The Beijing Consensus is Neither: China as a Non-Ideological Challenge to International Norms

John Wagner Givens[1]

ABSTRACT

This paper analyses the impact of a rising China on the international system, especially in terms of its effect on liberal democracy and human rights. It finds that, largely because of its unfamiliar non-ideological nature, the threat posed by China has sometimes been exaggerated and often misunderstood. The "Beijing Consensus" does not represent an ideologically coherent alternative to dominant international norms, and China makes no serious effort to promote the Chinese model as a template for other countries to follow. Domestically, the Chinese party-state may work to undermine democracy and fail to respect human rights. Internationally, however, China uses its soft power to pursue its interests, neither working actively for, or against, human rights and democracy. Because Beijing acts without regard for democracy and human rights, seeing its policy through the lens of these norms provides an unintelligible picture.

The impact of China's growing influence is largely ambiguous, as China offers aid and support to democrats and despots alike and does not condition such assistance on a state's human rights record. An examination of data on Chinese and US overseas aid show that both go to approximately the same mix of free and unfree regimes. Further analysis shows that Chinese aid does not appear to have a significant impact on the state of political and civil freedoms in recipient countries. In conclusion, China's impact on international norms of liberal democracy and human rights is shown to be marginal precisely because China makes no effort to affect these norms.

Introduction

Analyses of China's growing influence abroad sometimes describe the People's Republic of China (PRC) as a powerful new force for development and progress, often as a challenge to international norms of liberal

John Wagner Givens, "The Beijing Consensus is Neither: China as a Non-Ideological Challenge to International Norms," *St Antony's International Review* 6, no. 2 (2011): 10–25.

democracy and human rights, but almost always in terms of superlatives. Leading up to the 2008 Olympics, China was condemned for its crackdown against Tibetan rioters and its displacement of tens of thousands to make room for the games, but much of the bitterest criticism levelled against Beijing was reserved for its perceived failure to condemn the Sudanese government for ongoing violence in Darfur.[2] A sizeable Western movement attempted to brand Beijing as the "Genocide Olympics" and called for a boycott.[3] Almost concurrently, other foreign policy analysts asserted that "China is now willing to condition its diplomatic protection of pariah countries, forcing them to become more acceptable to the international community."[4] Barely a year later, Chinese involvement in Guinea prompted *The Economist* to charge China with "again mock[ing] human rights in Africa."[5] What explains these disjointed views regarding China's influence abroad and the nearly hysterical tone of much of the criticism?

In this paper, I argue that rhetoric about China's foreign influence is so confused and that criticism of it so frenzied precisely because of China's relative indifference, rather than outright hostility, to norms of liberal democracy and human rights. China does not observe these norms at home or promote them abroad, but neither does it attempt to undermine or supplant them. Instead, China primarily seeks to pursue its economic interests, especially in terms of securing access to natural resources and to gain recognition as a world power. Because China's foreign policy is indifferent to democracy and human rights, viewing its actions in terms of these norms provides an incoherent picture. China offers aid, loans, investment, and diplomatic recognition equally to autocrats and democrats, and attaches no conditions regarding governance or human rights to this support. Therefore, I characterize China's foreign policy and its growing international influence in terms of what it is, pragmatic, and what it is not, ideological. I propose that China is best understood as a non-ideological challenge to those states and organizations seeking to promote international norms of liberal democracy and human rights.

In the first section, I address the issue of China's ideology, or lack thereof. I argue that while there are ideas and concepts central to Beijing's thinking and decision-making, they neither form a coherent ideology, nor are many of them exported or exportable. In the second section, I demonstrate China's relative indifference to norms of liberal democracy and human rights, and suggest that this stance results in a misinterpretation of China's influence. I present five interconnected reasons that explain why China's non-ideology is difficult to grasp, and why the challenge it presents is often misunderstood. In the third section, I ana-

lyse the meaning of China's non-ideological challenge for international norms of liberal democracy and human rights. I conclude that while the non-ideological challenge of China is real, its unfamiliar nature has caused it to be significantly overstated.

A Non-Ideology

The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines ideology as "[a] systematic scheme of ideas, usually relating to politics or society, or to the conduct of a class or group, and regarded as justifying actions, esp. one that is held implicitly or adopted as a whole and maintained regardless of the course of events."[6] As we shall see, the concepts that guide Beijing's policy at home and abroad are neither systematic and adopted as a whole, nor maintained despite changing realities.

The ideas and concepts that seem to hold sway in Beijing are well known. At home these include emphases on stability and economic growth, a preference for government control of civil society and the commanding heights of the economy, pragmatism, and the cautious promotion of nationalism. In foreign policy Beijing tends towards non-interference and the supremacy of sovereignty, an anti-hegemonic anti-Americanism, developing world solidarity, and a self-interested pragmatism. Yet this does not amount to an ideology. Indeed, Beijing's post-Cultural Revolution emphasis on pragmatism is often explicitly in opposition to ideology; to the extent that its foreign policy has a guiding principle, it is the regime's emphasis on not interfering with the internal affairs of other states. Even China's critics tend to acknowledge that China does not use its growing influence abroad to peddle any particular set of ideas or political or economic policies. As US Congressman Chris Smith stated, "China's African partners are free to pursue any foreign or economic policies they wish."[7]

Notable exceptions to Beijing's non-ideology and non-interference are manifest in issues related to Tibet and Taiwan. China is often dogmatic about its "One China Policy," which insists that Taiwan is an indivisible part of China under the sovereignty of the People's Republic.[8] But as US President Obama was reminded in a recent phone call with Hu Jintao, China considers Taiwan and Tibet internal matters, and, at any rate, such issues are far too narrow to define a guiding ideology for Chinese foreign policy.[9]

The conversion of China's foreign policy from ideological to pragmatic is vividly illustrated by Beijing's relationship with Burma, now Myanmar. During the Mao era, Beijing strongly backed the Burmese

Communist Party's insurgencies against the ruling military junta, but by the late 1980s, it was pressuring the insurgents to retire.[10] Currently, the PRC is one of only a handful of countries willing to support the same brutal military junta that they had once sought to overthrow.

Even the term used by the Chinese party-state to characterize its economic system, "socialist market economy with Chinese characteristics" (有中国特色的社会主义市场经济), makes it clear that it is not designed for foreign emulation. In addition to being too cumbersome to export, the term clearly roots the model in Chinese soil and insinuates that it will not work elsewhere, or at least that other states will have to independently construct their own similar models.

Those who take an aggressive attitude towards China will point out that even if Beijing does not actively export or promote an ideology abroad, its tremendous economic success and increasing international stature inevitably make some kind of "Beijing Consensus" a model for the rest of the developing world. To a certain extent this is inevitable. However, the idea that China provides a radically new and different model is largely false. First, while the party-state does maintain control of some strategic sectors and companies, China's remarkable growth owes much to private entrepreneurship, the freeing of markets, and a "growing out of the plan."[11] The Chinese state currently controls only about thirty per cent of the Chinese economy by assets, and much less by other measures.[12] While state-allied national champions may grab headlines, the bulk of China's economic miracle was driven by privately owned small and medium enterprises whose relationship with the state tends to be minimal at best.[13] Additionally, China's development depends heavily on its openness to foreign firms, an example the developed world should applaud rather than fear. Second, an autocratic state-capitalist model of development was hardly pioneered by the Chinese. Western allies such as Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan have long provided successful examples of authoritarian, state-led growth.

It should not be denied that leaders in Beijing get some satisfaction out of being seen as a model for the rest of the world. Nevertheless, they would rather secure raw materials and respect than emulation. Indeed, Beijing's leaders probably prefer that other developing nations focus on extracting resources to sell to China, rather than following China's lead to become competitors in the manufacturing sector.

In this section, I showed that not only do the principles that guide Beijing's foreign policy fail to make up an exportable ideology, but that they are explicitly non-ideological and strongly advocate non-interference in the affairs of other states. Beijing may challenge international norms as a non-ideological alternative to developed world support, and,

to a limited extent, as a model, but it does not offer an alternative to those norms.

Non-Ideology in Practice

Both as a model for other countries and in its foreign policy, five interrelated factors make China's non-ideology difficult to analyse. Those who see China as a challenge to international norms more often recognize the first two factors, implicitly or explicitly, while those who are optimistic about China's influence more often cite the latter three. As I will show, however, all five factors stem from China's ambiguous stance towards democracy and human rights and make it difficult to gauge its impact in these terms.

First, China's non-ideological pragmatism means that its influence is capable of striking anywhere, and that its overall impact is hard to quantify. China can and increasingly does trade, provide loans or aid, and offer political support to almost any country on earth. It provides investment, loans, and aid to reasonably well-established democracies like Costa Rica, moderately free states like Mozambique, and serial human rights violators like North Korea. Nor is China shy about giving large sums of aid or investment to countries with strong ties to developed-world donors, as the example of Cambodia shows.[14]

The increasing spread of Beijing's influence frightens China hawks who understandably tend to focus on China's involvement with pariah regimes. In order to secure the natural resources its economy requires, China, as a recently emerged major consumer, is often left to deal with regimes that the developed world would rather avoid. But it is important to recognize that this is a product of competition for natural resources rather than an inherent preference, and even liberal democracies have a long and sordid history of supporting resource-rich despots. Extensive investment in Brazil shows that Beijing is just as happy to secure natural resources from liberal democracies. China's support for the world's most problematic regimes may garner the most attention, but the majority of recipients of Chinese support score above China in Freedom House ratings of political and civil liberties, although this is in part simply because China ranks so low.

Table 1 makes a comparison between nations to which China and the United States pledged aid or investment in 2008. The sample of 136 US recipients is drawn from official statistics of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) on Official Development Assistance (ODA). The Chinese sample of thirty-three nations was assem-

bled from a selection of recipients of Chinese aid, loans, credit lines, and investments drawn from a Congressional Research Service report and a report by the Lowy Institute for International Policy.[15] Although the two reports covering Chinese aid projects did not include any projects pledged to North Korea or Iran in 2008, I have added these countries to the China sample because they are recipients of sizeable and apparently ongoing Chinese aid that are too important to overlook. The table shows the average political and civil freedom scores in Freedom House's 2008 report.[16] In the Freedom House scoring system, seven is the worst possible score, and a lower number indicates greater freedom.[17] The report also lists the percentage of recipient countries that were ranked "free," "partly free," and "not free." Because China does not disclose its aid and investment abroad in a systematic fashion, it is impossible to gauge the representativeness of the thirty-three nations included in the Chinese sample, and the definition of Chinese aid varies from the definition of ODA used for the US sample. Despite these dramatic shortcomings, however, the table helps to provide insight into what kinds of regimes are receiving Chinese aid and investment.

Table 1: Political and Civil Freedom in Countries to which the United States and China Committed Aid in 2008

Variable	United States	People's Republic of China
Average Political Freedom Score	4.1	4.2
Average Civil Freedom Score	3.8	4.0
Percentage of Recipients Ranked "Free"	27.6%	24.2%
Percentage of Recipients Ranked "Partly Free"	39.3%	45.5%
Percentage of Recipients Ranked "Not Free"	33.1%	30.3%

Sources: Lum, "China's Foreign Activities in Africa, Latin America, and Southeast Asia"; Hanson, "China: Stumbling Through the Pacific"; and Freedom House, "Country Reports, 2008 Edition."

Table 1 clearly shows that there is little difference between China and the United States in terms of the political and civil freedoms en-

joyed by recipients of its aid. While US recipients scored slightly better in terms of average political and civil freedoms and the United States had a larger percentage of its recipients categorized as "free," it also had a larger percentage of "not free" recipients. While I consider these data too problematic for further statistical analysis, it seems unlikely that the scores in these categories are significantly different. Naturally, how aid is given, especially with regard to the conditions attached to it, is at least as important as the identity of the recipient.

China's non-ideological foreign policy makes the international impact of its influence difficult to predict, gauge, and understand. Because China's aid, investment, and political support come with no ideological strings attached, it is difficult to know if, and how, it will affect recipient nations. Among regimes that challenge international norms, China's non-ideology means it can offer support to any type of human rights violator, be it authoritarian, Marxist, or theocratic. China has as easily offered monk-repressing Burmese generals the protection of its United Nations (UN) veto, as it has given financial support to quasi-theocratic Iran and Stalinist North Korea. This is just different from, for example, a Soviet power that would offer support to Marxist and socialist regimes, but could find it ideologically inconvenient to support non-Marxist or theocratic governments. Understandably, there are fears that in offering support to pariah regimes, China will encourage whatever type of theocratic, Marxist, or autocratic tendency that is already present.

Yet the flipside of the coin could also be true. Chinese support may help encourage developing democracies. Concrete examples of how Chinese aid might contribute to freedom are strikingly easy to come by. The PRC has just finished a new parliament building in Malawi and will soon complete another in Lesotho, two countries with multiparty electoral systems far more robust than China's.[19] Additionally, China has committed funds for the provision of computers to the Micronesian Congress, the development of a parliamentary office complex in Samoa, and an e-government project in Vanuatu. Naturally, spending on these types of projects pales in comparison to spending on infrastructure, especially infrastructure that facilitates natural resources extraction and transportation. Yet, as a country that is still very much developing itself, it is unreasonable to expect China to share the developed world's obligation to provide large amounts of purely altruistic aid.

Second, it is extremely difficult to discredit China's pragmatic non-ideological foreign policy. China's unconditional approach to foreign aid and investment means that it offers very few drawbacks for the leaders of recipient countries. Both at home and in China, leaders of countries receiving Chinese assistance may feel as though China is the first donor

and world power to treat them as equals. Beijing is careful to offer pomp and circumstance to the heads of even the smallest states, and President Hu is better travelled in Africa than many African leaders. These sorts of trappings certainly help, but perhaps even more important is the PRC's ability to treat recipients of aid as peers rather than problems. China's non-ideology means that it neither needs to lecture foreign leaders about the importance of political reform, nor snub them to punish bad behaviour.

Understandably, advocates of democracy and human rights are upset by footage of Chinese leaders rolling out the red carpet for serial human rights violators. There is little the developed world can do, however, to convince countries to reject Chinese aid or investment. "Don't accept that money—it comes with no political requirements whatsoever" is hardly a convincing warning, and even long-standing US allies, such as Costa Rica, Chile, and the Philippines, willingly except Chinese aid and investment. It was much easier to vilify the Soviet Union's aggressive Marxism than it is to cast aspersions on China's pragmatic aid, investment, and non-interference.

Third, China's non-ideological foreign policy means that it has become an important patron to a variety of the world's most problematic regimes, especially Stalinist North Korea, autocratic Burma, and theocratic Iran. China hawks point to these relationships as proof that Beijing is using its increasing prominence to shield the world's worst regimes from criticism and sanction. Yet in some cases, this means that China may be capable of exerting pressure on regimes that would not give the time of day to diplomats from the developed world. This presents a limited but important opportunity. While Beijing has not proved ready to push for dramatic reforms, it is sometimes willing to help the developed world grapple with some of its most acute problems. For example, during a crackdown in Burma, it "pushed the Burmese government to receive the UN special envoy Ibrahim Gambari and grant him access to senior generals and the opposition leader Aung San Suu Kyi."[20] Still, the lack of progress in talks with North Korea and the Cheonan incident demonstrate China's limited effectiveness as a broker. To some extent this is due to a lack of willingness on the part of Beijing. But the more important lesson to draw from Beijing's failure to gain significant leverage over North Korea and Burma may be that the world's most problematic regimes are largely immune to outside pressure.

Fourth, China's lack of commitment to ideology can make it a fickle patron. Chinese aid, loans, and investment are generally offered because they are in China's own interest, but international opprobrium can easily change this equation. Potential access to natural resources

may not be worth the condemnation of the international community. Such amendments, however, do not represent real changes of heart; as soon as international interest wanes, China may return to its support of a resource-rich pariah. Put another way, "China's shifting diplomacy reflects not a fundamental change in its values but a new perception of its national interests."[21] This has led many to decry China as a regime that is only concerned with human rights when it is under international pressure. This is accurate, but the confusion and frustration implicit in such charges reveal a lack of understanding. Withdrawing support from a problematic regime only when international attention makes such support undesirable is entirely consistent with China's non-ideological and pragmatic foreign policy.

Optimists may occasionally claim that China is learning to stay away from the least internationally acceptable regimes and is becoming a responsible power. This situation may occur, but it is much more likely to be driven by the repeated lesson that the return on investment from supporting pariah regimes is not worth the bad press, rather than a genuine change in the Chinese Communist Party's (CCP) attitude towards international norms. Additionally, in places like Zimbabwe, China may be learning the lesson that regimes that frequently violate human rights and the rule of law tend to create instability that makes a profitable economic relationship difficult. These uncommitted positions and shifting policies make Chinese influence even more difficult to assess and predict.

Fifth, China's authoritarian resilience is in large part a product of certain institutional capacities of the Chinese state, yet China's non-ideological stance means that it does not promote the development of these capacities in other nations. An authoritarian but increasingly competent and institutionalized ruling party has underpinned China's ongoing growth and stability. Institutional features such as norm-bound succession, a reliance on technocrats and meritocracy, and an increased capacity to monitor and control low-level officials are all an integral part of what allows China to continue to develop without obvious liberalization or democratization.[22] If China were serious about building a "Beijing Consensus" and encouraging others to follow the Chinese model, a significant part of its foreign aid and investment would have to be targeted towards helping other states develop these institutional features. Just as developed democracies promote certain institutional capacities in order to facilitate the development of certain norms and values, China would need to promote its own set of institutional capacities if it intended to challenge those values.

As China's critics often point out, however, the lion's share of China's aid and development assistance is devoted to purely economic goals,

especially resource extraction, while virtually none of it goes towards developing an institutional infrastructure reminiscent of China's own. This is in sharp contrast to past eras in which the Soviet Union, and to a lesser extent the PRC, actively sought to develop Leninist institutional features in parties throughout the world.[23] Even if other regimes that lacked these institutional features became determined to emulate China, it seems unlikely that they would have the institutional capacity to do so.

Gauging the Non-Ideological Challenge

In this section, I analyse what China's non-ideological challenge means for international norms of liberal democracy and human rights, and find that while China's non-ideological challenge is real, it has been substantially exaggerated. Indeed, there is even cause for optimism. China's impact on liberal democracy and human rights is largely ambiguous. Even when Chinese support works to undermine or delay the spread of beneficial international norms, it cannot replace them because it offers no alternative. Unlike the lingering effect of Soviet socialism, it is improbable that China's non-ideological challenge to international norms will prove enduring. Finally, most regimes that defy international norms would continue to do so regardless of China's support. If liberal democracies wish to defend international norms, they should recognize China's challenge as non-ideological, and work on strengthening their own efforts abroad rather than worrying about China.

Part of the problem with the idea that China undermines the developed world's aid regime is the belief that this regime actually produces benefits in terms of democratization and human rights. Unfortunately, empirical evidence suggests that this is not the case.[24] In a recent and dramatic illustration of the problem, Rwanda's Paul Kagame has risen as an aid darling of the developed world, while at the same time becoming increasingly autocratic.[25] Given the developed world's disastrous record in the developing world, particularly in Africa, China can surely be excused for being incredulous of the idea that developed nations know best when it comes to helping others develop.

It is also important to note that much of Beijing's non-ideological aid is not without concrete benefits to the citizens of its recipient nations. It may be ethically admirable for Western donors to require elections before building a new highway, but if elections are never held and the highway is never built, little benefit accrues to citizens of the recipient nation. If potential recipient regimes are truly intransigent, Chinese-built infrastructure may be preferable to a languishing in underdevelopment.

Furthermore, of course, there is the argument that development helps to foster democracy and respect for human rights. Even if interaction with China stifles political progress, if it also facilitates significant economic growth, a positive long-term impact on democracy and human rights may still result.

The extensive and varied reach of Chinese influence makes it particularly hard to gauge its overall impact on international norms. Does $7 billion of infrastructure investment in democratic Brazil cancel out the damage done by a $2.4 billion investment in autocratic Burma? The harshest China critics may argue that China's backing for the world's pariah regimes encourages and supports their bad behaviour, while its investment in more liberal regimes could work to drag them down China's authoritarian path. Less critical observers may counter that the damage done by China's support for human rights violators can be offset by its assistance to more responsible regimes. Optimists could hope that Chinese aid and investment would work universally to promote economic development, and, at least in the long run, political liberalization. Because China's non-ideological foreign policy does not present a consistent pattern in terms of democracy and human rights, it is difficult to know which of these viewpoints deserve the greatest credence.

In an effort to bring an empirical perspective to a difficult question, I have assembled a table of selected recipients and amounts of pledged Chinese aid, loans, credit lines, and investments drawn from a Congressional Research Service report.[26] Table 2 also includes an average of the Freedom House scores for political and civil freedom at the beginning and end of the period for which the aid and investment are reported. The final column records the change in the average score from the 2002 to the 2008 Freedom House reports. Although the congressional report did not include data on North Korea, Cuba, and Iran, I have added these countries to the table without aid figures because they are recipients of Chinese aid too important to overlook. Because China does not disclose its aid and investment abroad in a systematic fashion, it is impossible to know how representative a picture these nineteen nations provide. Despite the limitations, I hope this effort contributes towards a more balanced and empirical assessment of the impact of China's growing influence abroad.

In Table 2, fears voiced by critics find the most support among the worst regimes, i.e., Cuba, Sudan, Burma, Iran, and North Korea, all of which remained obdurate throughout this period. Additionally, as Cuba, Sudan, Burma, and North Korea had the lowest possible scores in 2002, it is possible that their human rights situations actually deteriorated over this period. How much Chinese support contributed to the continued

survival and obstinacy of these worst of the worst is an extremely difficult question. While a strong case can be made that economic support and diplomatic cover from China have long helped to keep North Korea in business, Iran, Cuba, and Burma remained unrepentant autocrats for decades before receiving substantial Chinese support. It is worth keeping in mind that all of these regimes have also received aid from developed-world donors, including the United States. Finally, slight improvements by other low-scoring nations such as Angola, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and Vietnam suggest that China's influence does not necessarily prevent problematic regimes from improving their stance on democracy or human rights.

Yet if Table 2 shows the fears of critics to be exaggerated, it falls short of vindicating the views of optimists. Most of the improvement in human rights and democracy in this sample stems from four Latin American democracies, three of which received the smallest sums in the table. If these Latin American countries were excluded, the total score would still show a half-point improvement, and according to Freedom House, "Over the past five years countries with only some features of institutionalized democratic systems have slipped significantly."[27] Taking into account this more general deterioration, a slight optimism about the prospects of Chinese aid recipients might be forgiven, but the overall picture presented by Table 2 should be described as largely ambiguous.

While this section focuses primarily on Chinese aid and investment, much is also made of the diplomatic cover China provides to pariah regimes, especially as a veto-wielding permanent member of the UN Security Council. Yet since 1972, China has used its veto in the UN Security Council only four times. This is in stark contrast to twelve uses each by France and Russia, the United Kingdom's nineteen vetoes, and a towering seventy by the United States.[28] What China's vetoes have lacked in number have not been made up for in importance. In 1997, China vetoed a resolution that would send a small force of UN observers to Guatemala because of that country's ties with Taiwan, but then dropped the veto after ten days.[29] In 1999, it vetoed the extension of a UN peacekeeping force in Macedonia because of that country's decision to recognize Taiwan.[30] In 2007 and 2008, China joined Russia in vetoing a resolution condemning Burma and another sanctioning Zimbabwe's president, Robert Mugabe, and eleven senior members of his government.[31] Nor is there any evidence that the PRC's use of the veto is increasing, as the period from 1990 to 2010 saw only four Chinese vetoes. China hawks may respond that China prefers to work behind closed doors and use instead the threat of veto. The PRC would surely need to use its veto somewhat more often for it to have real power as a deterrent. Indeed, China's ten-

dency to abstain has led some pundits to see the veto threat as a largely idle one.[32] At present, the most responsible conclusion to make is that in the short run at least, the effect of China's influence abroad is ambiguous. As I have suggested, this accords with an understanding of China's foreign policy as non-ideological.

Table 2: Selected Recipients of Large, Reported Aid and Investment Projects, 2002-7

Recipient Nation	Pledged Aid, Loans, Credit Lines, and Investments	2002 Freedom House Average Score	2008 Freedom House Average Score	Change in Score from 2002 to 2008
Angola	$7.4 billion	6	5.5	-0.5
Congo (DRC)	$5 billion	6	5.5	-0.5
Gabon	$3 billion	4.5	5	0.5
Equatorial Guinea	$2 billion	6	6.5	0.5
Ethiopia	$1.85 billion	5	5	0
Mozambique	$2.4 billion	3.5	3	-0.5
Nigeria	$1.6 billion	4.5	4	-0.5
Sudan	$4.2 billion	7	7	0.0
Burma	$3.1 billion	7	7	0
Philippines	$5.4 billion	2.5	3.5	1
North Korea	Unknown	7	7	0
Vietnam	$3.4 billion	6.5	6	-0.5
Iran	Unknown	6	6	0
Brazil	$8.2 billion	3	2	-1
Chile	$0.5 billion	2	1	-1
Colombia	$0.4 billion	4	3	-1
Costa Rica	$0.4 billion	1.5	1	-0.5
Cuba	Unknown	7	7	0
Venezuela	$16.4 billion	4	4	0
Total	**$65.25 billion**	**93**	**89**	**-4**

Sources: Lum, "China's Foreign Activities in Africa, Latin America, and Southeast Asia"; and Freedom House, "Country Reports 2008 Edition."

In the long term, the non-ideological nature of China's foreign policy means that Beijing's influence is unlikely to outlive the concrete support it offers. In contrast to the legacy of Soviet Russia or Mao-era China, which inspired regimes and insurgencies that still cause problems today,

there is little in Beijing's words or deeds to galvanize support against international norms of human rights and democracy. As long as Beijing continues to pursue a policy of foreign aid and investment that ignores the issues of democracy and human rights, we can expect that the PRC's impact on international norms to be challenging but nebulous. While China's aid and investment abroad will doubtless rise in the coming years, the increase may not be as dramatic as many predict. China is still relatively poor per capita and Beijing is likely to continue to believe that keeping most of its aid and investment at home is in its best interest.

Nevertheless, Chinese foreign aid and investment may begin to develop a more intelligible tendency. It is possible that Beijing's pragmatic domestic and foreign policy may solidify into the authoritarian alternative to liberal democracy, human rights, and the Washington Consensus that China hawks have long feared. Alternately, as China grows richer, Beijing may become an active promoter of democracy and human rights abroad. Yet, for three decades, leaders in Beijing have seemed comfortable in their post-Maoist, non-ideological skin, and at present it is far from clear that Beijing is becoming more willing to take a stand either for or against human rights.

In conclusion, the developed world should worry less about China's growing influence, which is uncertain, likely only to be problematic in the short term, and largely beyond control, and more about its own troubled relationship with the developing world. ■

Notes

[1] The author would like to thank his advisors and professors, especially Kevin O'Brien, Stanley Lubman, and Vivienne Shue. He is also indebted to his mother for her tireless editing and to Rogan Nunn for his helpful comments. Finally, he would like to acknowledge his beautiful wife for her support and honesty.

[2] See Peter Seabrook, "Tibet Tests China's Movement on Human Rights" *Online NewsHour*, May 16, 2008, http://www.pbs.org/newshour/indepth—coverage/asia/china/2008/tibet.html; and Sky Canaves, "Beijing's Olympic Cleanup Sends Migrants and Homeless Packing," *Wall Street Journal*, August 5, 2008, http://online.wsj.com/article/NA—WSJ—PUB:SB121788405566611245.html (both accessed August 9, 2010).

[3] See Nicholas D. Kristof, "China's Genocide Olympics," *New York Times*, January 24, 2008, http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/24/opinion/24kristof.html (accessed August 9, 2010).

[4] Stephanie Kleine-Ahlbrandt and Andrew Small, "China's New Dictatorship Diplomacy: Is Beijing Parting With Pariahs?," *Foreign Affairs* 87, no. 1 (2008): 38-56, 38.

[5] The Economist, "Don't Worry About Killing People," October 15, 2009, http://www.economist.com/node/14664647?story—id=1466464 (accessed August 11, 2010).

[6] The Oxford English Dictionary, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).

[7] "China's Influence in Africa," *Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Human Rights and International Operations of the Committee on International Relations House of Representative, One Hundred Ninth Congress*, First Session, July 28, 2005, Serial No. 109–74, http://www.foreignaffairs.house.gov/archives/109/22658.pdf (accessed August 10, 2010), 3.

[8] See People's Republic of China Taiwan Affairs Office (中华人民共和国国务院台湾事务办公室国务院新闻办公室), "The One China Policy White Paper (一个中国的原则与台湾问题白皮书)," February 2002, http://www.gwytb.gov.cn/bps/bps—yzyz.ht (accessed August 31, 2010).

[9] See Xinhua News Agency, "Chairman Hu Jintao's Appointment to Call President Obama (国家主席胡锦涛2日应约同美国总统奥巴马通电话)," http://www.gov.cn/ldhd/2010-04/02/content—1571994.htm (accessed August 31, 2010).

[10] See Donald M. Seekins, "Burma-China Relations: Playing with Fire," *Asian Survey* 37, no. 6 (1997): 525–39.

[11] Although I use the term more generally, it was first coined in Joshua Ramos, *The Beijing Consensus: Notes on the New Physics of Chinese Power* (London: Foreign Policy Centre, 2004). For more perspectives from China hawks see: Martin Jacques, *When China Rules The World: The Rise of the Middle Kingdom and the End of the Western World* (London: Allen Lane, 2009); and Stefan Halper, *The Beijing Consensus: How China's Authoritarian Model Will Dominate the Twenty-first Century* (New York: Basic Books, 2010).

[12] See Barry Naughton, *Growing Out of the Plan: Chinese Economic Reform, 1978-1993* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

[13] Office of the Leading Group of the State Council for the Second National Economic Census, National Bureau of Statistics of China, "Communiqué on Major Data of the Second National Economic Census (No.1)," http://www.stats.gov.cn/english/newsandcomingevents/t20091225—402610168.htm (accessed August 10, 2010).

[14] See Leo Paul Dana, "Small Business as a Supplement in the People's Republic of China (PRC)," *Journal of Small Business Management* 37, no. 3 (1999): 76–80; The Economist, "The Capitalist Road," March 18, 2004; Xianping Rong, "Research on China's Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises' Cluster Development Model," *The Chinese Economy* 37, no. 5 (2004): 7–18; and David L. Wank, "Private Business, Bureaucracy, and Political Alliance in a Chinese City," *Australian Journal of Chinese Affairs* 33, (1995): 55–71.

[15] "Cambodia is a telling example. The government in Phnom Penh, which has received substantial aid from the United States and other democracies, now receives comparable amounts from China." Christopher Walker and Sarah Cook, "The Dark Side of China Aid," *New York Times*, March 24, 2010, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/25/opinion/25iht-edwalker.html (accessed August 31, 2010).

[16] Thomas Lum, "China's Foreign Activities in Africa, Latin America, and Southeast Asia," *Congressional Research Service* (2009), http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R40361.pdf; and Fergus Hanson, "China: Stumbling Through the Pacific," Lowy Institute for International Policy, *Policy Brief* (2009), http://www.voltairenet.org/IMG/pdf/China—stumbling—through—the—Pacific.pdf (both accessed August 11, 2010).

[17] Freedom House, "Country Reports 2008 Edition," http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=21&year=2008 (accessed August 11, 2010).

[18] Freedom House, "Methodology 2008 Edition," http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=351&ana—page=341&year=2008 (accessed August 11, 2010).

[19] See People's Daily Online, "China Hands Over New Parliment Building to Malawi," http://english.peopledaily.com.cn/90001/90776/90883/6994852.html; and The Economist, "Lesotho Meets China: The Chinese are Everywhere," August 5, 2010, http://www.economist.com/node/16750131 (both accessed August 11, 2010).

[20] Kleine-Ahlbrandt and Small, "China's New Dictatorship Diplomacy," 53.

[21] Ibid., 54.

[22] See Andrew Nathan, "Authoritarian Resilience," *Journal Of Democracy* 14, no. 1 (2003): 6–17; and Maria Edin, "State Capacity and Local Agent Control in China: CCP Cadre Management from a Township Perspective," *The China Quarterly* no. 173 (2003): 35–52.

[23] For example, Mikhail Borodin was dispatched by Stalin to reorganize both the Chinese Nationalist and Communist Parties along Leninist lines. See Dan Jacobs, *Borodin: Stalin's Man in China* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981).

[24] See Stephen Knack, "Does Foreign Aid Promote Democracy?," *International Studies Quarterly* 48 (2004): 251–66.

[25] See The Economist, "Rwanda and Other Aid Darlings: Efficiency Versus Freedom," August 5, 2010, http://www.economist.com/node/16743333 (accessed August 11, 2010).

[26] See Thomas Lum, "China's Foreign Activities in Africa, Latin America, and Southeast Asia," *Congressional Research Service* (2009), http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R40361.pdf (accessed August 11, 2010).

[27] Lum, "China's Foreign Activities."

[28] See Global Policy Forum, "Changing Patterns in the Use of the Veto in the Security Council," http://www.globalpolicy.org/security-council/tables-and-charts-on-the-security-council-0-82/use-of-the-veto.html; and Global Policy Forum, "Subjects of UN Security Council Vetoes," http://globalpolicy.org/security-council/tables-and-charts-on-the-security-council-0-82/subjects-of-un-security-council-vetoes.html (both accessed August 4, 2010).

[29] See Paul Lewis, "China Lifts U.N. Veto on Guatemala Monitors," *New York Times*, January 21, 1997, http://www.nytimes.com/1997/01/21/world/china-lifts-un-veto-on-guatemala-monitors.html (accessed August 4, 2010).

[30] See Lijun Sheng, *China's Dilemma: The Taiwan Issue* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2001), 165–6.

[31] Colum Lynch, "Russia, China Veto Resolution On Burma: Security Council Action Blocks U.S. Human Rights Effort," *Washington Post*, January 13, 2007, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/01/12/AR2007011201115.htm; and CNN.com International, "Russia, China veto U.N. sanctions on Zimbabwe," http://edition.cnn.com/2008/WORLD/africa/07/11/zimbabwe.sanctions/ (both accessed August 4, 2010).

[32] See Catherine Philp, "China Could Veto Sanctions Against Iran—But History Suggests it Won't," *The Times*, February 10, 2010, http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/middle—east/article7021195.ece (accessed August 30, 2010).