REALISM AND LIBERALISM: THE TWO CONTRASTING THEORIES FOR ANALYZING CHINA AND UNITED STATES POWER RELATIONS.

OSAYI, OSADEBAMWEN FRANCIS, PhD
Department of Political Science, University of Benin, Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria.
francis.osayi@uiben.edu
ORCID: 0000-0002-1652-4867

DOI: https://doi.org/10.64633/wissj.v9i8.27

Keywords

Power Relations, Liberalism, Realism, Foreign Relation, Hegemony

Abstract

Research Problem:
The political tit-for-tat and the crab political culture exhibited by China and USA have affected the international political system and by extension, their friends and allies. These ding dong affairs not only impacts the core principles of global relations but also have its impact on politics and economy of the global ferment with Africa being the worst hit.
Method:
This study which is based on desk research has the task of examining the main ideas that govern Chinese and American relations in the world as well as the nature of politics that come into play in these relationships. While the Chinese built their relationships on liberalism (Idealist doctrine) through the soft power approach, American interaction is hinged around acquisition of Power (realism).
Results:
The study finds that as both countries are trying to outrival one another in the international environment, they expanded their military industrial complexes and extended their economic reach through invasion of every facet of African economy.
Conclusion:
It concluded that the USA is at a breaking point thus giving China the opportunity to take over global affairs.
Key contribution to knowledge:
The study took a deep look into the strategic and ideological thoughts of China and USA and how this interests have impacted the international system.
Recommendation:
It recommended that the United State should tread cautiously while China should avoid direct confrontation with the United States because the latter's military position in world affair is almost unbeatable.

Introduction

Realism and Liberalism represents two theoretical concepts which has clinched privileged position in international relations conceptual doctrine. Majority of the prominent intelligentsia contentions among international relations academics occurs either between, within or across the divide of both paradigms (Mearsheimer, 2002:71)

The financial catastrophe of the Western nations was a key adjustment in the power balance between China and the United States, though both governments have been unwilling to publicly acknowledge it. True to their character, Beijing has been completely quiet on the matter while USA has failed to agree that Beijing has become its equal in most aspects. While in public they are both in denial but behind, it is a different thing for China at least. Thus this has led to scholarly debate about its implication for the foreign policy of China. For more than 30 years since the commencement of the reform era, proclamation by Deng Xiaoping that China focus on scaling down of poverty, economic growth and guaranteeing that the global ferment of the Chinese as well as its interaction with the US, was favorable as attainable for realizing those goals, was resolutely followed. With the close of that era, a change in the foreign policy of Beijing has become conspicuous. The priority that was hitherto pursued to avoid a clash with US was dropped because the Chinese are now concerned on the best way to advance and express their international interest and responsibilities.

As for the USA, it is faced with more difficult roles as it has to contend with the reality of decrease of its global power, the role it is anxiously unprepared for. The regime of George Bush had declared some years ago about how the world will be remarked in the depiction of USA in the midst of an extravagant exaggeration of a modern American century. Despite the fact that the decrease of USA has been globally expressed and consented by a few, the discourse on what it meant has rarely commenced; surely, it is elevating and better to be a country that is expanding than decreasing. Beijing can perceive the expansion of its power in a way that within 20 years from now, it will exert more international influence and be superfluously wealthy than it is presently. For the USA, it is confronted with a contrasting milieu; a key decrease over time in its international role (Jacques, 2011). Although there are plethora of literature on China-USA global competition, however, this study is hinged around how both countries are deploying their various ideologies in dominating global politics and economy.

An Overview of the Realist Tradition

This school of thought came as a direct reaction to idealism. Most often, it is also referred to as power politics school. The realist, like the idealist, belongs to the positivist category. In addition, realism belongs to a rational realm of decision making. It views the global arena with pessimism, particularly on the issue of whether the globe would ever attain stability. Realism describes the global politics of the world, ‘as instead of the manner we may want it to be. It see the international system as a dangerous, competitive and secure place for the possible and capable where savagery is undesirable but domesticated’(Burchill, et al 2001:70) in the law that govern human nature. This school of thought represents an aspect of classical theories of global relations with several assumptions. The global ferment is anarchical. Power is the basis of state relations; states are propelled by self or national interest and they are the key player in the global politics (Dunne, et, 2020), not NGOs and MNCs. States are rational, unitary, pre-occupied by wealth accumulation to attain and consolidate their self-interest. In the area of global politics, Realists becomes pessimists. They are in agreement with the fact that the creation of a world devoid of crisis would be advantageous yet do not consider any effortless way to break away from the cruel world of security competitiveness and warfare. It is a beautiful idea to create a world that is devoid of crisis nonetheless, it is not practicable.

Realists seems to stress the enticing capacity of prevailing forces and the unavoidable persona of existing inclinations

and to maintain that the greatest wisdom hinged around the acceptance and adaptation of oneself to these inclinations and forces (Carr, 1962). This shallow perception of global relations is anchored on three central conclusions. Firstly, realists consider nations as the key players in global politics. Their major concentration is on the superpowers, this is due to the fact that it is nations that models control global politics and also responsible for fatal combats. Secondly, realists consider that attitude of superpowers is majorly determined by domains that are external to them and not internal considerations. The composition of the global arena which every country must face, mostly influence their external relations. Realists avoids drawing sharp divergences between nations that are bad and good because every superpower behaves in line with similar logic irrespective of their political system, belief system or those in charge of governance. Thirdly, realists believe strongly that power calculus dominates behavior of states and nations rival among themselves for power. Sometimes, this, competitiveness requires calling for warfare, which is seen as necessary tool statesmanship (Mearsheimer, 2002).

Realist states pursue their interest vigorously regardless of whose ox is gored. The interest can be security, economy or politics. Hence, US involvement in Panama, Cuba, Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya, Somalia and others just to achieve that vital interest which they considered as threat to international peace. Similarly, China has vigorously pursued its traditional non-interference policy in the domestic character of other nations. This only applies to crisis situation that may emanate either through regime change or economic woes, because presently, its presence is felt in almost all natural resource endowed countries in Africa which she entered through its soft-power approach.

The liberal tradition: an analytical discourse

Historically, liberalism emanated from the enlightenment; an 18th century era in Europe when political heads and great thinkers had a dominant faith that reason could be deployed to make the universe a better haven. Liberalists rejected many basic postulations that governed most foundational theories of government which includes; divine right of kings, hereditary position, absolute monarchy and institution of religion. The earliest liberal intellectual, John Locke, who is mostly associated with the formation of liberal doctrine as a marked philosophical belief, deployed the usage of social contract and natural right to contend that the laws were dependent on the assent of the citizens and that those in private domains had a fundamental right of liberty, property and life (Mearsheimer, 2002: Malouin, 2007). Accordingly, liberalists are of the hope for a peaceful and safer world in the future. Many liberalists are firm in their belief on the possibility of significantly lessening the menace of armed conflict and to expand global well-being. This explains why they are often referred to as idealist or utopianists.

Liberals positive perception about the global arena is hinged on a tripod. Firstly, liberals consider state as key actor in global politics. Secondly, liberalists argued firmly that domestic consideration of nations considerably differ and these varyness have intense impact on states character. They consider democracy (domestic consideration) as most preferred than dictatorship or other governmental forms. They believe in the existence of bad and good states. A state is good when it focus on collaborative strategies and barely on their own, start violent armed conflict whereas a nation that is bad starts war with other countries and are susceptible to deploying force to have their way. Hence, the only way to achieve peace is to ensure that the universe is populated with good countries.

Thirdly, liberalists are of the belief that power calculus does not matter much in the explanation of good states character. Other types of economic and political considerations are more important. Perhaps, the motivation of bad states is the quest to get power at others expense, but that is the result of misplaced reasoning. In a perfect society where only good states exist, power would be mostly insignificant (Mearsheimer, 2002).

Is America anti-liberalism? Not quite true. While the first World War was ongoing and shortly after the war, Woodrow Wilson campaigned against balance-of-power politics. In the closing era of the second World War, Roosevelt (1945) pronounced that in the coming world, power as suggestive in the concept of power politics must not be the dominating element in global relations. Similarly Clinton (1992) proclaimed, in a universe where liberty not absolutism is on the go, the pessimistic calculus of naked power politics simply do not reckon. It is unsuitable to a modern period.

China-US relations: application of liberalism and realism

An analysis of this study will anchor on two basic yet opposing theoretical perspectives to global relations and their appearances are worth revealing in this discourse. Generally, realists are of the view that in an anarchical globe, nations will behave in what is of best interest them regardless of others interests in other to expand their influence and power in tandem with other nations. Nevertheless, liberalists are slightly pessimistic trusting that even in a world of anarchy, nations will relate collaboratively for the betterment of one another and to expand the universal power and prosperity for everyone. Liberalists do not differentiate between states that are good and bad and often consider liberal democracies with free competitive market as the most ideal. Unsurprisingly, citizens of America seem to appreciate this viewpoint because it recognized the USA as a charitable entity in global politics and depicts its actual and prospective competitors as fallacious or hostile rabble-rouser. Foresee ably, this line of thought accentuated the pleasure that followed the ruination of Soviet Union and the termination of the Cold War. With the collapse of the Soviet Union, most American and European citizens agreed that democracy would expand throughout the world and that there would soon be an outbreak of global peace. This positivism was dependent heavily on the confidence that democratic America is a righteous nation. If every nation imitated the USA, the universe would be dominated by good states and this occurrence could translate to the collapse of global dispute (Mearsheimer, 2002).

Political theories on state rise are germane for dual purposes. First, the theories are necessary in unraveling the rationale and manner of Chinese considerable re-appearance on the global platform, including the provision of little understanding of what might take place in time to come. Second, it can also be utilize in splitting between sharply divergent political ideals concerning what is important when examining and forecasting the vital nature of global interaction in a universe that is mutually dependent and globalized. It is important to remember that the Chinese, even with their advancement in economic improvement, global opening and increasing inter-relationships, is still a communist state, hence the challenge inn engaging any theory of global relations. Nonetheless, liberal democracy might be deemed rational, despite the fact that authoritative communist leaders might not see it same way. Chinese may not adhere to standard rule as anticipated yet may be the first among the great powers to arise without not copying the model of the West or may be the first of the new wave of nations to emerge in the Eastern method or as Naazneen et al (2008) argued, Beijing will be able and is building a globe devoid of the West, a universe that is astonishingly free from the liberal

global order. Notwithstanding, international relations theories have their place, even under this situation, decoding the data and assisting to comprehend how Chinese will get on in the years ahead.

At its very foundation, realism possesses power politics-the hunt for the realization of relative power and the displaying. In line with this viewpoint, the global balance of power as China increases is of importance. Chinese pursuit for relative power and prestige will be a future of its external policy and a major component of its anticipated emergence as the predominant state in the region. Indeed, a dominant realist school, offensive-realism, suggest the emergence of superpower can usher in modern strategic conflict (Mearsheimer, 2001). For offensive realism, countries functioning in a world of anarchy are seeking security and if the level of security or power needed cannot be ascertained (or even achieve), then countries will not be satisfied with the power they have and will desire more of survival and security. Thus, its primary theme is to maximize share of global power; become the major power, and since no state is likely to realize global dominance, the universe is lost to eternal super power rivalry (Valeriano and Teo, 2003).

According to Mearsheimer, nations have a will to power simply because they don't just desire survival but to flourish in the global system; the objective is maximization of their share of global power. This relentless focus on power implies that superpowers are disposed to seek an occassion to adjust global power distribution in their interest. Put simply, super powers are destined for resentment. That means, power is a persistent objective for countries that offensively minded. The focus of offensive realism is on the exploits of superpowers and the paramount goal of the superpower is ascending the hegemonic role. To become an hegemonic power and commanding the global power balance is the only means a nation can be sure of its existence in an environment of anarchy.

Becoming an hegemonic nation is hinged around three conditions-a state must first achieve become regional hegemonic role; a mass land power and wealth and build nuclear arms. Each one constitutes a phase towards power and basically, power is realized through violent conflict, intimidation, threat, decoy, bleed strategy, and bloodbath (Mearsheimer, 2001). Like every study of realists, power remain the major means for the determination of action of a country however, the objective is to achieve power and not to uniformly disperse it (Waltz, 1979). Therefore, balance of power is not the desirable result since countries will at all time desire to achieve increased power and alter the balance (Valeriano and Teo, 2003). Since USA and China understands the superpower politics and both countries are leaders of their respective regions, to maintain this hegemonic leadership position, there is therefore the need to scrabble for wealth and land power abroad. This is the present role of Beijing and Washington.

Since it is difficult to determine the quantum of power that is sufficient for the present and the future, superpowers concede that the greatest means of ensuring their safety is the realization of hegemonic position, hence eradicating potential rivalry by any other superpower. Only an unreasonable country would jettison a chance of becoming hegemonic in an environment because it felt it already possess enough power for its survival (Mearsheimer, 2001). This perspective is captivating yet laced with pessimism and based on this explanation, the states of China is rising. It will not be satisfied with present balance of power and will thus find it almost not possible or exceedingly tasking to be a status quo nation. Its continuous economic military expansion with power politics of the region, it surely desires to boost its power to protect or attain preeminence. Assuredly, it might relate collaboratively and participate in

bi-lateral and multi-lateral arrangements, other organizations and establishments that subscribe to regional and global stabilness, good order, peace including economic and trade wellbeing. This might infer liberalism but from the position of realism, it is more than initiative which allows Beijing to secure influence and relative power. On the other hand, liberalists, constructivism and institutionalism view China as having gained from the advantages provided by a globalized and reciprocal universe, has persistently been a significant contributor to the status quo.

Just as the Japanese and Germans who after the second World War were completely united with the global world order, aspiring for peace and became significant partners in economy, political and trade. Based on this, China will be encouraged for what has taken place for more than three decades during which their country has taken a path of peace to achieve progress. On what basis should they now adjust their approaches? (Guo, 2006). The leaders of China assessed the gloomy incidents of previous conflicts of China with neighbors and some powers and came to the conclusion that it will be difficult for China to attain its objectives of economic modernity and growth through contestation and clahses (Sutter, 2005).

Although this does not rule out the possibility to seek power in favour of national interest which is a perspective of realism yet it seem for the little while that liberalism may be more suitable. To maintain and proceed on its path of economic progress, China motivates and contribute to a peaceful global ferment and ingress to markets for export. Hence, China has weighed down in certain actions; its intuitive realist attitude in the last few years, and this has to go on so as to limit the possibility chance of confrontation and eschew a withdrawal into under-performance. Despite the remarkable build-up of its military which has undoubtedly contributed to regional tension, the Chinese have had several decades of peaceful growth. These are good signs that will be sustained hence, its external policy attitude has continually been in tandem with that of a status quo nation (Goldstein, 2008). The emergence of China has evoked international apprehension and awareness, and as (Guo, 2006) opined, combating an expanding China, there has been growing weariness, fright and misgiving across the globe, especially from the USA. It has gotten to a level where it has been identified both as an opposition and direct threat to the hegemonic position of USA in the region. The Chinese will ensure they sustain their dominant position to the point that no country in Asia will have what it takes to oppose them. In due course, the neighbours of China will align with a balancing coalition led by USA which is conceived to curtail the expansion of China almost same way England, Paris, Berlin, Rome, Tokyo, Beijing and Washington were united in the Cold War era to checkmate the Soviet Union (Mearsheimer, 2010).

Of particular worries to political theorists is the regional advancement of China. Present, is the threat rhetoric of belligerent China, contending that the rise of China as hegemonic leader in North East Asia region will be one of the greatest savagely challenge that will in the beginning of the 21st century, confront the USA (Stivachtis, 2007).In several ways, the Chinese are imitating the appearance of USA as a superpower, the greatest and prospectively most dominant Asian country, is striving in the region for increasing economic, military and political position and also daring the current USA domination in East Asian region. The expectation is that an influential China will attempt to thrust out America from the region of Asia-Pacific, same way America in the 19th Century, shoved away superpowers of Europe from Western Hemisphere (Mearsheimer, 2010).

Aware of this influence, leaders of China are conscious of the global anxiety created by its speedy emergence as military and economic

power and has been eager to depict itself as a friendly, valuable and peaceful state, resurging as a great country. Emerging peacefully or frequently mentioned as peaceful development, has witnessed China advancing within a steady globalal system peacefully and not as a menace or a destabilizing entity. Juxtaposing the manner in which rising powers have historically plundered the resources of other countries through occupation, conquest, encroachment and warfare to promote their own aspirations and avarice, thus far, the state of China has peacefully risen. It has been cautious in ensuring that its economic and political relationships with other countries are blossoming and fine (Bijain, 2005), however, these relationships are skewed towards China's development to the detriment of its partners through its soft-approach and going global strategy.

China-US Power relations: who hold the ace?

Some analyst are of the view that the spectacular accomplishment of the Chinese in prevailing over the financial catastrophy and its greater possession of dollars have improved its power over the USA. However, a diligent examination focus more intimately on power and interdependence. Interdependence comprises short term sensitivity and long run vulnerability. As been used, sensitivity means the quantum and tempo of the impact of reciprocal reliance, that is, how speedily does change in one part of an entity lead to change in another area? For example in 1988, weakness in emerging markets in Asia had an infectious impact that cut across other developing economies in Russia and Brazil. Also in 2008, the Lehman Brothers disintegration in New York swiftly impacted economies throughout the globe. Vulnerability means the costs of changing the shape of an entity of interdependence. Vulnerability generates more power in relationships than sensitivity. The less vulnerable of two nations is not necessarily the less sensitive but instead the one that would sustain lower costs from adjusting the condition (Hu and Kahn, 1997).

The USA in 1998, was not vulnerable but sensitive to the economic situation of East Asia. The financial cataclysm reduced America's growth rate by 0.5 percent of but having a market that is burgeoning, it could afford it. Contrastingly, Indonesia was vulnerable and also sensitive to adjustment in investment patterns and international trade. It faced severed domestic crisis due to economic dysfunction. Also vulnerability entail magnitude. For instance, given the illusional circumstances of its subprime mortgage market and its increasing deficits in 2008, the USA demonstrated further vulnerableness than it had been when its market was booming in preceding years. Symmetry means a condition of relatively balanced as against unbalanced, dependence. To be non-dependent can be a power source. If two entities are inter-dependent and one appear lesser than the other, the less dependent one has a power source as long as they mutually cherish the inter-dependent friendship.

Maneuvering the asymmetries of inter-dependence is a significant element of economic power. Perfect symmetry is fairly uncommon hence, many issue of economic inter-dependence also comprise a prospective power relationship. When President Ronald Reagan increased expenditures and reduced taxes in the 1980s, the USA afterwards reliant on imported capital from Japan for stability of its federal government budget. Some opined that Japanese then had immense power over the USA but at the other side, Japan would hurt itself including the USA if to its lending to USA. The economy of Japan was a little above half the size of the economy of USA It then means that Japan needed the market of USA for its exports more than the USA needed Japan, although they needed each other and are benefitting from the inter-dependence (Wagner, 1988).

Presently, same interaction has emerged between Chinese and Americans. Americans accepted imports from China and pays China in dollars while the Chinese possess the dollars of USA and bonds thus making a loan to the Americans. Chinese has accumulated around $2.5 trillion of foreign exchange reserves, much of it kept in U.S. treasury securities. A number of spectators have explained this as a critical adjustment in the international power balance because the Chinese could humble Americans through threat of its dollars sale. In doing so however, China would not only cut the worth of its reserves as dollar price fell, also, it would endanger America's readiness to continually import cheap goods from China which could lead to loss of job and unstableness in China. While attempting to bring America to its knees by dumping its dollars, China could also be strangulating its own economy.

None between China and America will want to obliterate the balance of asymmetries that binds them, America has has given chance for a steady growth of China's influence in global gathering including increased influence in other developing markets. Therefore, the forum of G-8, where Europe is represented by four of the eight nations, has been broadened by a G-20 summit that comprises of markets representing 80%t of global products. Such for a has debated the necessity of to rebalancing flow of finance, adjusting the previous method of America's deficits matching the surpluses of China. Such alteration would demand politically arduous adjustment in local consumption and investment styles with America multiplying its savings and China multiplying local consumption (Halifax Initiative, 2009).

Although these adjustments may not happen swiftly, it is noteworthy that the G-20 has accepted that the weight of European votes in IMF should be lessened while China and other developing markets should expand theirs steadily. Again, this proves the significance of the restrictions on power of economic inter-dependent. There could be a threat from China to dispose of its dollars holdings and destroy the economy of USA while a diminished America's economy would imply a miniature market for China's exports and the government of USA might retarliate with tariffs against goods from China. Further, as other developing economies like Brazil and India find their exports impaired by an underrated China's currency, they may utilize a multi-lateral platform like the G-20 to strenghten the USA's stance against China (Rathbone, 2010; Nye, 2010a, 2011;Koehane and Nye, 1977). Both nations are not in hurry to distort the symmetry of their vulnerabile inter-dependence but each continues to contend to pattern the institutional and shape of their market interactions (Nye, 2010b).

U.S.- China Power relations: the role of the economy

When the 1990s came to an end, America's economy was the largest in the globe. In the year 2000, its overall worth of every goods and services produced or its Gross National Product (GNP) stood at $9.9 trillion as against $2.1 trillion of Germany and $4.1 trillion of Japan. In the 1st quarter of 2015, America's GNP reduced to $16, 371.40 billion from $16, 377.70 billion in the 4thquarter of 2014 while that of China rosefrom 566, 130.20 CNY in 2013 to 634, 367.30 CNY in 2014 (NBS China, 2015; Almond et al, 2004).

The United States dollar continues as the global primary monetary unit, the worth of many country's legal tender is measured traditionally by how many Yen, Pounds, francs, euro, rubble, and other units it is partly exchanged for or fully for a dollar. A few economists have agreed that economic dominance of USA has come to an end. For several decades, America which was the prominent creditor country in the globe, has become the greatest debtor state on earth, due partly to the fact that it continually purchase

billions of dollars of foreign products than foreigners buy USA products and also partly a result of the perennial huge deficits in the budget of federal government. The stockpiled gross national debt as at 1997 stood at $5.2 trillion and rose in 2015 to $18,152,809,942,589 trillion (Almond et al, 2004; Concord Coalition. 2015; US Bureau of Economic Analysis, 2015) and currently stands at about $34, 578, 161, 115, 189 trillion (PGPF, 2023).

America has been held liable for the not-too-long financial calamity. As its economy struggle and China's economy continually expand in the 2008-2009 recession, authors in China floated a sea of diminishing narratives about America. It was speculated that the year 2000 was high point of America's power projection. China wasn't alone in this as it was claimed that the time it is expected that the largeness of China's economy will exceed that of America in 2027 and almost twice in 2050, nevertheless Chinese citizens will still remain poor than those of United States. In a research center poll of 2009,large proportion in the 13 of 25 nations agreed that China will topple America as the leading superpower of the world even as the government of United States national intelligence council in 2008 forecasted that the dominance of United States would in 2025 be encouraged(Fu Mengzhi, cited in Geoff Dyer, 2009).

The global economic forum still estimates the economy of America as next to Switzerland in terms of competitiveness in the globe because of adaptability of its labour market, higher education, political stableness, innovation openness while in the areas of bio-technology, nano-technology and the second generation of the world wide web, Chinese is rated 29; that is, America still ahead. However, while it is expected by some that the Chinese will militarily exceeds America in the next 20 years, a lot of persons still see the conflict as transformational in soft power relationship (liberalism) and economic. Therefore, it is significant to concentrate on the consequences of the conflict so as to examine the economic power interactions between USA and China (Nye, 2010a).

Funding remains one of the significant part of any state's military, as rightly opined by Frederick the Great and Napoleon, the army often matches on its stomach (Martyris, 2015). Available funds to the military at any point in time are specifically significant, hence bearing in mind the economic posture of the two countries should be deemed significant in comprehending their military capacity. The foremost thing to note is that America external debt is more than that of the Chinese thrice, but it is noteworthy that this figure in present times has been enormously expanded by the Chinese as it has swiftly develop the country's infrastructure. Thus in juxtaposing the economic strength of both countries, it is not wholly justifiable to mention the America's greater national debt as being severely important. Surely, the two nations are notably indebted, this must be seen as major economic issues for both countries.

In the meantime, America's defense budget guaranteed that it stays ahead of Chinese for many years to come. In 2014, the military expenditure as estimated by SIPRI in $billions of ten countries include: U.S. 609, Russia, 84, China 236; India 50, UK, 60, France 62; South Korea 36; Germany 46, Japan 45, Turkey 22. These countries are considered as having the strongest military. The U.S. expenditure alone is almost same with the combined total of the other nine nations. America's defense budget rose to $637 billion in 2015, which quadruple that of China with the current defense budget of China totaling around $131 billion. The most notable part of the two countries is that the Chinese has remained an enormous bearer of treasury of the U.S. This implies that Beijing and Washington have interests that are common to them and hopefully could open the way for a harmonious friendship between both great powers (Value walk, 2015).

The great powers balance: a comparism of American and Chinese military

Thus far, the Chinese has focused on economic reforms and as it became increasingly cosy with its economic progress and posture, it is likely to divert its endeavour to other aspects. China knows that its continual progress in the economy which a lot relies, is dependent upon the stability of the international system but, if however, it perceives the needs to secure or build interest of its own, it may be tempted to deploy its new discovered influence and power to lighter peaceful result. Thus far, it is expanding and overhauling its military and growing to be increasingly opinionated over disputed territories as in with Taiwan; India over Tibet and several others over the spratly Paracel Island. Not to mention its dispute over its right to perpetually govern Hong Kong and its crisis with Japan over the East China Sea. This of course is a realist approach. Asia has continue to be a place of danger where power is still important. To China, this military power is associated with influence, honour, status and position, accomplishment that a country flaunts and possesses. Under this circumstance, China is said to be a 19th century power politics state with the believe that its survival and achievements is dependent on economic strength, but what counts essentially, is military strength. Currently, China posses the financial capability to modernize and expand its military and has plough significant resources on this lately. As the Chinese can attest for (which they emulated from Japan), flourishing nation and strong military should be approached (Kagan, 2008; Blumanthal, 2009).

The geo-political needs of China can be assisted through an expanded military that is highly technolicalized; the protection of its sovereignty and providing the capability to extend its frontiers and supports beyond the pacific ocean and deep inside India ocean. The Chinese realizes this inter-relatedness of the international context including the prerequisite to own the military ability to secure its interests and to fly its nation's emblem. The 2006 White Paper defense of China opined that, never before has the Chinese been so interwoven with other nations of the globe as it presently is (Xinhua News, 2006). Prior to this time, the strategic creed of China was to focus on defense of the fatherland and the frontiers particularly in areas of dispute. In achieving this resposnbility, it has a large military forces particularly those that was design and built for extended attritional warfare on its native land. As it Presently perceives comfortability in its frontiers, there is a minute hostility of assault or conquest, it is carrying out an outstanding modification of this forces to allow a distance operation, thus ensuring strategic deepness including the ability to withstand highly technological regional opposition. Originally designed as a reaction to the issue of Taiwan, these capacities enables action father Taiwan. Although China has always described the provision of these this forces for local wars purposes.

Irrespective as to whether the Chinese are involved in promoting trade agreement without American dollar; purchasing a number of the largest companies in d globe; taking possession of foreign housing markets or developing gigantic webs of wind or nuclear power grids, it is certain that China is without doubt, a global power. To be regarded a powerful force, China must have the capacity to support its political and economic strength with a top level armed forces. The Chinese is still a greenhorn when it comes to spending on armed forces. Despite the fact that of it increase in modern times, it is still trailing Britain, France, Germany, Japan, Russia, Turkey, Republic of Korea, and the USA. Nevertheless, China covered this gap with its population size. In the area of military spending, China happens to be the second highest globally with an approximate of $216 billion annually which represent around one-

third of Americas. In terms of GDP, its yearly GDP on armed forces is around 2.1% while America spending stands at about 3.8%.

What may possibly be the greatest difference between both powers is the influence outside their territories. America controls 133 military bases across the globe while China has none and of specific importance is the fact that the USA has bases in across several territories surrounding China including Afghanistan, Diego Garcia, Guam, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Republic of Korea, Singapore, and, several other Islands in and around the Indian Ocean (Valuewalk, 2015). As diplomatic anxiety develops between China and USA, thus some pessimist have conceived the notion of a possible military squabble. Under this circumstances, it is instructive and fascinating to contrast the military capacities both great powers. For several years now, America happens to have the biggest economy in the globe but recently, some scholars have argued that the Chinese has surpassed, at least in terms of GDP. This placed both countries on an undisputed pedestral which in several forms guarantees the presence of innate hostility among them (Morris, 2015).

Table 1: Military weapons in the arsenal of both countries

Army	China	U.S.	Navy	China	U.S	Air-force	China	U.S.
Battle tanks	6450	2338	Aircraft Carriers	1	10	Aircraft	2239	1410
Light tank	950	1900	Cruisers	0	22	Helicopters	50	143
AIFV	3850	4559	Destroyers	17	62	Air defence	16600	N.A
APC	5020	25209	Frigates	54	11			
Artillery	13178	5923	Submarines	70	73			
Helicopters	501	4191	PCC	223	55			
Air defence	7672	1207	Mine Warfare	53	11			
			Amphibious Ships	241	276			
			Aircraft	332	1150			
			Helicopters	103	685			

Source: Lopez and Cedric(2015).

At the nuclear fronts and in line with the non-proliferation treaty (NPT), China and America remains among the five nuclear countries. This multi-lateral arrangement guaranteed legitimately under global controls for USA and China to keep specific number of nuclear weapons. Following the policy Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) that was executed in the Cold War era, America remains the biggest nuclear power globally in the areas of overall warheads, even though there are certain estimates suggesting that Russia surpassed its outcome moderately with less than 5,000 lively warheads. It is noteworthy that there are considerable variations in the approximation of' nuclear potentials of America. Contrastingly, nuclear weapons stock of the Chinese has not been recorded properly but normally assumed to be within the neighborhood of 250 nuclear war heads (Morris, 2015).

On the reality of military spending and capabilities of both countries, it was noted that, following many decades of double digit expenditure, military expansion of China is restricted to its territory while the frontiers of America's. military comprises historical affinity with traditional trusted confidants, geographic distribution and highly advanced technology including income through export of ammunitions. This comment suggests that China shivers when America sneezes.

However one writer noted that most strategic thinkers in USA appears to affirm that as long America put much military pressure China will surrender. However, the present China is no longer subjected to the oppression or torment of America. Under the current Chinese leader Xi Jinping, the more aggressive posture taken by America, the more confident reaction China will take. This is the present truth of China's external policy (Lopez and Cedric, 2015; Zhang, 2015)

China-U.S. Relations: The Scrabble for Africa

The partitioning of Western Africa by the powers of Europe two decades prior to the close of the 19th century, is the major significant events of its past. This resulted from the concluding occurrence in the sequence of activities in the 19th century that eventually brought West Africa, and the rest of the continent, except Liberia and Ethiopia, under colonial governance. This division is frequently called the scrabble for Africa due to the speed and the busy brawl with which the powers of Europe; Belgium, Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Portugal and Spain mapped out Africa's division among one another. Though the date of the beginning of the scrabble remains controversial, 1879 is now popularly accepted because France which happened to be a key player in the scrabble until 1879, didn't attain political stableness. The French were greatly perturbed with the 1830, 1848 revolutions and with the 1870-71 Franco-German war. In 1879 however, the republicans that favored imperial extension, toppled the crown while the great French imperialist, Jules Ferry, was chosen as Prime Minister. Same year, Jules Ferry sent Savorgnan de Brazza, an explorer to acquire the North Bank of the Congo for France so as to challenge the occupation of King Leopold of Belgium in the Congo. The struggle for territories by both powers in that area in company of its global effects triggered the scrabble (Onwubiko, 1970).

The end of colonialism signaled the independence and sovereignty of African states. However, a new pattern of scrabble commenced in Africa with the United States leading the charge and becoming a dominant nation. As China began the modernization process, Africa became its focal point, thus taking over from the U.S., hence, one scholar observed,

As America was showing off its strength in Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya presently in Syria, and farther into other countries, taking a lesser vocal and more efficacious attitude of soft power in penetrating regions that are deserted. The duty of a pacemaker among emerging sponsors of the advanced economy was clearly grabbed by China that has entrenched itself as the foremost trade associate and important investor both in Africa and in the region that for centennial had been considered as the America's enclosure (Volkhonsky, 2012).

Contemporary economic and political relationships between Africa and China started in Mao Zedong era, the Chinese communist party earliest leader, after the civil war of China. Beginning in the 21st century, the contemporary nation of the People's Republic of China has established progressively powerful economic link with Africans. In the African continent, there are about 1,000,000 Chinese residents (Economist, 2013) while about 200,000 Africans works and live in China (Matthews and Yang, 2012). In the 1990s, there was 700% increment in trade relationships between Africa and China (Le-Monde, 2005) and presently, China is Africa's biggest business partner (Wonacott, 2011).

Created in the tenth month of year 2000, forum on China-Africa cooperation (FOCAC) became the formal platform for strengthening this friendship. Nations like Britain and USA have expressed apprehension regarding Chinese economic, military and political roles in the continent of Africa. The ministry of foreign affairs of China stresses Chinese development assistance to Africa while it also

announced that Africa and China are working closely to preserve the legitimate rights of third world nations and pushing for the formation of a contemporary, just and equitable economic and political order across the globe (MFA, 2002). Wide-range structural projects, frequently followed by concessional funding are suggested to richly endowed states in Africa. What is common is that Chinese sponsors construction of infrastructure that includes airports, dams, rail, roads, dams and ports. These amenities assist in transporting natural resources to China while giving China the bargaining-chip to acquire the rights to drill and explore. Relations are mostly carried out through trade and diplomacy while another key area is military assistance through supply of arms and other equipments.

China and western nations have various perspectives to Africa's resource market and manner of building it. Strategy of the West is hinged on the Washington consensus wherein human rights is at the front burner while China's tactic is centered on the Beijing consensus. Between 1980 and 2006, the volume of trade between Africa and Chine rose from US$1 billion to US$55 billion thus confirming Chinese as the second biggest African trading partner following the USA with a trade volume of US$91 billion. As at 2012, Africa-China trade has increased to US$163.9 billion (Wonacott, 2011). Chinese corporations, mainly private entities, estimatedly around 800, are trading in Africa, investing in areas of banking, energy and infrastructure. concessional and reduced-rate credit lines (rates at 1.5% across 15-20 years) have replaced the extreme compacted and subjugative loans of the West. Since 2000, China has cancelled over $10bn in debt owed it by African states (Le-Monde, 2009)

America, France and Britain are major Chinese contenders in the economic and diplomatic flight into Africa. At a time, Britain and France were the foremost trading partners with Africa until lately when in 2009China became the biggest business partner with an estimated trade worth of US$90 billion. While America came second with $86 billion trade worth. Despite evidence of continental economic growth through export of commodity to China, pundits contend that exports from China to Africa including China's trading systems, have hampered parts of the continent's development but more encouraging than the miniature or absence of improvement forthcoming from Europe or USA. Chinese have continue to extend their African regional influence on commercial, cultural and diplomatic fronts while working for a stable and secured continent for continuous profits.

In the meantime, the West has always viewed China-Africa relations as neo-colonialism. As Tull Denis puts it:

In aspects of the economy, China was occasionally accused of economic sabotage. Due to Chinese natural resources focus, there's contention that relationship between Africa and China is unequal and formed a single street for the region and reduced its possibility for economic growth. Politically, Chinese non-interference principle in internal matters of other countries is described as see no evil perspective that is deemed to compromise democracy and human rights in Africa (2008:5)

This was re-echoed by Hillary Clinton then US Secretary of State during a press conference in Lusaka,' China is guilty of carrying out neo- colonialism in Africa. China is not a good model for governance (Murray, 2011). In hindsight, the foregoing statement is a thinly veiled allusion to Chinese increased trade and commercial relations with Africans but viewed from a foreign policy context, it is perhaps one of U.S. foreign policy instruments (i.e, propaganda) aimed at weakening, and eventually displacing Beijing's foothold in the continent.

Conclusion and recommendations

Realism and Liberalism possesses historical traditional intellectualism within global political study and both have long evolved to become grown-ups philosophical doctrine. A greed that rationale for politics is contention for power, realists affirmed that the prudence of nations and its leaders can compel them to focus their external policy on the existence of a Darwin nation-eat-nation universe (Falode, 2009) wherein power is central to national survival. Liberalism on the other hand argues that if sense and reason could be employed in taking decisive actions by men and nations, society would be a desirable clime. Accordingly, liberalism is a hopeful concept on the prospect of changing the universe and making it more peaceful and safer as several liberalists believes in the possibility of substantially reducing war plagues and expand global well-being, hence their utopianist or idealist identity

History has shown trade achievements, military might, wealth acquisition, economic growth and commerce extension frequently led to increased international contestation than international collaboration. It was hopeful that with the collapse of cold war, countries would imbibe democratic liberalism, conflicts and wars world be a thing of the past while states would concentrate on economic harmonization based on equal win scenario instead on involving in avoidable conflicts and contestation. This hope was that nations would eschew realist power politics and contestation and confrontation and embrace soft-power engagement where there's presence of peaceful consultations and all-round success and development.

The continuous debate among scholars about China's rise to global stardom and its possibility of overtaking the United States in no distant time (though according to some, it has already does), including their ideologies of dealing with other nations in the global market place, exhume the long standing debate among realist and liberal scholars. While dealing with other nations in terms of trade and investment, China adopted a 'going-global strategy which she implemented through the 'soft-power' approach (liberalism). This involves the uninvolvement in the internal matters of its partners including desire to assist debtor nations to cancel their debts while also assisting developing nations to build social infrastructure.

At the other end, America continues to adopt its realist tradition of dealing with its partners. It interferes in the affairs of other states where its interest seems threatened while turning a blind eye to abuses committed by its friends and allies. While China has gained and continues to gain more grounds in global affairs, the United States continues to lose friends and allies. Africa, which for decades has been the United States backyard, has become a sitting room to China. Hence the conclusion that the USA is in the place of demise which has allowed China to take over, should be taken cautiously. China should avoid direct confrontation with the United States because the latter's military position in world affair is unbeatable. Despite this position, it is Geoff (2009) opinion that though the financial cataclysm hit America, disparity between the globe and USA is so extensive and other economies are extremely committed to America to the effect that any significant adjustment cannot alter USA relative status on global affairs.

References

Almond, G., Powell, B., Strom, K. and Dalton, R. (2004). Comparative Politics Today: A World View. New Jersey: Pearson Education.

Bijian, Z. (2005). China's Peaceful Rise to Great-Power Status. *Foreign Affairs*, September/ October. Available at:

https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/asia/2005-09- 01/chinas-peaceful-rise-great-power-status, accessed June 22, 2024.

Blumembal, D. (2009). The Erosion of U.S. Power in Asia. *Far Eastern Economic Review*, May 1. Available at: https://www.aei.org/publication/the-erosion-of-u-s-power-in-asia/, accessed June 22, 2024

Burchill S., Richard, D. and Andrew, L. (2001). Theories of International Relations. New York: Palgrave

Carr, E. (1962). The Twenty Years Crisis, 1919-1939. London: Macmillan.

Clinton, B. (1992). Campaign on US. Role. *New York Times*, October 2. Available at: http://www.nytimes.com/1992/10/02/us/the-1992-campaign-excerpts-from-speech-by-clinton-on-us-role html, accessed June 4, 2024.

Concord Coalition (2015). US Total National Debt. Available at: http;//www.voncordcoalition.org/us-total-national

debt?gclid=CNrW9OK2vccCFcHnGwod06EE9w, accessed June 22, 2024.

Dunne, T., Milja, K. and S. Steve (2020). International Relations Theory: Discipline and Diversity (5th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press

Falode, A. (2009). The Theoretical Foundation of Realism. *Nigeria Journal of International Affairs*, 35(2); 35-48

Fu, M. quoted in Geoff Dyer (2009). The Dragon Stirs. *Financial Times*, September 24. Available at: http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/671a76ec-a950-11de-9b7f-00144feabdc0.html#axzz3k54QpzzJ, accessed June 28, 2024.

Geoff, D. (2009). The Dragon Stirs. *Financial Times*, September 24. Available at: http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/671a76ec-a950-11de-9b7f-

00144feabdc0.html#axzz3k54QpzzJ, accessed June 28, 2024.

Goldstein, A. (2008). Rising to the Challenge: China's Grand Strategy and International Security. Stanford: University Press.

Guo, S. (ed.) (2006). China's Peaceful Rise in the 21st Century: Domestic and International Conditions. San Francisco: Ashgate.

Halifax Initiative, (2009).Other - G-8, G-20 and UN. May 15. Available at: https://halifaxinitiative.org/content/other-g-8-g-20-and-un, accessed July 26, 2024.

Hu, z. and M.S. Khan, (1997). Why is China Growing so Fast? *Economic Issues*, Number 8. New York: International Monetary Fund.

Jacques, M. (2011). A New Balance of Power Requires a U.S.-China Modus Vivendi. The German Marshall Fund of the United States, January 20.

Kagan, R. (2008). The Return of History and the End of Dreams. New York: Knopf.

Koehane, R. and Nye, J. (1977). Power and Independence: World Politics in Transition. Boston: Little Broom.

Le-Monde, D. (2005). China's Trade Safari in Africa – 11 May. Available at: http//mondediplo.com/2005/05/11 chinafrica, accessed June 25, 2024.

Lopez, L. and Cedric, S. (2015). INFOGRAPHIC: Balance of Superpowers-Comparing the Armed Forces of US and China. *South China Morning Post*, June 3. Available at: http://www.scmp.com/infographics/article/1815609/infographic-balance-superpowers, accessed June 23, 2024.

Malouin, P. (2007). Cosmopolitikos Note: Liberalism (Theory of International Relations. Available at:

http:%2Fwww.cosmopolitikos.com%2Fliberalism%2Fpdf, accessed June 4, 2024.

Matthews, G. and Yang, Y. (2012). How Africans Pursue Low-End Globalization in Hong Kong and Mainland China. *Journal of Current Chinese Affairs*, 41(2): 95-121.

Martyris, N. (2015). Appetite for War: What Napoleon and his Men Ate on the March. Available at; http://www.npr.org/sections/thesalt/2015/06/18/414614705/appetite-for-war-what-napoleon-and -his -men-ate-on-the-march, accessed June 22, 2024.

Mearsheimer, J. (2001). The Tragedy of Great Power Politics. New York: Norton.

Mearsheimer, J. (2002). Liberal Talk, Realist Thinking. University of Chicago Magazine, 4 (3): 24-28.

Mearsheimer, J. (2010). The Gathering Storm: China's Challenge to US Power in Asia. *The Chinese Journal of International Politics*, 3 (4): 381-396.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China (MFA), (2002). China-Africa Relations. April 25. Available at: htttp://www.fmprc.gov.cn/mfa_eng/ziliao_665539/3602_665543/3604_665547/tl8059.shtml, accessed June 26, 2024.

Morris, C. (2015). U.S. vs. China: Military Might. *Valuewalk*, June 5. Available at: http://www. valuework.com/2015/06/us-vs-china-military-might-comparison, accessed June 23, 2024

Murray, E. (2011), U.S Attempts at Countering Chinese Influence in Africa. *The Current Analyst*, October 10. Available at: http://www.currentanalyst.com/, accessed June, 2024.

Naazneen, B., Ely, R. and Steve, W. (2008). Chinese Ways. *Foreign Affairs*, May/June. Available at: https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/asia/2008-05-03/chinese-ways, accessed June 28, 2024.

National Bureau of Statistics of China (NBS, China) (2015). China Gross National Product, 1952-2015. Available at: http:///www.tradingeconomics.com/china/gross-national-product, accessed June 22, 2024.

Nye, J. (2010a). American and Chinese Power after the Financial Crisis. *The Washington Quarterly*, 33(4): 143-153.

Nye, J. (2010b). The Dollar and the Dragon. *Project Syndicate*, July 12. Available at: https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/the-dollar-and-the-dragon, accessed July 27, 2024.

Nye, J. (2011). The Future of Power. New York: Public Affairs.

Onwubiko, C. (1970). School Certificate History of West Africa, 1800-Present. Onitsha: Africana Educational Publishers.

Peter, G. Peterson Foundation (PGPF), (2023). What is the National Debt Today? Available at: https://www.pgpf.org/national-debt-clock?gad_source=1&gclid=EAIaIQobChMIgKj5rKSLhQMVE5pQBh2YAwWLEAAYASAAEgLt1PD_BwE, accessed March 23, 2024.

Rathbone, P. (2010). BRICS Balance Shared Interests with Rivalries. *Financial Times*, April 14.

Roosevelt, F. (1945). State of the Union Address. January 6. Available at: http://www.thisnation.com/library/sotu/1945fdr.html, accessed June 4, 2024.

Stivachtis, Y. (2007). International Order in a Globalizing World. Aldershot, England: Ashgate.

Sutter, R. (2005). China's Rise in Asia: Promises and Perils. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield)

The Economist, (2013). Africa and China: More than Minerals. 23 March. Available at: http://www.economist.com/news/middle-east -and-africa/21574012-chinese-trade-africa-keeps-growing-fears-neocolonialism-are-overdone-more, accessed June 25, 2024.

Tull, D. (2008). China in Africa: European Perception and Responses to the Chinese Challenge. African Studies Program: The Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies, Working Papers in African studies, Washington, DC. Available at: http://www.sais-jhu.edu/academics/regional-studies/Africa, accessed June 25, 2024.

United States Bureau of Economic Analysis, (2015). United States Gross National Product, 1952-2015. Available at: http://www.tradingeconomics.com/united-states/gross-national-product(Accassed, accessed June 22, 2015.

Valeriano, B. and Teo, K. (2003). The Tragedy of Offensive Realism: Testing Aggressive Power Politics Models. A Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, Portland, February 25-March 1.

Valuewalk, (2015). China vs United States: Military Power Comparison. July 15. Availiable at: http://www.valuewalk.com/2015/07/china-vs-us-military-power-comparison/, accessed June 22, 2024.

Volkhonsky, B. (2012). The Scramble for Africa: Another U.S. Battleground to Challenge, Supplant China. *Global Research*, August 8.

Wagner, R.H. (1988). Economic Interdependence, Bargaining Power and Political Influence. *International Organization*, 42(3): 461-483.

Waltz, K. (1979. Theory of International Politics, Reading: Addison-Wesley.

Wonacott, P. (2011). In Africa, U.S. Watches China's Rise. *The Wall Street Journal,* September 2. Available at:http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424053111903392904576510271838147248, accessed June 26, 2024.

Xinhua News, (2006). China's National Defense in 2006. December 29. Available at: http://news.xinhuanet.com/English/2006-12/29/content_5547029.htm, accessed June 23, 2024.

Zhang, F. (2015). Provoking Beijing in the South China Sea will only Backfire on Washington. *Foreign Policy*, May 21. Available at: http://foreignpolicy.com/2015/05/21/united-states-provoke-beijing-south-china-sea-air-defense-identification-zone/, accessed June 23, 2024.