



DIPLOMACY

DIPLOMACY LEADS TO WORLD HARMONY

◆ Author: Chen Jian ◆

Translator: Zeng Liren

Current Affairs Press

时事出版社

DIPLOMACY LEADS TO WORLD HARMONY



◆ Author: Chen Jian ◆

Translator: Zeng Liren

Current Affairs Press

时事出版社

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

外交, 让世界走向和谐 = Diplomacy Leads to World Harmony:
英文/陈健著. —北京: 时事出版社, 2013. 11

ISBN 978-7-80232-659-0

I. ①外… II. ①陈… III. ①中外关系—文集—英文
IV. ①D822—53

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2013) 第 254826 号

出版发行: 时事出版社
地 址: 北京市海淀区巨山村 375 号
邮 编: 100093
发行热线: (010) 82546061 82546062
读者服务部: (010) 61157595
传 真: (010) 82546050
电子邮箱: shishichubanshe@sina.com
网 址: www.shishishe.com
印 刷: 北京百善印刷厂

开本: 787×1092 1/16 印张: 12.5 字数: 200 千字

2013 年 11 月第 1 版 2013 年 11 月第 1 次印刷

定价: 98.00 元

(如有印装质量问题, 请与本社发行部联系调换)

CV of Ambassador Chen Jian

Ambassador Chen Jian was born in Shanghai in 1942, and graduated from Fudan University and then from Beijing Foreign Studies University.

After joining the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, he has served successively as Staff member, Department of International Organizations and Conferences, Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Attaché, Permanent Mission of the PRC to the United Nations; Staff member, Department of International Organizations and Conferences, Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Third Secretary, Second Secretary and then First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the PRC to the United Nations.

He was Special Assistant to the Executive Director of China, International Monetary Fund, 1984—1985; Director, Counselor, and then Deputy Director-General, Department of International Organizations and Conferences, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1985—1992; Ambassador and Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the PRC to the United Nations, 1992—1994; Foreign Ministry Spokesperson and Director-General, Information Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1994—1996; and Assistant Minister of Foreign Affairs, 1996—1998.

He served as Chinese Ambassador to Japan from 1998 to 2001 and Under-Secretary-General of the United Nations from 2001 to 2007.

He was President of the United Nations Association of China from 2007 to 2012.

Ambassador Chen Jian is currently President of China Academic Net for UN Studies, Honorary President of Shanghai UN Research Association, Honorary Dean of School of International Relations at Renmin University, and Director of Center for UN Studies at Fudan University.

CONTENTS

1	CHAPTER 1
	THE UN NEEDS CHINA AND CHINA NEEDS THE UN
31	CHAPTER 2
	LOW PROFILE FOREVER
48	CHAPTER 3
	CHINA'S CURRENT INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT
65	CHAPTER 4
	OPENING SPEECH AT 2012 CHINA MODEL UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE
68	CHAPTER 5
	CHINA WILL NEVER BE A SUPERPOWER

82	CHAPTER 6 OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES
90	CHAPTER 7 GIVE CHINA'S DIPLOMACY MORE ELBOW ROOM
106	CHAPTER 8 DIPLOMACY REQUIRES BOTH FIRMNESS AND FLEXIBILITY; FLEXIBILITY IS NOT WEAKNESS
120	CHAPTER 9 WE NEED TO RESOLUTELY DEFEND OUR CORE INTEREST, BUT NOT TO AMPLIFY IT
130	CHAPTER 10 MILD BUT FIRM
136	CHAPTER 11 TRANSPARENCY AND CONFIDENCE
141	CHAPTER 12 INFLUENCE IS ALLOWED, INTERFERENCE IS NOT
144	CHAPTER 13 FOR THE SECURITY OF THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION

CONTENTS

149	 	CHAPTER 14 CHINA'S POLICIES TOWARDS ITS NEIGHBORS
159	 	CHAPTER 15 THE DEVELOPMENT OF SINO-US RELATIONS
167	 	CHAPTER 16 BIG POWER RELATIONSHIP
181	 	CHAPTER 17 REBUILDING CONSENSUS ON R2P
189	 	AFTERWORD

CHAPTER 1

THE UN NEEDS CHINA AND CHINA NEEDS THE UN

* This transcript is based on the recording of a speech by Ambassador Chen Jian at the Wenhui Lecture Series on August 5, 2007. *

First of all, I want to make clear today that I have retired from the UN and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs by the end of last month. So, my speech today represents neither the UN nor the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. All opinions expressed here are my personal experience and views, and are for your reference only. I am going to talk about three issues.

I

The first issue is: What is the UN? Who can represent the UN? This issue arises mainly because the former Secretary General of the United Nations, Kofi Annan, often aired his opinions on important international issues in front of the media in his ten-year tenure. So it was widely believed

Diplomacy Leads to World Harmony

that he represented the UN and he was the spokesman for the UN. This conception is not exactly accurate, because the UN is a plural body featuring no sovereignty, so no agency or person in charge of it can comprehensively and completely stand for the UN over all issues.

Why do I say the UN is a plural body? First, plurality is relative to centralization. We Chinese people favor centralized leadership, but the UN is not a centralized organization. Among the numerous UN agencies, there are six principal organs listed on the *Charter of the United Nations* alone, which are also called the “Charter Organs”, namely the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Trusteeship Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Secretariat and the Hague-based International Court of Justice. As these six principal organs have subsidiary bodies, and they differ in membership, jurisdictional limits and decision-making processes, they are parallel to each other.

I would like to illustrate this with two examples. One is the Hague-based International Court of Justice. The International Court of Justice is responsible for the jurisdiction of proceedings. That is to say, if two UN member states voluntarily submit a dispute between them to the International Court of Justice, and announce in advance their acceptance of the Court's ruling, it becomes a case. A recent case is a dispute between Nigeria and its neighbor Cameroon over an enclave between the two countries. There was no definite boundary. In the past, the two countries did not care much about it and no one claimed its ownership, but recently oil and gas were discovered in this land. We all know that there will be disputes wherever oil and gas exist. So a dispute arose. Were it not for the UN, the two countries would have just started to fight over ownership of the land and ownership of the oil and gas resources. At this point, Kofi Annan, then Secretary General of the United Nations, took advantages of his position as the Secretary-General and his special identity as an African, and started to mediate between them. Thanks to his mediation, these two

CHAPTER 1 THE UN NEEDS CHINA AND CHINA NEEDS THE UN

countries agreed to accept the Court's ruling. After more than half a year, the Grand Justices of the International Court of Justice reached a verdict that the land belonged to Cameroon, and the two countries accepted the verdict. Under the arrangement of the UN, these two countries have now established a Border Demarcation Commission to demarcate the border between the two countries. The practice of the International Court of Justice is distinct from that of other UN agencies I have mentioned, so is its jurisdiction.

Another common example; if a draft resolution does not get passed in the Security Council, it could be submitted to the General Assembly. This is exemplified by the Middle East issue. When a draft resolution on the Middle East involving criticism and condemnation of Israel is submitted to the Security Council, it will surely be rejected by the US. Then this resolution, remaining "intact", will be submitted by the Arab countries to the General Assembly. "Intact" means only few words are changed, with the subject changed from "the Security Council" to the "UN General Assembly". Then it is put to the General Assembly for voting, and the voting result usually shows over 100 affirmative votes, 4 negative votes (by the US, Israel and two other nations, i. e., a small country and an island country) and abstentions by most European countries. Without doubt, this draft resolution will be passed by an overwhelming majority. Here you may wonder: which better represents the position of the UN, the Security Council vetoing the draft resolution or the General Assembly's passing it?

Since the six principle organs of the UN are parallel to each other, none of them could represent the UN on all issues at all time. So the resolutions adopted by these organizations could not begin with "the United Nations", but only the names of the organs themselves. The Security Council is just the Security Council, and the General Assembly is just the General Assembly. Among all the UN documents, only the *Charter of the United Nations* bears the "United Nations" title. In this sense, only the *Charter*

of the United Nations can represent the UN.

Why does the UN have no sovereignty?

The UN is different from the EU in this respect. The member states do not have to transfer any part of their state sovereignty to this international organization. For this reason, the UN does not have any independent rights. Then where do its rights come from? From the member states. There are currently 192 member states, who are the bosses of the UN. Among whom, the five permanent members in particular, are the big bosses. It is they, the member states, who determine which institution, including the Secretary General of the United Nations, can act and preside on an issue on behalf of the UN.

The *Charter of the United Nations* has two general provisions on the authority of the Secretary-General: For one, the Secretary-General is the chief executive officer, which means the Secretary-General has executive power; for another, the Secretary-General has the right to report to the Security Council international issues that threaten world peace and security. That is to say the Secretary-General has reporting power. According to the *UN Charter*, the Secretary-General has executive power, reporting power, but no decision-making power. The decision-making power lies in the hands of the member states. So the Secretary-General does not have an independent authority to speak and act on behalf of the UN. He is more hamstrung by the member states than constrained by the *UN Charter*.

According to my observation, three out of the seven former Secretary-Generals had strived for an independent status of the Secretary-General. Among them, the seventh, Kofi Annan, had achieved a fair amount of success.

The three Secretary-Generals are the second, Dag Hjalmar Agne Carl Hammarskjöld from Sweden, the sixth, Boutros Boutros-Ghali from Egypt, and the seventh, Kofi Annan. During Hammarskjöld's tenure, he was widely believed to be the first Secretary-General who had a clear un-

CHAPTER 1 THE UN NEEDS CHINA AND CHINA NEEDS THE UN

derstanding of this post. He once said, "The Secretary-General has neither military power nor financial means. The only thing the position entitles is the international moral force." He took full advantage of the moral force, especially in the Suez Canal Event in 1956. When Egypt declared the resumption of sovereignty over the Suez Canal, the UK and France, both being former colonialist powers, did not accept the declaration. They subsequently dispatched troops to occupy the Suez Canal. This move provoked discontent and opposition of the two superpowers—the US and the Soviet Union. Hammarskjöld seized this opportunity to mediate, resulting in the UK and France withdrawing their troops. And for the first time in the history of the UN, peace-keepers were sent to and stationed on the Suez Canal. On the basis of this successful peace-keeping mission, Hammarskjöld put forward a set of peace-keeping principles, which are still in use today. He played an independent role as the UN Secretary-General and made his special contribution in this event. Therefore, his efforts were widely acclaimed as a successful trial in the history of the UN and he is believed to be an accomplished Secretary-General. The UN Library, one of the three buildings at the UN headquarters, is named after Hammarskjöld. But his next move was a failure. His intervention in Congo's conflict directly or indirectly caused the tragic death of Patrice Lumumba, Congo's national hero. Hammarskjöld himself lost his life in a plane crash when he flew to Congo to accomplish his task, leaving his ten-year tenure unfinished. Generally speaking, a Secretary-General can serve another five years after the first term, which means a Secretary-General can stay in office for up to ten years.

The second one who strives to take full advantage of the power entitled by the *UN Charter* and achieve an independent status is Boutros Boutros-Ghali. When Boutros Boutros-Ghali came into office, the Cold War had just ended. The Security Council started to function normally, and convened the first summit meeting. Peace-keeping became the top priority of the

Security Council. The summit meeting passed the declaration of peace-keeping, requiring that the Secretary-General formulate proposals regarding peace-keeping. Boutros Boutros-Ghali indeed seized the historic opportunity to put forward agenda for peace and development. It should be pointed out that he was ambitious and a little bit complacent about the status. He once made a speech that sounded like this: "As the Secretary-General, I should assume more responsibility than my predecessors, which requires me to keep my post independent and confront any member state that hinders me from carrying out my duties." He made his declaration of "confrontation" and practiced what he preached. First, he confronted the US permanent representative Madeleine Albright, who later became the Secretary of State of the US. As a result, the first thing she did after being appointed as America's Secretary of State was to prevent Boutros Boutros-Ghali from serving a second term at any cost. So Boutros Boutros-Ghali is up to now the first Secretary-General who was allowed to serve only one term in the history of the UN.

The third one who avails himself of the moral force of the UN Secretary-General is Kofi Annan, who finished his ten-year tenure. During his ten-year tenure, he accomplished three pioneering tasks that had an impact on the world and the international community:

First, he initiated the so-called "Millennium Development Goals", making poverty elimination the common goal of the international community. Through his efforts, the "Millennium Development Goals" were written into the declaration of the UN Millennium Summit in the year 2000.

Second, he advocated human rights and placed the same emphasis on it as security and development, making it one of the three pillars and the three major tasks of the UN. Based on this, he put forward the "humanitarian intervention" theory, in the name of "Responsibility to Protect". After a long time, this was also written into the documents of the 60th UN Anniversary Summit in 2005.

Third, when US President George W. Bush waged the Iraq War, he was opposed to the unilateral actions of the US without the authorization of the Security Council. Moreover, he insisted that the UN solve disputes in a peaceful way, which manifested his principle of independence.

As a result, he infuriated the US government, especially the conservatives and the neo-conservatives, the latter of whom mounted a campaign to discredit the UN and the Secretary-General. The campaign is called an investigation of the “Oil-for-Food Scandal.” Back then, the UN imposed sanctions on Iraq. In order to protect the Iraqi people from the damage of the sanctions, the UN allowed Iraq to export a fraction of its oil for money to buy food and medicine for the people. The income of the oil export came under the UN control. In order to place blame on Kofi Annan, the US seized the opportunity and scrutinized possible corruption in the project. This is the so-called “Oil-for-Food Scandal.” It turned out that there was at most maladministration, and no serious corruption. In comparison with the US corruption in the Iraq War, this is not even worth mentioning.

So, despite the US campaign to discredit the Secretary-General, Kofi Annan’s farewell speech was frequently interrupted by applause. The speech finished in a lengthy standing ovation. This showed the deep appreciation of most member states for Kofi Annan’s ten-year tenure, and a demonstration of opposition to the US. The media also heaped praises on him, hailing him as the “secular Pope.”

The question is why so far only three Secretary-Generals have taken full advantage of the moral force of this post and achieved an independent status, and only one has succeeded? There are two reasons according to my first-hand observations: One is the external factor; the other is the internal factor, namely, the individual factor.

The so-called external factor is the current state of international affairs. For the UN, it means whether the member states allow or need the Secretary-General to play an independent role. In this regard, four of the

seven Secretary-Generals are completely devoid of this kind of opportunity, for their tenures were in the period of the Cold War when the US and the Soviet Union sought supremacy and they would have run into trouble if they had tried. So these four Secretary-Generals were wise enough to know what was beyond their reach and let things take their own course. Boutros Boutros-Ghali and Kofi Annan came into office at the best time in the history of the UN when the Cold War finished and the UN could come into play. In his short tenure, Hammarskjöld from Sweden was lucky to have this opportunity, for the US and the Soviet Union reached a consensus on the issue of the Suez Canal. The rest of them were out of luck during their tenure.

Two aspects matters when it comes to the individual factor: One is perspicacity; the other is a sense of balance.

The so-called perspicacity means that the Secretary-General should know he could not abuse his moral force and cross the line. From this point of view, Kofi Annan, who climbed up his career ladder from within the Secretariat, obviously knew the tolerance of the member states quite well. However, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, who was Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of Egypt before directly becoming the Secretary-General, failed to understand this point. As a result, he took a stance of confrontation. However, Kofi Annan expressed the same meaning in a different way: "Only when the Secretary-General doesn't serve the narrow interest of one country, could he take care of the interest of all countries. "

His words also mentioned independence but he kept a low profile. In a sense, he had a begging rather than challenging tone. He meant that only when he got independence could he offer his services, which was reasonable and acceptable to everyone.

This does not mean that Annan's knowledge of the tolerance would prevent him from utilizing his power fully. In this aspect, I think the first

CHAPTER 1 THE UN NEEDS CHINA AND CHINA NEEDS THE UN

two of the three achievements mentioned above showed that he took full advantage of the special influence the Secretary-General's position entails.

The first is "the Millennium Development Goals" (MDGs) mentioned above. Supporting MDGs was not the original intention of the US, who had little interest in assisting developing countries. How did the Secretary-General do it? He did it by first persuading American civil societies, and seeking support from celebrities and high-profile entrepreneurs, thereby creating public opinion in the country and pushing their government to accept the MDGs.

The second is the issue of human rights, on which a considerable number of countries in the UN, especially African countries, had doubts. Kofi Annan, shortly after taking office as Secretary-General, put forward this issue first to the African countries while attending an African Union summit. For the reason that he was the newly appointed Secretary-General from Africa, African countries did not question this issue despite their doubts. Then he slowly advanced this issue over the next six to seven years and finally succeeded in writing it into the UN documents. This is the aspect of perspicacity I mentioned. Annan's perspicacity is reflected in the following aspects: First, he realized that with the member states being his boss, he should keep a low profile. But at the same time, he was aware of the moral force he had and that through tenacity he could enable the state members to accept things that he thought right.

Then, we will talk about his sense of balance. In this aspect, he is wiser than Dag Hammarskjöld. Inside the Secretariat of the UN, many people would give Hammarskjöld a higher approval rating than I would. Most of them believe that Annan inherited the ideas of Hammarskjöld and is a loyal successor. But in my opinion, Annan is wiser, for Hammarskjöld did not have as good a sense of balance. When the Congo Crisis broke out, the US and the Soviet Union took an opposite stance. Hammarskjöld basically stood on the US side, and thus was criticized by the Soviet U-

nion. Therefore, some even suspected that his death in the plane crash was a plot by Soviet spies, which of course lacks evidence. But Annan, on the contrary, has a better sense of balance. He once said that as the Secretary-General, he should not only keep good relations with the US, but also serve all the 190 member states (there were only 190 at the time) well. He practiced what he preached. Among all the former Secretary-Generals, he was the one who frequented Washington the most. He kept in touch with various circles in the US, including the business community, the media and celebrities besides the government. His charisma was widely recognized among American celebrities. Even so, he never spoke without balancing the interests of various players. In fact, he often took into account the interest of all parties involved. There are many such examples, but the most outstanding example in my view is his comment on Ambassador John Bolton, an American permanent representative to the UN.

Before the heads of state summit on the 60th anniversary of the UN, the US government, taking advantage of the recess of the House and the Senate, appointed John Bolton, a neo-conservatism figure, as the permanent US representative to the UN. This person had kept a negative view of the UN. Therefore his nomination already alarmed the UN. After taking office, the first thing he did was to propose over 170 draft amendments to the virtually agreed documents of the summit meeting, which amounted to almost a new start. This caused common resentment in the UN, including even US allies. Under these circumstances, when Annan emerged from a Security Council meeting, he was interviewed by a reporter about his view on Bolton's imposition of American views on the UN. He replied, "Any country's permanent representative to the UN is here to advocate his national position." This sentence was meant to give Bolton face. But then he added, "Yet whether he could succeed depends on his ability to convince other countries' permanent representatives, and his willingness to listen to