

Offshore Balancing as Grand Strategy: Hegemonic Control and Sino-US Trade War; Implications for Pakistan

Vol. VI, No. IV (Fall 2021)

URL: [http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gpr.2021\(VI-IV\).04](http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gpr.2021(VI-IV).04)

Pages: 33 – 42

p- ISSN: 2521-2982

e- ISSN: 2707-4587

p- ISSN: 2521-2982

DOI: 10.31703/gpr.2021(VI-IV).04

Headings

- [Introduction](#)
- [Literature Review](#)
- [Theoretical Background](#)
- [Causes of Disagreement](#)
- [Trade War and its impact for Pakistan](#)
- [Conclusion](#)
- [References](#)

Abstract

This paper gives a concise outline of US-China trade & merchandise relations, recognizes significant causes, results or issues of the contention, and gives explicit answers for how to decrease the heightening of such a "battle" between the two financial authoritarians. The Research has used economic data from American and Chinese Governments and elaborated it qualitatively employing post-modernist discourse analysis. All in all, our examination will emphasize the trade battle between the two nations from an Ideological, authentic & monetary viewpoint, and as it were, to comprehend its causes results and give explicit answers for such a "war", set in this specific circumstance. The point of this paper is to assess the long time outcomes of the worldwide trade and economic war and its effect on the financial improvement of Pakistan.

Key Words: Trade War, Offshore Balancing, Hegemony, Economic Impact, Pakistan

Introduction

The monetary & Economic changes that started in the year 1979 have changed China as among of the world's leading and quickest developing economic systems and Country ([Grossman & Helpman, 1991](#)). It has been seen that China's financial & trade environments, regulations, & moves have a great effect on the economy of the U.S. as an entire and on positive U.S. sector and, as a result, worry U.S. Parliament ([Bloom, Draca, & Van Reenen, 2016](#)). With the aid of comparing continuing trade conflict with comparable change disputes during history, we become aware of positive essential causes, of various important factors, from a monetary and political point of view. America-China exchange

warfare can be brought about in the main by trade inequality, in addition to disputes over international financial domination (Terence, 2019).

In the midst of rising tensions between the United States and China, Pakistan strives to maintain strong associations and relations with both countries. Pakistan has stated that the country's future is inextricably linked to China in terms of trade and monetary development. However, the United States remained geo-strategically significant and the largest basis of foreign assistance, as well as assisting Pakistan in the arrangement of dollars in millions in the shape of aid in the military and regular

*Chairman, Department of International Relations, Emerson University Multan, Punjab, Pakistan.

†Lecturer, Department of Political Science, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Punjab, Pakistan.
Email: muhammadimranpasha1@gmail.com

‡Lecturer, Department of Political Science, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Punjab, Pakistan.

citizen backing against the region's extended war on terror. ([Propakistani, 2019](#)).

Literature Review

This section describes previous Research on the US-China trade war:

The main reasons for the growing trade tensions between the two countries were increased U.S. trade protection and the attraction of certain political and economic interests in the U.S. superstructure. According to Navarro and Autry (2011), Chinese state capitalism must have led numerous world champions to successfully carry out mercantilism & security through illegal export support, violations of U.S. intellectual property rights, secure environmental protection, and the excessive use of labour to destroy industries. Employment in America. According to Bhidé and Phelps (2005), domestic industrial workers exerted policy pressure on the United States, but China's version of mercantilism was an unavoidable result of trade between developing and developed countries.

Du et al. (2017) built a model of political relations using monthly data for China from 1990 to 2013. Political shocks were also found to be short-lived, according to the researchers. From 1970 to 2015, [Freund and Gagnon \(2017\)](#) investigated the impacts of border-adjusted indirect taxation (mainly Value added tax) in 34 industrial economies. They revealed that when the maximum cost of every national sales tax increased, the exchange rate rose, with little impact on the minor balancing & current account effects on income balances & trade. Muro et al. (2018) separated China in response to U.S. investigations of 232 items, issued China's own response about 128 tax items of the U.S.A. & also the same has been done in another economic episode in which the U.S. issued 301 investigations, and China Countered them with its own investigations of 106 tax items these were paired to U.S.A.'s employment & States, including both, and coupled them with the outcomes of then U.S. President Trump's 2016 presidential election.

Literature on the influence of the U.S. & China's rising tensions on capital markets generally examines the effect of trade disputes on the trade

itself, with certain research findings also analyzing the impacts of conflicts on the financial system, especially the stock exchange. As per Heilmann (2016), protest movements might have a detrimental negative effect on intergovernmental exports of goods & services, & an exploratory study on Japanese investment returns demonstrates that the China ban only momentarily diminished trading volumes of the expressly decided to boycott Japanese firms. Regarding the implications between U.S. & China trade frictions on the financial system, Jia et al. (2019) have used improved event analytical method to measure the horizontal & pattern effects of U.S. & China trade disputes on China's banking, collateralized debt obligations, & insurance industries' systematic risk from the perceptions of the average level of value & natural inclination over the period. Fang et al. (2019) also used the event analysis method.

Theoretical Background

Hegemonic Empire

"Hegemony as Authority" is a roundabout type of majestic strength where a hegemon taken as pioneer state rules other developing states by the inferred method for economic powers moderately using direct military power. For many, a Hegemonic Empire doesn't have to control through its military ([Doyle, 1986](#); [Zolo, 2007](#)). A Hegemonic Empire rules through fascination, retention, enthrallment, and some of the time Bread and Circuses, Just towards its "adversaries," does it use intimidation, blackmail and inculcation. "The historical backdrop of the United States is the historical backdrop of Empire" (Farrar, Strous, and Giroux, 2019). For scholars, a hegemon is a dominant state which holds the best military & financial power, assuming a role of worldwide stabilizing force by guaranteeing the global political-economic system and threats to that system ([Gilpin, 1981](#), [Kindleberger, 1981](#), [Keohane, 1984](#)). On the other hand, in a Gramscianism, hegemony views as controls through coercive, material means yet additionally works through the belief and values system, which Antonio Gramsci termed as "social authority" ([Thomas, 2009](#)). Joining above discussed two viewpoints, a state or country can set up its Hegemonic authority after it can utilize its material

and cultural supremacy to overwhelm the global framework and keep everything under control, as far as governmental issues, culture, security and financial matters. Keohane in 1984 asserted that the world without authority, there is no worldwide system, which prompts the flimsiness of the global economy, as the powers of monetary patriotism will be raised; making it is hard for collaborate ([Keohane, 1984](#))

The American hegemonic authority arrived at its prime when the USSR was broke down in 1991, denoted a victorious "unipolar World order" ([Krauthammer, 1990](#)), empowering the U.S.A. for legitimization for a worldwide defender & stabilizer, controlling the international system unilaterally with any "rebel state", or all in all, allowed to be police state of the world ([Mearsheimer, 2018](#)). The U.S. executed its authority. Attacking Iraq, overturning "rebel pioneers," executing a "liberal authority" international strategy as an answer for struggle (Walt, 2018), all are predicting for the U.S.A.'s aspiration to keep up with the worldwide concern for security and to use this scene to its greatest advantage. Furthermore, this has been brought up in to the notice that the authoritative construction is "the most pervasive one in the set of experiences" ([Gilpin, 1981](#)), and it was predicted that as the world is becoming more and more multipolar, it can start certain contentions among states ([Waltz, 2010](#)).

Offshore Balancing, U.S. Regional Allies and Partners in Asia

Offshore balancing, is a theory of international or global relations that sees multi-polarity—when worldwide relations are overwhelmed by numerous superpowers—as a chance rather than as a danger. The fabulous methodology of "offshore Balancing" allows great and big power to keep up with its influence without the expenses of massive military deployment or organizations all throughout the planet. It is commonly regarded as such an informal Empire, as opposed to federalism in conventional models. if we perceive that for the Imperial Federation in the late British Empire. Offshore Balancing, like the term suggests, is a grand strategic arrangement that could be pursued solely by island states on the outskirts of Eurasia and also

by unprecedented bounded superpowers, such as the United States (Mearsheimer, John J.; Walt, Stephen M, 2019).

In the case of the United States during the mid-21st century, advocates of offshore balancing trust that endeavors to keep up with U.S. authority as the world's just superpower will lead different states to join against the United States and eventually diminish its relative power. As indicated by this view, on the grounds that the United States can't stop the ascent of new great powers, it should point toward a system of shifting the burden by which others will assume control over liability regarding keeping up with regional power balance and controlling issues. Offshore balancing is an essential idea utilized in the realist paradigm in global relations. Christopher Layne termed this "offshore balancing" in 1997 article (Layne, Christopher, 1997).

As indicated by political specialist John Mearsheimer, explained that America adopted offshore balancing as the grand strategy and technique utilized by the United States during the 1930s, effectively used against Russia after 1979 Afghan invasion using Pakistan as an offshore balancer and offshore Empire and furthermore in the Iran–Iraq War in 1980–1988 ([Mearsheimer, John J. 2010](#)).

India & U.S.: Emerging Offshore Alliance

As per this strategy of offshore balancing, the U.S.A. can alliance with a nearby regional power, which could act as the front line of defense and line of protection, allowing both of them to maintain the overall influence under their specific area and it can help to maintain hegemonic control, as both of those influential powers a far more noteworthy interest in keeping another regional power from overwhelming them. Renowned Australian strategist Paul Dibb projected in 1995 that for the U.S.A., India has a "greater potential as a power of influence" & "could emerge as a useful player in a multipolar Asian balance" & "attract American interest as a counterbalance to China." ([Paul Dibb, 1995](#))

The U.S. and India have become close lately. Contrasted and in the past century, this connection between India and U.S.A. is inconsistent

development. Under the administration of both the Bush & Obama, & presently the Biden government as well, India has gotten critical significance in United States key strategy towards the region of Indo-Pacific. In the eyes of American foreign policy decision-makers, the rise of India as a dependable partner in Asia has transported the two nations a lot nearer. The relationship has likewise consistently advanced as an aftereffect of China's development as a possible hegemonic power in Asia. The United States faces trouble in keeping up with its prevalent situation through the region of Indo Pacific & needs solid partners in the area around China to assist with sharing the imbalance burden. In such a manner, the United States perceives India to act as offshore balancer of U.S.A. in Asia pacific region to tackle China's development as an expected hegemon in that region ([Ashley J. Tellis, 2020](#)).

US-India Military ties to keep offshore Balancing

The five largest spending countries in 2020 were the U.S.A., Russia, China, India, & the United Kingdom, accounting for 62 percent of the world's top military expenditure. When In 2016, the U.S.A. appointed India as its grand Defense ally. In line with this alliance, in 2018, India was promoted to the 1st phase of the Strategic Trade partner, which allows India to gain unrestricted accessibility to a wide range of dual technologies and military equipment controlled by the Division of Trade. (U.S., Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, 2021)

Defense and securities trade collaboration between United States of America and India continues to grow with the arrival of agreements named as Logistics Exchange Memorandum of Agreement (LEMOA), Communications, Security Compliance (COMCASA), & also Industrial Security Agreement (I.S.A.). Political & Military Bureau has supported the growth of complete defense & security trade cooperation between India & U.S.A. from almost nothing in 2008 to more than \$ 20 billion by 2020. ([Paul Staniland, 2020](#)) The said Bureau is dedicated to promoting defense sales in

the US-India with the support of both Foreign Service Sales and Direct Trade Processes. This trade cooperation provides many jobs to the people of both countries & helps make sure the strength of the fundamentals of the security industry in both countries. ([Shubhajit Roy, 2020](#))

U.S. Trade Dilemma with China

Famous IPE researcher Taggart Murphy shares Cohen's presumption that China's strategic choices are driven by power motivated however. He sees China right now not as a contender to the existing orders but instead as a retainer (Murphy, 2011). U.S. China monetary and trade relations have strengthened significantly since when China started changing its economy from a closed economic model to a more open and liberal economic order. While this change in China's trade and Economic system started in the 2nd half of the decade of 1970s. Comprehensive U.S.A. & China economic ties which were of \$2 billion 1979 and it rose to \$592 billion out of 2020. With all this trade connections, China is presently the United States' biggest product exchanging accomplice ([U.S. Census Bureau, 2021](#)).

The table below presents the data and facts about the uneven trade ties between the two economic giants. This table clearly indicates the Dilemma between Geo-strategic and economic interest of U.S.A.

U.S. trade in goods with China in last decade

China-US import/export imbalance was of 315.1 billion U.S. Dollars back in 2012 & this trade grew up to 367.3 billion \$ till the end of 2015. It showed decline in 2016 to 346.8 billion \$. By 2018, it again risen to 418.9 billion \$ & again exhibited decline to 345.2 billion \$ of 2019 trade. Toward the finish of 2020, the deficiency with China has been decreased up to \$310.8 billion, the most minimal starting around 2011. ([U.S. Census Bureau, 2021](#))

Table 1.

Year	Exports	Imports	Balance
2011	104,121.5	399,371.2	-295,249.7
2012	110,516.6	425,619.1	-315,102.5

Year	Exports	Imports	Balance
2013	121,746.2	440,430.0	-318,683.8
2014	123,657.2	468,474.9	-344,817.7
2015	115,873.4	483,201.7	-367,328.3
2016	115,594.8	462,420.0	-346,825.2
2017	129,997.2	505,165.1	-375,167.9
2018	120,281.2	538,514.2	-418,232.9
2019	106,448.4	450,760.4	-344,312.0
2020	124,485.4	434,749.0	-310,263.5
2021 (till Sep)	104,976.2	360,415.0	-255,438.8
Total	1277698.10	4969120.60	-3691422.30

Source: U.S. Census Bureau NOTE: All statistics are in millions of U.S. dollars.

Causes of U.S.—China Trade Deficit

China at this moment considered as world's leading economic hub & it owns the biggest labor force in the world. It should split its creation between practically 1.4 billion residents. (Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, 2021) This is numerous times high quantity of individuals in the U.S. China sits at near \$14.trillion in total national output, whereas the G.D.P. of U.S.A. is simply more than \$21.4 trillion. Chinese national output per capita is much lower compared with U.S.A., which financial experts used to measure way of life. Last year before Covid in 2019, China's G.D.P. per capita was 16,804, U.S. Dollars and compared with China, the U.S.A. amounted at \$65,298 (World Bank, 2021).

Causes of Disagreement

United States. Politicians & Political experts have for a long time grounded a trade dispute with U.S.A.'s major trade ally and partner on imports and exports. The deficit in trade occurs when imports exceeds from exports (Kimberly, 2018). This trade war showed its glimpse when in 2017, the U.S.A.'s trade deficit reached to 130 billion \$ with China. This deficit was visible in the three main classifications of exports. The first category is aerospace products which reach up to \$ 16 billion; while 2nd is soybean, which makes up \$ 12 billion; and the last one is cars, and cars make up \$ 11 billion. United States purchases from Chinese Government amounted to 506 billion U.S. Dollars. Maximum of these goods are electrical appliances, clothing, & equipment. However, most of the items

sold came from American producers who are producing export raw ingredients and materials to China for packing at low rate. On the return back to the U.S.A., these items are taken as imports. Due to this, prices hurt U.S.A. and foreign companies. China leads the world. The biggest comparative advantage for China is that it can produce items and finished goods at very low cost compared to other competing countries. Chinese People lead a simple life which makes things easy for them and for companies to pay less to their workers, this simple formula bring good business to China, and it has brought China to replace America as economic Hegemon not only to Asia but to whole world. On the other hand, lavish consumerism of American People forces U.S. manufacturers and companies to extract more money than China. This means high wage rate and high production cost. American common people, of course, can buy these goods coming from China as lot price. Most people cannot buy only to save the national narrative of "Made in America." America's trade conflict with Chinese economic force is actually about reducing or in any case preventing, the very development of China's technological advancement & growing global Geo-economic impact of China's Empire. China is investing in technology in the U.S.A., and it has been scrutinized, and U.S. government agencies are raising awareness of China's attempts at industrial intelligence. To protect U.S. national interest and to limit China's influence on American Economy, the U.S. is increasing tariffs and taxes by invoking a clause in the U.S. Trade Act of 1974 (Lovely & Liang, 2018).

US-China Trade War: Bilateral and Multilateral Impact

A trade war is a financial war among nations. Due to this war each nation enforces trade protectionist regulations towards each other. These obstacles may be imposed in many ways, which include import quotas, tariffs, currency devaluation, domestic subsidies & embargos. When any country imposes a trade and economic barrier, the other nation will retaliate with everything possible and alternate policies are formulated. This constructs the “warring” concept of trade war ([Liadze, 2018](#)).

China replaced America as the leader in international trade, especially in commodity exports in 2015 & and this replacement made China a dominant international economic player in Global system. The absolute nominal G.D.P. of China's reached 14 092 million USD, and this makes China's share to 16.1% on G.D.P. of the whole world, China is second place just behind the U.S. 20 412 million USD which contributed 23.3% share of world G.D.P. (Statistics Times, 2018).

It has been thought that 2018 was the formal year for the peak of this trade war as the signing by then American President Trump of the “Presidential Memorandum Targeting China's Economic Aggression” & high rate of tariffs on steel & aluminum was introduced. Nevertheless, stiffness & tension in financial relations between the China & United States had escalated and had been discussed earlier by American policymakers and China's top political leadership. When the World Trade Organization granted China market economy status in 2017, it was met with criticism from the United States, as such the step had limited opportunities for protectionist policies against Chinese manufacturers. The refusal of the United States to recognize China as a free market economy was the first step against this conflict inside the "Group of Two." The National Security Strategy, released in December 2017, reflected Trump's divisive policies. He restricted Investment flows in U.S. technology, tightening up export controls, as well as continued to expand the list of double items that cannot be transported to China ([Bown, C., Jung, E., & Lu, Z, 2018](#)).

Effect of the U.S. & China Trade War on International Economic System

The U.S.A. & Chinese enmity is perceived as a danger to world harmony & development ([Erken, Every, & Giesbergen, 2018](#)). The war between the two powerful economic States will not only disrupt the international Economic System, on the other hand, the trade off can also hurt the current global trade & economic system. This trade dispute cast a shadow over the Southeast Economic Cooperation conference held in Papua New Guinea in 2018, where leaders failed to produce a united communiqué for the first time. Even as China-US conflict has progressed, wide-ranging corporate strategy concerns have emerged, with some experts describing it as the start of a new economic war ([Itakura, K, 2020](#)).

By using computable general equilibrium model, the World Bank has tried to make an economic calculation: if the United States introduces a 25% tariff on all Chinese products imported into the United States, it can reduce global exports up to 3% & overall world products by 1.7%. Their analysis forecasts that a tariff increase between the China & United States could decrease global exports up to 674 billion \$ & this trade dispute has the potential to damage global income as per estimation up to 1.4 trillion dollars while losses covering all regions” (C. Freund, M. Ferrantino, M. Maliszewska, M. Ruta, 2018).

Trade War and its impact for Pakistan

Traditionally, Pakistan has always upheld strong ties with the United States & China on economic, political & security grounds. The contemporary pillars of US-Pakistan relations include Pakistan's current cooperation on Afghanistan issue, which will need to go beyond the decline of U.S. troops. Although military and economic aid has declined, Pakistan's largest export market remains the United States and the preferred educational center for Pakistani elites. On the other hand; China has become Pakistan's largest arms supplier, and has launched an unprecedented economic partnership through CPEC, with an estimated \$ 62 billion. Pakistani strategists have relied on China for consistent support to fight India's unequal rival and

moral support for helping Kashmir's case become more international — a help the U.S. does not provide ([Propakistani, 2019](#))

As Pakistan is the very crucial ally of each Nation due to the fact that Pakistan is keeping sustainable close friendly relations with both the Countries since its independence. American imports are in huge numbers with Pakistan. While in the fiscal year of 2019-20 from July to March, American imports from Pakistan reached up to 471 billion Rs., while in the same time frame, Pakistani exports to China was Rs. 219 billion, when comparing Pakistani imports from the United States had been. 692.6 billion Rs, whereas Chinese imports to Pakistan changed into 1394.3 billion Rs. ([Economic Survey of Pakistan, 2020](#)). An eminent monetary and geopolitical analyst Osama Rizvi, says that for Pakistan, this monetary trade-off which in between the two biggest economies and most crucial Political players in international arena is very important due to the fact each Nation is certainly considered one among Pakistan's biggest buying and selling partners ([Propakistani, 2019](#)).

Pakistan and India holds key Geo-strategic position in the subcontinent. It would not be easy for any country to satisfy them both because both the countries hold historical animosity. As we discuss on a scenario where offshore balancing as grand strategy may be used by America India to counter China and keeps its hegemonic control in the region. It will make Pakistan apprehensive if U.S.A. the military help on the name of offshore balancing to India can be used against Pakistan. So, America's offshore balancing grand strategy will not be that easy in the subcontinent. to counter India U.S.A. needs Pakistan; as in cold war India never been that much close to America while Pakistan always helped America to resolve its Geo-Political issues like Pakistan providing assistance in defeating USSR as offshore balancer, two-time front-line State, most allied ally while Pakistan thinks that America only uses Pakistan. For America it would not be that easy to successfully launch offshore balancing as it has done in the past when it used Pakistan against Russia as offshore balance state. United States will keep Pakistan engaged to counter India, if in any given scenario, India becomes a

threat to the U.S.A. and it will also want Pakistan to stay in Western Block (Ehsan Choudhri, 2017)

Conclusion

As per the findings, it can be concluded that this trade war is the greatest of all in the economic and monetary history of the world. It can bring about an adjustment of the worldwide trade structure; it can slow down the economic and monetary business sectors. Cold war being an ideological war represented two different types of Socio-Political System but this trade war has the optional to divide the world and the nations into two economic blocks associated with the U.S.A. or China, & simultaneously, shaping the mega coalitions of economies, constructing two different territorial currency or money zones. The role of Asia in globalization processes and the improvement of worldwide economic order can be enhanced. The U.S. activities are to debilitate its primary rival and keep up hegemonic dominance and control in the Global system. U.S.A. is trying its best to slow down the fast monetary development of the People's Republic of China & the rising significance on the World economic system. The Chinese administration is seeking an opportunity to accomplish authority in the fields of mechanical technology, artificial intelligence, and biotechnology. It will offer monetary help to innovative businesses, and will do all that could be within reach not to allow the U.S. to stop or dial back the digitalization & modernization of the current China's economic structure.

Pakistan is keen to reclaim its role as to work as Bridge Empire — remembering the period when it facilitated the US-China conflict in the period of Nixon era. In that particular period, two major powers & a “melting point” to transform China & American interests in order to promote regional security & prosperity of the region, including Afghanistan. In this process, Pakistan will simultaneously benefit from the economic & security benefits associated with maintaining beneficial relations with the two. Pakistan would like to lead the world powers, without having to rely too much on any of them.

References

- Afzal, M. (2020, June 15). "At all costs": How Pakistan and China control the narrative on the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor. Brookings. <https://www.brookings.edu/research/at-all-costs-how-pakistan-and-china-control-the-narrative-on-the-china-pakistan-economic-corridor/>
- Allday, L. (2014). The British in The Gulf: An Overview. <https://www.qdl.qa/en/british-gulf-overview>.
- Allison, G. (2017). *Destined for War: Can America and China Escape Thucydides's Trap?* Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Autor, D. H. (2018). Trade and Labor Markets: Lessons from China's Rise. *IZA World of Labor*. <https://doi.org/10.15185/izawol.431>
- Bloom, N., Draca, M., & Van Reenen, J. (2016). Trade Induced Technical Change? The Impact of Chinese Imports on Innovation, I.T. and Productivity. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 83, 87-117. <https://doi.org/10.1093/restud/rdv039>
- Bown, C., Jung, E., & Lu, Z. (2018). *Trump, China, and Tariffs: From Soybeans to Semiconductors*. VOX, CEPR Policy Portal.
- Carr, E. H. (1945). *Nationalism and After*. Macmillan.
- Carr, E. H. (1946). *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to The Study of International Relations*. Macmillan London.
- Chong, T. T. L., & Li, X. (2019). Understanding the China-US trade war: causes, economic impact, and the worst-case scenario. *Economic and Political Studies*, 7(2), 185-202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20954816.2019.1595328>.
- Countries by GDP (PPP) 2020. (2021). StatisticsTimes.Com. <https://www.statisticstimes.com/economy/countries-by-gdp-ppp.php>
- Dalgaard, C.-J. et al. (2018). *Public goods are REALLY good: thousands of years later, the Roman roads are still paying dividends*. Boing Boing. <https://boingboing.net/2018/04/10/romanes-eunt-domus.html>
- Davis, P. K. (2001). *100 Decisive Battles: From Ancient Times to the Present*. Oxford University Press, U.S.A.
- Dawn. (2018, July 11). *What's on everyone's mind in China-US trade war?* <https://www.dawn.com/news/1419321>
- Dirzauskaite, G. & Ilinca, N. C. (2017). *Understanding "Hegemony" in International Relations Theories*. Development and International Relations, Aalborg University, Denmark. https://projekter.aau.dk/projekter/files/260247380/Understanding_Hegemony_in_International_Relations_Theories.pdf
- Doyle, M. W. (1986) *Empires*. Cornell University Press.
- E.C.B. (2018). *Macroeconomic Implications of Increasing Protectionism*. E.C.B. Economic Bulletin 6/2018, Frankfurt.
- Economic Survey of Pakistan. (2020). *Pakistan Economic Survey 2019-20*. Islamabad: Ministry of Finance.
- Erken, H. P. G., Every, M., & Giesbergen, B. (2018). *US-China Trade War: Back to the Future*. Rabobank.
- Fajgelbaum, P. D., Goldberg, P. K., Kennedy, P. J., & Khandelwal, A. K. (2019). The Return to Protectionism*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 135(1), 1-55. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjz036>
- Ferguson, N. (2005). The unconscious colossus: limits of (& alternatives to) American empire. *Daedalus*, 134(2), 18-33. <https://doi.org/10.1162/0011526053887419>.
- Findling, J. E. & Thackeray, F. W. (2002). *Events that Changed Great Britain Since 1689*. Greenwood Press.
- Freund, C.L., Ferrantino, M.J., Maliszewska, M., & Ruta, M. (2018). *Impacts on global trade and income of current trade disputes*. Macroeconomics, Trade Investment (M.T.I.) Practice Notes.
- Gilpin, R. (1981). *War and Change in World Politics*. Cambridge University Press.

- Gilpin, R. (2016). *The Political Economy of International Relations*. Princeton University Press.
- Grossman, G. M., & Helpman, E. (1991). *Innovation and Growth in the Global Economy*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.
- Hobson, J. M. (2000). *The State and International Relations*. Cambridge University Press.
- Iqbal Dar, A. (2019). The Hell of Good Intentions: America's Foreign Policy Elite and the Decline of US Primacy. *Asian Affairs*, 50(3), 412–414. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03068374.2019.1635824>.
- Itakura, K. (2019). Evaluating the Impact of the US–China Trade War. *Asian Economic Policy Review*, 15(1), 77–93. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aep.12286>.
- Keohane, R. O. (1984). *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kimberly, A. (2018). Trade Wars and How They Affect You.
- Kindleberger, C. P. (1978). *Government and International Trade*. International Finance Section, Department of Economics, Princeton University.
- Kindleberger, C. P. (1981). Dominance and Leadership in the International Economy: Exploitation, Public Goods, and Free Rides. *International Studies Quarterly*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd Oxford, U.K., 25(2), 242–254.
- Kishore, M. (2008). *The New Asian Hemisphere: The Irresistible Shift of Global Power to the East*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Konig, M., Song, Z., Storesletten, K., & Zilibotti, F. (2017). *From Imitation to Innovation? Where Is All that Chinese R & D Going?* Working Paper in Progress, New Haven, CT: Yale University.
- Krasner, S. D. (1983). *International Regimes*. Cornell University Press.
- Krauthammer, C. (1990). The Unipolar Moment. *Foreign Affairs*, 70(1), 23–33. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20044692>.
- Liadze, I. (2018). Trade War Saga Continues. NiGEM Observations, No 13. The National Institute of Economic and Social Research (NIESR).
- Liu, K. (2020). *The effects of the China-US trade war during 2018–2019 on the Chinese economy: an initial assessment*. Economic and Political Studies.
- Lovely, M. E., & Liang, Y. (2018). *Revised Tariffs against China Hit Non-Chinese Supply Chains even Harder*. Washington DC: Peterson Institute for International Economics.
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (2018). *Great Delusion: Liberal Dreams and International Realities*. Yale University Press.
- Mentan, T. (2010). *The State in Africa: An Analysis of Impacts of Historical Trajectories of Global Capitalist Expansion and Domination in the Continent*. African Books Collective.
- Napoleon. (1817). *A Sketch from Life at St Helena*. London: F. P. Tomkins.
- Nye, J. S. (1990). Soft Power. *Foreign Policy*, 80, 153–171. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1148580>.
- Paul, D. (1995). *Towards a New Balance of Power in Asia*. Adelphi Paper 295. pp. 33–34. Cited in Brendan Taylor, "Paul Dibb and the Asian Balance of Power," in *Geography, Power, Strategy and Defence Policy*, ed. Desmond Ball and Sheryn Lee (Canberra: A.N.U. Press, 2016), 171–82.
- Prieger, J. E., Bampoky, C., Blanco, L. R., & Liu, A. (2016). Economic Growth and the Optimal Level of Entrepreneurship. *World Development*, 82, 95–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2016.01.013>
- Propakistani. (2019, December). *End of US-China Trade War: What's in it For Pakistan?* <https://propakistani.pk/2020/01/16/end-of-us-china-trade-war-whats-in-it-forpakistan/>
- Pstaniland. (2020, September 25). *4 Questions on India, Liberalism, America, etc*. Paul Staniland. <https://paulstaniland.com/2020/09/25/4-questions-on-india-liberalism-america-etc/>
- Pugh, M. (1999). *Britain Since 1789: A Concise History*. Macmillan.
- Random, H. (2001). *Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language*. Thunder Bay Press.
- Ross, S. (2004). *Conrad and Empire*. University of Missouri Press.
- Shubhajt, R. (2020). *Explained: What is in the India-US defence deals?*

- <https://indianexpress.com/article/explained/michael-pompeo-rajnath-singh-india-visit-us-defence-deals-6812159/>
- Statista. (2020, May 28). *Number of middle class population in China 2002–2020*.
<https://www.statista.com/statistics/875874/middle-class-population-in-china/>
- Strange, S. (1987). 'The Persistent Myth of Lost Hegemony', International Organization. *Cambridge University Press*, 41(4), 551–574.
- Tellis, A. J. (2020). *India's Path to the Big Leagues - The Day After*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
<https://carnegieendowment.org/2020/09/09/india-s-path-to-big-leagues-pub-82470>
- The World Bank. "G.D.P. Per Capita, P.P.P. (Current International \$)." https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GD.P.PCAP.PP.CD?most_recent_value_desc=true
- Thomas, P. (2009). *The Gramscian Moment: Philosophy, Hegemony and Marxism*. Brill.
- Thucydides. (2017). *The History of the Peloponnesian War*. New York: Dover Publications Inc.
- Trade Map. (2020). Bilateral trade between Pakistan and China: Product: TOTAL All products.
https://www.trademap.org/Bilateral_TS.aspx?nvpm
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2021). "Foreign Trade - Trade in Goods With China"
<https://www.census.gov/foreign-trade/balance/c5700.html>
- U.S. Security Cooperation With India. (2021, January 14). United States Department of State. <https://www.state.gov/u-s-security-cooperation-with-india/>
- Vogel, S. (2018). *Changing the Soybean Trade Rhythm*. Rabobank.
- Wallerstein, I. M. (2004). *World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction*. Duke University Press.
- Waltz, K. N. (2010). *Theory of International Politics*. Waveland Press.
- Webb, M. C. & Krasner, S. D. (1989) 'Hegemonic Stability Theory: An Empirical Assessment', *Review of International Studies*. *Cambridge University Press*, 15(2), pp. 183–198.
- Wei, S. J., Xie, Z., & Zhang, X. (2017). From "Made in China" to "Innovated in China": Necessity, Prospect, and Challenges. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 31, 49-70.
<https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.31.1.49>
- Wu, H. X. (2014). China's Growth and Productivity Performance Debate Revisited. The Conference Board Economics Working Papers No. 14-01.
- Yu, M. (2014). Processing Trade, Tariff Reductions and Firm Productivity: Evidence from Chinese Firms. *The Economic Journal*, 125, 943-988.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/eoj.12127>
- Zolo, D. (2007). 'Contemporary Uses of The Notion of "Empire"', *The Monist*. JSTOR, 90(1), pp. 48–64.