

NEO-REALISM & INDIA CHINA RELATIONS

Sumit

M.Phil Scholar,

Deptt of Political Science,

Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra.

Email: sumitlathwal7@gmail.com

1.0 Introduction

India and China both are ancient civilization, which reincarnated as modern republic around the same time. Both countries have lived through tumultuous time domestically and internationally. The two most populous nation on earth China and India are on their way to become economic power house and these states are keenly observed by the rest of world in their journey. Now the power in international politics is shifting from the west to the east , that what has been called by various scholars the Asian century . the future of this Asian century highly depend upon both of these states , how they will behave and carry their relations with each other and other states .

Being ancient civilization both the states India and China have cultural and trade ties with each other since a long time back. The famous Silk Road facilitated trade purposes and Buddhism was responsible for cultural ties. But political relation between India and China remain under developed 1950. After 1950 when relation established , it has gone through a lot of transformation . For analytical convenience the modern history of India China relations is divided by most of scholars in four distinct phases.

1. 1950 to 1962
2. 1962 to 1976
3. 1976 to 1998
4. 1998 onwards

1.1 1950 to 1962:

This phase is considered period of friendship and ideological congruence. On 1 April 1950 India became the first non-socialist block country to established diplomatic relations with the people's republic of china. India opposed a US sponsored attempt in the United Nation Security Council to label china an aggressor in the Korean War. In 1951 India boycotted the San- Francisco peace treaty on the ground that, the settlement didn't return the island of Formosa (Taiwan) to China . The ideology of anti-imperialism was endorsed by both nations. It was considered a phase of Hindi Chini Bhai Bhai .

But this phase as it is presented so peaceful, full of cooperation and ideological congruence, in real , it was not like that. Contentions were there between both the states. Chinese demonstrated unhappiness towards India's Non-Alignment Policy. Mao Zedong openly stated that one can either be towards imperialism or with socialism and a third road didn't exist. He called Nehru a hireling of Anglo-American imperialism. There were differences between both the states on Tibet problem. In January 1959 People Republic of China premiere Zhou Enlai informed Nehru that China never accepted the McMahon line defining the eastern border between India and China, rejecting Nehru's contentions that the border was based on treaty and customs. This border problem later emerged as the border war of 1962. So problem was there, but those problems didn't come out clearly till 1962.

1.2 1962 to 1976 Security Dilemma

After the war India came close to USSR, which had begun to split from China within the international communist moment . China on the other hand started collaborating with Pakistan, which is now considered as all-weather friendship. A modest program of military transfer from China to Pakistan began in 1964. In this phase ,China

developed its nuclear power capability with its first nuclear test at Lop Nor in 1964. A New Kind of alliances formed during this time where China-Pakistan-USA were on the one side and India-USSR on another.

1.3 1976 to 1998 Tentative Rapprochement

After Mao death in 1976, Deng Xiaoping came to power. He was more concerned with building up domestic economic strength and disentangling the country from international conflict. Various visits were exchanged by leaders of both the states to improve their relations but the problem stays, after all those visits. In 1979, when Atal Bihari Vajpayee made a historic visit to China, the visit coincided with the Chinese invasion of Vietnam. In 1986-87 there was a military stand off between India and China in the eastern sector at Sumdorong Chu region.

1.4 1998 Onwards

India did its second nuclear test in 1998 and declared China a 'potential threat'. Bilateral ties between India and China touched their nadir in the immediate of India's nuclear test in May 1998. After sometime dialog again started, India and China decided to expedite the process of demarcation of the line of actual control and the JWG on the boundary question has been meeting regularly.

Now in the contemporary time several project initiated by China like ONE BELT ONE ROAD, Maritime Silk Route are creating tension in India China relations. These projects and various institutions created by China show its intention to be a super power. On the other hand India is collaborating with USA, Australia and Japan to defend its interest. There is competition between India and China in the central Asian region to meet their energy requirement to feed their developmental activities.

2.0 Statement of Problem

China and India, demographically being the two largest countries in the world, are together accounting for more than a third of the world's population. This makes the Sino-Indian relationship critical not only for those living in China and India but for the whole world. Regardless of ancient trade and cultural ties their modern relations are filled with conflict and a contemporary competition over regional influence.

In the study of international relations there is a great emphasis on explicit theory formulation and testing of specific hypothesis with empirical, quantified data. Theories provide conceptual background for how leaders and their advisor understand the world and make foreign policy decisions. A field where there is so much to look at and so much phenomena to interpret, that it is difficult to know which things matter and which do not. For international relations, than theory become the kind of simplifying device that allows you to decide which fact matter and which do not. It is difficult to understand the complexities of world's politics without the aid of a theory.

So it is time to look on Sino-Indian relations through a theoretical perspective which can explain their actions. But there is a lot of main traditions, approaches and numerous specific theories exist, which tries to reflect various aspects of international relations. Different theories are like people put on different colored sunglasses like red, blue, yellow, pink, black, green whatever, people with different type of glasses see the world around them differently. The surrounding around people do not change nor the people who put glasses. But people look at world differently through different glasses. So same with theories, whether it is Realism, Liberalism, Marxism or any other but as they started looking through the lenses these theories they start looking at the world differently.

The focus of this research lies in the contemporary Sino-Indian relations, which aims to understand the power politics, geo-strategic compulsions and expansionism. These variables will be tested by the Neo-Realist perspective. Neo-Realist tradition focuses on the structure of international system and the reason why state wants to gain power and how much power is enough for the states. The overriding goal of each state is to maximize its share of power which means gaining power at the expenses of other states. In a worlds of limited resources and growing wants of states, each state is striving to maximize its resources. If the resources are limited in the world and demands are more than resources than it will leads to conflict. So the efforts which now look like cooperation will end in a confrontation.

States want to be Hegemon, to influence the other state in their decision making process. China is an example of this. China is trying to be a Hegemon in Asian region by its various activities like creation of new institutions, its policy of expansionism and providing loans and aid to other developing states in this region. China's intension to

be a Hegemon creating tension in this region and impacting India in an adverse way. To defend its interest India is also engaging itself various alliances and tackling this problem diplomatically and strategically. A kind of tussle is going on between India and China. So Neo-Realist perspective possibly explain the actions of these states. Offensive Realism explain the behavior of those states, which tries to maximize their power, on the other hand Defensive Realism explain the action of those states which wanted maximization of security. This research will focus on India-China relation through Neo-Realist perspective.

3.0 Objectives of the Paper

The purpose of this research is to analyze the Sino-Indian relationship through a New-Realist perspective. The focus of this research will be (1) To analyze Geo-Strategic compulsion in India-China relations. (2) To study Neo-Realist perspective on India-China relations. (3) To explore the area of China's expansionism. (4) To explore the measures India is taking to defend its interest.

4.0 Theoretical Framework

Theories are inexact signs, international politics involves so many variables, write Joseph Nye, there are so many changes occur at the same time that events are over determined, there are too many causes. Nye an international theorist hinting at the effect that no theory is comprehensive enough to provide an exhaustive analysis.

Theory is simplifying device for complex phenomena. Theory is provide conceptual background for how leaders and their advisor understand the world and make foreign policy decisions. For international relation, where there is so much to look at and so much phenomena to interpret that it is difficult to know which things matter and which don't. For international relation, theory becomes 'kind of simplifying device that allow you to decide which things matter and which don't'. Theories provide us with assumptions that help you look at the most relevant factors in order to come up with a general idea. The theoretical framework applied in this research is Neo- Realism. The aim is not to find a model that can be universally applicable because it is not possible in a inter-disciplinary subject to explain everything. So anomalies will be there as said by John Mearsheimer in his book 'Tragedy of Great Power Politics', but rather tried to explain major phenomena Neo-Realism perspective will be applied on power politics, Geo-strategic compulsion and energy security issues.

5.0 Neo-Realism

In this research, one of the theories tested on the Sino-Indian relation, will be neo-realism, with a special attention towards Kenneth Waltz's, Theory of International Politics. The main focus will be on two concepts, presented by Waltz, namely the balance-of-power theory and self-help. First, a general discussion about Kenneth Waltz's, Theory of International Politics, will be presented, in order to grasp the different parts of the balance-of-power theory, as well as the concept of self- help.

Neo-realists distinguish themselves from classical realists, arguing that the struggle for power not is a result of human nature. Neo-realism stresses an emphasis on survival, competition and balance of power, explaining the international environment. Kenneth Waltz, being the ground- father of neo-realism, claims that all states have survival highest up on their agendas, arguing that you can find explanations for states behavior by solely looking into the motives of survival. Every state, according to Waltz, are security maximizers and not power maximizers, and this tells him apart from other prominent neo-realists, such as Mearsheimer that argues for a power maximization in his theory of 'offensive realism', which compared to Waltz's theory of 'defensive Realism', has another perspective of how much power a state want.

Kenneth Waltz, foremost study the concept of structures, and the relevance it has in international politics. He argues that the structure of a system changes with changes in the distribution of capabilities across the system's units. He also claims that change in structure also changes the expectations and behavior units have towards what outcome that will come out of interaction. A structure, according to Waltz, is defined by the arrangement of its parts, and it is the changes of arrangement that creates structural changes. Waltz, argues that the distribution of capabilities is the main factor behind structural changes. In other words, pointing at economic and military capabilities as the causes for structural change in the international system. Because these capabilities are used by actors in order to achieve their goals of survival, it affects the structure. Examples of how these capabilities can be used to change the structure of

the international system could be to increase one's military strength, form alliances or to weaken an opposing actor. This will later be developed in the balance-of-power theory.

6.0 Self-help

Structural realism, or neo-realism, is a cynical approach that provides the idea of a world where everyone is responsible for their own survival, meaning that you should only rely on your own capability. In contrast to domestic politics where public agencies have as duty to protect the citizens, and where the citizens not are allowed to enforce the law by themselves, the unitary actors in the international system on the other hand has to rely on themselves, as there is no higher authority to offer protection. This is known as the so called self-help, which has its roots in the doubt realists has towards institutions, international law and alliances. The structure of international politics creates insecurity in itself. That is what Kenneth Waltz claims in his work, *Theory of International Politics*, arguing that the anarchic system inevitably forces states to rely on self-help. Before moving forward, we have to make some definitions clear. First, states are unitary actors who, at a minimum, seek to survive, and at a maximum, strive for domination in the international system. The international system, thus, consists of sovereign states, all equal to each other, which also is referred to as, anarchy. These are by the neo-realism seen as units, thus no higher authority is present that can enforce any law, or maintain the security by preventing the use of force. The lack of an authority is simply how realists explain the anarchy in the international system. Moreover, is each state a separate, autonomous and equal unit, which in the end only relies on its own resources in order to realize its national interests. Logically, this leads to the conclusion that one state's security is another state's insecurity, in the sense that when one state strengthens its security, it will automatically create insecurity among other states, possibly leading to a security dilemma. The concept of self-help contributes to the explanation why realists generally are skeptical of cooperation with other states. If two states, equal in power, both would gain from a cooperation (absolute gain) it would still result in a relative gain, meaning that one state nevertheless is going to gain more than the other. Furthermore it would engender a destabilization between the states, as the balance of power is being shifted, and therefore might turn into a future threat. Allowing another state to have a higher relative gain in the cooperation, can therefore be more costly than missing out on the absolute gain the state would get from the cooperation. Another aspect of cooperation between states is the fact that agreements and future intentions not can be ensured by the word, or signature of other states, as the possibility of a state breaching an agreement could become a great risk to one's national security. According to realism are morality and law subordinate to the overall struggle for power in the international system. Thus making agreements unreliable, even though it is an agreement enhancing regional security, it could make the state even more vulnerable, seeing that power weighs more than morality.

Economic interdependence, according to Waltz, increases the risk of creating new conflicts. This argument is based on the idea that all states are competitors, and that power is a zero-sum game. No matter how you look at it, there's always someone with the highest relative gain. Contrary, neo-liberalism argues that increased interdependence will lead to spill-over effects, which will enhance cooperation in other areas. Additionally, neo-liberals emphasize how states can learn to cooperate and adjust policies.

7.0 Balance of Power

A state should, according to realism, only rely on its own capabilities when it comes to national security. But as a state you sometimes have to rely on others by forming alliances in order to balance a more powerful state in international politics. A state can by forming an alliance strengthen its own national security by using its allies resources, and thus be able to balance a more powerful state. Balancing by forming alliances are called external balancing, and when a state balance another state by increasing its own military power, it's called internal balancing. This form of internal balancing is what will be applied to the Sino-Indian discussion, as both countries increases military spending each year.

Waltz sees the balance of power as natural, and advocates that the balance-of-power theory is the most distinctively political theory of international politics. Further the theory of balance of power views states as merely concentrations of power in a system which is anarchic and thus put them in an environment of competitiveness. Further, Waltz argues that the constraints in the international system lead to the balance-of-power theory, where all states are confined in the international structure, which explains why a certain similarity in behavior is expected by the theory. China and India are possible allies in the future, even though this scenario is unlikely to happen in the

Sino-Indian relations, it is still important to have the possibility of an alliance in mind, seeing how cooperation over energy sources in a way has formed the relationship into some sort of alliance against the developed world over energy sources.

8.0 References:

Books & journals:

1. Acharya, A., "*Course Correction: An analysis of the Origins and Implications of the Sino- Indian Agreements of 2003 and 2005*", Sage (2011)
2. Anindya, "*Balancing China in Asia: A Realist Assessment of India's Look East Strategy*", Sage (2006)
3. Athwal, A., "*China-India relations, Contemporary dynamics*", Routledge, New York (2008)
4. Batabyal, A., "*Balancing China in Asia: A Realist Assessment of India's Look East Strategy*", Sage (2006)
5. Baylis, J., Smith, S., Owens, P., "*The Globalization of World Politics*", 4th edition, Oxford University Press, UK (2008)
6. Dunne, T., Kurki, M., Smith, S., "*International Relations Theories - Discipline and Diversity*", 2nd edition, Oxford University Press, UK (2010)
7. Goh, E., "*Southeast Asian Perspectives on the China Challenge*", Routledge (2007)
8. Holslag, J., "*The Persistent Military Security Dilemma between China and India*", Journal of Strategic Studies, Routledge (2009)
9. Holslag, J., "*Progress, Perceptions and Peace in the Sino-Indian Relationship*", Springer (2008)
10. Jain, B.M., "*India-China relations: issues and emerging trends*", in The Round Table, Routledge, New York (2004)
11. Keohane, R., Joseph, N., "*Power and Interdependence*", 3rd edition, New York, Longman (2001)
12. Kurian, N., "*Emerging China and India's Policy Options*", Delhi: Lancers Publishers & Distributers (2006)
13. Mearsheimer, John J., "*The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*" W.W.Norton & Company, New York (2014)
14. Radtke, K., "*Sino-Indian Relations: Security Dilemma, Ideological Polarization, or Cooperation Based on Comprehensive Security?*"
15. Srinivasan, T.N., "*China and India: economic performance, competition and cooperation: an update*", Journal of Asian Economics 15, Elsevier (2004)
16. Waltz, K., "*Theory of International Politics*", University of California, Berkeley (1979)
17. Xuecheng, L., "*Look Beyond Sino-Indian Border Dispute*", Sage (2011)