Revolution: a very short introduction. *Oxford University Press*.

Kwak, Tae-hwan. (1980). China and the Korean peninsula in the 1980s. *Korea & World Affairs*, 4(1).

- Lampton, M. David. (2007). The faces of Chinese power. *Foreign Affairs*, 86 (1), 115-127.
- Langdon, Frank. (2001). American northeast Asian strategy. *Pacific Affairs*, 74(2), 167-184.
- Lankov, Andrei. (2015). The real North Korea: life and politics in the failed Stalinist utopia. *Oxford University Press*.
- Larsen, K. W. (2012). China's rise and the Two Koreas: politics, economics, security. *China Review International*, 19(1), 119-122.
- Lasater, L. Martin. & Yu, Kien-hong, Peter. (2000). Taiwan's security in the post-Deng Xiao-ping era. London: *Frank Cass*.
- Lee, Bong. (2003). The unfinished war: Korea. New York: *Algora Plub*.
- Lee, Chae-jin. (1996). China and Korea: dynamic relations. Stanford: *Hoover Institutions*.
- Lee, Chae-jin. & Hsieh, Stephanie. (2001). China's "Two-Koreas Policy" at trial: the Hwang Chang Yop Crisis. *Pacific Affairs*, 74(3), 321-341.
- Lee, Min-yung. (2015). The similar histories of Taiwan and South Korea. Available from: <http://www.taipeitimes.com/News/editorials/archives/2016/12/18/2003661427> (Viewed on 25th, June 2019).
- Lee, O. H. (2017). THAAD: a critical litmus test for South Korea-China relations. Available from: <http://www.38north.org/2017/03/hlee030217/> (Viewed on 10th, June 2017).
- Lee, Yung-hong. (1977). Korea's future: Peking's perspective. *Asian Survey*, 17(11), 1088-1102.
- Levine, I. Steven. (1984). China in Asia: the PRC as a regional power. *China's foreign relations in the 1980s*, edited by Harry Harding.
- Li, Dong. (2018). Hepinggongchuwuxiangyuanze – goujian xinxingguojiguanxi de jishi [On the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence – the basis for establishing newly type of international relations]. *Heilongjiangsheng shehuizhuyixueyuan xuebao (Journal of Heilongjiang Institute of Socialism)*, (3), 41-43.
- Li, Jie. (2001). Changes in China's domestic situation in the 1960s and the Sino-United States relations. In Robert S. Ross and Jiang, Chang-bin, eds., *Re-examining the Cold War: US-China diplomacy, 1954-1973*.

Cambridge: *Harvard University Press*.

Li, Ke. & Hao, Sheng-zhang. (1989). Wenhua dageming zhong de renmin jiefangjun [The People's Liberation Army during the Cultural Revolution]. Beijing, *CCP Historical Materials Press*, 408-409.

Li, Yan. (2002). Jianguo chuqi "yibiandao" waijiaozhengce de biranxing he helixing [On the necessity and the reasonability of the "Leaning-to One Side Policy" in the early stage of the newly established PRC]. *Jiangxi shehui kexue (Jiangxi Social Sciences)*, (2), 95-98.

Li, Yan. (2015). Piaojinhui fuqin zai zhongguo de xingxiang zhuanbian [On Park Geun-hye's father – Park Chung-hee's image changes from the aspect of China]. Available from: <https://cul.qq.com/a/20150911/043447.htm> (Viewed on: 28th, September 2019).

Li, You-shen. (2012). Guojiali yi shijiaoxia de "taoguang yanghui" zhengyi [On the controversy of the "Low-profile" strategy from the aspect of national interest]. *Guojizhanwang (Global Review)*, (3), 27-40.

Li, Yue. (2006). Chaoxianzhanzheng duiyu liangda zhenying geju de yingxiang [The influence of the Korean War on the pattern of the two Camps]. *Hanguo xuelun wenji (Social Science Documentation Publishing House)*, (00), 105-112.

Liang, Zhi. (2008). Hanguo zhengzhi fazhan zhong de meiguo: 1945-1961 [On the United States' role in the development of South Korea's politics: 1945-1961]. *Lengzhan guojishi yanjiu (Cold War International History Studies)*, (1), 216-239.

Liang, Zhi. (2009). Meiguo duiwai kaifa yuanzhu zhengce yu hanguo de jingji "qifei" [On the United States' assistance policy and South Korea's economic "take-off"]. *Dangdai hanguo (Contemporary Korea)*, (1), 30-38.

Lin, Hsiao-ting. (2012). Taiwan's secret ally. *Hoover Institution*, (2), Available from: <https://www.hoover.org/research/taiwans-secret-ally> (Viewed on 24th, June 2019).

Lin, Hsiao-ting. (2012). Hoover fellow and library & archives curator Hsiao-ting Lin Publishes a new view of modern Taiwan. *Hoover Institution*, (2), Available from: <https://www.hoover.org/news/hoover-fellow-and-library-archives-curator-hsiao-ting-lin-publishes-new-view-modern-taiwan> (Viewed on 24th, June 2019).

Lin, Li-min. (2000). Chaoxianzhanzheng yu meiguoduihua ezhizhengce de queli [On the Korean War and the formation of the United States' containment policy towards China]. *Shixuejikan (Collected Papers of*

History Studies), (2), 90-95.

Lin, Jun-feng. (2004). Shixi Deng Xiao-ping linghuo wushi de waijiao zhanlve siwei [On Deng Xiao-ping's flexible and pragmatic foreign policy thinking]. *Guangdong jiaoyu xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Guangdong Education Institute)*, 24(3), 20-24.

Lin, Sheng-ai. (2014). Gaigekaifang zhichu zhongguo dui hanguo "guanminfenli" zhengce chutan [Exploration on China's policy of "Separation of the Official and the People" to Republic of Korea in the beginning of the reforming age]. *Dangdai zhongguoshi yanjiu (Contemporary China History Studies)*, 21(2), 68-73.

Liu, Chang. & Hao, Xiang-yang. (2009). Qianxi zhongguo mulinzhengce de xianzhuang yu fazhan [On current situation and later tendency of China's "Good-neighbour" policy]. *Keji xinxi (Science & Technology Information)*, (19), 524.

Liu Gui-jun. (2016). Lishi shi zheyang zhuanzhede – lun Deng Xiao-ping, Chen Yun yu shishi qiushi sixiangluxian de chongxin queli [The historical turning point – on the re-confirmation of Deng Xiao-ping's, Chen Yun's thought – "seeking truth from facts"]. *Deng Xiao-ping yanjiu (Deng Xiao-ping Research)*, (3), 63-71.

Liu, Hong. (1993). The Sino-South Korean normalization: a triangular explanation. *Asian Survey*, 33(11), 1083-1094.

Liu, Jian-fei. (2000). Yishixingtai dui xinzhongguo "yibiandao" juece de zuoyong [On the role of ideology in the newly established PRC's lopsided foreign policy]. *Guoji huntan (International Forum)*, 2(5), 43-48.

Liu, Jian-fei. (2019). Xinshidai zhongguowaijiao jixu taoguangyanghui yeyao fenfayouwei [On the necessity of pursuing the "Low-profile" strategy as well as the "achievement-oriented" principle in the new era]. *Zhongguo dangzheng ganbu huntan (Chinese Cadres Tribune)*, (1), 46-48.

Liu, Jin-zhi. & Zhang, Min-qiu. & Zhang, Xiao-ming. (1998). Dangdai zhonghan guanxi [On the contemporary Sino-South Korean relationship]. Beijing: *Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe (China Social Sciences Press)*.

Liu, Shu-huai. (2017). Shi ping Geerbaqiaofu duiwaizhanlve de "xinsiwei" – jianlun sulian jieti de yuanti [On Gorbachev's new diplomatic thinking and causes of the collapse of the Soviet Union]. *Fazhi bolan (Legality, Vision)*, (35).

- Liu, Tao. (2013). Lengzhan hou meiguo dongya anquan zhanlve yanjiu [On the United States' security strategy towards East Asia in the post-Cold War era]. (A Doctoral Dissertation), *Jilindaxue (Jilin University)*.
- Liu, Ya-wei. (1998). Mao Ze-dong and the United States: a story of misperception. In Li Hong-shan and Hong Zhao-hui, eds., *Image, Perception, and the making of the United States-China relations*. Lanham: *University Press of America*.
- Liu, Ya-xian. (2005). Guanyu Deng Xiao-ping waijiao sixiang yanjiu de jidiansikao [Some reflection on the study of Deng Xiao-ping's diplomatic thought]. *Suzhou kejixueyuan xuebao (Journal of University of Science and Technology of Suzhou)*, 22(2), 10-12.
- Lu, Feng. (2003). Cong guojialiyi shijiao kan "yibiandao" waijiaozhengce chengyin [On the formation of the "Leaning-to One Side Policy" from the perspective of national interest]. *Heilongjiang jiaoyu xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Heilongjiang College of Education)*, 22(1), 67-69.
- Lu, Ning. (1997). The Dynamics of foreign policy decision-making in China. Boulder, CO: *Westview Press*.
- Lu, Ning. (2005). Yetan yinxiang zhongguo chubin chaoxian juece de yinsu [On factors of why China decided to dispatch troops to Korea]. *Dangdai zhongguoshi yanjiu (Contemporary China History Studies)*, 12(5), 87-93.
- Lu, Wen-pei. (1994). Waijiao "yibiandao" zhengce de lishi fenxi [A historical analysis of the "Leaning-to One Side Policy"]. *Lilun jianshe (Theory Research)*, (4), 73-76.
- Lynch, Michael. (2015). Mao's China: 1936-1997. Third Edition, *Hodder Education*.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo. (2019). The prince, second edition. *Cambridge University Press*.
- Markey, S. Daniel. (2002). Reviewed work(s): Mao's China and the Cold War by Chen Jian. *Political Science Quarterly*, 117(2), 328-329.
- Mati, E. Michael. (2002). China and the legacy of Deng Xiao-ping: from communist revolution to capitalist evolution. Washington D.C.: *Brassey's, Inc.*
- Maxwell, Robert. (1987). Deng Xiao-ping: speeches and writings. (The second edition). Oxford & New York: *Pergamon Press*.
- McConnell, Allan. (2016). A public policy approach to understanding the nature and causes of foreign policy

failure. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23(5), 667-684.

McDonald, Angus. (1976). Mao Ze-dong and the Hunan self-government movement, 1920: an introduction with five translations. *The China Quarterly*, (68), 750-777.

McNamara, S. Robert. & Blight, James. & Brigham, Robert. (1999). Argument without end: in search of answers to the Vietnam tragedy. New York: *Public Affairs*.

Mearsheimer, J. John. (2014). The tragedy of great power politics, updated edition. *W. W. Norton*.

Meyer, Falkenheim, Peggy. (1994-1995). Russia's post-Cold War security policy in northeast Asia. *Pacific Affairs*, 67(4), 495-512.

Michael, M. Sheng (1995). Korea and world affairs. *University of Missouriism*, XIX (2).

Mitter, Rana. (2004). A bitter revolution: China's struggle with the modern world. *Oxford University Press*.

Mitter, Rana. (2008). Modern China: a very short introduction. *Oxford University Press*.

Mitter, Rana. (2013). China's war with Japan, 1937-1945. *Penguin Press*.

Modern China: <https://www.jstor.org/journal/modernchina>

Morgenthau, J. Hans. (1948). Politics among nations: the struggle for power and peace. New York: *Knopf*.

Morgenthau, J. Hans. (2018). Politics among nations: the struggle for power and peace, sixth edition. *Kalyani*.

Morton, H. Halperin. (2006). Bureaucratic politics and foreign policy. Washington, D. C.: *Brookings Institution*.

Nam, Jong-ho. & Choo, Jae-woo. & Lee, Jang-won. (2013). China's dilemma on the Korean peninsula: not an alliance but a security dilemma. *The Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, 25(3), 385-398.

Navarro, Peter. & Autry, Greg. (2011). Death by China: confronting the dragon – a global call to action. *Pearson Education, Inc.*

Naughton, Barry. (1993). Deng Xiao-ping: the economist. *The China Quarterly*, (135), 491-514.

Naughton, Barry. (1995). Deng Xiao-ping: the economist (Available from the book: Deng Xiao-ping: portrait of a Chinese statesman). Oxford: *Clarendon Press*.

Nixon, M. Richard. (1967). Asia after Vietnam. *Foreign Affairs*, 121-123.

Nogee, L. Joseph. & Donaldson, H. Robert. (1981). Soviet foreign policy since World War II. *Pergamon Press*.

Oberdorfer, Don. (2001). The Two Koreas: a contemporary history. *Basic Books*.

Oksenberg, C. M. (1971). Policy making under Mao Tse-tung, 1949-1968. *Comparative Politics*, 3(3), 323-360.

Olsen, A. Edward. (2005). Korea, the divided nation. *Praeger Security International*.

Ou-Yang, wei. (2013). Shenhua zhonghan guanxi dui baochi chaoxianbandao wending juyou zhongyao yiyi [On the deepening Sino-South Korean relationship and its significance for stabilizing the Korean peninsula]. *Heping yu fazhan (Peace and Development)*, (6), 27-30.

Pacific Affairs: <http://www.jstor.org/journal/pacificaffairs>

Pacific Historical Review: <https://www.jstor.org/journal/pacihistrevi>

Paine, S. C. M. (2003). The Sino-Japanese War of 1894-1895: perceptions, power and primacy. *Cambridge University Press*.

Park, Hun-bong. (2003). China's policy toward the Korean peninsula from 1978 to 2000. (A Doctoral Dissertation) *Durham University*, Department of Politics.

Park, Il-keun. (1999). Chinese foreign policy and the Korean peninsula. *International Journal of Korean Studies*: Spring/Summer, III(1), 116-135.

Park, Tae-gyun. (2009). Beyond the myth: reassessing the security on the Korean peninsula during the middle 1960s. *Pacific Affairs*, 82(1), 93-110.

Park, Young-soo. (2011). Revisiting the South Korean developmental state after the 1997 financial crisis. *Australian journal of international affairs*, 590-606.

Pashakhanlou, Heydarian. Arash. (2017). Realism and fear in international relations – Morgenthau, Waltz and Mearsheimer reconsidered. *Palgrave Macmillan*.

Peng, An-yu. (2003). Lengzhan zhengce yu chaoxianzhanzheng de baofa [On the Cold War policy and the outbreak of the Korean War]. *Junshi lishi yanjiu (Journal of Military History Analysis)*, (1), 102-107.

Peng, Hong-zhi. (2003). Deng Xiao-ping waijiao lilun de lilun jichu, zhuti yu celve [On the bases, themes and tactics of the theory of Deng Xiao-ping's diplomacy]. *Guizhou daxue xuebao (Journal of Guizhou University)*, 21(1), 8-13.

Piao, Dong-jun. & An, Hua-shan. (2011). Lun Piao Zhen-xi shiqi hanguo fazhanxing guojia de xingcheng yu yanbian [On the formation and evolution of South Korea's developmental state in the Park Chung-hee period]. *Yanbian jiaoyu xuebao (Journal of Yanbian Institute of Education)*, 44(1), 81-87.

Piao, Rui-lin. (1999). Hanguo waijiaozhengce de fazhanguocheng [On the developmental process of South Korea's foreign policy decision]. *Hanguo yanjiu luncong (Collected Papers for Korean Studies)*, (00), 23-38.

Plant, T. & Rhode, B. (2013). China, North Korea and the spread of nuclear weapons. *Survival*, 55(2), 61-80.

Pollack, D. Jonathan. (1993). China between the superpowers: in search of a security strategy (Available from the book: China in the era of Deng Xiao-ping: a decade of reform). *An East Gate Book*.

Pratt, Keith. (2007). Everlasting flower: a history of Korea. *Reaktion Books*.

Psychology, Foreign Policy, and International Relations Theory:

http://www.jstor.org/stable/3791705?Search=yes&resultItemClick=true&searchText=China's&searchText=Foreign&searchText=Policy&searchText=and&searchText=Critical&searchText=Theory&searchText=of&searchText=International&searchText=Relations&searchUri=%2Faction%2FdoBasicSearch%3Fgroup%3Dnone%26amp%3BQuery%3DChina%2527s%2BForeign%2BPolicy%2Band%2BCritical%2BTheory%2Bof%2BInternational%2BRelations%26amp%3Bfc%3Doff%26amp%3Bwc%3Don%26amp%3Bacc%3Don&refreqid=search%3Aa6cd3ec3e7fade62c0b5afa5cf7c9b66&seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents

Qian, Qi-chen. (1990). The changing international situation and China's foreign policy. Seeking Truth, as reported in Press Release No.27, Embassy of the PRC, 27 December 1990.

Qu, Guang-long. (2012). Xinzhongguo jianguochu "yibian dao" waijiaozhengce yanjiu [On the "Leaning-to

One Side Policy” in the early stage of the newly established PRC]. *Fazhi yu shehui (Legal System and Society)*, (12), 153-154.

Ray, Dennis. M. (1975). China’s perception of social imperialism and economic dependency: the impact of Soviet aid. *Stanford J. of International Studies*, 5(Spring), 36-82.

Reuters. (2011). China formally opens first overseas military base in Djibouti. Available from: <https://uk.reuters.com/article/uk-china-djibouti/china-formally-opens-first-overseas-military-base-in-djibouti-idUKKBN1AH3E1> (Viewed on 14th, August 2019).

Rice, E. E. (1973). The Sino-United States détente: how durable? *Asian Survey*, 13(9), 805-811.

Richard, Synder. & H. W. Bruck & Burton, Spain. (1962). Foreign policy decision making: an approach to the study of international politics. New York: *Macmillan*.

Robert, M. Blum. (1982). Drawing the line, the origins of the American containment policy in East Asia. New York: *Norton*.

Ross, S. Robert. (1989). From Lin Biao to Deng Xiao-ping: elite instability and China’s US policy. *China Quarterly*, 118: 265-299.

Ross, S. Robert. (2010). The rise of Chinese power and the implications for the regional security order. *Orbis*, 54(4), 525-545.

Roy, Denny. (1998). China’s foreign relations. London: *MacMillan Press*.

Roy, Denny. (2003). Taiwan: a political history. *Cornell University Press*.

Ruan, Xiao-jing. (2011). Dui Tai heping tongyi celve yanjiu [On China’s peaceful unification strategy towards Taiwan]. (A Doctoral Dissertation) *Fujian shifan daxue (Fujian Normal University)*.

Rubinstein, A. Murray. (1994). The other Taiwan: 1945 to the present. *An East Gate Book*.

Salisbury, E. Harrison. (1993). The new emperors: Mao and Deng. *HarperCollins Publisher*.

Sarantakes, Evan. Nocholas. (1999). In the service of pharaoh? The United States and the deployment of Korean troops in Vietnam, 1965-1968. *Pacific Historical Review*, 68(3), 425-449.

Saunders, C. P. (2005). Long-term trends in China-Taiwan relations: implications for U.S. Taiwan policy. *Asian Survey*, 45(6), 970-991.

Schiavenza, Mattt. (2013). How humiliation drove modern Chinese history. Available from: <https://www.theatlantic.com/china/archive/2013/10/how-humiliation-drove-modern-chinese-history/280878/> (View on 25th June 2019)

Schilling, W. Roller. & Hammond, Y. Paul. & Synder, Herald. Glenn. (1962). Strategy, politics, and defense budgets. New York: *Columbia University*, Institute of War and Peace Studies.

Schmid, Andre. (2002). Korea between empires: 1895-1919. New York: *Columbia University Press*.

Segal, Gerald. (1980). China and the great power triangle. *The China Quarterly*, (83), 490-509.

Selden, Mark. (2006). Jack Gray, Mao Ze-dong and the political economy of Chinese development. *The China Quarterly*, (187), 680-685.

Seth, J. Michael. (2006). A concise history of Korea: from the neolithic period through the 19th century. *Rowman & Litterfield*.

Seth, J. Michael. (2016). A concise history of modern Korea: from the late 19th century to the present. *Rowman & Litterfield*.

Sha, Qi-guang. (2000). Dui xifangmeiti sanbu “zhongguoweixielun” de pingxi [On western media’s description of ‘China threat’ theory]. *Guojizhengzhiyanjiu (The Journal of International Studies)*, (3).

Shambaugh, David. (1995). Deng Xiao-ping: portrait of a Chinese statesman. *Oxford University Press*.

Shambaugh, David. (2013). China goes global: the partial power. Oxford: *Oxford University Press*.

Shan, Shi-ying. (2013). Zhonghan maoyi de hubuxing yu jingzhengxing fenxi [On complementarity as well as competitiveness of the Sino-South Korean trading relations]. *Zhongguo shanmao (China Journal of Commerce)*, (20), 129-130.

Shang, Hong. (2009). Aobama gaodiao “chongfanyazhou” [On the Obama government’s focus on the “Pivot-to-Asia” strategy]. *Liaowang (Outlook)*, (47), 60-61.

Shen, Ding-chang. (2002). Hanguo waijiaozhengce de fazhanguocheng jiqi bianqianyuanyin [On

developmental process and influential factors of South Korea's foreign policy]. *Hanguo xuelun wenji* (Collected Papers of Study of Korea), (00), 296-308.

Shen, Zhi-hua. (2012). Chaoxianzhanzheng qijian de zhongchao tongmeng [On the alliance relationship between China and North Korea in the period of the Korean War]. *Fazhan* (Developing), (4), 63-69.

Shen, Zhi-hua. & Dong, Jie. (2011). Chaoxian zhanhou chongjian yu zhongguo de jingji yuanzhu 1954-1960 [On North Korea's post-war reconstruction and China's economic aid 1954-1960]. *Zhonggong dangshi yanjiu* (The Chinese Communist Party History Studies), (3), 48-57.

Shen, Zhi-hua. & Xia, Ya-feng. (2012). Between aid and restriction: the Soviet Union's changing policies on China's nuclear weapons program, 1954-1960. *Asian Perspective*, 36, 95-122.

Sheng, M. Michael. (2008). Mao and China's relations with the superpowers in the 1950s: a new look at the Taiwan Strait crises and the Sino-Soviet split. *Modern China*, 34(4), 477-507.

Shepard, Graham. (1988). Personality effects on American foreign policy, 1968-1984: a second test of international generation theory. *International Studies Quarterly*, 32(1), 91-123.

Shi, Yin-hong. (2009). China's dilemma over the North Korean nuclear problem. (Available from the book: Challenges to China's foreign policy). *The University Press of Kentucky*.

Shi, Yuan-hua. (2003). Zhongguo gaigekaifang yihou de dui han zhengce ji chaoxianhe wenti [On China's policy towards South Korea in the post-"Opening and Reform" era and the North Korean nuclear issue]. *Hanguo yanjiu conglin* (Collected Papers for Korean Studies), (0), 18-28.

Shi, Yuan-hua. & Wen, En-xi. (2012). Shilun zhonghan zhanlve hezuo huoban zhong de meiguo yinsu [On the United States' role in the strategic cooperative partnership between China and South Korea]. *Dongbeiyaluntan* (Northeast Asia Forum), (5), 15-22.

Shi, Zhi-fu. (1994). Zhonghua renmin gongheguo duiwai guanxi (1949.10 -1989.10) [A history of the foreign relations of the People's Republic of China (1949.10-1989.10)]. Beijing: *Beijing daxue chubanshe* (Pecking University Press), 5-8.

Shi, Zhe. (1993). With Mao and Stalin: Liu Shao-qi in Moscow. *Chinese Historians*, 6 (Spring), 84-85.

Smith, Hazel. (2003). Asymmetric nuisance value: the border in China-Democratic People's Republic of Korea relations. In Timothy Hildebrandt (ed), 'Uneasy allies: fifty years of China-North Korea relations'.

Washington, DC.: *Woodrow Wilson International Centre*, Asia Program Special Report, (115), 18-25.

Smith, Hazel. (2005). Hungry for peace: international security, humanitarian assistance, and social change in North Korea. Washington, D. C.: *United States Institute of Peace Press*.

Smith, Hazel. (2015). North Korea: markets and military rule. *Cambridge University Press*.

Smith, Hazel. & Rhodes, Chris. & Pritchard, Diana. & Magill, Kevin. (1996). North Korea in the new world order. *Palgrave Macmillan Press*.

Sneider, L. Richard. (1986). United States' security interests. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 36(1), 76-87.

Snyder, Richard. C. & H. W. Bruck. & Burton, Sapin. (1954). Decision-making as an approach to the study of international politics. Princeton, NJ: *Princeton University Press*.

Snyder, Scott. (2009). China's rise and the Two Koreas: politics, economics, and security. London: *Boulder*.

Song, Hai-qiong. (2001). Chaoxianzhazheng qianhou liangguo sanfang guanxi qianxi [On the relationship among three sides of two nations before and after the Korean War]. *Zhongguo kuangye daxue xuebao (Journal of China University of Mining & Technology)*, (4), 111-114.

Song, Ji-he. & Luo, Bao-cheng. (2010). Lun kangmeiyuanchao de zhengyixing – jianping chaoxianzhazheng dui Taiwanweni de yingxiang [On the justice of the Korean War to resist United States aggression and aid Korea – comments on the impact of the Korean War on the situation regarding Taiwan]. *Dianzi keji daxue xuebao (Journal of University of Electronic Science and Technology of China)*, 12(6), 70-74.

Spence, D. Johnathan. (1990). The search for modern China. *Norton*.

Sprout, Harold. & Sprout, Margaret. (1956). Man-Milieu relationship hypotheses in the context of international politics. Princeton, NJ: *Princeton University Press*.

Starr, Bryan. John. (1977). On Mao's self-image as a Marxist thinker. *Modern China*, 3(4), 435-442.

Steiner, A. H. (1972). Re-thinking U.S. China policy. *Pacific Affairs*, 45(2), 255-268.

Smith, Steve. & Hadley, Amelia. & Dunne, Tim. (2008). Foreign policy: theories, actors, cases. Oxford:

Oxford University Press.

Stueck, W. (1981). The road to confrontation, American policy toward China and Korea, 1947-1950. Chapel Hill: *University of North Carolina Press*.

Sui, Shu-ying. (2004). Lun “yibiandao” zhengce de lishi juxianxing [On the historical limitation of the “Leaning-to One Side Policy”]. *Qilu xuekan (Qilu Journal)*, (6), 48-54.

Sun, Qi-ming. (1995). Shi lun jianguo chuqi shixing “yibiandao” zhengce de libideshi [On gains and losses of carrying out the “Leaning-to One Side Policy” in the early days of the newly established PRC]. *Shanghai dangshi yanjiu (Shanghai CPC History Research)*, (1), 9-15.

Sutter, G. Robert. (1984). Realities of international power and China’s independence in foreign affairs, 1981-1984. *Journal of Northeast Asian Studies*, III(4), 3-28.

Swaine, D. Michael. (2017). Chinese views on South Korea’s deployment of Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD). Available from: <http://carnegieendowment.org/2017/02/02/chinese-views-on-south-korea-s-deployment-of-terminal-high-altitude-area-defense-thaad-pub-67891>. (Viewed on 21st, August 2017).

Szonyi, Michael. (2008). Cold War Island: Quemoy on the front line. *Cambridge University Press*.

Tan, Hong-mei. & Li, Jun. (2014), Meiguo dongya zhengce pinggu yu zhanwang – yatai zaipingheng zhanlve yu dongya zhixu de chonggou [On the United States’ policy towards east Asia – the strategy of re-balancing the Asia-Pacific region and the reconstruction of the order in east Asia]. *Liaodong xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Eastern Liaoning University)*, 16(4), 23-28.

Tang, Tsou. (1963). America’s failure in China, 1941-1950. Chicago: *University of Chicago Press*.

Tao, Jay. (1968). Mao’s world outlook: Vietnam and the revolution in China. *Asian Survey*, 8(5), 416-432.

Tao, Ji-yi. (2005). Jinnianlai xifang xueshuji dui xinzhongguo “yibiandao” zhengce de yanjiushuping [On recent western academy’s comments on the newly established PRC’s “Leaning-to One Side Policy”]. *Dangdai zhongguoshi yanjiu (Contemporary China History Studies)*, 12(2), 117-122.

Tarar, Ahmer. (2001). International bargaining with two-sided domestic constraints. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 45(3), 320-340.

Telegram, Mao Ze-dong to Stalin, October 2, 1950, (1987). Jianguo yilai Mao Ze-dong wengao [Mao Ze-dong's Manuscripts since the formation of the PRC]. Beijing: *Zhongyang Wenxian Chubanshe and Shijie Zhishi Chubanshe (Central Party Literature Press & World Affairs Press)*, 539-540.

The China Journal: <https://www.jstor.org/journal/chinaj>

The China Quarterly: <http://www.jstor.org/journal/chinaquarterly>

The Chinese Academic Journal Electronic Publishing House website (Zhiwang)
<http://www.cnki.net>

Tian, Jing. (2005). Meiguo duihuazhengce yu xinzhongguo "yibian dao" zhengce de queli [On the United States' policy towards China and the formation of the newly established PRC's "Leaning-to One Side Policy"]. *Liaoning gongcheng jishu daxue xuebao (Journal of Liaoning Technical University)*, 7(4), 355-357.

Tom, De, Lua. & John, Buell. (2006). Free trade: a paradox for democracy. *Routledge*, in *New political science*, 507-525.

Tow, William. & Rigby, Richard. (2011). China's pragmatic security policy: the middle-power factor. *The China Journal*, (65), 157-78.

Trofimenko, Henry. (1989). Long-term trends in the Asia-Pacific region: a Soviet evaluation. *Asian Survey*, 29(3), 237-251.

Truman. Harry. S. (2008). Dulumen huiyilu [Memoir of Truman]. Yanji: *Yanbian Press*.

Trucker, N. (1983). Patterns in the dust: Chinese-American relations and the recognition controversy, 1949-1950. New York: *Columbia University Press*.

Tsai, G. T. & Littlefield, A. (2011). China's foreign policy: realpolitik or something new?. *Journal of Contemporary Eastern Asia*, 10(1), 1-13.

Vogel, F. Ezra. (2011). Deng Xiaoping and the transformation of China. *The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press*.

Walker, L. Brett. (2015). A concise history of Japan. *Cambridge University Press*.

Wallace, W. (1971). Foreign policy and the political process. London: *Macmillan*.

Waltz, N. Kenneth. (2010). Theory of international politics, reissued edition. *Waveland Press, INC*.

Wang, Chen-main (Peter). (2007). A bastion created, a regime reformed, an economy reengineered, 1949-1970. (Available from the book: *Taiwan – a new history*). London & New York: *Routledge*.

Wang, De-fu. (2007). Chaoxianzhanzheng qian meiguo de dongbeiya celve [On the United States' approach towards northeast Asia ahead of the Korean War]. *Daqing shifan xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Daqing Normal University)*, 28(4), 126-128.

Wang, Dong-yan. (2010). Chaoxianzhanzheng: Zhongguo weishengme yaocanzhan [The Korean War: why China attended the war]. *Fujian dangshi yuekan (Journal of Fujian Monthly History)*, (17), 22-24.

Wang, Fei-ling. (1999). Joining the major powers for the status quo: China's views and policy on the Korean re-unification. *Pacific Affairs*, 72(2), 167-185.

Wang, Gang. (2007). Deng Xiao-ping mulin waijiao sixiang yu dongya quyu hezuo [On Deng Xiao-ping's friendly diplomatic thinking and regional cooperation in east Asia]. *Dongnanya zongheng (Around Southeast Asia)*, (5), 8-12.

Wang, Guo-hong. & Wang, Ke-na. (2007). Zhou En-lai yu Deng Xiao-ping waijiao sixiang zhi bijiao fenxi [A comparative analysis of Zhou En-lai's and Deng Xiao-ping's diplomatic thought]. *Shijiqiao (Shijiqiao)*, (2), 3-5.

Wang, Hui. & Zhang, Yu-shan. (2014). Meiguo "chongfanyazhou" zhanlve dui chaoxianbandao jushi de yingxiang [The influence of the United States' "Pivot- to-Asia" strategy on the Korean peninsula situation]. *Shehui kexue zhanxian (Social Science Front)*, (7), 165-170.

Wang, Jian-wei. (2009). Building a new conceptual framework for U.S.-China relations. (Available from the book: *Challenges to China's foreign policy*). *The University Press of Kentucky*.

Wang, Jin-shu. (1998). Zhuhua xiaokang jianshe bao jingji fazhan [On the importance of building a well-off society to China's economic development]. *Zhongguo nongcun xiaokang keji (Chinese Countryside Well-off Technology)*, (4).

Wang, Sheng. (2007). "Zhonghanjianjiao 15nian (Fifteen years since normalization of Sino-Korea relationship)". *Waijiao (China's Diplomacy)*.

Wang, Shu-zeng. (2009). Chaoxianzhanzheng baofaqian de daguo zhengzhi jiaoliang [On the political competition among great powers ahead of the eruption of the Korean War]. *Baocan huicui (Newspaper Meta)*, (10), 68-70.

Wang, Ya-jie. & Song, Xiao-wei. & Lan, Yu-ming. (2013). Mao Ze-dong queli “yibiandao” wajiao zhengce de yuanyin fenxi [On factors that constituted Mao Ze-dong’s “Leaning-to One Side Policy”]. *Beihua daxue xuebao (Journal of Beihua University)*, 14(5), 72-75.

Wang, Yu-xuan. (2015). Zhongguo wajiao zhanlve tiaozheng dui chaoxianbandao zhengce de yingxiang huigu [The influence of China’s diplomatic strategy adjustment on its policy towards the Korean peninsula]. *Shenyang gongcheng xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Shenyang Institute of Engineering)*, 11(1), 73-76.

Warren, I. Cohen. (1971). America’s response to China: an interpretive history of Sino-American relations. New York: *Wilsey*.

Weber, Max. (1964). The religion of China. New York: *Free Press*.

Weinstein, F. B. (1972). The uses of foreign policy of Indonesia: an approach to the analysis of foreign policy in the less developed countries. *World Politics*, 24(3), 356-381.

Westad, Arne. Odd. (2013). Restless empire: China and the world since 1750. London: *Vintage Books*.

Whiting, S. Allen. (2001). China’s use of force, 1950-1996, and Taiwan. *International Security*, 26(2), 103-131.

William, U. Stueck. (1981). The road to confrontation, American policy toward China and Korea, 1947-1950. Chapel Hill: *University of North Carolina Press*.

Womack, Brantly. (1986). Where Mao went wrong: epistemology and ideology in Mao’s leftist politics. *The Australian Journal of Chinese affairs*, (16), 23-40.

Woody, Christopher. (2017). China is going after South Korea's wallet in their dispute over the THAAD missile system. Available from: <http://uk.businessinsider.com/china-south-korea-economic-boycott-protests-over-thaad-missile-system-2017-3?r=US&IR=T> (Viewed on 10th, June 2017).

Workman, D. (2017). South Korea’s top trading partners. Available from:

<http://www.worldstopexports.com/south-koreas-top-import-partners/> (Viewed on 11th, April 2017).

Wu, Chen-lin. (2011). Guojihua shiyuxia “yibiandao” waijiaozhengce de queli [On the formation of the “Leaning-to One Side Policy” from the aspect of internationalization]. *Guoji guanxi xueyuan xuebao (Journal of University of International Relations)*, (3), 13-17.

Wu, Jing-lian. (2005). Understanding and interpreting Chinese economic reform. Mason, Ohio: Thomson/South-Western.

Wu, W. Y. Friedrich. (1981). From self-reliance to inter-dependence? Developmental strategy and foreign economic policy in post-Mao China. *Modern China*, 7(4), 445-482.

Xia, Fei. (2012). Chaoxianzhanzheng qijian de jiangjieshi [Chiang Kai-shek in the period of the Korean War]. *Dangshi zongheng (Over the Party History)*, (1), 8-11.

Xia, Ya-feng. (2006). Negotiating with the enemy: US-China talks during the Cold War, 1949-1972. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 109-14, 234.

Xiao, Jun. & Lu, Jian-hong. (1991). Baofa chaoxianzhanzheng de genbenyuanyin tanxi [On the fundamental factor that influenced the eruption of the Korean War]. *Shangdong yikedaxue xuebao shehuikexueban (Journal of Shangdong Medical University – Social Sciences Edition)*, (1), 53-56.

Xie, Tao. (2008). Congress and China policy: an analysis of China bills. *Journal of Contemporary China*, 17(54), 141-165.

Xiong, Kun-xin. (2004). Cong zhongguo chuantongwenhua de shijiao kan zhongguo yu zhoubianguojia de mulinyouhan zhengce [On China’s friendly approach towards neighbouring states from the perspective of Chinese conventional culture]. *Guoji zhengzhi yanjiu (Studies of International Politics)*, (2), 17-27.

Xu, Jia-bin. & Xu, Jia-rong. (2000). Chanye tiaozheng zhong de zhengce jidian fenxi – hanguo de gongyehua lichen jiqi dui zhongguo de qishi [An analysis of policy base point of industrial adjustment – the developmental process of South Korea industrialization and its implications for China]. *Zhongguo gongye jingji (China Industrial Economics)*, (12), 51-55.

Xu, Wen-ji. (2005). Eluosi de chaoxianbandao zhengce tiaozheng jiqi mubiao [Russia’s changing policy towards the Korean peninsula and its purposes]. *Eluosi zhongya dongou yanjiu (East European Russian & Central Asian Studies)*, (3), 57-61.

Xu, Xiao-ming. (2013). Lun chaoxianzhanzheng de qi yuan yu zhongguo canzhan – Stalin, Jin Ri-chen, Mao Ze-dong yu chaoxianzhanzheng [On the origin of the Korean War and China's involvement – Stalin, Kim II-Sung, Mao Ze-dong and the Korean War]. *Zhanjiang shifan xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Zhanjiang Normal University)*, 34(4), 65-71.

Xue, Mou-hong. Et al. (1988). Dangdai zhongguo waijiao [Contemporary Chinese diplomacy]. Beijing: *Zhongguo Shehui Kexue Chubanshe (China Social Sciences Press)*, 4-5.

Yahuda, Michael. (1995). Deng Xiao-ping: the statesman (Available from the book: Deng Xiao-ping: portrait of a Chinese statesman). Oxford: *Clarendon Press*.

Yahuda, Michael. (1995). Deng Xiao-ping: the statesman. *The China Quarterly*, (135), 551-572.

Yan, Su-e. (2011). Yishixingtai yuxia de chaoxianzhanzheng [On the Korean War from the aspect of ideology]. *Qianyan (Forward Position)*, (24), 48-51.

Yan, Xue-zhe. (2014). Zhongguo chaoxianbandao zhengce mianlin de jiyu yu tiaozhan [Opportunity and challenge of China's policy towards the Korean peninsula]. *Liaoning daxue xuebao – Zhexue shehui kexueban (Journal of Liaoning University – Philosophy and Social Science)*, 16(5), 17-22.

Yang, D. L., & Su, F. (1998). The politics of famine and reform in rural china. *China Economic Review* (1043951X), 9(2), 141-155.

Yang, Yun-long. & Xiao, Xiao-chen. (2013). “Yibiandao” waijiao zhengce xingcheng yuanyin zaixi [A review of the formation of the “Leaning-to One Side Policy”]. *Shangdong xingzheng xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Shangdong Academy of governance)*, 4, 50-53.

Yao, Shu-jie. (1999). A note on the causal factors of China's famine in 1959-1961. *Journal of Political Economy*, 107(6), 1365-1369.

Yi, X. (1995). China's Korea policy: from 'One Korea' to 'Two Koreas'. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 22(2), 119-140.

Yi, Yan-xia. & Chen, Yu-hua. (2006). Lun Deng Xiao-ping dui Mao Ze-dong waijiao sixiang de fazhan [On Deng Xiao-ping's role in the development of Mao Ze-dong's diplomatic thinking]. *Zhonggong Yunnan shengwei dangxiao xuebao (The Journal of Yunnan Provincial Committee School of the Chinese Communist Party)*, 7(2), 39-41.

- Yoo, Hyon-joo. (2012). The Korea-United States alliance as a source of creeping tension: a Korean perspective. *Asian Perspective*, (36), 331-351.
- Yoo, Hyon-joo. (2014). Reluctant flexibility caused by abandonment fears: a theoretical analysis of South Korea's approach toward China in the 1970s and the early 1980s. *The Korean Journal of Defence Analysis*, 26(2), 225-242.
- Young, Whan-kihl. (2002). Security on the Korean peninsula: continuity and change. *Sage Publications*: 33(1), 59-79.
- Yu, Bin. (2009). Sino-Russian relations in the 'post'-Putin era. (Available from the book: *Rising China – power and reassurance*). *ANU Press*.
- Yu, bing-yong. (1995). Hanguo de beifangzhengce [South Korea's "Northern Policy"]. *Dangdai hanguo (Contemporary Korea)*, (3), 14-17.
- Yu, Sui. (2012). Sulianjiети dui zhongguo de sidianyingxiang [The four main effects of the collapse of the Soviet Union on China]. *Juece yu xinxi (Decision & Information)*, (2).
- Yuan, Zheng. (2010). "Chongfanyanzhou" – aobama zhengfu dongya zhengce pingxi [An evaluation of the Obama government's policy towards east Asia – the "Pivot-to-Asia" strategy]. *Dangdai shijie (Contemporary World)*, (1), 49-52.
- Zagoria, S. Donald. (1974). Mao's role in the Sino-Soviet conflict. *Pacific Affairs*, 47(2), 139-153.
- Zagoria, S. Donald. (1977). Korea's future: Mosow's perspective. *Asian Survey*, 17(11), 1103-1112.
- Zang, Ru-yue. (2017). Hua Guo-feng yu "liangge fanshi" [Hua Guo-feng and the "Two whatevers" viewpoint]. *Tianjin daxue (Tianjin University)*.
- Zhai, Qiang. (2000). China and the Vietnam War, 1950-1975. Chapel Hill: *University of North Carolina Press*.
- Zhang, Bai-jia. (1992). Zhou En-lai-the shaper and founder of China's diplomacy. In Michael H. Hunt and Niu Jun, eds., *Towards a history of Chinese communist foreign relations, 1920s-1960s: personalities and interpretive approaches*. Washington, D. C.: *Woodrow Wilson International Centre for scholars*, Asia program.

Zhang, Bai-jia. (2005). “Kangmei yuanchao” yu “yuanyue kangmei” – zhongguo ruhe yingdui chaoxianzhanzheng he yuenanzhanzheng [“Aiding Korea to resist the United States” and “Aiding Vietnam to resist the United States” – how China responded to the Korean War and the Vietnamese War]. *Shijie jingji yu zhengzhi (World Economics and Politics)*, (3), 8-15.

Zhang, Bai-jia. (2006). ‘Resist America’: China’s role in the Korean and Vietnam Wars. In managing Sino-American crises: Case Studies and Analysis, edited by Michael D. Swaine. Washington D.C.: *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*.

Zhang, Bai-jia. (2009). The evolution of China’s diplomacy and foreign relations in the era of reform, 1976-2005. (Available from the book: Challenges to China’s foreign policy). *The University Press of Kentucky*.

Zhang, Bin. (2009). Chaoxianzhanzheng baofa qianhou meiguo duitai zhanlve juece zhuanbian tanxi [An analysis of the United States’ policy shift towards Taiwan before and after the eruption of the Korean War]. *Yingcai gaozhi luntan (The Forum of Yingcai Higher Vocational Education)*, 5(2), 40-44.

Zhang, Hui-zhi. & Wang, Xiao-ke. (2013). Zhonghan guanxi ershinian: chengjiu yu wenti [On achievements as well as contradictions of the Sino-South Korean relationship in the last two decades]. *Xiandai guoji guanxi (Contemporary International Relations)*, (1), 20-27.

Zhang, Jun-fa. & Qi, Xiao-yu. (2015). Chaoxianzhanzheng dui zhongguo de yingxiang [The influence of the Korean War on China]. *Puyang zhiye jishu xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Puyang Vocational and Technical College)*, 28(5), 48-50.

Zhang, Kun-sheng. (2004). Chaoxianzhanzheng dui Taiwanwenti de yingxiang [The influence of the Korean War on the situation regarding Taiwan]. *Guancha yu sikao (Observation and Ponderation)*, (7), 44-46.

Zhang, Lian-gui. (1990). Nanchaoxian de “beifangzhengce” [South Korea’s “Northern Policy”]. *Lilun qianyan (Theory Front)*, (1), 18-20.

Zhang, Ming. (2001). Lun chaoxianzhanzheng de qiying he jieju [On origins as well as results of the Korean War]. *Dang de wenxian (Literature of Chinese Communist Party)*, (2), 65-70.

Zhang, Qin-min. (2014). Towards an integrated theory of Chinese foreign policy: bringing leadership personality back in. *Journal of Contemporary China*, 23(89), 902-922.

Zhang, Qing-min. (2015). Evolving bureaucratic politics in Chinese foreign policy-making. *The Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, 27(4), 453-468.

Zhang, Shao. (2014). Yishixingtai shijiaoxia chaoxianbandao fenlie de neiyin fenxi [An analysis of the internal origin of the division of the Korean peninsula from the aspect of different ideologies]. *Minzu luntan (Minzu Tribune)*, (2), 56-59.

Zhang, Wei. (1989). China at the 24th Olympics Games. *Beijing Review*, 31(41): pp. 24-28 (10-16 October 1988).

Zhang, Xiao-ming. (2005). Chaoxianzhanzheng de diyuan zhengzhixue fenxi [An analysis of the Korean War from the aspect of geo-politics]. *Nankai xuebao (Academic Journal of Nan Kai)*, (3), 1-7.

Zhang, Ying-qing. (1995). Zhongguo de gaigekai fang zhengce yu zhongri, zhonghan guanxi [On China's "Opening and Reform Policy" and the diplomacies with Japan, South Korea]. *Guoji zhengzhi yanjiu (The Journal of International Studies)*, (2), 113-120.

Zhang, Yong-jin. (2013). China's security problematique: critical reflections. *ANU Press*.

Zhang, Yu-shan. (2010). Zhonghan guanxi de huigu yu zhanwang [A review and outlook of Sino-South Korean relationship]. *Dangdai hanguo (Contemporary South Korea)*, 2010 (Spring), 1-9.

Zhao, Ming-hao. (2018). Daguo jingzheng beijingxia meiguo dui "yidaiyilu" de zhiheng taishi fenxi [An analysis of the United States' strategy to contain the "One Belt, One Road" programme in the context of the competition among major powers]. *Shijie jingji yu zhengzhi (World Economics and Politics)*, (12), 4-31.

Zhao, Quan-sheng. (2001). Chinese foreign policy in the post-Cold War era. *World Affairs*, 159(3), 114-129.

Zhao, Shi-yang. (2008). Zhongguo hepingjueqi yu meiguo yataizhanlve de tiaozheng [On China's peaceful rise and the United States' policy adjustment towards the Asia-Pacific region]. (A Master's Thesis) *Xiangtandaxue (Xiangtan University)*.

Zhao, Shu-zhao. (2008). Dui woguo jianguochuqi "yibiandao" waijiaozhengce de fansi [Some reflection on the "Leaning-to One Side Policy" in the early state of the newly established PRC]. *Chongqing keji xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Chongqing University of Science and Technology)*, (4), 4-5.

Zhao, Sui-sheng. (2004). Chinese foreign policy: pragmatism and strategic behaviour. London & New York: *Routledge*.

Zhao, Xiao-guang. & Liu, Jie. (2011). Deng Xiao-ping de sanluosanqi [The three falls and three rises of

Deng Xiao-ping. *Shengyang: Liaoning renmin chubanshe (Liaoning People's Press)*.

Zhao, Xue-gong. (1996). Chaoxianzhanzheng yu meiguo de dongyazhengce [The Korean War and the United States' policy towards east Asia]. *Lishijiaoxue (History Teaching)*, (11), 42-44.

Zhao, Yu-qiang. (2010). Chaoxianzhanzheng dui liangan guanxi de yingxiang [The influence of the Korean War on the cross-Taiwan Straits relations]. *Chifeng xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Chifeng University)*, 31(3), 21-22.

Zheng, Cheng-hong. (2017). Jindazhong de "yangguangzhengce" jiqi xianshiyiyi [Kim Dae-jung's "Sunshine Policy" and its practical significance]. *Haerbin gongyedaxue xuebao (Journal of Harbin Institute of Technology)*, 19(3), 18-25.

Zhongguo Shiyou. (1992). Fresh impetus from Deng's message. *Beijing Reivews*, 35 (15): 4(13-19 April).

Zhou, Cai-fang. (2000). Shixi chaoxianzhanzheng dui xinzhongguo fazhanlicheng de yingxiang [An analysis of the influence of the Korean War on the developmental process of the newly established PRC]. *Nanjing shehui kexue (Social Science in Nanjing)*, (12), 45-51.

Zhou, Jian-chao. (2002). Zailun "yibiandao" waijiao zhengce de lishi yuanyin [On the historical causes of the "Leaning-to One Side Policy"]. *Yangzhou daxue xuebao (Journal of Yangzhou University)*, 6(2), 14-19.

Zhou, Yuan. (1992). Pact to protect trade with South Korea. *China Daily*, (4).

Zhu, Fang. (2014). Zhongguo "Lianmeikangsu" waijiao zhanlve yanjiu [On China's strategy of "Uniting the United States against the Soviet Union"]. *Neimenggu daxue (Inter Mongolia University)*.

Zhu, Feng. (2003). "Liufanghuitan" hou de chaoheweiiji: wenti yu qianjing [The North Korean issue in the aftermath of the "Six-Party Talk": problems and prospects]. *Xiandai guojiguanxi (Contemporary International Relations)*, (9), 9-21.

Zuo, Ji-ping. (1991). Political religion: the case of the Cultural Revolution in China. *Sociological Analysis*, 52(1), 99-110.