

This article was downloaded by: [Canadian Research Knowledge Network]

On: 30 November 2010

Access details: Access Details: [subscription number 783016864]

Publisher Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



The Nonproliferation Review

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t716100717>

Chinese-Pakistani nuclear/missile ties and balance of power politics

T. V. Paul^a

^a James McGill Professor of International Relations, McGill University, Canada

To cite this Article Paul, T. V.(2003) 'Chinese-Pakistani nuclear/missile ties and balance of power politics', The Nonproliferation Review, 10: 2, 21 – 29

To link to this Article: DOI: 10.1080/10736700308436928

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10736700308436928>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.informaworld.com/terms-and-conditions-of-access.pdf>

This article may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, re-distribution, re-selling, loan or sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

Chinese-Pakistani Nuclear/Missile Ties and Balance of Power Politics

T.V. PAUL

T.V. Paul is James McGill Professor of International Relations at McGill University, Canada. During 2002-2003 he taught at the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, California, and was also a senior visiting scholar at the Center for Nonproliferation Studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies. He is the author of Power versus Prudence: Why Nations Forgo Nuclear Weapons (McGill-Queen's, 2000), and coauthor with Baldev Raj Nayar of India in the World Order: Searching for Major Power Status (Cambridge University Press, 2002).¹

In a recent report to the U.S. Congress, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) stated that during the period July-December 2001, Chinese entities continued to supply nuclear and missile materials to Pakistan. According to the report, Chinese entities have been the principal suppliers for Pakistan's serial production of solid-propellant short range ballistic missiles (SRBMs) such as the Shaheen-1 and Haider-1. Moreover, the report contends that successful development of the Shaheen-2 medium range ballistic missile (MRBM) will also require continued Chinese assistance. The report suggests that China has continued to interpret its nonproliferation commitments narrowly with regard to supplying nuclear and missile-related materials to its key allies in the developing world, especially Pakistan.² Although the report does not accuse the Chinese government of direct involvement in the transfers, a strong argument can be made that in a political system such as that of China, sensitive transfers of this sort cannot take place on a sustained basis without the prior knowledge of the central government. This Chinese behavior has special significance because China has joined the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of

Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and has accepted many principles of the international nuclear and missile nonproliferation regimes.

Over the years, largely in response to U.S. economic and technological sanctions or the threat of such sanctions, China has made several unilateral and bilateral commitments that it would abide by the provisions of these regimes. Most recently, in October 2002, China issued a set of comprehensive new export control regulations covering missile technology, chemical weapons precursors and technology, and biological agents. These regulations were issued just prior to the visit of Chinese President Jiang Zemin to the United States.³ Despite these assurances, China has remained both a cause of, and a contributor to, nuclear and missile proliferation in South Asia. Since the late 1990s, evidence suggests that China has limited some such transfers, but it has found loopholes in the regimes that it has joined that have enabled it to continue its proliferation links with Pakistan, especially in the missile technology area. What motivates China in this issue area?

This article argues that Beijing's motivations in transferring nuclear and missile materials and technology to

Pakistan derive largely from Chinese concerns about the regional balance of power and are part of a Chinese effort to pursue a strategy of containment in its enduring rivalry with India. Although bureaucratic politics and commercial interests may have some influence on Chinese policy, in a centralized political system like China, they cannot plausibly account for the consistent pattern of nuclear and missile supplies to Pakistan.

A more convincing explanation is that China wants to limit India's power capabilities to South Asia and thereby constrain New Delhi's aspirations to become a major power in Asia. India's emergence as a peer competitor in Asia would upset China's predominant position in the region. However, if acute conflict and an intense arms race between India and Pakistan persist, India would continue to be bracketed with its smaller regional rival Pakistan and not with China. The continuing contradictions in Chinese nonproliferation policy are caused by the tension that exists between China's regional interests in South Asia and its global power aspirations.

As China emerges as a stakeholder great power, its nonproliferation policy has become more attuned to maintaining its status, which means supporting outwardly the norms prohibiting nuclear acquisition by new states. Yet, regional and global balance of power considerations simultaneously pull on Chinese policy in this regard, as evident in persistent Chinese support for the Pakistani nuclear and missile programs. In the future, China may limit these supplies to Pakistan in order to prevent the emergence of a U.S.-Indian military alliance. However, if the relationship between the United States and India evolves into a military alliance aimed against China, it is equally likely that China will court Pakistan more intensely. Balance of power considerations will again be the key source of such possible policy changes.

The evolution of China's nonproliferation policy has coincided with the change in China's status in the international system from a challenger to a quasi-status quo great power actor. Contemporary China has accepted many norms of international governance, as its status as a great power has been acknowledged by other major powers, especially the United States. The progression in Chinese policy reflects its acceptance of some of the elements of the international order that gives legitimacy to China's status as a great power and as a preponderant power in Asia. Sinologists have noticed the gradual progression of China in the 1980s as both a "system-maintaining" and "system-exploiting" great power as it began to ask "more and more what international organizations could do for

China, and less and less what China itself could do to reform or transform the existing world order...." The change in China's position on international organizations coincided with "the dramatic rise of China's international standing in the hegemonic world order and its sui generis status as a 'poor global power' [which] can be explained by the change in China's national role conception from a revolutionary system-transforming actor to a neo-realist system-maintaining status quo actor."⁴ In the nonproliferation area, some such behavioral changes have been the result of U.S. pressures. However, the tension between China's role as a great power that needs to support those norms that favor great power dominance of the international system and China's regional interest in balancing a rising power, India, explains the current contradictions in Chinese nonproliferation policy in South Asia.

CHINA AND NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN SOUTH ASIA

China's nuclear nonproliferation policy, especially with respect to South Asia, contains several elements. First, China is both a cause of, and a contributor to, nuclear and missile proliferation in the region. Yet, China appears to give the impression that as a nuclear weapon state and permanent member of the UN Security Council (P-5), it has a responsibility to limit proliferation in South Asia.

Second, Beijing uses nonproliferation objectives to maximize its national interests, which include retaining China as the sole and predominant recognized nuclear weapon state in Asia, especially in East Asia. For that reason, China is reluctant to see any other states in East Asia acquiring nuclear arms. In this regard, China seems to make a distinction between strategically vital regions and less vital regions. South Asia and the Middle East are less vital to China than is East Asia. China has been uncomfortable with North Korean nuclear aspirations, and Beijing shares the desire of the United States and Japan that the Korean peninsula remain non-nuclear. In particular, China does not want Japan to exploit North Korean nuclearization as a pretext to acquire nuclear weapons or adopt a policy of large-scale militarization.⁵ But China is unwilling to impose economic sanctions on North Korea, which could trigger a flood of refugees onto its territory. China also seems reluctant to abandon the sovereignty principle and coerce North Korea. China would, however, provide nuclear and missile assistance to Pakistan if that meant its regional rival India could be balanced and contained, although China would formally recognize neither India nor Pakistan as nuclear powers.

Third, over time China has come to see nonproliferation as an avenue to confirm its great power status and gain recognition from other great powers, especially the United States. This explains China's 1992 accession to the NPT, its 1996 signature of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), the 1997 ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC; April 1997), its joining the Zangger Committee in October 1997, Premier Li Peng's issuance of nuclear export control regulations in September 1997, assurances to the United States in November 2000 not to help develop ballistic missiles that can be used to deliver nuclear weapons, and the October 2002 comprehensive export control regulations—covering missile technology (which nearly matched the Missile Technology Control Regime [MTCR] regulations), chemical weapons precursors and technology, and biological agents. These steps gave China greater legitimacy as a nuclear weapon state and as a major power. The United States and its allies have rewarded these actions with increased trade and access to advanced Western technology, which have helped China to strengthen its military and economic capabilities. Over the years, China seemed to have changed its supply patterns from fully developed missiles to missile components and scaled back some such supplies to Middle Eastern states. However, joining the nonproliferation regime and other cooperative regional or global institutions does not automatically mean China complies fully with the norms and principles of these regimes and institutions.⁶

China's accession to the nonproliferation regime occurred as a result of its realization that the regime does not sharply constrain China's sovereignty as a major power. China has been an ardent supporter of the Westphalian sovereignty norm, which enshrines the internal and external autonomy of a state and prescribes non-interference by other states. This conception of sovereignty has been described as a "normative obstacle to agreement on limits on weapons proliferation, since it is the sovereign right of a major power to make money and influence people, as the U.S. example amply demonstrates."⁷ China, however, seems to make a distinction between the sovereignty of powerful states and that of less powerful states, despite its rhetorical support for the juridical concept of sovereign equality of all nations. Thus, in spite of its formal and often eloquent support for the equality of nations, "China uses the concept of equality as a way to protect its territory and sovereignty. Apart from a declaratory policy of equality based on the five principles, there is little evidence to suggest that China cares too much whether the

world is organized according to some universal hierarchical order as long as its own order in the immediate neighborhood is maintained. Apparently, the Chinese government makes more noises than takes concrete actions to right the inequality that exists in the world."⁸

Becoming a full-fledged global power in the 21st century remains a core national objective of China. Chinese policymakers justify their goal of global power status as necessary to "prevent the historical humiliations suffered at the hands of Western and Japanese imperialism."⁹ Interestingly, Chinese writings on major power relations in Asia rarely mention India as a rising power of much significance. For instance, Xue Mouhong, a former ambassador and vice president of the Society of Asian-African Studies, argues that the international system is led by one superpower (the United States) and four other powers: the European Union (EU), Japan, Russia, and China. Within Asia, Mouhong views the triangle of relationships involving the United States, Japan, and China as the deciding factor for peace and stability.¹⁰

Fourth, Beijing applies nonproliferation norms selectively in order to strengthen China's exports of nuclear materials and, thereby, improve China's own nuclear and missile industries. The supply of nuclear and missile technology to countries in regions where China would have very little influence otherwise is part of this policy posture. China has especially been keen to use nuclear and missile supply as leverage against the United States, particularly in the Middle East. The expectation in Beijing seems to be that the supply of these materials to Middle Eastern countries will increase Chinese influence and reduce the effectiveness of U.S. policies in the region. China's reluctance to fully join the MTCR, despite promises to abide by its principles in 1992, has been partially driven by the implications of MTCR membership for commercial dealings with states such as Iran and Pakistan. Since the late 1990s, there have been indications that China has considerably reduced nuclear and missile transfers to the Middle East and that China has ceased exporting complete missiles to the region. Instead, China now exports missile components and dual-use technology. However, the increasing Chinese dependence on Middle Eastern oil has been an additional factor in China not fully abandoning its missile relationship with the states in the region. In October 2002, China issued comprehensive export control regulations, which are somewhat similar to MTCR guidelines. These regulations could further constrain Chinese proliferation behavior in the Middle East in the future. However, it is too early to predict how tightly China will implement these regulations.¹¹

South Asia is the region where Chinese policy shows its highest level of contradictions. China's involvement in nuclear proliferation in South Asia is long standing. As a military ally of Pakistan and an adversary of India, China has helped Islamabad to build its nuclear and missile capabilities. China has used this assistance to Pakistan as a way to balance India militarily and politically. By helping to continue the India-Pakistan rivalry, China has also sought to keep India limited to regional power status and prevent its recognition as a major power. Balance of power and containment considerations are behind these Chinese calculations. The rise of a new great power in Asia with nuclear weapons would adversely affect China's preeminent status on the Asian continent.

India is the only Asian state (with the possible exception of Japan) with the potential, and the inclination, to balance China and challenge its status as the "Asia-Pacific's sole 'Middle Kingdom.'" In this view, the possible rise of India as a challenger can be prevented through the deliberate propping up of the regimes surrounding India—especially Pakistan—and the pursuit of policies that would reinforce the perception that India is "weak, indecisive and on the verge of collapse." The main plank of this strategy has been military support for states neighboring India. Chinese arms transfer data show that the overwhelming majority of Chinese arms sales go to the states bordering India.¹² China has argued that its alliance with Pakistan has been in response to what it views as "Indian imperial tendencies to annex and develop territory, which Beijing deems too close to its own borders."¹³ Therefore, China has offered the most strident opposition among all major powers on the question of offering even de facto recognition of India as a nuclear weapon state.

According to Robert Ross, China continues its support for Pakistan by supplying nuclear and missile technology because "China views a credible Pakistani deterrent as the most effective way to guarantee the security of its sole ally in Southern Asia against Indian power." China views its relationship with Pakistan as somewhat similar to the U.S. relationship with Israel.¹⁴ To John Garver, China wants to keep Pakistan independent, powerful, and confident in order to present India with a standing two-front threat. If India subordinates Pakistan, its position against China would become much stronger, reducing China's power in South Asia.¹⁵ The Chinese calculation appears to be that, while India is preoccupied with Pakistan, New Delhi may not be able to develop long-range military capabilities, especially missiles and naval systems,

to match those of China. This is a short-run calculation, however, as Chinese assistance to Pakistan seems to be having a galvanizing effect on India's determination to develop capabilities that can match those of China. Over the longer term, Chinese policies in South Asia may well work against China's own interest by making India militarily and economically stronger, while also encouraging New Delhi to forge a balancing coalition with the United States.

Chinese-Pakistani nuclear cooperation began in the 1970s during the tenure of Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. This cooperation reached its peak in the 1980s and early 1990s when Beijing assisted Pakistan in building its nuclear capabilities. The precise nature of Sino-Pakistani nuclear cooperation is not fully known, but U.S. intelligence sources have long contended that the Pakistani nuclear bomb project would not have come to fruition without the active support of China. Chinese support reportedly included a secret blueprint for a nuclear bomb in the early 1980s, highly enriched uranium, tritium, scientists, and key components for a nuclear weapons production complex. Critical Chinese-supplied components included 500 ring magnets useful in gas centrifuges that can make weapons-grade enriched uranium (1994-1995), tritium used to boost the yield of atomic weapons (1986), heavy water needed to operate a plutonium production reactor, a special industrial furnace to melt plutonium or weapons-grade uranium into the shape of a nuclear bomb core (1996), high-tech diagnostic equipment (1996), a nuclear weapon design (1983), and weapons-grade uranium for the production of one or more nuclear weapons (since 1983). More significantly China has provided direct assistance in the building of the unsafeguarded Khushab reactor, from which Pakistan is known to draw plutonium for weapons production. China has also been the major supplier of the IAEA safeguarded Chasma reactor and plutonium reprocessing facility and the PARR-2 research reactor at Rawalpindi.¹⁶

A report in the *New York Times* in 1998 presented the Chinese support to Pakistan vividly: "Beginning in 1990, Pakistan is believed to have built between 7 and 12 nuclear warheads—based on Chinese designs, assisted by Chinese scientists and Chinese technology. That technology included Chinese magnets for producing weapons grade enriched uranium, a furnace for shaping the uranium into a nuclear bomb core, and high-tech diagnostic equipment for nuclear weapons tests."¹⁷ The relationship between the two countries "forced the U.S. to impose

sanctions against Chinese and Pakistani companies several times—most recently in 1993 and 1996. However, former CIA officials now claim that to prevent a U.S.-China bust-up, the Clinton administration avoided heavier sanctions, especially after China supplied 34 M-11 SRBMs to Pakistan in 1992.¹⁸ According to a 1997 *Time* report, the CIA has concluded that China helped Pakistan establish a factory to manufacture M-11 SRBMs near Rawalpindi in addition to supplying 30 ready-to-launch M-11s that are stored at the Sargodha Air base near Lahore. These missiles—delivering a payload of 1,100 pounds (500 kg) to a range of 185 miles (300 km)—could be ideal for Pakistani nuclear weapons, and can be targeted on Indian cities near the Pakistani border.¹⁹

The Clinton administration generally ignored intelligence reports about Chinese missile transfers to Pakistan or, after threatening limited sanctions, often backed down after considering the larger policy interest of continued engagement with China.²⁰ Even after Pakistan's nuclear tests in 1998, China is reported to have continued its assistance to Pakistan by helping to establish the unsafeguarded 50-megawatt Khushab reactor, which will produce weapons-grade plutonium, "although such a help is in direct violation of Article III of the NPT."²¹

Some evidence suggests that China may have made limited direct nuclear transfers to Pakistan since the late 1990s. But the most likely explanation for this shift is not that China has accepted nonproliferation norms, but rather that Pakistan no longer needs much assistance, as it has already acquired an operational nuclear force, thanks principally to previous transfers from China. Current transfers seem to be confined to dual-use items in the missile technology area, which gives China the possibility of claiming that it is not directly violating its regime commitments.²²

Sino-Pakistani collaboration was evident in the visit to China by a Pakistani delegation immediately after the May 1998 Indian nuclear tests. The delegation hoped to gain Chinese nuclear guarantees and politico-military backing. Although the precise outcome of the meeting was not clear, it is believed that China was not opposed to Pakistan conducting nuclear tests in response to the Indian tests. No open security guarantees were forthcoming from Beijing, and Pakistan subsequently conducted its own nuclear tests, claiming that it needed an autonomous nuclear capability to deter India.

Chinese missile assistance to Pakistan has persisted for more than a decade and seems to continue steadfastly

even today. This support reportedly includes the M-11 SRBMs noted above, missile components, specialty steels, guidance systems, and technical expertise. Evidence also suggests that Chinese and North Korean assistance were involved in Pakistan's acquisition of the Hatf-1 and Hatf-2 SRBMs and the Shaheen MRBM.²³ Since 1998, Pakistan reportedly received China's support in the serial production of the Shaheen-1 SRBM and the Shaheen-2 MRBM, including 12 shipments of missile components and the building of a second missile plant.²⁴ These supplies seem to be occurring even as Pakistan and India have been engaging in nuclear saber rattling. China has continued these activities despite the conclusion of many analysts that the possibility of nuclear war in South Asia has increased since 1998. Even considering signs during 2003 of a thaw in India-Pakistan relations, the possibility of a nuclear crisis erupting still exists.

The China-Pakistan nuclear and missile relationship assumes new importance in the light of revelations of a missile-nuclear barter deal between Pakistan and North Korea. Reports appeared in October 2002 suggesting that Pakistan had been transferring nuclear materials and technology for uranium enrichment to North Korea since 1997. In return, Pyongyang has supplied Pakistan with Nodong MRBMs. Pakistan offers North Korea the best possible source for nuclear technology, given Islamabad's need for missiles as delivery systems for its nuclear weapons. The Bush administration has as yet refused to impose sanctions as required by U.S. law because of Pakistan's cooperation in the war against Al Qaeda.²⁵ China's direct role in the North Korea-Pakistan relationship remains unclear, although some speculate that China tacitly approves these transactions. U.S.-made C-130 transport aircraft used in the barter deal have made stops at Chinese air bases on their trips between Pakistan and North Korea. Strong evidence also indicates that the Nodong MRBM is a copy of the Chinese CSS-2 missile, suggesting that the key source of North Korean missile technology was China.²⁶

It is noteworthy that as an ally of both Pakistan and North Korea, China would be well-placed to restrain their behavior. Beijing has, however, shown no such leadership in this regard. This reticence may well be due to fears of undermining its relationships with both Pakistan and North Korea. This episode also shows China's continuing unwillingness to assume nonproliferation responsibilities as a P-5 member state and aspiring global power. Despite its great power aspirations, China has not yet engaged

regional states in a nonproliferation leadership role similar to that of the United States.

THE INDIAN RESPONSE

The Sino-Pakistani military relationship, especially its nuclear component, has had an impact on Indian policy. To New Delhi, the Chinese nuclear and missile transfers to Pakistan, which continued even after Beijing acceded to the NPT and pledged to abide by MTCR guidelines, demonstrate that a nuclear weapon state can blatantly violate its commitments and get away with it.²⁷ Barring occasional U.S. protests, the international community—especially those nations and nongovernmental organizations that ardently support the NPT—has remained silent even while stepping up pressure on India to adhere to the NPT and abandon its nuclear weapons program. The Indian elite have viewed the Chinese nuclear/missile relationship with Pakistan as a deliberate containment strategy by Beijing designed to deny India a leadership role in the regional and global order. Sino-Pakistani nuclear cooperation contributed to India's decision to accelerate its nuclear weapon program and conduct open nuclear tests in May 1998, following a period of virtual limbo after the 1974 nuclear test. The 1974 test itself was partially the result of Indian concerns about China's nuclear program and the U.S.-Chinese alliance with Pakistan during the 1971 Bangladesh War. Domestic and idiosyncratic factors were important reasons that the Indian program remained dormant for over a decade. It was only in response to Pakistan accelerating its nuclear program with the aid of China that Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi initiated an Indian weapons program around 1988.²⁸

The stridently nationalistic Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) government conducted the 1998 nuclear tests shortly after taking office, arguing that China formed the most powerful long-term threat to India. Prior to the tests, Indian Defense Minister, George Fernandes, called China the number one potential threat to India. This statement led to vociferous denunciations from Beijing and an intense debate in India, with left-leaning political parties and intellectuals accusing Fernandes of inventing the China threat.²⁹ These latter groups cite China's drifting away from Pakistani foreign policy positions on Kashmir, Afghanistan, and Islamic fundamentalism to counter the BJP-led government's claim that China threatens India. Subsequently, Indian Prime Minister, A.B. Vajpayee, in a letter to President Clinton, justified India's tests largely because of the 1962 Indo-Chinese War, China's own

nuclear weapons policy, and Beijing's support for the Pakistani nuclear weapons program.

This justification irritated China further and Beijing responded with strong rhetoric about the need to roll back the Indian nuclear program. Since then, China has continued its policy of strident opposition to the open nuclear tests by India. As a result, diplomatic relations between the two countries remained somewhat frozen for nearly two years, although the United States, France, and Russia have engaged in negotiations with New Delhi, accepting the Indian nuclear deterrent as a *fait accompli*.³⁰ Since 2000, China has begun to resurrect its diplomatic and economic ties with India, largely motivated by fears of a U.S.-Indian alignment.

Indian analysts believe that China has been pursuing a strategy of simultaneous containment of, and engagement with, India.³¹ The Chinese containment strategy involves alliance with Pakistan and a gradual military buildup in the Indian Ocean/Bay of Bengal region through establishing military bases in places such as Myanmar.³² The Chinese policy of containing India through military buildup has been noted by Western analysts as well. Quoting Chinese sources, Iain Johnston has argued that the dominant Chinese motivation in arming Pakistan has been to "help divert Indian military resources away from China."³³ The Chinese engagement policy has involved reduction of tensions in the border region, a series of high-profile visits, and periodic proclamations in official and unofficial statements about the traditional friendship between the two countries. Since 1988, joint working groups have been negotiating confidence-building measures and other means to promote mutual cooperation. However, the engagement policy received a severe backlash with the Indian nuclear tests in 1998.

Following the tests, the P-5 foreign ministers met in Geneva and condemned the tests. The meeting was chaired by the Chinese foreign minister, even though China had helped to build the Pakistani nuclear weapons capability. The resolution adopted at the meeting declared that "notwithstanding the recent nuclear tests, India and Pakistan do not have the status of nuclear weapon states in accordance with the NPT."³⁴ The Chinese position, according to Jonathan Pollack, is that China, as a permanent member of the UN, views itself as a "stakeholder" in the existing nuclear order and would "want to keep it to be a small club."³⁵

Since the Indian nuclear tests, the United States has begun serious negotiations with India and Pakistan. Several rounds of these talks have begun to bear fruit—both

India and Pakistan have softened their position on the CTBT and have initiated a process of political dialogue. China has been the most strident opponent of the negotiations and de facto recognition of India's nuclear status. According to Chinese foreign policy officials, even discussing with India the maintenance of a minimum nuclear deterrent would violate UN Security Council Resolution 1172. They maintain that the tests "have severely interrupted the 'good momentum' of global non-proliferation efforts since the Cold War, and concerted efforts by the major powers are essential to 'halt the slide.'"³⁶ To Chinese officials, Vajpayee's letter to Clinton was intended to "drive a wedge between the U.S. and China" and an attempt by New Delhi to "align itself with the U.S. as a potential ally against China and to confront it in the region."³⁷ However, since April 1999, China's relations with India seem to have been on a mending course. The joint working groups met in Beijing in April 1999, and Chinese Vice-Premier Qian Qichen told Indian Foreign Secretary K. Reghunath that the "world needs to be democratized... China and India can make important contributions in giving shape to a multi-polar system." This meeting was perhaps the first time that China has mentioned India as a player in the global system.³⁸ Despite this statement, however, China still holds to the position that both India and Pakistan should implement UN Security Council Resolution 1172, which calls on both countries to disarm.

China has criticized India's policies in the sub-continent as "hegemonistic" and has demanded India abandon its nuclear program and join the NPT as a non-nuclear state. It is worth remembering that it was not too long ago that China criticized the Partial Test Ban Treaty and the NPT as instruments designed by the superpowers to maintain their hegemony. India now uses the same justification as China did earlier. China's transformation into a supporter of the NPT occurred in the early 1990s with the end of the Cold War. Since then, China has also supported the CTBT and played an important role in introducing a clause in the CTBT that requires all 44 countries with at least one nuclear reactor to sign the treaty before it can enter into force. To India, this clause was a deliberate attempt by China to coerce New Delhi into accepting the CTBT, even though the clause violated the Vienna Convention on Treaties.³⁹

Partially in response to China's containment and balancing strategy, India has stepped up its defense modernization programs with the aim of developing a blue-water navy during the next decade. The BJP government's "look

East policy" has been aimed at enhancing military and economic cooperation with East Asian and Southeast Asian countries. In pursuing this policy, India has conducted several joint naval exercises with Vietnam, South Korea, and Malaysia. In addition, it has stepped up maritime cooperation with Japan and the United States. India's rapprochement with the United States has also been partially driven by the China factor.⁴⁰ The U.S.-Indian relationship has been moving on a steady course, but was slowed down by the 9/11 terrorist attacks and the subsequent U.S. need to gain the support of the Musharraf regime in Pakistan for its war against Al Qaeda.

During the visit of Indian Prime Minister Vajpayee to Beijing in June 2003, China pursued the engagement strand of its strategy. At the meeting, China and India agreed to accelerate the process of border settlement and open up the Nathu La pass in Sikkim for trade with Tibet (with China thereby implicitly accepting Indian control over Sikkim)—while for its part India agreed to recognize Tibet as part of Chinese territory. It seems that the possibility of India sending troops to Iraq in support of the U.S. occupation forces there was a pivotal factor in Beijing's decision to make these concessions to New Delhi.⁴¹ Chinese overtures to India like these may be partially aimed at preventing a U.S.-India alliance from emerging. It is too soon to predict how improving Sino-Indian relations might impact China's missile and nuclear relationship with Pakistan, however.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

China's promotion of nuclear and missile proliferation in South Asia through its transfer of materials and technology to Pakistan has major consequences. Through its continued supply of nuclear and missile materials to Pakistan, China has become a cause of, and a contributor to, nuclear proliferation in the region. Although this relationship with Pakistan also offers China some means for limiting the extent and scope of the nuclear arms race between India and Pakistan, China has shown little inclination to restrain its regional ally, largely because the Chinese policy toward South Asia is driven by balance of power and containment considerations. These policies are part of China's realpolitik strategic culture, which values the pursuit of traditional power and prestige as "maximizing national interests in a competitive and relatively dangerous world."⁴² The realpolitik approach also views international politics as an "intensely competitive struggle to acquire relative gains, a struggle in which military and economic power are crucial determinants."⁴³

Chinese policies in South Asia have helped to undermine the effectiveness of the NPT and have decreased the possibilities of India and Pakistan joining the regime as non-nuclear weapon states. China's nuclear transfers to Pakistan violated Beijing's obligations under the NPT, as the treaty explicitly prohibits transfer of nuclear weapons materials by nuclear weapon states to non-nuclear weapon states. Nevertheless, the international community generally ignores this policy as unavoidable behavior by a great power. This stance has weakened the legitimacy of the NPT and made the adherence of India to the treaty virtually impossible. The contradictions in Chinese nuclear nonproliferation policy seem to have hurt the nonproliferation regime in both the short and long run. These contradictions are unlikely to end anytime soon, given the influence of balance of power considerations on the relationship between China, India, and Pakistan in South Asia and China and the United States in East Asia.

Some analysts argue that Chinese actions do not always reflect the preferences of the Chinese government, as some bureaucratic actors and firms may be acting independently. Thus, not all Chinese actions should be regarded as those of a centralized actor. This explanation is plausible in some rare and isolated instances, but it is very unlikely that the Chinese government has no knowledge or control over one of the most sensitive areas of national policy—nuclear and missile transfers to unstable countries. Without the knowledge of central authorities, bureaucratic actors or industrial firms cannot continually violate international regime commitments over an extended period of time, as has been the case with nuclear and missile technology transfers to Pakistan.

China has partially changed its policies toward Pakistan in response to U.S. pressure and as a result of increasing participation by Beijing in international institutions and regimes. But as long as the Sino-Indian and Indian-Pakistani rivalries exist, China is likely to support its South Asian ally, even though some of this support may in the long run accelerate India's military and economic buildup and cause New Delhi to focus on military competition with China. Containment and balancing as strategies are generally not successful in the long run, however, if the target has the potential to develop indigenous capabilities and form alignments that can thwart such policies. Great powers that practice containment and balance of power strategies often tend to ignore these longer-run consequences and costs. Continuing U.S. pressures, the possibility of a U.S.-Indian alignment, improved Sino-Indian

relations, rapprochement between India and Pakistan, and finally China's deeper involvement in international institutions and regimes could eventually prove to be sources of change for Chinese policy in South Asia. But regardless of how these factors may develop, balance of power considerations will still remain a dominant source of Chinese proliferation behavior in the region.

¹ The author would like to thank William Hogg and Izumi Wakugawa for their research assistance and the anonymous reviewer and the editor of the journal for their useful comments.

² Central Intelligence Agency, "Unclassified Report to Congress on the Acquisition of Technology Relating to Weapons of Mass Destruction and Advanced Conventional Munitions, 1 July through December 2001," Washington D.C., January 2003, pp. 8, 10-11, <http://www.cia.gov/cia/reports/721_reports/july_dec2001.htm>.

³ Center for Nonproliferation Studies, Monterey Institute of International Studies, "Chinese Export Controls and Jiang Zemin's Visit to the United States," October 21, 2002, <<http://cns.miis.edu/research/china/chiexp/index.htm>>

⁴ Samuel S. Kim, "China's International Organizational Behavior," in Thomas W. Robinson and David Shambaugh eds., *Chinese Foreign Policy: Theory and Practice* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994) pp. 401-34. On China's changing attitudes towards nuclear proliferation, see Weixing Hu, "Nuclear Nonproliferation," in Yong Deng and Fei-Ling Wang eds., *In the Eyes of the Dragon* (Lanham, MA: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999), pp. 119-140.

⁵ Eric A. McVadon, "Chinese Military Strategy for the Korean Peninsula," in James R. Lilley and David Shambaugh eds., *China's Military Faces the Future* (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1999), pp. 273-76.

⁶ Samuel S. Kim, "China as a Great Power," *Current History* 96 (September 1997), pp. 246-51. As Allen Whiting has argued, "Within this limited framework, however, there is a potential basis for increased cooperation emerging from association with a group where values, norms, and institutionalized behavior provide intangible rewards of status or punishment of censure." Allen S. Whiting, "Chinese Foreign Policy: Retrospect and Prospect," in Samuel S. Kim ed., *China and the World*, 4th ed. (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1998), p. 297.

⁷ Alastair Iain Johnston, "International Structures and Chinese Foreign Policy," in Kim, ed., *China and the World*, p. 73.

⁸ Gerald Chan, *Chinese Perspectives on International Relations* (Houndmills, UK: Macmillan, 1999), p. 78. Although ideology has retained "identity defining dimension" of China's foreign policy behavior, it has become "increasingly transformed into a set of abstract principles and behavioral norms used to criticize the conduct of other states." Steven I. Levine, "Perception and Ideology in Chinese Foreign Policy," in Thomas W. Robinson and David Shambaugh eds., *Chinese Foreign Policy: Theory and Practice* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), p. 39.

⁹ Paul H. Goodwin, "Force and Diplomacy: China Prepares for the Twenty-First Century," in Kim, ed. *China and the World*, p. 17. China has been fairly successful in enhancing its major power status immediately following the nuclear tests by India and Pakistan in May 1998 as evident in the Clinton administration bestowing on it the chairmanship of the P-5 foreign ministers meeting at Geneva in June 1998 to condemn the nuclear tests by India and Pakistan.

¹⁰ Quoted in Chan, *Chinese Perspectives on International Relations*, pp. 110-11.

¹¹ On the importance and limitations of these regulations, see, Jing-dong Yuan, Phillip C. Saunders, and Stephanie Lieggi, "Recent Developments in China's Export Controls: New Regulations and New Challenges," *Nonproliferation Review* 9 (Fall/Winter 2002), pp. 153-167.

¹² J. Mohan Malik, "South Asia in China's Foreign Relations," *Pacifica Review* 13 (February 2001), p. 74. This pattern may also partially reflect the budgetary constraints of the small South Asian states, which rely on China because they cannot afford to buy more modern weapons from other suppliers.

¹³ William T. Tow, "China and the International Strategic System," in Robinson and Shambaugh, *Chinese Foreign Policy*, p. 152.

¹⁴ Robert S. Ross, "Engagement in U.S. China Policy," in Alastair Iain Johnston and Robert S. Ross, eds., *Engaging China: The Management of an Emerging Power* (London and New York: Routledge, 1999), p. 193.

¹⁵ John W. Garver, "China and South Asia," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 519, 1992, pp. 80-83, cited in Malik, *South Asia in China's Foreign Relations*, p. 85.

¹⁶ Center for Nonproliferation Studies, "China's Nuclear Exports and Assistance to Pakistan," <<http://www.nti.org/db/china/npakpos.htm>>, pp. 6-11.

¹⁷ Tim Weiner, "U.S. and China Helped Pakistan Build the Bomb," *New York Times*, June 1, 1998, p. A6.

¹⁸ Ahmed Rashid, "Comrades-in Arms," *Far Eastern Economic Review*, June 25, 1998, p. 13.

¹⁹ Douglas Waller, "The Secret Missile Deal," *Time*, June 30, 1997.

²⁰ Mel Gurttov and Byong-Moo Hwang, *China's Security: The New Roles of the Military* (Boulder CO: Lynne Reiner, 1998), p. 219.

²¹ K. Subrahmanyam, "Eight Months after the Nuclear Tests," Paper Presented at McGill University, Montreal, Canada, February 16, 1999.

²² Center for Nonproliferation Studies, "China's Missile Exports and Assistance to Pakistan," <<http://www.nti.org/db/china/mpakpos.htm>>.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Shirly A. Kan, "China and Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction and Missiles: Policy Issues," Washington D.C.: Congressional Research Service, September 6, 2002, pp. 5-7.

²⁵ David E. Sanger, "Atomic Ties Link North Korea and Pakistan," *New York Times*, November 25, 2002; Jim Hoagland, "Nuclear Deceit," *Washington Post*, November 10, 2002, p. B07; Gaurav Kampani, "Second Tier Proliferation: The Case of Pakistan and North Korea," *Nonproliferation Review* 9 (Fall-Winter 2002), pp. 107-115.

²⁶ Edward Timperlake and William C. Triplett, "N. Korea, Pakistan, China," *Washington Times*, December 8, 2002, <www.washingtontimes.com>. Some analysts, however, argue that Russia has also been a source of assistance for the North Korean missile program. See, Center for Nonproliferation Studies, "North Korea Profile: Missile Chronology," <http://www.nti.org/e_research/profiles/NK/Missile/65.html>.

²⁷ Article I of the NPT explicitly prohibits such transfers. It states: "Each nuclear weapon state party to the Treaty undertakes not to transfer to any recipient whatsoever nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices or control over such weapons or explosive devices directly, or indirectly; and not in any way to assist, encourage or induce any non-nuclear weapon state to manufacture or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices; or control over such weapons or explosive devices." *Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons*, Appendix IV, in William Epstein, *The Last Chance* (New York: The Free Press, 1976), p. 317.

²⁸ George Perkovich, *India's Nuclear Bomb* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), Chs. 10-11.

²⁹ On the debate that Fernandes' statement caused, see *India Today International*, May 18, 1998, pp. 10-13.

³⁰ C. Raja Mohan, "Ending the Sino-Indian Drift," *The Hindu*, January 27, 1999, p. 14.

³¹ Indian strategic analyst K. Subrahmanyam has argued that the Chinese threat to India is indirect. China's emergence as a superpower is bound to affect India's security. "If China can transfer nuclear and missile technologies to Pakistan and thereby countervail India, there is no need for China to pose a threat to India. China can continue to be friendly with India but at the same time lock India in a nuclear standoff with Pakistan. It can also treat both Pakistan and India in the same category as regional powers, not in the same class as China, which is a global player." K. Subrahmanyam, "Understanding China: Sun Tzu and Shakti," *Times of India*, June 5, 1998, p. 7.

³² "China has developed a commercial and military presence in Myanmar (Burma) through Hunnan and also has a military presence in the Coco and Hynghai Islands, which give China a military platform in the Bay of Bengal. China has established a long-range, low frequency facility in the Coco Islands," to use for submarine activities and also to monitor Indian missile tests. "Ashok Kapur, "China and Proliferation: Implications for India," *China Report* 34 (1998), pp. 401-17.

³³ Johnston, "International Structures and Chinese Foreign Policy," in Kim ed., *China and the World*, p. 63.

³⁴ Associated Press, June 4, 1998. See also Baldev Raj Nayar and T.V. Paul, *India the World Order: Searching for Major Power Status* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), ch. 6.

³⁵ Quoted in Rone Tempest, "Dangerous Dynamic Between China and India," *Los Angeles Times*, June 13, 1998.

³⁶ "China Opposes Minimum N-deterrence for India," *The Hindu*, January 28, 1999, p. 14.

³⁷ Aziz Haniffa, "China Prevents P-5 from Softening Stand on N-tests," *India Abroad*, January 1, 1999, p. 9.

³⁸ *Times of India*, April 28, 1999, p. 1. Indian Foreign Minister Jaswant Singh and Commerce Minister Murasoli Maran visited Beijing in June 1999 and February 2000 respectively, increasing the tempo of interactions between the two countries. In 2003, both the Indian Defense Minister Fernandes and Prime Minister Vajpayee visited Beijing.

³⁹ Jaswant Singh, "Against Nuclear Apartheid," *Foreign Affairs*, 77 (September-October 1998), p. 46.

⁴⁰ Malik, "South Asia in Chinese Foreign Relations," p. 80.

⁴¹ Jyothi Malhotra, "For India's Tibet Turn, China to Amend its Sikkim Map," *Indian Express*, June 25, 2003.

⁴² Alastair Iain Johnston, "China's Militarized Interstate Dispute Behavior 1949-1992: A First Cut at the Data," *China Quarterly* 153 (March 1998), pp. 2-3.

⁴³ Alastair Iain Johnston, "Prospects for Chinese Nuclear Force Modernization: Limited Deterrence versus Multilateral Arms Control," *China Quarterly* 126 (June 1996), p. 549.