IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Supply Chains As The New Battleground: Trade, Technology And Foreign Policy In A Fragmented World

Dr. Jaydeb Ghosh Chowdhuri
Assistant Professor,
Dept. of Political Science,
Dr. Bhupendra Nath Dutta Smriti Mahavidyalaya,
Hatgobindapur, Purba Bardhaman
West Bengal, India
ORCID iD: 0009-0009-7060-9907

&

Dr. Sudeshna Chowdhury
SACT- I, Dept. of Political Science,
Dr. Gour Mohan Roy College,
Monteswar, Purba Bardhaman,
West Bengal, India
ORCID iD: 0009-0005-5815-279X

Abstract

Global supply chains have become the new battlefield in a world of geopolitical contention, technological competition, and shifting trade links. This paper studies the shift from a deep globalization period of integrated production networks and soaring trade growth to progressive fragmentation under growing protectionism, geopolitical rivalries, and disruptive crises. It investigates how trade policy instruments like tariffs and export controls are being used with growing frequency to create strategic dependencies and decouple from enemy economies. Case studies, such as the U.S.-China trade war and pandemic-driven disruptions, highlight vulnerabilities of hyper-globalized systems. Novel approaches such as friend-shoring and resilience are considered, as countries look to achieve a tradeoff between efficiency and security requirements. Above all, the analysis is unambiguous: the reorganization of global supply chains signals wider economic seismic shifts that are driving immediate reform throughout the world. The results also add to the nascent policy discussions and lay groundwork for additional research.

Keywords: Geopolitics, Fragmentation, Resilience, Weaponization, Friend-shoring.

Introduction

At a time of deepening geopolitical rivalries and economic nationalism, global supply chains have become an increasingly contested prize that intersects with trade, technology and foreign policy. After once being taken for granted as neutral conduits through which commerce could flow unimpeded, supply chains are now regarded as strategic assets— and points of vulnerability — in a world that is more volatile and fragmented. A series of shocks in recent years, from trade wars to a pandemic and military conflict, has shown how fragile that cloture is — and how easily the flow of goods can be disrupted, with repercussions across economies and societies. This new normal will lead to a re-set in national strategy: policymakers now talk about "economic security" with the same urgency that they do efficiency, and alliances are being thought of differently through the lens of supply chain reliance (*How Tariffs Are Breaking Supply Chains| Morgan Stanley*, 2025 & Nelson, 2023).

This article looks at how a globally connected trading system is being remade in the face of greater competition and suspicion. It presents a panoramic perspective on the transition from an era of globalization to one of fragmentation, offers practical advice for coping with this highly fragmented environment and shows in unprecedented detail how supply chains have moved to front and center as tools used by market participants ranging from companies, industries or countries to impose their interests in a variety of macroeconomic negotiations (trade policy, technology wars and general foreign politics). A balanced, evidence-driven discussion will illuminate these developments and their implications.

Background: From Globalization to Fragmentation

In the late 20th and early 21st centuries, globalization led companies and governments to create production networks that were deeply fragmented in search of efficiency. From 1950 to 2008, world trade increased roughly twenty-sevenfold, based on just-in-time manufacturing, lean inventories and the expectation of stable, open markets. They had distributed their operations around the world, taking advantage of comparative strengths and spinning webs of complicated supplies from electronics to energy.

That paradigm started to crumble following the financial crisis that originated in 2008—09, with trade growth grinding to a halt (Grazia Attinasi & Mancini, 2025). The revving of protectionism and populism ended with the 2018 U.S.-China tariffs that zoomed average duties to about 20% and jolted businesses into assessing their dependencies on cross-border value chains. The pandemic exposed those vulnerabilities: when factories closed and transportation was restricted due to COVID-19, it led to severe shortages of semiconductors, medical devices, and key inputs, leading to export bans and government takeovers (Nelson 2023).

Geopolitical tensions have amplified the trend. Post-incursion, Russia's gas hold over Europe vanished (in the vicinity of 150 billion m^3 in 2021, to an estimated 52 billion m^3 by 2024 (Valantasis & Kanellos et al.,2025); sanctions and strikes accentuated conversations around dependence on strategic materials from adversarial states.

Today, geoeconomic fragmentation is the age of trade and investment following geopolitical boundaries (Grazia Attinasi & Mancini, 2025). We have selective dis-integration, not a smooth welt interlacement; and what we have are new trust- and security-based blocs. Globalization's legacy of interdependence is now crashing headlong into rivalry and uncertainty, sculpting supply chains into the new version of a contested battlefield.

Research Approach and Methodology

This paper, in a multi-disciplinary perspective, examines the intersection of supply chains, trade, technology and foreign policy. It draws from academic literature, policy reports, trade statistics and case studies to paint a very wide picture.

A comprehensive literature review would rest on economic assessments of globalization and fragmentation, such as those produced by the I.M.F. and central banks about trade decoupling, and international relations theories alike turn to "weaponized interdependence." Recent events updated include information from think

tanks, government white papers, and reputable news sources addressing trade tensions, pandemic havoc and the Ukraine situation.

World Trade Organization and International Monetary Fund data lay bare trends of rising tariff rates, foreign direct investment and critical technology supply chains. The "chip war" among semiconductors is a case in point, and so are rare-earth minerals conundrums.

Not only does this approach give us insight into the strategic roles of supply chains in foreign policy, it also provides a background to the more detailed analysis below.

Geopolitics of Supply Chains and Trade Policy

Global supply chains are now at the centre of modern trade policy as countries dovetail economic plans with their geopolitical aims. Today, national security imperatives are often pitted against the free trade ideal (*How Tariffs Are Breaking Supply Chains | Morgan Stanley*, 2025). This paradigm shift can be seen in the ascendancy of tariffs, trade controls and new alliances being formed to reconfigure supply networks. Between 2019 and 2022, nearly three times as many new trade restrictions were implemented around the world., i.e., approximately 3,000 measures in one year (*The High Cost of Global Economic Fragmentation,* 2023). Policies of these sorts, advanced under the rubric of "fair trade" or "strategic autonomy," are redrawing the map of global commerce.

The U.S.-China economic split is a case in point. The United States has imposed steep tariffs on more than $300 billion in Chinese imports since 2018, citing unfair trade practices and security reasons. U.S. tariffs on Chinese goods leapt from about 3% by 2020 to about 20% — six times the level before the trade war began. China countered, raising its tariffs on American exports to more than 20 percent from roughly 8 percent in that time. This tit-for-tat escalation shattered one of the world's most solid trading relationships as it leveraged trade policy not just to gain economic advantage, but also to cut strategic dependence. Washington is now looking to partners including Mexico, Vietnam and India (Kallen, 2025), while Beijing seeks to build further trading relations in Asia and the Global South.

And meanwhile, multilateral trade norms are increasingly under attack. The World Trade Organization's dispute settlement mechanism has weakened in practice, and unilateral measures have multiplied. New trade blocs also muddy the waters. The Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP), signed in 2020, by 15 Asia-Pacific countries including China and Japan, now accounts for some 30% of global GDP. The tariff cuts that RCEP provides among its member states might deepen intra-Asian supply chains and potentially leave the Western economies worse off. The US, by contrast, has turned its back on the TPP as it seeks to forge more bespoke alliances around supply chain security (like with Canada and Mexico under the USMCA) or embryonic architecture like that seen in the Indo-Pacific Economic Framework.

In Europe, the concept of "open strategic autonomy" shapes policies that mix market openness with national security. The EU already screens foreign investments in sensitive sectors and negotiates trade deals designed to bolster resilience in critical supply chains—such as pharmaceuticals, batteries and advanced manufacturing. These moves show that the new security imperatives of our day require rethinking global trade.

Export controls and sanctions of cement trade policy to geopolitical strategy. Blocking access to global supply networks through economic sanctions has emerged as a tool of coercion. For instance, overly broad restrictions on Russia's imports of technology and military goods can make it difficult to distinguish between economic policy and foreign policy. China on its part has demonstrated a willingness to restrict exports of important commodities, like rare earths, during diplomatic frictions. As a result, trade patterns are shifting along geopolitical fault lines as friendly nations draw closer, and adversaries are limited to more circumscribed commerce. Strategic industries — energy, electronics and others — are being reoriented to reduce the costs of a newly fragmented world. In the end, these changes in trade policy are symptomatic of a broader change in global economic governance as countries balance interdependence and security during an age of strategic competition.

Technology as a Supply Chain Battleground

Today, the tech supply chain has emerged as a key battlefield of global power: Technology industries now sit at the frontlines of geopolitical competition. Semiconductors clearly illustrate this dynamic. These microchips form the basis of today's digital economies and military systems, but their production is highly consolidated. For instance, TSMC in Taiwan produces over 90% of the most advanced chips in the world (Zaman, 2023). And this concentration of production makes those countries that rely on the components strategically vulnerable, turning their supply chains into an "Achilles' heel" just as regional tensions over Taiwan's fate are mounting.

In turn, countries are scrambling to safeguard chip supply lines and control core technologies. Aggressive efforts have been initiated in the United States to shield its leadership in technology and deny China lucrative access to cutting-edge semiconductor capabilities. On October 7, 2022, the US announced extensive export controls of high-end chips and production tools sold to China (C Allen, 2023). (The COVID-19 pandemic, coming as it did after U.S. export restrictions on these items had been in place for nearly two years, enhances the illusion that China can be deprived of such capability - c.f.: Freund et. al., 2020). Officials (correctly) asserted that these controls were intended to "actively degrade" Chinese leading edge chip production capacity so as to maintain a substantial technology gap (C Allen, 2023). This policy took effect straight away and Chinese entities, including key chip designers and fabs suddenly found themselves starved of crucial componentry; setting their own timeline back years (C Allen, 2023). And the United States' allies, like Japan and the Netherlands, have taken similar steps and added to the limits on Beijing's technology ambitions.

China has responded with an increased emphasis on technological self-reliance. While China cannot magically replicate a full high-end systemic ecosystem overnight, it is diverting investment into legacy chip production, concentrating on midsize nodes that are common in automotive, appliances and military applications. At the same time, China is working on developing its own semiconductor manufacturing equipment and fostering domestic chip startups. It is with this two-pronged approach, securing existing markets and creating alternative supply networks as well as new alliances with nations outside the U.S. sanctions orbit, that India can end its purchasing of Iranian oil with much less negative repercussions for itself.

This battle is broader than just semiconductors and ranges across the entire high-tech landscape. The deployment of 5G networks turned into a geopolitical flashpoint when the United States and its allies banned Chinese equipment from Huawei, forcing telecom supply chains to be restructured around trusted vendors. In the area of critical minerals, China's control— it controls approximately 69% percent of global rare earth production and almost 90% of processing ("China Currently Controls Over 69% of Global Rare Earth Production," 2025) — has propelled the United States and Europe to secure infidelity mining and refining endowments. Under the same Inflation Reduction Act, which is now guiding U.S. policy, electric vehicle tax credits are now linking pay dries to battery components made domestically or by an ally—the policy seeks to push manufacturers away from relying on China.

The power of technology has been transformed into control. States are also pouring billions into industrial policies, including the U.S.'s $52 billion CHIPS Act and Europe's €43 billion Chips Act to support domestic semiconductor production (Council of the European Union [Council of the EU], 2023). International partnerships, like the "Chip 4" connection among the United States, Taiwan, Japan and South Korea, are attempting to ensure a resilient supply of chips while excluding potential adversaries. As Secretary of State Antony Blinken has said, technology is at the center of today's great-power competition (C Allen, 2023). In this new arena, securing access to critical tech and denying it to rivals have become twin imperatives that marry industrial strategy with national security. In sum, these are three strategies that highlight the relevance of a world in transition towards technological decoupling as well as the inevitability of nations and companies to address issues of economic autonomy and resilience due to strategic considerations.

Foreign Policy and the Weaponization of Supply Chains

The increasing fusion of supply chains with geopolitics has resulted in their weaponization — the utilization of choke points and industrial levers as tools of pressure and statecraft. In today's fractured world, regulating the stream of crucial items is a valuable strategic weapon, and overreliance can turn into vulnerability. This awareness is redefining foreign policy doctrines and prompting measures to protect national interest.

A clear example is the energy industry. Russia's decadeslong role as supplier of a critical natural gas to Europe shifted from mutually beneficial partnership to strategic cudgel. In 2022, when war broke out in Ukraine and sanctions were introduced, Moscow drastically reduced gas exports to Europe. Russian pipeline gas flows fell by nearly 80% compared to the previous level, leading to spikes in energy prices and forcing European governments into emergency actions. European leaders lamented this *weaponization of energy* and quickly sought to diversify—from importing U.S. LNG to developing North African pipeline alternatives. The level of Russian gas in Europe's energy mix was reduced from around 45% to less than 20% by 2024 (Mikic et al., 2023), reflecting a clear policy shift intended to minimize enemy power projection.

Another area in which supply chains are weaponized is with regard to critical minerals and resources. Rare minerals like rare earths, lithium and cobalt — essential for militaries and industries in economies around the world — power modern economies. China has repeatedly shown that it can move global markets by cutting back exports on these items. In 2010, during a crisis over Japanese diplomats row diplomatic battle China used rare earth shipments as the tool of its trade-war message that Beijing was willing to use supply denial as a pressure lever (Bowie, 2024). In 2023 China put new export licensing requirements on gallium and germanium — key elements for semiconductor and defense technologies — effectively narrowing supplies during increasing tech tensions. These steps reveal the notion of weaponized interdependence, in which states use their centrality in global supply networks to try and exert political pressure and achieve strategic aims.

Continuing evolving doctrine shines a light on such sanctions. The United States and its allies have also expanded sanctions regimes to limit the targeted states' access to essential goods, tools, and funds. American sanctions against Iran and North Korea seek cut off those governments' vital imports, and wide-reaching export controls on Russia since 2012 have limited its military-industrial base, hobbling production of precision-guided munitions. The saga of Huawei, which has been limited in its access to cutting-edge chips by U.S. actions since 2019, shows how even private companies can be used as instruments in larger geopolitical games.

Nations are also working together to pool strength in the collective quest for leverage. Nations that export the goods form a cartel (similar to OPEC), and nations that import the goods band together (by, for example, friending up shore) (Nelson, 2023). Alliances between countries allow each to harmonise policy, develop alternative suppliers and not be dependent on strategic foes. This multifront approach to weaponizing supply chains reflects a basic proposition that foreign policy in today's world is wrapped around the axis of managing dependencies, choke points and global market leverage.

In the end, this weaponization of supply chains has transformed global trade into a tool for economic leverage in foreign policy — prompting countries to reassess alliances and strategic priorities.

Innovative Strategies and Emerging Models

In the context of geopolitical and supply chain disturbance, firms are becoming more resilient by taking security and robustness into consideration at the expense of inefficiency.

- **Friend-shoring and Alliance-Based Supply Chains:** Re-organising trade relationships by giving priority to the trusted allies lead to mitigating supply risks (Mikic et al., 2023). Europe, for example, relies on Canada for battery minerals and the U.S. looks to India and Europe for pharmaceuticals.
- **Regionalization and "China+1" Strategy:** These strategies can further provide options to regionalize production away from China and move some operations to Vietnam or Mexico, so as not rely too heavily on one country (Kallen, 2025).
- **Stockpiling and Inventory Buffering:** Firms move from a just-in-time to a justin-case system, holding more stock of critical inputs (J Palin, 2022).
- **Strengthened supply chain mapping and early warning systems:** More sophisticated digital technologies reveal weaknesses that can be mitigated before disruptions occur, as with models like the semiconductor industry's (Mikic et al., 2023).
- **Public-Private Partnership:** Governments incentivize the production of these lifesaving products domestically, in addition to joint national stockpiling and reworking trade policies.
- **Environmental and Ethical Supply Chains:** To comply with regulations on forced labor and carbon emissions, only products from ethical, safe sources will be sourced.

Together, these strategies form a flexible model of localized and partnership-based supply chains – durable short supply chains – that will give nations and companies a competitive advantage in mitigating risk while ensuring success.

Conclusion

First, global supply chains are no longer just the concern of economists: They have become high politics. A move toward a sliced-up world has made supply networks newly vulnerable, and potentially new weapons and shields, which will mean dramatic changes in strategy. Our examination points out that the recalibration of trade policies to lower strategic vulnerabilities, technology becoming a center stage domain for supply chain competition and foreign policy acting more often in the hard edges of interdependence. Nations and companies are working to test out new models — from friend shoring to next-generation risk-monitoring systems — for managing in this anxious landscape.

The challenge now is getting the integration right, while keeping it secure. And the financing to achieve absolute self-sufficiency may be impractical — just as knee-jerk hyper-globalization is. A balanced policy will rely on many diverse suppliers; trust among members; and resiliency in the face of a loss of supply. In fact, resilience has now been added to efficiency. To manage supply chains as a new battlefield will also require foresight and cooperation, for if a fragmented world economy is more fragile than one not fractured, those who would fracture it may well stand to lose by their own victories.

Reference:

1. Bowie, B. (2024, September 5). *Japan's Responses to China's Supply Chain Dominance*. Royal United Services Institute. Retrieved May 18, 2025, from https://www.rusi.org/explore-our-research/publications/commentary/japans-responses-chinas-supply-chain-dominance
2. C Allen, G. (2023). China's new strategy for waging the microchip tech war. In *csis.org*. Retrieved May 15, 2025, from https://www.csis.org/analysis/chinas-new-strategy-waging-microchip-tech-war
3. China currently controls over 69% of global rare earth production. (2025, January 17). *Mining Technology*. https://www.mining-technology.com/analyst-comment/china-global-rare-earth-production/
4. Council of the European Union [Council of the EU]. (2023, July 25). *Chips Act: Council gives its final approval* [Press release]. Retrieved May 16, 2025, from https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2023/07/25/chips-act-council-gives-its-final-approval/
5. Grazia Attinasi, M., & Mancini, M. (2025, March 28). *Trade wars and fragmentation: Insights from a new ESCB report*. CEPR. Retrieved May 10, 2025, from https://cepr.org/voxeu/columns/trade-wars-and-fragmentation-insights-new-escb-report
6. *How Tariffs Are Breaking Supply Chains | Morgan Stanley*. (2025, May 6). Morgan Stanley. Retrieved May 10, 2025, from https://www.morganstanley.com/insights/articles/supply-chain-in-fragmented-global-market
7. J Palin, P. (2022, November 13). *Just In Time, Just In Case, or just right?* supplychainresilience.org. Retrieved May 17, 2025, from https://supplychainresilience.org/just-in-time-just-in-case-or-just-right/
8. Kallen, C. (2025, April 10). *How is Geopolitical Fragmentation Reshaping U.S. Foreign Direct Investment?* Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System: FEDS Notes. Retrieved May 13, 2025, from https://www.federalreserve.gov/econres/notes/feds-notes/how-is-geopolitical-fragmentation-reshaping-us-foreign-direct-investment-20250410.html
9. Kanellos, N. V., Dublin, T., & Schiffling, S. (2025, February 28). How rare minerals & supply chains have become a new battleground. *RTE*. https://www.rte.ie/brainstorm/2025/0227/1499238-rare-minerals-ukraine-donald-trump-us-supply-chains-global-conflict-geopolitics/
10. Mikic, M., Nag, B., Stephenson, S., & Pacific Economic Cooperation Council. (2023). *INDIA 2023 Supply Chain Resilience, Friend-shoring, and the Pursuit of Non-Economic Objectives* [T20 Policy Brief]. https://t20ind.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/T20_PolicyBrief_TF1_Friend-shoring.pdf
11. Nelson, M. (2023, June 2). *The Roles of Diplomacy and Homeland Security in a New Supply Chain World Order HS Today*. HSToday. Retrieved May 10, 2025, from https://kaptest.hstoday.us/featured/the-roles-of-diplomacy-and-homeland-security-in-a-new-supply-chain-world-order/
12. Pandey, A. (2023, September 1). EU gas supply: When Russia went into self-destruct mode. *dw.com*. https://www.dw.com/en/eu-gas-russia-nord-stream-crisis/a-66668256
13. Valantasis Kanellos, N., Dublin, T., & Schiffling, S. (2025, February 28). How rare minerals & supply chains have become a new battleground. *RTE*. https://www.rte.ie/brainstorm/2025/0227/1499238-rare-minerals-ukraine-donald-trump-us-supply-chains-global-conflict-geopolitics/
14. Zaman, R. (2023, December 5). *Taiwan's Semiconductor Monopoly- How did it arise?* THE WAVES. Retrieved May 15, 2025, from https://www.the-waves.org/2022/03/19/taiwans-semiconductor-monopoly-how-did-it-arise/