DKI APCSS SECURITY NEXUS

The DKI APCSS journal for comprehensive security issues throughout the Indo-Pacific region and the world!

Security Nexus Perspective

WHERE MAPS BLUR AND RIVERS SPEAK

China, India, and the Contest for the Eastern Himalayas

By Shyam Tekwani

Abstract:
As India suspends the Indus Waters Treaty, attention must shift eastward, toward a quieter, more dangerous front in the eastern Himalayas. At the tri-junction of Bhutan, China, and India, territorial claims, spiritual stakes, and water politics are converging at high altitude with little warning structure and diminishing trust. This essay unveils the fragility beneath the fog, where military buildup meets glacial melt, and the absence of crisis architecture makes miscalculation more likely than resolution.

India's suspension of the decades-old Indus Waters Treaty in April 2025 marked more than a rupture with Pakistan. It signaled a broader shift in South Asia's strategic temperament. While the tremor was felt westward, its quiet echoes carried far to the east, into a lesser-watched frontier where Bhutan, China, and India meet in the folds of the eastern Himalayas.

At the heart of this high-altitude triangle lies Arunachal Pradesh, a state perched in cloud and controversy, claimed by India, coveted by China, and watched warily by Bhutan. Beijing calls it 'South Tibet'; Delhi considers it sovereign ground. But this is more than a border dispute. It is a collision of maps and memory, of rivers and religion, of terrain and time. To borrow from Mamang Dai, Arunachal's most luminous literary voice, "the hills have withheld their stories," but geopolitics is now coaxing them out, one trench, one outpost at a time.

The fault lines are old. They trace back to the 1914 Simla Convention, where British India sketched the McMahon Line across Himalayan ridges. China rejected it then, and rejects it still. India, over decades, wove the region into its electoral fabric and military posture, formally renaming the Northeast Frontier Agency (NEFA) to Arunachal Pradesh in 1972. Sovereignty was not just declared; it was built, village by village, road by road.

The most charged point of contact is Tawang, a town not merely of tactical value but of spiritual weight. It is the birthplace of the sixth Dalai Lama, a sacred site in Tibetan Buddhism, and a symbol Beijing sees as integral to its hold on Tibet. For India, it is inviolate. As the question of the Dalai Lama's succession looms, so too does the prospect of a deeper confrontation.

Across the eastern sector, the mountains have grown more crowded. China has spent years reshaping the Tibetan plateau with extensive dual-use infrastructure: highways, tunnels, roads and rail lines that bring the frontier within reach of rapid deployment. India, once slow to move, is now matching stride for stride, carving roads into rock, constructing the Sela Tunnel, establishing forward bases, and reviving long-neglected corps. Still, the terrain plays tricks, and the Line of Actual Control (LAC) remains what it has always been: not a line, but a blur. Past agreements meant to preserve the peace now hang like faded parchment - present, but powerless.
In a remote sector near Tawang, an Indian patrol unit sets out before dawn. The fog moves faster than the men, swallowing their visibility within minutes. Radios crackle with partial coordinates; boots slip on frost-covered rock. Somewhere across the ridgeline, a Chinese unit may be doing the same; separated by distance, language, and a line that exists more in perception than precision. No shots are fired, no flag is raised; only a lone soldier, hand lifted to the wind, signaling halt as the GPS flickers uncertainly. In those frozen silences between movements, deterrence is not just doctrine but breath held in cold air, decision deferred by uncertainty.

Downstream, in a control room above the Subansiri River in West Siang, a hydropower engineer watches swollen monsoon waters rush past the turbines. The sensors read strange; sediment is rising, pulse irregular. Last week's hydrological data from China never arrived. She records the numbers anyway, unsure whether a flood has been unleashed upstream or whether the river is simply changing its mind. There is no hotline. No protocol. Only silence. And in that silence, assumptions grow, and risks multiply.

The 2020 Galwan Valley clash in Ladakh offered a cold lesson in how quickly quiet can shatter. Here in Arunachal, where elevation isolates and cloud cover confounds, that danger is sharper still. A single misstep - misread, misunderstood, mislocated - could bring escalation that neither side claims to seek, yet both prepare for.

Alongside the contest on land flows another struggle, quieter, but no less consequential. Water is becoming weapon and witness. The Yarlung Tsangpo, which bends dramatically before entering India as the Brahmaputra, originates in Tibet and sustains millions downstream. China's plans to dam it, especially at the Great Bend, where the river twists westward, raise alarms in Delhi about disrupted flows and ecological collapse.

India, in turn, is racing to dam its own side of the watershed, not just for power, but for presence. Hydropower becomes cartography by other means. For Bhutan, whose economy leans on exporting electricity to India, the stakes are existential. Changed flows upstream could unravel livelihoods. Yet there is no water-sharing treaty between India and China, only informal understandings and vanishing data, especially when tensions rise or rivers swell.

Bhutan sits uneasily between the two giants. It has no diplomatic ties with China, yet has met Beijing at the negotiating table more than two dozen times. In 2020, China widened its claims to include Bhutan's Sakteng Wildlife Sanctuary, a move that signaled less rigidity, more reach. The Doklam standoff in 2017, where Indian troops crossed over to block Chinese roadwork near the tri-junction, reminded the world of Bhutan's strategic exposure, and India's enduring stake.

Traditionally aligned with Delhi, Bhutan is recalibrating. A younger generation sees greater merit in balance than in allegiance. What looks from afar like deference is, up close, something else: a slow, deliberate calibration to preserve space, dignity, and maneuverability in a narrowing corridor of choice.

Looking forward, three futures shimmer; none certain, all plausible.

In the first, a cold peace holds. China and India entrench themselves along the eastern frontier. Bhutan walks the tightrope, a master of stillness between giants. Tensions simmer, but crisis is deferred, held at bay by weariness and wary calculation. The mountains keep their silence, and silence, for a time, keeps the peace.

In the second, that quiet breaks in pulses. Patrols collide in the fog, roads creep across contested ridgelines, and diplomacy calcifies into statements and standoffs. The eastern Himalayas become not just a frontier, but a frontline, an arena where presence is policy, and peace a ritual too brittle to believe in.

The third future is the most unsettling: limited conflict, ignited not by grand design but by a stumble. A line misdrawn on a map, an advance misread, a drone that flies too far. The spiral is swift; jets breach the skies, networks fray under cyber pressure, and Bhutan, once buffer, becomes battleground.

What stands out is not just the threat, but the unpreparedness. There is no trilateral crisis protocol, no formal compact for the shared governance of rivers, no hotline steady enough to bear the strain of altitude and anger. For a region so rich in elevation, it suffers from a poverty of foresight.

For all the towering altitudes of the eastern Himalayas, the political architecture below remains perilously threadbare. Unlike other fault lines of global tension - the bristling stillness of the Korean Peninsula, the vigilant choreography of the Taiwan Strait - this frontier has no reliable rituals of restraint. There are no mutual measures to still the hand before it tightens into a fist, no shared satellites to read the pulse of the rivers, no quiet channels resilient enough to carry grief or grievance. Even among friends, coordination stumbles, improvised and exposed to the weather of domestic politics. And in landscapes shaped by altitude, pride, and ambiguity, improvisation is a poor defense. The absence of rules does not soften the blows, it sharpens them. It does not forestall consequence, it hastens it.

Arunachal Pradesh is no longer a periphery. It is a barometer of strategic competition in South Asia; a high-altitude proving ground for deterrence, diplomacy, and the evolving geometry of Indo-Pacific security. Without a framework for dialogue and de-escalation, strategic ambiguity will keep outpacing strategic understanding. Policymakers must do more than stare at maps; they must listen to the terrain, read the rivers, and respect the stories the mountains keep trying to tell.

May 2025