

Beijing's Bismarckian Ghosts: How Great Powers Compete Economically

*Markus Brunnermeier,
Professor of Economics, Princeton University*

*Rush Doshi,
Brookings-Yale Postdoctoral Research Fellow*

*Harold James,
Professor of History and International Affairs, Princeton University*

Forthcoming: The Washington Quarterly, Fall 2018, pp. 161-176

Abstract: The economic and technological rivalry between China and the United States in the twenty-first century holds an uncanny resemblance to that between Bismarck's Imperial Germany and a preeminent Great Britain in the nineteenth and early twentieth. Both rivalries feature competing states enmeshed in profound interdependence at a time of explosive technological innovation. Both feature an established democracy with a free-market system feeling cheated by a rising autocracy with a state-protected economic system, and choosing to lash out with counterproductive unilateral tariffs. Finally, both rivalries reveal that such competition is about much more than tariffs: it is also about sophisticated instruments like standard-setting, technology acquisition and theft, financial power, and infrastructure investment. We argue that, like Great Britain a century ago, the United States is ignoring these more sophisticated instruments of competition with its narrow focus on ineffective blunt force tariffs that alienate allies (as the recent G-7 breakdown suggests) without weakening adversaries. As the Anglo-German rivalry demonstrates, a truly competitive American approach requires a fuller range of instruments combined with robust efforts to harness network power in economic and technological domains, especially through multilateralism. Unfortunately, Washington's limited and unilateral approach risks being confrontational without being competitive.

Introduction

Great power competition is back. As China and the United States ramp up their strategic rivalry, the search is on for a vision of what their evolving great power competition will look like in a globalized and interconnected world.

The looming trade war and ongoing technology competition between Washington and Beijing suggest that economics may be the central battlefield in the bilateral contest. Much of the abundant literature on great power competition and grand strategy focuses on military affairs, and little of it prepares us for what economic and technological competition among great powers looks like, let alone how it will be waged.¹

But great power economic competition is nothing new. Indeed, the rivalry between China and the United States in the twenty-first century holds an uncanny resemblance to that between Germany and Great Britain in the nineteenth. Both rivalries take place amidst the emergence of economic globalization and explosive technological innovation. Both feature a rising autocracy with a state-protected economic system challenging an established democracy with a free-market economic system. And both rivalries feature countries enmeshed in profound interdependence wielding tariff threats, standard-setting, technology theft, financial power, and infrastructure investment for advantage. Indeed, for these very reasons, the Anglo-German duel can serve as a useful guide for policymakers seeking to understand the dynamics of the emerging Sino-American competition – as well as the strategies and tactics likely to be employed and the risks and dangers likely to be incurred.

The Roots of Rivalry

The Anglo-German rivalry, like the present Sino-American one, was as much a clash of two countries as it was of two systems: the liberal, free-market constitutionalism of an established Britain and the autocratic, state-protected development of a rising Germany. Indeed, differences in economic system amplified the salience of the narrowing economic gap, leading the established power to feel cheated and the rising power to feel unsatisfied and threatened.

Germany and China both believed their struggle for unification left them as latecomers to modernization. Germany industrialized in the 1850s nearly a century after Great Britain while China emerged from the Century of Humiliation and then the senseless stagnation of Maoism only in 1979. Both countries believed that catching up with established powers required state-directed economic and technology programs. Fair competition was beside the point and national strength was the goal under both Bismarck and Deng, to the eventual detriment of relations with the free-market Great Britain and the United States.

German and Chinese skepticism of Anglo-American laissez faire approaches set the foundation for enduring economic tensions. Bismarck frequently cited the mercantilist theories of the German economist Friedrich List to criticize Great Britain's laissez-faire system and championed protection, economic coordination, and cartels.² German banks played a major role in the patriotic coordination of Germany's industrial efforts by guiding companies, promoting mergers, encouraging industrial concentration, and even financing strategic infrastructure; in contrast, Great Britain's banks provided no such industrial coordination. In addition, visionary German industrialists like Alfred Krupp along with state bureaucrats grasped the importance of exports and elevated them into a national priority in state development plans. German state agencies, through a variety of instruments including an extensive consular system, heavily promoted German exports. During World War I, French economic historian Henri Hauser published an influential expose of how Germany by a "deliberate plan" had "turned all her forces to the systematic conquest of external markets" in a "phenomenon unprecedented in economic history" but surprisingly reminiscent of modern Chinese industrial policy.³ Germany's coordinated development, like China's, allowed the country to create its own comparative advantages; by the end of the 19th century, its centralized system had made German goods competitive in foreign markets and Great Britain itself – creating both interdependence as well as political tension.

The German story resembles the Chinese one, and these parallels are not entirely coincidental. China has long admired the German export-led growth model and been skeptical of laissez faire capitalism. The nineteenth century general and official Li Hongzhang – who suppressed the Taiping rebellion, engineered a coup, and served as a high-level Qing official – kept a photograph of Otto von Bismarck in his study and admired Alfred Krupp as a model for how to industrialize China.⁴ Germany and its powerful centralized leadership became a defining inspiration for China's self-strengthening movement. Chiang Kai-shek reportedly asked his cadets at Whampoa military academy to write exams on how Bismarck unified Germany, and some of his own development plans borrowed from the German example.⁵ As China emerged from Maoism, it even structured its development banks on the German model, though it supplemented their loans with Western capital. Under state-directed development, China eventually emerged as the world's largest exporter with enormous market share in the United States, similarly creating economic interdependence while inadvertently laying the foundation for political competition.

As a result of these strategies, Germany and China promptly caught up to their British and American competitors, sometimes leapfrogging technologies to shrink the gap while their established rivals were encumbered with legacy technologies sometimes backed by interest associations. For example, as a then-backwards Germany invested in state-of-the-art industrial technology, Britain continued to rely on an old rail system with small tunnels and heavy industry with outdated furnaces. Today, China's advances in mobile payments and transportation

infrastructure, for example, provide a marked contrast to U.S. reliance on credit cards and mid-20th century infrastructure.⁶

The speed of the catch up was as alarming to British elites then as it is to American elites now. German GDP was 67% of Great Britain's in 1871 and exceeded it by 1908 in the aftermath of a financial crisis. Adjusting for purchasing power, China's GDP was only 25% of U.S. GDP in 1990 after a decade of reforms and exceeded American GDP in 2014, also in the aftermath of a financial crisis. Even when their economies eclipsed those of their rivals, Germany and China remained poorer in per capita terms – with German income 74% of British income in 1913 and Chinese income only 25% of American income in 2016.⁷

The fact German and Chinese citizens remained poorer than their counterparts in Britain and the United States did little to alleviate anxiety in established powers. From the perspective of the established powers, Imperial Germany and contemporary China had undergone a radical and alarming economic modernization that catapulted them into the ranks of first-rate powers in mere decades. British elites believed that the German developmental model was a form of cheating. For their part, German elites were concerned that Great Britain would seek to halt their country's rise and undermine their economy by restricting trade, technology, or capital flows – whether through economic or military means.

Similar fears are at the core of Sino-American strategic competition, with Washington accusing Beijing of cheating and Beijing accusing Washington of seeking to halt its rise through trade tariffs. Indeed, just as British politicians levied blunt and sometimes counterproductive tariffs on their German competitors, so too do U.S. political leaders risk making a similar mistake. Indeed, economic competition among great powers is often about tools far more subtle and sophisticated than tariffs – a lesson the United States appears to have forgotten.

The Struggle Over Standards

Technological standard-setting, and its attendant network effects, is a longstanding and subtle arena of great power competition. States whose technology becomes the dominant standard can wield that leverage over others, a point not lost on rising powers, who often work to reduce their vulnerability by creating parallel systems. Indeed, the present Sino-American contest over information communication technology (ICT) mirrors a century-old contest between Germany and Great Britain for dominance in that era's ICT infrastructure, with uncanny parallels and key lessons for the present.

In the late nineteenth century, the Italian engineer Guglielmo Marconi, supported by the British Royal Navy, created a radio network that gave Britain a monopoly over radio transmissions. When combined with Britain's 60 percent share of the world's undersea cable network, Britain dominated international transmissions.

Fearing vulnerable, Kaiser Wilhelm II authorized direct state support for German scientists and engineers as they successfully copied Marconi's designs, patented them within Germany, and built their own radio networks financed by contracts with the German military.⁸ Even so, Marconi's superior longer-range radio and first-mover advantage established his British-backed company as the global standard, and Marconi leveraged these network effects to pursue a policy of "non-intercommunication" with non-Marconi radio operators. German businesses and ocean liners did not want to be cut off from global communication, so they preferred the British-backed system to German ones.

To contest the British standard, Kaiser Wilhelm II intensified German industrial policy. He swiftly decreed that two large German electrical companies with competing radio efforts – Siemens & Halske and AEG – join together to establish the definitive German alternative, Telefunken. "The [domestic] rivalry in the field of wireless telegraphy weakens the competitiveness of Germany," the Emperor explained, "and gives the Marconi Company the opportunity to reach a worldwide monopoly" that was "not in Germany's interest."⁹ Under Kaiser Willhelm II, Germany pursued protectionism by banning the Marconi systems in some cases. It pursued emerging markets by selling its technology to South America and Africa to set the standard in those regions and secure revenue. And when those efforts failed, it found success in multilateralism. Germany organized the great powers together in a conference on radio standards that jointly prohibited Marconi's "non-intercommunication" policy, breaking the British monopoly and establishing an effective Anglo-German duopoly.¹⁰

Germany's efforts were not born of paranoia – Britain successfully wielded its monopoly against Germany during the First World War by cutting German cables, monitoring German transmissions, and forcing German traffic onto British-controlled networks – uncovering the Zimmerman telegram that helped bring America into the war.¹¹

The Anglo-German competition reveals that standard-setting, especially in ICT, can become highly political against the background of strategic competition. China today uses many of the techniques that Germany used a century ago: state-led industrial policy, generous state contracts, civil-military integration, bans on rival products, forced mergers, the pursuit of third-world markets, and even international treaties to set its standards. The Belt and Road project raises the possibility that standards for "smart infrastructure" across Asia, especially the relevant sensors and software, may be set by China and may deny U.S. companies interoperability, thereby shutting the United States out of autonomous vehicles and other industries.

China's decision to ban or constrain Western internet companies like Facebook, Twitter, and Google allowed its indigenous alternatives – Alibaba, Tencent, Baidu – to become the domestic standards. Baidu, for example, has an effective monopoly in China's online search market; Renren

and Tencent's WeChat have taken the role of Facebook; and Sina Weibo offers an alternative to Twitter.

These protected local champions are now innovators. In China's cash-based economy, Alibaba and Tencent leapfrogged Western economies more reliant on credit cards, thereby popularizing electronic payments and emerging as global leaders in financial technology. These companies have expanded overseas, often targeting not the U.S. market but – like Germany's Telefunken before them – emerging markets with lower profits and reduced competition. If Chinese payment apps become the worldwide standard, it will allow Beijing to become the first-mover and reap the network effects of a shift to mobile payments that could benefit Chinese banks, companies, and the intelligence apparatus. Indeed, Berkshire Hathaway argued in 2018 that China's WeChat mobile payments app with its 1 billion users worldwide could present a threat to the dominance of Visa, Mastercard, and American Express in global payments.¹²

China is also contesting standards in the hard infrastructure of internet connectivity. Its government is investing billions so Chinese chipmakers can beat American rivals in the race for 5G mobile internet standards. Similarly, Chinese firms like Huawei and ZTE receive government loans to build the hard infrastructure of internet connectivity throughout the developing world. As the British example demonstrates, these efforts not only make Chinese technology the standard – they also offer opportunities for surveillance.

The Anglo-German rivalry in telegraphy shows that Washington needs to take China's state-directed challenge in standards seriously. It also offers a way forward. In much the same way Germany used international conferences to break the British monopoly on telegraphy, the United States could set or preserve favorable ICT standards through the very kinds of multilateral agreements – like TTIP and TPP – that President Trump rails against. Doing so may keep China from unilateral standard-setting through its free trade agreements, state champions, or infrastructure projects.

Technology Acquisition

To compete over standards, countries first have to have access to new technology, and rising powers have pursued theft as well as basic science investments as two strategies to gain advantage over established powers.

Technology theft has long been a feature of great power competition. Indeed, copying best practices was an established feature of German government policies. Frederick the Great of Prussia once sent the head of the Prussian industrial and mining agency, Count von Reden, to England in the 1780s to pick up the latest techniques. He even invited the brother of the great British ironmaster John Wilkinson to Germany to manage a royal iron works. Alfred Krupp in the 1830s disguised himself as a traveling aristocrat to snoop around British iron works.¹³ Having

emulated and in some cases leapfrogged British capabilities, by the late nineteenth century, Germany had established a technical lead in many areas.

These German practices have corollaries in China's efforts to copy Western technology. China has used generous grants to lure talented expatriates back to China; opened research centers in Silicon Valley to learn cutting edge methods in artificial intelligence; and even used hacking and other illicit methods when these methods fail. By some measures China accounts for half if not as much as eighty percent of U.S. intellectual property theft.¹⁴

Even so, there was no German corollary to China's Made in China 2025 initiative, a state program that combines industrial policy with legal and illegal methods of obtaining foreign technology on an unprecedented scale. The initiative harnesses state-owned enterprises to reverse China's lag in ten critical future industries ranging from electrical batteries to biologics. For example, China's banks under direction from the government have set aside tens of billions of dollars for an "Integrated Circuit Fund" that will use instruments ranging from venture capital to private equity proxies or corporate acquisitions to acquire Western semiconductor capabilities in an industry central to the future of the internet.¹⁵ As former Assistant Attorney General for National Security in the Obama administration John Carlin complained: "They're targeting our private companies. And it's not a fair fight. A private company can't compete against the resources of the second largest economy in the world."¹⁶

These efforts to acquire technology are of course not the same as innovation. To generate new technology, great powers have historically made investments in basic science research, especially in universities. Building on the example of French technical schools, a rising Germany launched an unprecedented higher education plan with generous state financing, transforming itself from a technological laggard into a high-tech leader through state investments. By the middle of the nineteenth century, Germany had a clear scientific lead, especially in chemistry and physics. Of the 100 Nobel prizes in sciences awarded between 1901 and 1932, 33 went to German scientists, 18 to British and 6 to Americans.

This is a lesson the United States once understood well, and that China has firmly grasped. Indeed, the German example inspired American higher-education investments after the Second World War as part of strategic competition with the Soviet Union; similarly, university support is also a prominent part of the Chinese effort to gain a lead in global technology, and Chinese universities are moving ahead rapidly in international league tables. In 2018, Peking University ranked 27 in the THES ranking and Tsinghua ranked 30, and both continue to climb.¹⁷ China has laid the foundation for a university system on a scale matched previously only by Germany and the United States. Meanwhile, the United States is neglecting its universities even as the Chinese challenge mounts.

The Anglo-German rivalry suggests that unrestricted openness can facilitate a rising power's ascent, and that autocratic industrial policies can dramatically facilitate a rising power's achievement of technological parity. An American answer to China's policies will call for more than tariffs: it requires better managing America's technological openness, policing technology theft, scrutinizing Chinese investment, and reinvesting in the basic science to sustain U.S. technological leadership.

Fighting with Finance

International financial instruments are an important weapon in peacetime great power competition. Indeed, the British response to Germany's rise was to assemble detailed strategies for economic warfare, as Nicholas Lambert shows in his book *Planning Armageddon*. Britain wielded its network advantages in financial services, such as trade finance and marine insurance, to pull together data that could be used to create a detailed schedule of the raw material dependence of Germany and its ally Austria-Hungary.¹⁸ France too used economic instruments: a coordinated French-led attack on the German stock exchange was used as an instrument to bring Germany to compromise in the 1911 Morocco crisis.

The dominance of the United States over the global financial system offers similar possibilities. The reach of the U.S. banking system, the dominance of the U.S.-dollar, the authority of U.S. credit rating agencies, and the shadow of U.S. influence over interbank payments together gives Washington enormous economic power. That dominance, which has already been exploited in the form of financial sanctions against Iran and Russia, is deeply unsettling to China – just as Britain's economic centrality likewise frightened Germany.

If established powers seek to exercise their financial leverage, rising powers seek to escape it. Indeed, Germany actively sought ways to reduce its vulnerability to British financial power in the run-up to World War I. In 1907, when Britain concluded its alliance with Russia in the Triple Entente, the German banker Max Warburg pushed a series of reforms that would develop German trade finance through acceptance bills as an alternative to what had been a British monopoly; his younger brother, Paul, launched a similar initiative in another rising power, the United States.¹⁹

Moreover, banks had always been seen by German policymakers as a key instrument of power and could provide alternatives to British financial services. Indeed, while British financial houses concentrated on the provision of limited and precisely specified services (trade finance; dealing in government bonds; dealing in private stock; managing deposits; industrial finance), German banks provided all these services on a common platform. In this way, German banks constituted a "universal" bank that – rather than the British capital markets or financial houses – offered variety of services that reduced German financial vulnerability.²⁰

Like Germany, China has worked to mitigate U.S. financial influence, especially after the Global Financial Crisis. Its efforts are multifaceted, and they include advocacy for special drawing rights at the International Monetary Fund; internationalization of China's currency through bilateral swap agreements; the pursuit of alternatives to the Western-dominated SWIFT inter-bank payments system; investment in new global credit rating agencies for sovereign debt; and aspirations for building cities like Shanghai into global financial center akin to New York or London. Through these efforts, China hopes to reduce its reliance on dollars, to reroute payments through indigenous or parallel financial systems that the U.S. does not control, to question the credibility of certain Western credit rating agencies, and to enmesh U.S. banks in China's own system, thereby making financial sanctions virtually impossible. A major distinction between the Anglo-German and Sino-American examples is China's enormous holding of U.S. treasuries, but for the moment that advantage offers little asymmetric leverage since its exercise would directly harm China as well.

As the Anglo-German example shows, the struggle for financial leverage and asymmetric interdependence between the United States and China is unlikely to abate, and American strategy – like British strategy before it – will need to adjust to China's efforts to reduce its vulnerability. Abusing U.S. financial power by wielding sanctions too often or against U.S. allies will only hasten China's independence from Western financial leverage.

Economic Power Projection

Infrastructure investments are another understudied tool of economic rivalry. They not only facilitate trade and connectivity, they also offer the opportunity to practice “economic power projection” – that is, to reshape the strategic geography of great power competition.

In both the German and Chinese cases, the preexisting strategic geography was unfavorable. These continental rising powers were encircled by wary neighbors; moreover, they were vulnerable given their reliance on sea lanes controlled by established maritime competitors like Britain and the United States. Although Germany and China pursued blue-water fleets to remedy that vulnerability, infrastructure investments offered another way to project power – one that could expand the hinterland, break encirclement, and reduce maritime dependence.

Roughly a century ago, Germany's leadership sought to construct a 1,000 mile railway to circumvent British naval supremacy. The railway would have proceeded from Berlin all the way to Baghdad and onward to the Persian Gulf. The German government pressured national financial institutions to support the project, and top German officials described it as a “German national undertaking, executed, administered and operated as such.”²¹ For Germany, the Berlin-Baghdad railway would not only bypass the preeminent British navy, it would also spread German influence deeper into the Middle East, open up the Ottoman Empire as an export market and

source for raw materials, and offer Germany new ways to protect its overseas possessions in Africa. The ill-fated project, which saw significant progress but fell short of completion due to World War I, could have revolutionized Eurasia’s strategic geography had it been completed.



Berlin-Bagdad Railway



Belt Road Initiative

China’s Belt and Road projects similarly leverage Chinese economic instruments for strategic ends. Originally announced by Xi in 2013, the program has been promoted by the Chinese government as a the “project of the century,” as China’s “Marshall Plan,” and as a new “silk road.” In historical quirk, the very term “Silk Road” was originally devised in Imperial Germany and shaped Berlin’s own continental ambitions.

China’s ambitions, however, are grander. Beijing seeks to connect nearly seventy countries and three continents together through rail lines, pipelines, highways, ports, and other infrastructure. Together, these projects are meant to crisscross Eurasia and link China to Europe and Africa through an overland “belt” and an overseas “road.” The project has received outsized focus from top leadership: it is a signature initiative of President Xi, the focus of one of the Party’s powerful “leading small groups” that sit above ministries and coordinate policy, and has been declared a key foreign policy focus for the next decade.

One of China’s main motivations in pursuing the Belt and Road is similar to Germany’s – to circumvent its inferiority along the maritime dimension. As Peking University Wang Jisi noted in an influential article in 2012 believed to have shaped the initiative’s evolution, China’s east posed security challenges: maritime disputes, island chains, wary neighbors, and the U.S. Navy. “Marching Westward” over the land, as Wang noted, provided an alternative. “Unlike East Asia, there is no U.S.-led regional military alliance among the countries to the west, and there is no possibility that one will arise.”²² Indeed, China had abundant resources and a continental vacuum all to its west, as well as the surplus capacity and dollar reserves to fill it with pipelines, railways, highways, and even overland internet infrastructure that reduce China’s dependence on the sea. China’s western ambitions in this way bear a stark resemblance to Germany’s eastern equivalents.

Both countries' continental investments had another important purpose – reaching the sea, and in particular the strategically important Indian Ocean. In Germany's case, Indian Ocean access would help Germany protect its African colonies. For China, it helps China ensure that its energy and commodity imports – most of which flow through these waters – are safe from interdiction. Less than two decades after President Hu first raised these concerns in a 2003 speech, Chinese railroads and highways will now link the country directly to Chinese-built ports in Pakistan and Myanmar, permitting resources to be transported by sea and overland back to China. And as some military officials admit, these ports may well one day host a Chinese military presence. Indeed, China's new facility in Djibouti broadcasts such ambitions.

German and Chinese grand investments in infrastructure constitute the classic gambles of continental power encircled by maritime rivals. Like the Berlin-Baghdad railway before it, China's Belt and Road too may collapse, and it faces headwinds from recalcitrant partners, financial limitations, and local security challenges. Even so, Washington cannot assume its failure and must recognize that, if these projects are successful, they could reshape Asia's strategic geography. A wiser course is to understand the power of China's geo-economics tools and, where possible, work with allies and partners to offer superior alternatives.

Blunt Force Tariffs

The heart of great power economic competition is subtle and sophisticated, occasionally patient and long-term, and rarely emotional and reactive. Competition over standards, technology leadership, and financial leverage are far more complex and far less intuitive than the blunt levying of tariffs.

And yet, tariffs have a simple and emotional appeal, especially in established powers with angry publics reckoning with the loss of preeminence and economic security. The quick fix of tariffs, while psychologically soothing, too often proves strategically counterproductive in a competition that requires more nuance.

Great Britain offers a cautionary tale in this regard. In the late 19th century, British protectionists threatened by what they perceived as German imitations of British goods passed the Merchandise Marks Acts, which required products to be labelled with their country of origin. A few years later, a charismatic Birmingham politician named Joseph Chamberlain advocated tariffs as British manufacturing to protect against German exports. In 1903, Chamberlain lamented that, "Agriculture ... has practically been destroyed. Sugar has gone; silk has gone; iron is threatened; wool is threatened; cotton will go!" A year or so later, he said: "In the past this country was ... the workshop of the world ... That is no longer the case ... Our competitors are gaining upon us in that which makes national greatness ... Those are the wise nations that look a little ahead and see a difficulty before it overwhelms them." Germany was cheating. As Henri Hauser put it, "The

dice which Germany throws on the international table are loaded. It is madness under these circumstances to practise fair play with a player who cheats.”²³ In his speeches, Chamberlain linked tariffs to security, and declared that without protection and the development of Britain’s imperial markets, the country would sink to be a fifth rate power.²⁴ Tariffs, in his view, were needed to “consolidate the British race.”²⁵

Chamberlain’s approach was faithfully implemented by his son, Neville Chamberlain, some years later. When Neville Chamberlain introduced protection and Imperial Preference in 1932, and France similarly chose to trade more within its empire and less with other countries, the effect not only made life harder for German exporters, but also for many exporters across Central and Southeast Europe as well as Scandinavia, who in consequence turned more to Germany. Tariffs ultimately proved an imprecise instrument, one that damaged Britain’s allies, partners, and the global swing states hanging between Germany and Britain – and weakened Britain’s own strategic position.

In his famous Glasgow speech, Joseph Chamberlain had emphasized that Britain must never be isolated when exposed to dangers. But isolation is effectively what his policies brought about. Chamberlain’s dream ultimately strengthened rather than weakened Germany by breaking up a multilateralism that could have contained or encircled it. Within a year of the tariffs, Germany had a new and highly aggressive leader, one who could fully use the strategic opportunities that British tariffs had created for German power. Indeed, as the political economist Albert Hirschman has painfully documented, European states became asymmetrically dependent on Germany. That in turn made it difficult to challenge it.

Donald Trump’s message today has an eerie resemblance to that of Joseph Chamberlain: “We’re taken advantage of by every nation in the world virtually,” Trump complained, and “it’s not gonna happen any more.”²⁶ His campaign manifesto, *Great Again: How To Fix Our Crippled America* explained that: “There are people who wish I wouldn’t refer to China as our enemy. But that’s exactly what they are.”²⁷ In Trump’s view, China’s economic success was a form of cheating, and his looming Sino-American trade war is one that Joseph Chamberlain would likely have supported.

Trump’s instinct to “do something” is not entirely unwelcome, but a strategy of unbridled confrontation is unlikely to be successful. Indeed, like Chamberlain’s, Trump’s trade approach is emotionally satisfying but diplomatically disastrous. By raising tariffs not only on China but also on American allies, partners, neighbors – not to mention Asia’s smaller states – Trump risks driving them towards China. In contrast, some commentators fearing Trump’s confrontational strategy support a more cooperative economic relationship with China. The problem with that alternative, however, is that like a rising Germany, China does have a state-directed system

competing in technology standards, innovation, financial politics, and geoeconomics. The United States needs a coordinated response.

That American response should neither be blindly confrontational nor naively cooperative; instead it should be competitive. The right approach, in contrast to tariffs would be to work with those allies and partners to strengthen rules, set standards, punish Chinese industrial policy and technology theft, and create alternatives to its geo-economic statecraft. China is playing a good hand well, but the United States and its allies and partners have an even better one – but only if they work together.

¹ For example, Barry R. Posen, *The Sources of Military Doctrine: France, Britain, and Germany Between the World Wars* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984); Robert Art, *A Grand Strategy for America* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003); Hal Brands, *What Good Is Grand Strategy? Power and Purpose in American Statecraft from Harry S. Truman to George W. Bush* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2014).

² For an accessible overview of the ideas of Friederich List and their differences from the Anglo-German model, see James Fallows, “How the World Works,” *The Atlantic*, 1993, <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1993/12/how-the-world-works/305854/>.

³ Henri Hauser, *Germany’s Commercial Grip on the World: Her Business Methods Explained*, trans. Manfred Emanuel (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1918), 16.

⁴ Harold James, *Krupp: A History of the Legendary British Firm* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012), 51.

⁵ Frederic E Wakeman, *Spymaster: Dai Li and the Chinese Secret Service* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), 62.

⁶ Jennifer Surane and Christopher Cannon, “Why China’s Payment Apps Give U.S. Bankers Nightmares,” *Bloomberg*, May 23, 2018, <https://www.bloomberg.com/graphics/2018-payment-systems-china-usa/>.

⁷ Data provided by the World Bank and Angus Maddison. See <https://data.worldbank.org> and <https://www.rug.nl/ggdc/historicaldevelopment/maddison/>

⁸ Friedewald, Michael, *Telefunken vs. Marconi, or the Race for Wireless Telegraphy at Sea, 1896-1914* (2012). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2375755> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2375755>

⁹ Friedewald, Michael, *Telefunken vs. Marconi, or the Race for Wireless Telegraphy at Sea, 1896-1914* (2012). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2375755> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2375755>

¹⁰ Marc Raboy, *Marconi: The Man Who Networked the World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 226–28.

¹¹ Gordon Corera, “How Britain Pioneered Cable-Cutting in World War One,” *BBC News*, December 15, 2017, <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-42367551>.

¹² “Afternoon Session - 2018 Meeting,” Warren Buffet Archive at CNBC, May 5, 2018, <https://buffett.cnbc.com/video/2018/05/05/afternoon-session--2018-berkshire-hathaway-annual-meeting.html>.

¹³ James, *Krupp: A History of the Legendary British Firm*.

¹⁴ “Report of the Commission on the Theft of Intellectual Property,” May 2013, <http://ipcommission.org/mission/index.html>.

¹⁵ Yoko Kubota, “China Plans \$47 Billion Fund to Boost Its Semiconductor Industry,” *The Wall Street Journal*, May 6, 2018, <https://www.wsj.com/articles/china-plans-47-billion-fund-to-boost-its-semiconductor-industry-1525434907>.

¹⁶ “The Great Brain Robbery,” *CBS News*, January 17, 2016, <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/60-minutes-great-brain-robbery-china-cyber-espionage/>.

-
- ¹⁷ “World University Rankings 2018,” Times Higher Education World Rankings, 2018, https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings/2018/world-ranking#!/page/0/length/-1/sort_by/rank/sort_order/asc/cols/stats.
- ¹⁸ Nicholas A. Lambert, *Planning Armageddon: British Economic Warfare and the First World War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012).
- ¹⁹ Harold James, “Lessons from the Financial Preparations in the Lead-Up to the First World War” (Vox CEPR Policy Portal, July 9, 2014), <https://voxeu.org/article/financial-preparations-leading-wwi>.
- ²⁰ James.
- ²¹ Gall 72
- ²² Wang Jisi [王缉思], “Wang Jisi: ‘Marching Westward,’ The Rebalancing of China’s Geostrategy [王缉思: ‘西进’, 中国地缘战略的再平衡],” *Global Times* [环球网], October 17, 2012, http://opinion.huanqiu.com/opinion_world/2012-10/3193760.html.
- ²³ Hauser, *Germany’s Commercial Grip on the World: Her Business Methods Explained*, 89.
- ²⁴ Peter T. Marsh, *Joseph Chamberlain: Entrepreneur in Politics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 428.
- ²⁵ See for example Chamberlain’s address in October 6, 1903 address in Glasgow, printed in Joseph Chamberlain, *Mr. Chamberlain’s Speeches*, ed. Charles W. Boyd, vol. 1 (London: Constable and Company LTD, 1914), 143.
- ²⁶ ‘Don’t worry’ about tough phone calls, Trump tells Americans, *Financial Times*, February 3, 2017.
- ²⁷ Donald J. Trump, *Great Again: How To Fix Our Crippled America* (New York: Threshold Editions, 2016); Veronica Stracqualursi, “10 Times Trump Attacked China and Its Trade Relations with the US,” *ABC News*, November 9, 2017, <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/10-times-trump-attacked-china-trade-relations-us/story?id=46572567>.