SPAIS School of Sociology, Politics and International Studies

Reconstructing Identity to fit International Society: English school theory, constructivism, and the case of Taiwan

John A. Pella
University of Bristol
& Yana
Zuo
University of Bristol

**School of Sociology, Politics, and International Studies,
University of Bristol Working Paper No. 05-09**

John A. Pella is a PhD candidate in the Department of Politics, University of Bristol. His research utilizes the English school concept 'world society' to examine the role individuals and trans-national groups play in changing and influencing international society and its institutions. This research focuses particularly on how these three elements impact the expansion of international society narrative.

Dr Yana Zuo is a research associate in the Department of Politics, University of Bristol. Her research focuses on cross Taiwan Strait relations, and how state identity reconstruction in Taiwan has affected its relationship with the PRC. It also investigates whether existing theories on identity construction and IR are applicable to the cross Taiwan Strait relationship.

A revised version of this paper is currently being prepared for submission to an academic journal. Comments and feedback are welcome to pozjp@bristol.ac.uk and y.zuo@bristol.ac.uk.

Reconstructing Identity to fit International Society: English school theory, constructivism, and the case of Taiwan

John A. Pella & Yana Zuo

This paper fuses the constructivist theory of identity and the English school (ES) approach to international politics to examine the process by which Taipei attempted to construct and reconstruct its identity according to the institutions and values of international society. This theoretical fusion introduces new aspects to each theory; the robust constructivist understanding of identity construction and interactions between and among states to the ES, and the long-standing ES notions of institutions and international society to constructivism. The fusion also addresses weaknesses in both theories; namely the Euro-centrism critique often leveled at the ES particularly, but also at constructivism, and the criticism that constructivism often fails to engage with history and the global level of international politics. Structurally, we first introduce the ES-constructivist framework which will be employed here. We then, through engagement with both international society and cross Taiwan Strait relations, discuss how Taiwan attempted to utilize the diplomacy institution to construct and reconstruct its identity over the last sixty years. Furthermore, we examine how Taiwan attached its identity to values created within international society in an effort to enter the society. We conclude that this ES-constructivist dialogue creates a more robust framework for explaining international politics than either approach offers individually.

Key Words: *Taiwan – China – English School – International Society – Institutions/Diplomacy – Constructivism – Identity – Values*

Introduction

The English school (ES) of international relations, commonly associated with a historically, sociologically and philosophically based enquiry into the nature of international society, enjoys a rich intellectual tradition dating back – at least – to the first meeting of the British Committee on the Theory of International Politics in 1958. Contemporary ES scholars who draw, and build upon, this tradition assert that the school's central notions of international society and institutions, as well as the flexibility inherent to its methodological pluralism, best suit the study of IR.[1] However the reality is that within IR, the ES and its framework remain a relatively 'underexploited resource' (to borrow Barry Buzan's terminology),[2] at least outside a loyal group of scholars. By contrast, following the publication of Wendt's seminal article,[3] constructivism, as the 'social theory' of international politics, has rapidly emerged as one of the most fashionable in the discipline, enjoying popularity world-wide. Constructivism's appeal appears to rest in its ability to generate a robust understanding of the role played by social identity in international politics. This ES focus on international society and institutions, and the constructivist focus on identity, has naturally led certain scholars to highlight the similar focal points featured in the two theories;[4] in essence both stress the social basis for order among sovereign states. Yet while both constructivists and members of the ES have made rumblings and allusions to the benefits each theory could offer each another, this proposed alliance has failed to launch in any comprehensive manner. Christian Reus-Smit, who is sympathetic to both theories, hypothesizes that this failure to launch is perhaps due to an "unproductive dialogue of stereotypes"[5] between the schools, with the ES critiquing constructivism's alleged state-centrism and positivist tendencies, and constructivism critiquing the ES's loose notion of international society and lack of empirical work. Perhaps recent collaborations between ES and constructivist scholars indicate that this once "unproductive dialogue" is progressing,[6] yet unquestionably, this dialogue may be described as

---

[1] Richard Little, 'The English School's contribution to the Study of International Relations', *European Journal of International Relations,* 6 (2000), pp. 395-422

[2] Barry Buzan, 'The English School: An Underexploited Resource in IR', *Review of International Studies,* 27 (2001), pp. 471 - 488

[3] Alexander Wendt, 'Anarchy is What States Make of it: The Social Construction of International Politics', *International Organization*, 46 (1992), pp. 391-425

[4] Martha Finnemore, 'Exporting the English School?', *Review of International Studies,* 27 (2001), pp. 509-513.

[5] Christian Rues-Smit, 'The Constructivist Challenge after September 11', in Alex J. Bellamy (ed.), *International Society and its Critics* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2005), p. 82

[6] Evidence of this progression comes from recent publications, such as: Christian Rues-Smit, 'Imagining Society: Constructivism and the English School', *British Journal of Politics and International Relations,* 4(3) 2002, pp. 487–509. This move towards cooperation is further exemplified by joint publications between Amitav Acharya and Barry Buzan, who utilize constructivism and the ES respectively, see: Barry Buzan and Amitav Acharya, 'Preface:

embryonic at best and has not resulted in any robust interaction leading to an empirical study. This is quite unfortunate as after all, it is in the empirical world where the benefits of conjoining the two theories can truly be demonstrated. Following this logic, here we fuse the central elements of the ES and constructivism to analyze how Taiwan has repeatedly attempted to enter international society by re-constructing its identity according to the values and institutions of that society. To do so, we first provide a brief but critical discussion of the ES and constructivism, and proceed to highlight how a fusion of each theory's strengths produces a robust theoretical framework for explaining international relations. We then 'test' this framework in a case study detailing Taiwan's experience with China and international society, and finally draw conclusions regarding both this case and the merits of joining the ES and constructivism. Essentially, we ask if a cross-theoretical dialogue between the ES and constructivism can enhance our ability to explain international relations.

1. The English school *vs.* constructivism: a meeting of minds or divided by a common language?

The title of this section is adapted from Richard Little's piece,[7] where he argues that ES and American realist scholars share common intellectual roots; roots which *potentially* provide a framework for interaction. Despite this potential for interaction, ES and American realist cooperation has been scant at best. Interestingly, in very much the same vein, ES scholars have asserted that constructivism has roots in the work of Martin Wight and Hedley Bull – both considered 'founding members' of the ES. Yet a petty debate concerning Wight's or Bull's influence on constructivism is simply unhelpful, and if we seek to produce a fruitful dialogue between the ES and constructivism, we must be careful to avoid the pitfalls which so often plague theoretical cooperation, as exemplified by ES-realist and ES-constructivist efforts to date. As such, we must not only identify precisely how the ES and constructivism can *potentially* work together to solve each other's problems, but must also make this fusion and even go one step beyond to demonstrate the merits of this fusion in an empirical study. Towards the first end, we begin by concentrating on ES strengths – its global focus on international society and its robust understanding of how institutions constitute membership to it. We then discuss the merits of constructivism – its strong understanding of social identity, and how identity and identity construction impact international relations. Subsequently, we critically assess how each school's strengths can, when conjoined, rectify the weaknesses of the other theory. Indeed, in this fashion we see that the ES and constructivism represent a useful meeting of minds.

What the ES does particularly well, perhaps better than any other theory of international politics in fact, is analyze the totality of state-based international relations under the concept of international society.

---

why is there no non-Western IR theory: reflections on and from Asia', *International relations of the Asia-Pacific*, 7 (3). 2007, pp. 285-286. Further still, both joint PhD supervision and workshops held at the University of Bristol have brought theorists from both schools together.

[7] Richard Little, 'The English School vs. American Realism: A meeting of minds or divided by a common language?', *Review of International Studies,* 29 (2003), pp. 443-460

International society is the flagship concept of the ES, and specifically defined as a group of states which come to share common values and interests, which subsequently leads to the development of, and eventual cooperation within, common institutions.[8] From this definition we must stress the importance of institutions, as they are the glue which not only binds states together into an international society, but also serve to maintain order in international politics. Also important to note, they are born from state's shared values. In this regard, institutions are particularly interesting as "they are constitutive of both states and international society in that they define both the basic character and purpose of any such society."[9] Simplified, institutions are the shared practices which facilitate the formation of international society. In addition, ES discussions of international society and the centrality of institutions within that society have been particularly attentive to how both of these phenomena evolve throughout history. Indeed more generally, attention to history is a fundamental aspect – even a defining feature – of the ES and provides a strong means for engaging with change in, and the evolution of, international politics. Nowhere is more evident than in the historically orientated *Expansion of International Society*, where the argument is forwarded that a European international society evolved over the course of time to spread across the globe following the 19th century industrial revolution.[10] Of central importance to this expansion process – and to the ES's history of international relations more generally – is the role played by the diplomacy institution. As evidence of diplomacy's longstanding importance to the ES and its historical perspective, in what is arguably Wight's best work, *Systems of States*, he notes the centrality of diplomacy in the ancient Hellas states-system; and goes as far as to call diplomacy the "master institution" of the modern system.[11] Following in Wight's footsteps, Bull devotes considerable attention to diplomacy in *The Anarchical Society*, which suggests the institution may be defined as the management of international relations by negotiation, typically through ambassadors or diplomats.[12] In recognizing diplomacy's importance to the ES, we take this institution as the focus of this piece. In summary, these aspects of ES thought – their focus on the totality of state-based interaction through international society, their identification of institutions – particularly diplomacy – as the vehicle through which this interaction is channeled, and their attention to change in international politics through their broad historical perspective – are not problem free, we take these as the strengths of the school at this juncture.

---

[8] This definition is drawn from two sources: Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977) pp. 13; Buzan, *From International to World Society?*, p. 7

[9] Buzan, *From International to World Society?,* p. xviii

[10] Hedley Bull and Adam Watson (eds.), *The Expansion of International Society* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984)

[11] Martin Wight, 'The State System of Hellas', in Hedley Bull (ed.), *System of States,* (Leicester, UK: Leicester University Press, 1977), p. 46

[12] Bull, *Anarchical Society*, pp. 162-183

Turning now to the merits of constructivism and Wendt's work particularly, it is perhaps best to begin by highlighting that Wendt endorses a scientific approach to understanding international politics. This rigorous approach is dedicated chiefly to fostering an understanding of individual state behavior, though in a different manner than rationalist scholars. Instead, to develop these claims, constructivists employ their flagship notions of social identity and intersubjective values.[13] To clarify, social identity, perhaps the term most commonly associated with the constructivist approach, is defined as the "sets of meanings that an actor attributes to itself while taking the perspective of others."[14] In building this concept, constructivism has had fruitful engagement with rationalists whereby the notion that identity is more basic than interest, and that interests are not given, was developed. Indeed it is through social identity that states' interests are constructed, given that beliefs stemming from identity define needs. Considering social identity then, it is worth flagging two key points from these claims which become central to our framework. First, on identity construction, a state cannot enact a social identity in its own right considering that external perception is so critical to the process; additionally, interests are perceived only through interactions between and among states. Second, on this notion of external perspective, Wendt asserts that the driving factor behind a state's identity construction is the desire for external actors to recognize its sovereignty given that it is the key to physical survival and psychic security.[15] In accepting that the perspective of others, interaction and sovereign recognition are central to social identity construction, a discussion of intersubjective values becomes relevant, as this notion ties into each of these claims. Most importantly, values are not subjective in the sense that they stem from a single domestic entity, but instead are intersubjective, meaning they are the product of international intercourse amongst states. More broadly, it is this intersubjective intercourse between and amongst states which ultimately serves to shape actors' identities and the decisions taken in international politics. Thus, constructivists make use of values by noting that it is interaction between and amongst states through which intersubjective values are perceived and a state's identity is constructed. These notions of social identity and intersubjective values – while again not problem free – make up the theoretical core of Wendt's constructivism, and are noted here as constructivism's strengths.

Having detailed what we take as the strengths of the ES and constructivism, we turn now to the heart of this section, where a fruitful dialogue between the schools is created. We specifically assess how, quite remarkably, when the strengths of each school are fused, the weaknesses inherent to each are overcome; indeed, we in essence illustrate how the ES and constructivist minds meet.

---

[13] Social identity differs from what Wendt terms corporate identity, an identity based in the realm of domestic politics and thus not central to our concern here. Even more specifically, here we focus on external social identity.

[14] Alexander Wendt, 'Collective Identity Formation and the International State,' *American Political Science Review*, 88 (1994), p. 385.

[15] Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999) p. 237.

The formula for fusing the strengths of the ES and constructivism is to highlight where each theory has shortcomings, and mend those shortcomings with the other theory. To begin, while the ES has been strong in its global focus on international society and the constitutive role played by institutions in that society, the byproduct of this focus has been a neglect of how *individual* states operate within, and interact externally with, international society, its values and its institutions – indeed the ES framework does not seem to allow for detailed consideration of this; and a prime example of this oversight is the school's lack of consideration of the evolving relationship across the Taiwan Strait from the 1940s onward.[16] To rectify this lack of attention to individual states, the constructivist approach offers help if one elects to employ the notions of social identity construction and international society in conjunction, as we do here in the first part of our framework. *Specifically, in taking the robust constructivist notion of social identity construction as the theoretical launching point, and international society as the global arena, we examine the process by which an individual state (Taiwan) attempts to construct and reconstruct its social identity in an effort to 'join' international society; critically, we focus on how Taiwan consciously engaged with the diplomacy institution throughout this process*. In addition, the empirical data examined via this framework will necessarily engage with the impact Taipei's identity construction and reconstruction had on the cross Taiwan Strait relationship. An enquiry in this fashion will take a big step towards an ES understanding of the interplay between an individual state, international society and the diplomacy institution, and moreover will bring the useful concept of social identity construction into the ES. This fusion benefits constructivism as well, as integration of these concepts rectifies the school's failure to interact with, and consider its implications on, the totality of international politics; this fusion will also provide insights into how state's identities are constructed according to factors *beyond* the institution of sovereignty and the desire for sovereign recognition, namely diplomacy. This established the second aspect of our framework will build on this interplay between social identity construction, international society and the diplomacy institution by further linking these concepts with a study of values. *Specifically, by examining how a state's (Taiwan) identity is constructed not only via the institution of diplomacy, but also via that state's self-attachment to the values of international society, we are able to provide a robust and critical examination of both the significance of these values have on state identity construction, and the significance these values have for membership to international society.* This second aspect will strengthen the ES which, despite noting the centrality of values within institutions, features an underdeveloped notion of values given its lack of consideration of the wider implications these values have on individual states and its lack of critical reflection on the significance these values have on membership in international society – here these dimensions are added. This second aspect also benefits the constructivist approach which, we have seen, does well to explore how the significance intersubjective values have on identity construction, but fails to locate how these values influence state identity and international politics more generally. For instance, while constructivist's offer a good understanding of the influence Beijing, Taipei and Washington interaction had on Taipei's identity construction, they remain silent when it comes to the significance international society's values

[16] More generally, case studies of specific regions or individual states are lacking in the ES research portfolio.

had on this process. The last area of dialogue between the ES and constructivism relates to perspective rather than theoretical premises. Namely, while constructivism's strong notion of social identify construction is here strengthened by incorporating the totality of international politics – via the notions of international society and institutions – into the analysis, our framework still inherits constructivism's difficulties in examining identity change. This is where the ES offers assistance in the form of its historical perspective, which accesses how international society, institutions and values evolve and change throughout history – we utilize this historical perspective here. To succinctly summarize our framework then, *by utilizing a historical perspective to consider changes in both identity and international society, we examine how the process of social identity construction and reconstruction is tied to international society and its central institutions, namely diplomacy; moreover, in doing so we observe the importance of values hold over identity construction and membership to international society*.

Before transitioning into our empirical work, it is worth noting that our utilization of the ES and constructivism in conjunction demonstrates a meeting of minds between two similar, though distinct, theories. While we saw that connections exist in regards to the schools' focus on the social aspects of IR, marked differences exist in approach and concentration. These differences withstanding, this section has served to show that – theoretically – the strengths of each approach may be fused to produce a robust approach for analyzing social IR. We now turn to our case study to demonstrate the merits of this meeting of minds in an empirical study. Indeed, our case selection benefits the theories as well, considering both the ES and constructivism need to produce more case study research and engage with non-European IR in more depth. In this vein, our case study will commence with an investigation into the evolution of Taiwan's social identity construction over the last sixty years, concentrating on how that construction has lived and died via the institution of diplomacy. Where relevant, we also examine how Taiwan tied itself to the values which were of increasing importance to international society during these years. Throughout the case, the backdrop of our discussion will be the implications Taiwan's actions had on the island's relationship with mainland China.

2. Taiwan,[17] China and international society: identity construction in the face of ever-evolving diplomacy and values

In light of the historical perspective we employ here, our enquiry into the evolution of the Republic of China (henceforth ROC) will be divided chronologically over three distinct periods: 1949-1988, 1988-2000, and 2000-2008. Structurally, and in accordance with our framework, we analyze data drawn from these periods through a prism which sheds light how the ROC's identity evolved in accordance with international society's evolution, and specifically how diplomatic interaction impacted, even dictated,

[17] A note on names: in sections 2.1 and 2.2 we consciously avoid utilizing the name Taiwan, unless we are referring explicitly to the island in geographical terms; instead we use either the Republic of China or Taipei. This is because in a later period, discussed in 2.3, the name Taiwan is used by ROC politicians as part of an effort to re-construct identity.

social identity construction. In addition, where the empirical data deems it relevant, we reflect on the ROC's experience over the same periods in a slightly different light to see how the values of international society impacted the identity and behavior of the ROC, and how these values became tied to diplomatic engagement. Let us proceed.

2.1 *The KMT-CCP split and the battle for supremacy with the diplomacy institution (1949-1988)*

From Taipei's perspective, the period between 1949 and 1988 was one in which diplomatic relations with international society, and in consequence the means by which its identity evolved and changed, was dictated by Beijing's interaction with, and attempt to enter, that same society. As background, in 1949 the KMT[18] government withdrew to Taiwan following its defeat at the hands of the CCP[19] in the Chinese Civil War; the CCP, in turn, took control of mainland China. A period of intense diplomatic competition would follow. More specifically, the KMP and CCP both turned outwards towards international society in an effort to construct new identities via the diplomacy institution and in accordance with certain values. Let us examine this. First, it should be noted that throughout this period the Cold War dominated international politics.

Despite the KMT's defeat, under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek the ROC utilized established diplomatic channels to consolidate an identity in international society which asserted that it was the sole legitimate government of the whole Chinese nation, i.e. both mainland China and Taiwan. Interestingly, it was the ever-important institution of diplomacy which allowed the ROC to consolidate this identity. More specifically, the ROC was a founding member of the United Nations in 1945 and a member of the original Security Council; in addition Taipei enjoyed strong ties with Washington given the US' hostility towards communism. More specifically, once the policy of containment emerged in Washington, Taiwan became an intricate piece which needed to be defended from communist forces such as the People's Republic of China (henceforth PRC).[20] All this meant that Taipei maintained fairly broad and robust access to international society's diplomatic organs while identifying itself, and being identified as, the sole legitimate government of China. Critically, Taipei's UN membership, in conjunction with its relationship with the anti-Communist countries, indicates that the bulk of international society was receptive to Taipei's diplomatic efforts. Yet by the early 1970s, Taipei would begin to witness a marked drop off in its audience which had once consisted of the majority of international society; a drop off which was visibly linked with the increasing diplomatic efforts of the PRC and international society's increasing reception to them. This drop off in the ROC's diplomatic

[18] Kuomingtang, or the Chinese Nationalist Party

[19] The Chinese Communist Party

[20] Yuankai Xiao, *A Century's Knot*, (Beijing: People Press, 2001); Fu Qian, 'Reminiscences of Three Decades of U.S.-R.O.C. Relations 1967-1996', *CNAPS Roundtable Luncheon*, (The Brookings Institution Center for Northeast Asian Policy Studies: Washington DC, 2005)

audience in international society, in turn, meant that the ROC's identity as the sole legitimate government of China would begin to deteriorate. Given this, it is worth spending time on the evolution of the PRC's diplomacy before proceeding with discussion of Taipei.

The PRC's diplomatic strategy, in terms of engagement with international society, was set forth by Chairman Mao Zedong even before the creation of the state in 1949. Following Mao's plans, the newly-established PRC immediately reached out to the USSR, Eastern European states in the Communist Camp, and other Asian nationalist countries and successfully established diplomatic relations with them. Mao's plans for PRC diplomacy reached beyond the obvious links with nearby communist states however, as, in the western world, Sweden chose to enter into a diplomatic relationship with the PRC in 1950;[21] there was also an upsurge in diplomatic relations between the PRC and African and Latin American countries. In response to Beijing's effort to join international society as a sovereign political entity, Taipei adopted a 'zero-sum' principle – a diplomatic tool designed to compete with Beijing in international society. This 'zero-sum' principle was remarkably hard-line, declaring that any state which recognized the PRC diplomatically would be punished by the ROC, as Taipei would immediately break diplomatic ties with the offending state. Despite this, Mao's PRC was inspired by its early successes and continued to build on them in a thirst for diplomatic recognition by international society at large; the chief means to quench this thirst was the society's chief diplomatic organ, the UN. As the ROC was one of the founding members of the UN and a permanent member of the Security Council from 1945, if the PRC was to establish the diplomatic ties with the wider international society – which it badly needed – it would first have to confront, even attack, the diplomatic relationships which Taipei had so carefully constructed there, especially given Taipei's insistence on the 'zero-sum' principle. Thus after seizing control of the mainland, the PRC knocked on the UN's door seeking both diplomatic recognition and representation. In 1949 Zhou Enlai called for "the expulsion of the illegal representative of the KMT clique that could in no way represent China" and demanded that "the representative of the government of the PRC participate in the work of the United Nations."[22] Such speeches highlight Beijing's appeal to the UN to enter as the representative body of China; a move which consciously challenged Taipei's identity, and diplomatic prowess, as the sole legitimate government representing both the mainland and Taiwan. After more than a decade's effort, the PRC successfully had the UN General Assembly put its representation on the UN agenda in 1961 – the PRC had arrived diplomatically in international society. The culmination of this diplomatic intrigue between Taipei, international society and Beijing was the seating of the PRC in the UN in 1972, and the ROC's withdrawal from the organization at the same time in protest and in accordance with its 'zero-sum' principle. As such, members of international society

[21] 'The PRC's Glorious Journey on Developing Foreign Relations', paper published by the Foreign Ministry of the PRC <http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/chn/ziliao/wjs/t8737.htm> accessed on 04 December 2007.

[22] Enlai Zhou quoted in 'Diplomatic History: Struggle to restore China's lawful seat in the United Nations F. Ministry', a paper published by the FMPRC (2000b) <http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/eng/ziliao/3602/3604/t18013.htm> accessed on 07 January 2008

increasingly elected to adopt diplomatic ties with the PRC, and by 1971 the number of state actors that recognized Beijing was larger than those that recognized Taipei. The following table is useful in demonstrating this shift in international society:[23]

Year	Number of countries having diplomatic relationships with Taipei	Number of countries having diplomatic relationships with Beijing
1950	44	23
1960	59	42
1966	66	51
1969	69	50
1970	67	54
1971	**56**	**74**
1972	43	92

The table's data clearly indicates international society's welcome reception to the PRC's diplomatic efforts as, by 1972, the number of countries which recognized the PRC was more than twice those that recognized the ROC. The year 1972 has added significance as this same year the ROC elected to remove itself from international society's chief diplomatic organ, the UN. As such over the later years of the period in concern, the ROC's diplomatic recognition by members of international society continued to plummet. Let us continue the table:[24]

1974	32	104
1976	26	118
1979	23	127
1980	23	130
1983	24	135

[23] Min Wei, *The Bilateral Diplomacy of the ROC*, (Taipei: Yeqiang Publishing House, 1993), p2

[24] Ibid.

1985	23	138
1988	22	141

The period between 1971 and 1988 is particularly interesting, as over 80 countries set up diplomatic relations with the PRC, whereas 55 countries cut their diplomatic ties with the ROC.[25] Thus by the end of the 1980s, Taipei had managed to maintain diplomatic ties with just over 20 countries; by contrast the PRC enjoyed diplomatic relations with just over 140 countries. Importantly, the states which elected to maintain diplomatic ties with the ROC were insignificant players in international society, including Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Belize, the Dominican Republic, Federation of Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Tuvalu, Solomon Islands, Nauru, the Commonwealth of Dominica and Grenada; only Saudi Arabia, South Korea and South Africa were relatively powerful states in the society.[26] The PRC's ever increasing diplomatic ties meant, in turn, growing status within international society as a consequence of that society recognizing the PRC's identity as the legitimate government of China – after all, this is why the PRC desired such diplomatic ties. The PRC received a significant boost in its quest for diplomatic supremacy over the ROC with the US-PRC rapprochement of 1979. To offer brief background, as early as the late 1950s a USSR-PRC split along ideological lines was becoming evident; as a consequence, the West began to hint towards their wish to engage with Mao and his government. Such events opened a new chapter in the PRC-US relationship,[27] as Henry Kissinger travelled to Beijing on 9 July 1971 where he both settled terms for President Nixon's visit to China[28] and held prospective "ambassadorial talks."[29] Eight years later, Beijing and Washington signed a Joint Communiqué which established diplomatic relations between the two; Washington's diplomatic ties with Taipei were broken off. Considering all these events, Taipei's was effectively pushed into diplomatic isolation by the bulk of international society.

In response to Taipei's increasing isolation, Chiang Ching-kuo proposed and adopted the principle of "pragmatic diplomacy," which, more specifically, aimed to end Taipei's international isolation without challenging the 'one China' bottom line. Yet this policy was ultimately unhelpful in Taipei's quest for a

[25] Hungmao Tien, 'Factors affecting Taiwan's Diplomacy and Security', in *ROC White Papers on Defense and Foreign Policy* (Taipei: Yeqiang Publishing House, 1989), pp. 11-36, 13

[26] Zhengwen Cai and Rongxi Wu, 'Evaluations and Suggestions on Foreign Relations of the ROC' in *ROC White Papers on Defense and Foreign Poli*cy (Taipei: Yeqiang Publishing House**,** 1989), p. 83

[27] Jay Taylor, *The Generalissimo's Son: Chiang Ching-kuo and the revolutions in China and Taiwan*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000)

[28] Fu Qian, 'Reminiscences', 2005

[29] Richard C. Bush, *At Cross Purposes : U.S.-Taiwan Relations Since 1942*, (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 2004)

larger diplomatic presence in international society given the PRC's harsh response. To elaborate, while Taipei set up unofficial offices in more than 30 countries and joined nearly 300 international organizations,[30] the PRC countered by strongly opposing the use of any names which had official implications. As such, the name Chinese Taipei[31] was used when the ROC joined/re-joined 10 international organizations. In the late 1980s, the ROC received a heavy blow at the hands of the Asian Development Bank (hereafter ADB). While the ROC had been a member of the ADB since 1966, following the PRC's successful bid for membership in 1986 the ADB changed the ROC's name into "Taipei, China" in effect, lowering the ROC's international identity to beneath the sovereign state.[32]

To summarize the period then, we saw that initially the KMT's retreat to Taiwan did not lead to its exclusion from international society's central institution, diplomacy – on the contrary, the KMT enjoyed significance in this regard through the newly formed UN and as a key piece of the containment policy puzzle. Such diplomatic developments immediately following the Chinese Civil War allowed the KMT to utilize these channels to consolidate an identity asserting that the ROC was the sole government of the Chinese nation, including both Taiwan and the mainland. Yet the tide shifted quite dramatically for the ROC by the 1970s, not only because containment underwent changes as manifest by the US-PRC rapprochement, but more importantly because of the change in the representative body for the Chinese nation at the UN, international society's principal diplomatic body. These incidents led to a dramatic drop off in international society's member states diplomatic ties with Taipei, which in turn meant that the social identity Taipei had so carefully constructed in accordance with international society's diplomacy had failed. This failure led to a backlash in the following period, where we see Taipei now engage peripherally with international society and diplomacy, but moreover see a newly emerged interaction with international society's values over that time. These occurrences are the focus of the following section.

2.2 *Democratic transition and the appeal to international society's shared, intersubjective values (1988-2000)*

The year 1988 marks the beginning of our second period of enquiry because it featured an important leadership change in the KMT and the ROC. Specifically, Chiang Ching-kuo, who had been the mastermind behind Taiepi's "pragmatic" diplomatic engagement with international society to date, died suddenly. This meant vice president Lee Teng-hui became president of the ROC, and he subsequently transformed Taipei's diplomatic practice. We have seen that Lee inherited a landscape which was fraught with problems for Taipei; their diplomatic ties with the majority of international society had

[30] Songlin Li, *Chiang Kai-shek and Chiang Ching-kuo in Taiwan*, (Beijing: Chinese Friendship Publishing House, 2001), p. 414

[31] Tien, 'Factors affecting', p. 14

[32] Cai and Wu, 'Evaluations and Suggestions', p. 75

eroded, the West's hard-line anti-Communist beliefs were softening which meant a decrease in the island's strategic importance as a capitalist stronghold, and the PRC had solidified both its identity as the legitimate government of China and as one of international society's major diplomatic players. Indeed, Lee noted in his autobiography that "the essence of Taiwan's diplomacy is existence,"[33] and moreover, "in order to prove the fact that Taiwan does exist, we have to build up relationships with other countries."[34] Following this logic, Lee began to re-locate the ROC's identity in relation to the mainland in attempt to re-establish Taipei's diplomatic ties in international society. Quite importantly, Lee attempted to portray Taipei as Beijing's equal, rather than asserting Taipei as the sole legitimate government for both the mainland and Taiwan. Let us explore this process.

From 1988 Taipei actively sought to advertise a new identity to international society through a coherent diplomatic strategy labelled 'dual recognition.' This strategy firmly asserted the ROC's sovereignty over Taiwan and the offshore islands, namely Penghu, Jinmen, and Mazu; conversely the strategy recognized the PRC's sovereignty over the mainland. 'Dual recognition' unequivocally divided the ROC and the Chinese nation in sovereign terms.[35] Following the development of 'dual recognition,' Taipei immediately sought to utilize its diplomatic channels to build legitimacy for this newly constructed identity. Yet putting the diplomatic strategy of 'dual recognition' aside, we saw above that, quite problematically, by 1988 Taipei's worthwhile diplomatic ties had eroded, which in turn meant that Taipei had to re-establish diplomatic relations with other states if it wanted this new identity to be accepted by international society. As a further stumbling block, Beijing maintained the position that China's sovereignty was indivisible, making the ROC's case for 'dual recognition' to international society rather problematic. Thus in an effort to bolster diplomatic relations and promote its newly constructed identity, the ROC launched the 'dollar diplomacy' program. In essence, from 1993 'dollar diplomacy' encouraged ROC businesses to invest in Southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America in hopes that economic ties would lead to political ties. Dollar diplomacy withstanding, the ROC's diplomatic ties remained weak, meaning that Taipei soon expanded and developed different strategies in its efforts to build diplomatic engagement with international society; in this regard, it was Lee who did the bulk of leg work. In 1989, Lee sent delegates to the ADB conference and noted, in very sovereign and diplomatic language, that "the biggest concern in terms of foreign policy is whether national interests are damaged. If this is not a problem, we are willing to take part in primary international organizations."[36] Evidently, Lee was trying to sell the ROC as a sovereign entity and willing diplomatic partner for member states of international society. In addition to attending the ADB conference, from 1991 the ROC actively sought to re-join the UN. For instance, seven of the Latin American nations which maintained diplomatic

[33] Teng-hui Lee, *Taiwan's Proposals*, (Taipei: Yuanliu Publishing Housing, 1999)

[34] Lee, *Taiwan's Proposals*, pp. 125-126

[35] Teng-hui Lee, *Responses to Questions Submitted by Deutsche Welle*, (Taipei: Office of the President, 1999)

[36] Teng-hui Lee, *Press Conference Regarding to the ADB*, (Taipei: Office of the President, 1988)

relations with Taipei sent a letter to the UN secretary-general Boutros Boutros-Ghali, urging him to put the matter of Taiwan on the agenda of the upcoming 48th session of the UN General Assembly in 1993.[37] All of these activities clearly indicate that Taipei was trying to shift the identity and position it held throughout the previous period – yet the activities did not lead to any increase in diplomatic ties. In this vein, in addition to attempting to reconstruct itself through traditional diplomatic means, Taipei soon fastened its identity to – what it perceived as – shared values which were of increasing importance to international society and its institutions; let us explore this dynamic.

The beginning of the period in question witnessed the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the USSR, it followed that international society ventured into a new era wherein some states such as the US and the UK could actively push the merits of a capitalist democracy and the values associated with such a system onto international society. Indeed works such as Huntington's *The Third Wave* – wherein the ROC served as an illustrative example – categorized the early 1990s as a period which featured a global movement towards democracy and democratic values, a fact of which international practitioners were well aware. ROC leadership was quick to pick up on this trend as well, and they astutely linked the successful democratic transformation of their political system with these democratic transitions and values which were rapidly growing in importance across international society: this is termed 'democracy diplomacy.' Thus, in conjunction with dollar diplomacy and engagement with the ADB and UN, Taipei's leaders sought to promote themselves as champions of democratic values in hopes to get the ear of international society. Towards this end, Taipei began to emphasise 'Taiwan's experience' – highlighting the island's successful conversion to democracy. These narratives served as another path for the diplomatic quest of Taipei's political elite. These elites, such as Lee, saw the ROC's transition to democracy and democratic values as one of the key means to push 'dual recognition' and highlight the critical value differences between the ROC and the PRC, and thereby reopen Taipei's diplomatic relationships with international society. Therefore, Taipei consciously revamped its efforts at constructing a new identity by waving the 'shared value – democracy' flag in an effort to boost diplomatic engagement. In this vein, Lee's visit to the US in 1995 provided the perfect stage for the ROC to show the world that "the other China" held the same values as "the free world", and thus was worthy of its attention.[38]

On 9 June 1995 Lee delivered the Spencer T. and Ann W. Olin Lecture at Cornell University, entitled 'What the people want is always in my heart;' a title which certainly resonates with democratic values such as individual autonomy. While the lecture was seen as extremely provocative by the leaders in Washington and international society at large, it was successful in linking the ROC with Western democratic values. For instance, Lee argued that the ROC's democracy had led to the most free and

[37] ICHRT, 'Let Taiwan join the UN -- Opposition Plank Becomes Government Policy' in *Taiwan Communiqué*, (Taipei: International Committee for Human Rights in Taiwan, 1993)

[38] Alan D. Romberg, *Rein In At the Brink of the Precipice: American Policy Toward Taiwan and U.S.-PRC Relations*, (Washington, DC: Henry L. Stimson Center, 2003)

liberal era in Chinese history. Building on this, Lee appealed to international society to treat the ROC "fairly and reasonably." Moreover, as the leader of this free and liberal state, the people's needs were the exclusive guiding factor for Lee; quite pejoratively, the president proclaimed his hope that PRC leaders would be able to follow a similar route. In conclusion, Lee reemphasized that he acted in the peoples' interest, and that he knew what his people would like to say to the world: "we are here to stay; we stand ready to help; and we look forward to sharing the fruits of our democratic triumph."[39] It is also worth noting that Lee utilized the international stage to promote 'dual recognition,' proposing that leaders from the two sides of the strait should meet at international events as equal members of international society. Clearly, this provocative speech was aimed at securing the ROC's acceptance into diplomatic practice based on the notion that common shared values existed between it and the bulk of international society. Problematically, the speech would only serve to enrage the PRC and further isolate the ROC from international society. The reason behind Chinese vexation is clear as, from Beijing's perspective, the central issue in the cross Taiwan Strait conflict revolved around regime challenge, rather than Taiwan's identity in relation to the mainland. Taipei's newly defined identity challenged Chinese sovereignty over Taiwan which was simply not *re+negotiable. Therefore, Taipei's effort to re-identify the ROC's relationship with China and gain access to international society's diplomatic organs – as Beijing's equal nonetheless – was simply unacceptable. Thus, while these moves successfully transformed international society's perception of the ROC as a functioning democracy, it did not translate into the island's expanded participation in international society's diplomacy institution.

As a response to Lee's visit to the US, the People's Liberation Army (PLA) carried out large scale military manoeuvres which included missile launches and live-fire tests in areas within one hundred miles of Taiwan in July 1995 and March 1996.[40] Diplomatically, the PRC immediately set to work to put limits on the ROC's role on the global stage – chiefly through discussions with the US. After rounds of direct confrontations between the US and PRC, it is reported that Clinton passed a letter to Jiang Zemin in 1995 explicitly stating that the US did not support a 'one China, one Taiwan' policy or a 'two Chinas' policy;[41] furthermore, the letter made clear that the US did not support Taipei's independence or Taipei's membership in organisations requiring statehood.[42] The policy was later made official during the 1997 Clinton-Jiang summit, and has become known as the "three no's" promise. When the smoke cleared, quite literally, states realised that any subsequent visit by Lee to anywhere in international

[39] Teng-hui Lee, *What the People Want is Always in My Heart*, (Taipei: Office of the President, 1995)

[40] John W. Garver, *Face off: China, the United States, and Taiwan's Democratization*, (Seattle & London: University of Washington Press, 1997)

[41] Romberg, *Rein In At the Brink*

[42] Shirley Kan, 'Taiwan: Major U.S. Arms Sales Since 1990' in *Report for the Congress, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division*, (2007), p. 62

society would adversely impact the stability of the Asia-Pacific region and even the world; international society chose to avoid such consequences.[43]

To summarize this second period then, we initially saw a marked transition in Taipei's identity which was aimed at re-claiming the island's place in the diplomacy institution. This new identity, which in accordance with the principles of 'dual recognition' aimed to co-habit the international society with Beijing, was officially constructed through both 'dollar diplomacy' and 'democracy diplomacy.' As a third measure, Taipei's elites clearly elected to attach the ROC's identity to the newly emerging shared democratic values of international society, as exemplified by Lee's speech at Cornell. Yet the strategy and speech infuriated the PRC and Taipei failed to gain the desired access to international society's diplomatic organs. Thus, during this period it proved impossible for the ROC to lift its international profile and attach itself to international society's diplomatic practices, despite its successful link with international society's democratic values. These failures carry over into our final period, and continued to fuel the cross straight fire.

2.3 *The DPP's radicalization and the appeal to international society's 'freedoms' (2000-2008)*

Moving into the final period of concern, we again break up the evolution of Taipei's identity in accordance with a shift in the island's internal politics; in 2000 the DPP won the ROC presidency with the election of Chen Shui-bian. Not only did this mark the end of over half a century of KMT rule of the ROC, but it meant the rise of the more radical, pro-independence DPP party, the leaders of which identified Taiwan as a sovereign state independent of China. Above we saw that by the end of Lee's presidency, despite a reconstructed democratic value driven identity geared towards enhancing Taipei's diplomatic presence, the ROC had failed to reassert itself as an equal of Beijing and thus diplomatically remained outside of international society looking in. This enduring problem which faced Taipei's leadership continued to dominate behaviour during this final period, and we will see Taipei once again reconstruct its identity in accordance with the central values of international society in hopes of obtaining international diplomatic recognition as an independent and sovereign state of Taiwan.[44] Speaking internationally, early in this period international society continued to push democracy and democratic values globally; this push would shift slightly however with the attack on the World Trade Centre towers in 2001, where after anti-terrorism and cooperation with the War on Terror would rise to international prominence. In light of these internal and external developments, the DPP's sought to reconstruct its identity based on these factors; we explore this now.

The DPP's Platform – adopted by the party's First National Congress on 10 November 1986 and last modified on 19 March 1995 – stated that "Taiwan is becoming more and more isolated from the

[43] See Huiying Zhang, *The Super Diplomat Lee Deng-hui and His Pragmatic Diplomacy*, (Taipei: China Times Publishing Co., 1996), p. 243

[44] The name Taiwan is important here, as it was under this name that the ROC attempted to construct this new identity.

international community. This situation has made it difficult for Taiwanese people to take part in international activities and has seriously affected the development of Taiwan's external relations."[45] In regards to this situation, before elected into power the DPP applied pressure to the KMT government in hopes that the then ruling party would adopt several DPP proposals aimed at getting Taiwan back into the international diplomatic community; these proposals centered upon "resuming and developing relations with other countries [and] allowing all residents of Taiwan to determine the future of Taiwan."[46] After it came to power, the DPP adopted a more radical position, as Chen's DPP moved a step beyond Lee's conception of 'shared sovereignty,' to one of 'China is China, and Taiwan is Taiwan.' The means by which the DPP attempted to reconstruct Taiwan's identity in this mold – and indeed the very nature of that identity – makes the DPP era remarkable. More specifically, the identity which the DPP attempted to forge did not only follow the logic that an independent and sovereign Taiwan deserved a place in international society, but began putting more emphasis on drawing contrasts between "democratic and peace loving Taiwan" and China, "the biggest threat to the regional stability and a rogue state."

In an effort to promote this identity and fulfill the DPP's somewhat vague goals aiming at "upgrading our relationship with other states"[47] and "consolidating the existing diplomatic relationships,"[48] Taiwan stepped up its aforementioned 'dollar diplomacy' program. When, for instance, the Panamanian president's visited Taiwan in July 2000 the cost for the DPP was a $35 million loan and $10 million worth of aid; similarly Chen's visit to Nicaragua and Chad cost $100 and $120 million, respectively.[49] Yet 'dollar diplomacy' was still not resulting in Taiwan's acceptance into international society's diplomatic circle, as the PRC's rapid economic growth allowed the mainland to enter, and subsequently dominate, the 'dollar diplomacy' game.[50] Therefore, the DPP also began to target international organizations of which the newly deemed 'Taiwan' could become a member. Membership to these organizations, it was believed, would expand Taiwan's international space and reopen diplomatic ties with various members of international society, but *critically* as the sovereign state Taiwan, rather than a Chinese state. Equally importantly for the DPP however, was that membership to international organizations was a critical step towards constructing and defending an independent and sovereign identity. Nowhere is this strategy –

[45] DPP, *Platform*, (Taipei, 1995)

[46] Ibid.

[47] Hungmao Tien, *The ROC's 2000 Report on Foreign Policy*, (Taipei: MOFA, 2000)

[48] e.g. Huang, Zhifang, *The ROC's 2006 Report on Foreign Policy*, (Taipei: MOFA, 2006)

[49] *People's Daily*, 27 October 2004 (Hong Liu 'Taiwan Strait Observer: Behind the Scene: Plotting in Taiwan's "Dollar Diplomacy"')

[50] More specifically, according to Taipei's *China Post*, the cost of the PRC's diplomatic relationship with Dominica in March 2004 was $122 million in aid; Taiwan's offer was $9 million. From *China Post*, 17 February 2005, (Joe Hung, 'Dollar Diplomacy Continued')

and the firm opposition such a strategy sparked in China – more evident than in the case of Taiwan's attempt to join the World Health Organization (WHO).

When, in 1972, the ROC left the UN in protest, it also lost its membership to the WHO – moves which, we saw, naturally led to a decline in the then Taipei's diplomatic prowess. To rectify this, Taipei first launched a bid to re-enter the WHO in 1997 while the KMT was still control the island's political maneuvers. Yet in 2003, with the outbreak of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) in both mainland China and Taiwan, the now Taiwanese government seized upon the near pandemic in an effort to join the WHO under the name Taiwan, proclaiming "health is not a political issue; disease and medical care have no national boundaries."[51] A critical requirement for membership to the WHO is statehood, thus simply by applying for membership Taiwan was emphasizing its autonomy from the PRC. Yet in addition to applying for WHO membership, we again see Taiwan drawing on – what it perceived as – the central values of international society in order to re-open diplomatic channels. Specifically, a Taiwanese group (The Foundation of Medical Professionals Alliance) which was pushing for Taiwanese membership astutely drew on the argument that Taiwan's absence from the WHO was an abuse to "Taiwanese human rights."[52] Such a claim was a subliminal hit at the PRC, who, while combating Taiwan's push for membership, was necessarily denying Taiwanese their basic human rights. Yet the appeal to international society's values ran deeper than human rights, as evident in statements such as "while global terrorism rises, Taiwan may become a dangerous missing part of the worldwide anti-terrorism network, if it is still left out of the doors of important international organizations."[53] In this vein, Taiwan was actively re-constructing its identity according to the values and perceptions inherent to the War on Terror, and through this was hoping to improve its diplomatic status as a sovereign Taiwan with other member states of international society. Yet even while Taiwan successfully linked its WHO bid with important values, and established itself as a sovereign nation potentially key to the anti-terror effort, these efforts to gain diplomatic recognition as an independent and sovereign state fell short as the PRC blocked Taiwan's bid.[54]

In addition to the incident with the WHO, Taipei also attempted to re-join the UN in 2007. Specifically, President Chen sent a letter to Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon and the PRC's UN ambassador Wang Guangya, who was also serving as rotating president of the UN Security Council at the time, dated July 2007, wherein Chen condemned international society for not respecting the dignity of Taiwan's people.

---

[51] 'Participation in the World Health Organization Is Taiwan's Legitimate Right', paper published by GIO 2003, <http://www.gio.gov.tw/taiwan-website/5-gp/join_who/2003/who12.htm> accessed on 12 November 2008

[52] 'The Harm of Taiwanese Human Right', paper published by MPAT 2008, <http://www.taiwan-for-who.org.tw/chinese/say/say_area/content.asp?id=3> accessed on 13 November 2008

[53] Ibid.

[54] The most recent development with regards to the WHO: Taiwan was invited by the WHO to join the organization as an observer in May, 2009

Chen went further to claim that Taiwan's exclusion from the UN was "incomprehensible and unbearable" "political apartheid." Chen noted Taiwan was "a country that advocates the universal values of freedom, democracy, human rights, and peace," the identity of which "is denied and *its+ security threatened" given its exclusion from the UN[55]. Despite the fact that Taiwan's push for UN membership often demonstrated a willingness to engage with democratic mechanisms (i.e. referenda[56]), its pleas continued to fall on the deaf ears of international society.

These repeated setbacks in Taiwan's active quest for diplomatic status, most of which were suffered at the hands of the PRC since Taipei's newly defined identity of Taiwan as a sovereign and independent state was in no way acceptable. The CSR was becoming increasingly bitter. In responding to the DPP government's continuous effort to re-construct Taiwan's identity in relation to China, Beijing passed the Anti-Session Law aiming at "opposing and checking Taiwan's secession from China" and also "promoting peaceful national reunification, maintaining peace and stability in the Taiwan Straits, preserving China's sovereignty and territorial integrity, and safeguarding the fundamental interests of the Chinese nation;" it also ominously stated that the PRC would use non-peaceful means to "protect China's sovereignty and territorial integrity[57]."

In sum, despite all the DPP's efforts the story of Taiwan remained the same: the ROC's attempt to reconstruct its identity according to international society's newly emerged values, in an effort to enter international society's diplomatic channels, failed. In this final period, we again saw the ROC attempt to solidify its reconstructed sovereign and independent identity by reaching out to international society via international organizations, of course with the ultimate aim of increasing its diplomatic status. Moreover we saw the ROC – once again in an effort to strengthen a newly constructed identity – attach itself to the values which became of central importance to international society during this period. At the end of the day, Beijing strongly rejected any attempt to renegotiate Taiwan's identity in relation to China, and the 'one China' bottom line did not bend in the slightest. Consequently, international society remained unreceptive to Taiwan's latest identity change. Thus, despite Taiwan's appeal to the international society's institutions and values, the island once again found itself outside of international society looking in.

2.4 *Summary*

[55] Shui-bian Chen, 'President Chen Shui-bian's Letter to UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon', (Taipei: Office of the President, 2007)

[56] More specifically the DPP government held two referenda in 2004 and 2007 respectively, the first relating to UN membership and the second relating to the creation of a new constitution. Yet low turnout doomed both referenda as they failed to pass the threshold to be valid.

[57] NCP, *Anti-Secession Law: Article 1*, (National People's Congress: Beijing, 2005)

Before moving on to develop our conclusions concerning the benefits of fusing the ES and constructivist approaches, it is prudent here to reflect on the chief empirical findings uncovered in our study of Taiwan over these three periods. It is quite apparent that historical evolution of international society, changes in the diplomacy institution, and changes in international society's shared values, played hugely significant roles in Taiwan's identity construction and reconstruction throughout this case.

To elaborate, in the first period the ROC constructed a 'zero sum' identity based on it being China's sole legitimate government – construction of this identity was facilitated by the hostile Cold War environment which dominated international politics. This hostile environment enabled the ROC to exploit diplomatic channels friendly with anti-communist states. Yet as time passed, international society evolved towards a less aggressive stance on communism, as exemplified first by the US-PRC rapprochement. Secondly, and following the collapse of the USSR, international society evolved further to adopt pro-democratic values and human rights sentiments; thus the ROC was forced to reconstruct its identity to fit this evolution. The ROC's identity became one based on the democratic and human rights values which we saw emerge in international society during that period, and it was an identity which was employed diplomatically in hopes of obtaining 'dual recognition.' Yet this post-Cold War identity never held much weight in international society, as, given that the diplomacy institution was no longer based in Cold War logic diplomatic ties were essentially closed to Taipei. As the ROC's frustration built, so too did history progress, and international society began a period wherein anti-terrorism – fused with democracy and human rights – became of tremendous significance after 9/11. Consequently the ROC again reconstructed its identity accordingly, this time vehemently asserting Taiwan's independence from the mainland, but yet again through essentially non-receptive diplomatic channels. The lack of access to diplomacy again led the ROC to appeal to international society's values; this failed.

Thus we see that these factors – international society's institutionalized diplomatic practices, international society's values, and the historical evolution of international society the more generally – are the critical variables at play throughout each of the three periods examined. In light of this, there were clearly several variables at play which impacted Taiwanese identity construction over these 60 years; and the fusion of the ES and constructivist approaches is the best way to understand this array of influences. Let us conclude.

3. Conclusions

We began this study by examining the merits of the ES and constructivist theories separately, and proceeded to fuse the two so as to reveal how helpful the two theories are when conjoined and employed in an empirical study. In this sense the principal theme of this paper has revolved around the merits of cross-theoretical dialogue in IR; our conclusions follow this theme. Specifically, we begin by asking how each individual theory – first the ES then constructivism – has, in the context of the above case, been informed by the other theory in the sense that conclusions have been drawn which the theory in question would otherwise have 'missed.' Discussion in this vein will clearly reveal how a fused framework strengthens each theory's insights into the empirical realities of international politics.

To focus first on the value-added to the ES from this theoretical-dialogue, there are several findings in the above case which were brought to light via the constructivist approach; the manner in which we arrived at these findings, in turn, brings new and important dynamics to the existing ES framework. Firstly, utilization of the constructivist notion of identity construction demonstrated how the government in Taipei actively constructed and reconstructed its identity over three periods, moving from the sole government of China, to Beijing's equal, and finally to an independent and sovereign state of Taiwan. Yet domestic transitions and identity construction generally fall outside the scope of ES case study research, as the ES would instead prefer – in such cases – to highlight the significance of changes in, and the evolution of, international society itself (here the transition from the cold war, to the third wave of democratization, to the war on terror). However our case has demonstrated that identity construction and changes in international society are in no way mutually exclusive; in fact they are quite interrelated and serve to reinforce one another. Indeed, from the ES perspective considering these facets in conjunction offers new insights into the school's fundamental concepts. In regards to international society, this case demonstrated that while Taipei constructed its identity in relation to China, it actively drew upon the established shared practices and values of international society. Such findings add significance to the notion of international society, as they suggest that states *outside* international society are nonetheless influenced by the predominant practices and values of that society. This finding not only reinforces and strengthens the significance of international society in international politics, but also helps the ES which has to date not extensively considered states *outside* international society – and these states certainly do exist. Beyond this, our case's use of constructivist identity construction offers novel insights into the ES concept of institution. Specifically, Taipei clearly utilized diplomacy and shared diplomatic practices as the vehicle to construct and reconstruct its identity. This suggests a more enhanced role for institutions in international politics, namely that states can actively target, and engage with, specific institutions in an effort to become legitimate members of international society. In other words, institutions do not just constitute international society, but offer a potential channel to enter that society. This study has revealed that this can be the case with diplomacy, but outside this case we venture to say this could be – and has been – the case with other institutions; balance of power, sovereignty, war, and trade for instance. Building on these claims, it is quite remarkable to note that a state's engagement with institutions such as diplomacy does not necessarily ensure that state's membership to international society, as Taipei was clearly not accepted into international society despite constant engagement with a wide variety of diplomatic organizations and practices (i.e. the UN, the WHO, and dollar diplomacy). The final aspect of the ES which has been enhanced by this fusion with constructivism is the notion of shared values, and indeed the wider role played by values in international society. Study of Taipei's identity construction and reconstruction clearly demonstrated the centrality of international society's values in this process, as Taipei employed democratic, human rights, and anti-terror values depending upon which were favoured by international society at the time. Therefore, the case re-affirms the centrality of shared values both in regards to shaping state behaviour and constituting international society. Yet the case also reveals that we must tame our expectations in regards to the importance of values in international society, as Taipei's appeal to international society's central values clearly did not help Taipei enter that society. In short, while

states may actively engage with values in an effort to enter international society, engagement with these values does not necessarily ensure membership.

Thus it is quite clear that this theoretical fusion not only fits quite well with the existing ES concepts and framework, but more importantly enhanced these aspects by shedding new light onto them. In this way the notions of international society, institutions and the role of values have been developed. Therefore, it is clear that this cross-theoretical dialogue translated well into an empirical study. How did it benefit constructivism?

Just as with the ES, we assert here that our cross theoretical-dialogue significantly enhances constructivism, as the conclusions which we derived principally through use of the ES approach have, in turn, clearly reflected upon and strengthened the existing dynamics of constructivism. More specifically, the principal contributions made to constructivism have been through the ES's flagship concept of international society and its ability to engage with the totality of international politics. In this vein, our study of international society was channelled firstly through a central international institution, diplomacy, and secondly through shared values. For our purposes here, we reflect first on diplomacy and secondly on values; we then explicitly discuss the value-added these dynamic bring to the constructivist approach. Firstly then, our study witnessed repeated shifts in the nature of diplomacy and state diplomatic practice. In 1949 diplomatic relationships were heavily dominated by the Cold War, and Taipei gained leverage as a key component to the West's containment policy. Yet, as manifest by the US-PRC rapprochement, a shift occurred in the West's attitude towards communism which in turn changed diplomacy; this led to a deterioration of Taipei's diplomatic status from which the island never recovered. In regards to values, we again saw a dramatic transformation from those embedded in Cold War logic, to capitalist democracy, to human rights and anti-terrorism. Our examination of these changes in diplomacy and values at the global level made it quite clear that the process of Taiwanese identity construction was linked with the level of international society. Yet an exclusive use of the constructivist framework would have 'missed' such a finding. Instead, Wendt's constructivism – which does well to explain the impact intersubjective values have on identity construction through analysis of individual states' perception of one another – would have focused on the Taipei, Beijing and Washington relationship. Bringing the concept of international society enhances this understanding by highlighting that global institutions and values, and changes in them, significantly impact state identity construction. Theoretically speaking, these empirical findings based upon knowledge of the broader changes in international society's values and institutions offer much needed – and critical – insights into one of constructivism's chief weaknesses. This weakness is constructivism's failure to analyze the impact the totality of international politics has on identity construction, and this weakness is rectified when international society and its associated concepts are integrated into constructivist logic. By utilizing the concepts of international society, institutions and values *in conjunction* with identity construction, we learn that states clearly consider international society, its institutions, and its values when constructing identity; we saw this over and over with Taipei. In this vein, we go as far as to say that there appears to be an intrinsic link between changes in international society, its values and its institutions, and state

identity construction. To build on the benefits stemming from this fusion of the ES's consideration of the totality of international politics and the constructivist focus on identity construction, in the form of the historical perspective, the ES offers additional insights as to how to enhance constructivism. More specifically, by employing a historical perspective in this case we were able to divide our empirical discussion into three distinct periods. This helped highlight what we have just discussed, that the climate of international politics was in a constant state of change throughout the case, as exemplified by changes in values and institutions. Such a finding, in turn, offers theoretical insights into the constructivist approach. More specifically, if we accept the aforementioned link made between international society, its values and its institutions, and state identity construction, and subsequently add a historical perspective to the mix which sees that the totality of international politics is often in a state of evolution and change, it necessarily follows that these historical changes significantly impact state identity construction. This was indeed the case with Taipei who actively changed identity according to changes in international society's values and diplomatic practices. These findings lead us to conclude that constructivism must engage with historical research, and – following both our research and the claims of identity theorists who argue that identity construction is an ongoing and fluid process – we assert that how a state identifies itself in relation to international society is not static. Instead, it is a dynamic process wherein identity and the process of identity construction is influenced not only by historical roots, but evolves across time in accordance with international politics more broadly. The evolution of shared values within international society carries great significance in identity construction and reconstruction.

In total then, it is quite apparent that the ES and constructivism have a significant amount to offer one another, not simply in terms of theoretical engagement but also inside the confines of an empirical study. The empirical benefits of this cross-theoretical dialogue have been demonstrated throughout the above case study; indeed without employing this combination of theoretical concepts (i.e. international society, institution, values, identity construction and historical perspective) this study would have had significantly less explanatory power, and therefore missed several aspects of the case. To be more explicit, the explanatory power generated from this theoretical fusion allowed for detailed empirical work, namely: how a specific entity (Taiwan) changed domestically, how that entity engaged with other states and with international society more broadly, how international society's values and institutions evolved over a certain periods; and how all of this impacts state identity construction. It is this empirical research which leads to our main theoretical conclusion, namely, all of these aspects of international politics are interrelated and must be employed in conjunction if one wants to develop a robust and accurate understanding of both international society and state identity construction. Thus, not only do the ES and constructivism fit well together both theoretically and empirically, but they need each other.