ISSN : 2395-4132

THE EXPRESSION

An International Multidisciplinary e-Journal

Bimonthly Refereed & Indexed Open Access e-Journal

The Expression Journal

Impact Factor 6.4

Vol. 11 Issue 5 October 2025

Editor-in-Chief : Dr. Bijender Singh

Email : editor@expressionjournal.com

www.expressionjournal.com

The Expression: An International Multidisciplinary e-Journal
(A Peer Reviewed and Indexed Journal with Impact Factor 6.4)
www.expressionjournal.com ISSN: 2395-4132

Trade Wars and Economic Sanctions: Their Effect on Global Supply Chains and Market Stability

Harpreet Singh
Research Scholar, Faculty of Law, Tantia University, Sri Ganganagar
Dr. Deepak Singal
Research Supervisor, Faculty of Law, Tantia University, Sri Ganganagar

::

Abstract
Economic sanctions have already become trade wars, altering the trend of trade, the line of investment, and the international economic arena deprived of scenes of stability of the market practice. In comparison to tariffs, quotas, and retaliatory measures that are disruption to international trade, sanctions may be viewed as some geopolitical tools that limit international access to goods, capital, and technology. Together, they propagate effect on global supply chains, which is adjusted in both manufacturing, energy and technology industries, and has either unequal effect, both on developed and developing regions. The presented paper is a conceptual representation of trade war and sanctions which involves how they impact disruptiveness, the importance of war and sanction in a general economic sense. It examines this destabilizing impact of such moves on global supply chains, vulnerability industry-specific developed and shift in the dynamics driving the economies in areas. More special attention is drawn to the effect they have on the stability of the markets; in that connection, the instabilities in the trade and finance are one of the sources of fluctuations in investment flows, the power of inflation, and the strategic sleepwalking of companies and governments. As determined in the case studies concerning the trade war between the U.S and China, and in the informing sanctions imposed by the Western countries to Russia, the study brings out the direct shock and the structural change that has been instituted in the long run. In the short run, trade wars and imposed sanctions may lead to a temporary political or economic gain, although, as the analysis has proven, it would rather raise predictability, lack advancement of further cooperation in the global scene, and accelerate the process of seeking alternative supply channels. At its conclusion, the paper presents some policy guidelines that would provide a balance between the need to achieve national security and the need of achieving sanity and robustness in the global markets.

Keywords
Trade Wars, Economic Sanctions, Global Supply Chains, Market Stability, International Trade, Economic Statecraft.

::

The Expression: An International Multidisciplinary e-Journal
(A Peer Reviewed and Indexed Journal with Impact Factor 6.4)
www.expressionjournal.com ISSN: 2395-4132

Trade Wars and Economic Sanctions: Their Effect on Global Supply Chains and Market Stability

Harpreet Singh
Research Scholar, Faculty of Law, Tantia University, Sri Ganganagar
Dr. Deepak Singal
Research Supervisor, Faculty of Law, Tantia University, Sri Ganganagar

1. Introduction

In the recent years, trade wars and economic sanctions became the most conducted tools of statecraft as the model of multilateral cooperation transforms into the model of economic competition. Unlike the standard tariffs or regulatory barriers, they are predominantly politically and security-driven, an element which complicates the fact that they can impact global economic constructions to an even greater extent and in a very uncertain manner. The U.S and China trade war which has been escalating levies on goods worth hundreds of billions of dollars, has disrupted the global supply chains and exposed lack of technology, agriculture, and production gaps. Similarly, the Western factory sanctions of Russia, which have been imposed following the 2014 invasion of Crimea, and increased dramatically following the 2022 invasion of Ukraine, have created long-lasting effects in both the energy markets and food security and financial stability.[1]

The significance of trading war and sanction as a form of coercion in achieving geopolitical objectives of nations and the below grading principle of predictability and interdependence that have always been the pillars of world trade explain this gravity of these approaches in the future. The effect of destabilizing occurs systemically at his or her level of corporation multinational level in that it undergoes an augmentation of price, and chain of supply, at the consumer level in that the economy faces a pressurizing inflation lack of balance, at the developing economic sectors level in that the economy would suffer as a result of disruption of the global value chain.[2] In this manner, trade wars and sanctions are not short-term disputes as they are structural issues to stability of the world market order. Their impact is then significant in

[1] Evenett, Simon J., *Economic Sanctions, Trade Wars and the Future of Globalization* (Cambridge University Press, 2021) p. 64.
[2] Hainmueller, Jens and Hiscox, Michael J., "Domestic Demand for Economic Sanctions" (2006) 50(4) *International Organization* 755.

achieving how globalization is trying to implement a new concept and how the future in international economic governance would be.

Research Objectives

1. To discuss the conceptual bases of trade wars and the economic sanctions (what they are and what are the historical developments and the underlying theory behind those sanctions?
2. To examine how trade wars and sanctions affect the international supply chains with references to the main industries, including manufacturing, technology, and energy, and also regional patterns.
3. In order to gauge the impact of these steps on the stability of the global markets, it is important to concentrate on trade flows, financial markets, and investments patterns.
4. To evaluate the issues of implication on a case studies-based scenario of the U.S.-China trade war and the Western sanctions on Russia to draw conclusions on the aspects that govern international economic policies.

Research Methodology

The research design employed in the paper is qualitative and comparative that entails implementing both doctrine investigation and case study approach. The knowledge of the legal nature and of the policy of the sanctions and trade wars is regarded as knowledge of the principal sources of the achievement of the knowledge as a result of information represented by trade policy documents, researches of the WTO and formal systems of sanctions offered by the United States, the European Union, and the United Nations. In keeping with them, economic report, trade statistics and market data is considered to assess their actual impacts in real world scenarios on supply chain and financial stability on the supply chain. Critical insights and theory base, this is offered by secondary sources such as scholarly books, journal articles and think-tank sources. The Reports also use the case studies of the trade war of U.S. and Russia, as well as Western sanctions against Russia that are compared to identify not only common regularities in these cases but also the features typical of the situations. Such a hybrid strategy enables the comprehensive comprehension of the impact of coercive forms of the economy on the processes of trade and market stability in the world.

2. Trade Wars and Economic Sanctions: A Conceptual Overview

Trade wars are related war actions undertaken by nations to curb imports and exports by means of leveling of tariffs, quotas among other limitations to certain goods as a measure of perceived unfair trade. Trade wars, unlike normal trade conflicts that a multilateral system such as the World Trade Organization (WTO) might easily settle using economic- based reasons, are driven by retaliation mechanisms that often go beyond economic-based explanations to encapsulate underlying geopolitical argumentation. The U.S.-China trade war (as of 2018) is a characterizing instance where the hundreds of billions of dollars were levied by not only figuring out the imbalances in trade but also by counteracting technological upsurge of China.[3] Trade wars have historically manifested themselves in various formations, such as the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 in the midst of the Great Depression, with the most recent that can influence its essence being any one of the many trade-related controversies happening now in technology and the digital trade, but the overall net impact is to interrupt the

[3] Irwin, Douglas A., *Trade Policy Disaster: Lessons from the 1930s* (MIT Press, 2012) p. 88.

dual elements of free trade flow and the increased worry about scientific mitigation in the world market.

Economic sanctions on the other hand are imposed restrictions imposed by one or more states on another state, entity or individual with such a view as to induce behavior change. They may be in the form of freezing of assets, imposition of trade, imposing financial transactions or ban on essential goods like technology and energy. In contrast to tariffs, sanctions not only represent commercial tools but are entrenched in foreign policies and security policies. They want to erode the economy and political determination of a target and give an indication of disapproval to other countries. The imposition of sanctions on Russia in response to its activities in Ukraine or Iran to its nuclear program is an example of sanctions exceeding a trade controversy to a wider security issue.[4]

When it comes to theory, the trade wars and the sanctions can be justified both in realist and liberal terms of international political economy. Realist theories see them as power projection tools, and states adopted power and chose strategic dominance over economic efficiency. However, liberal theories warn that such actions destroy the concept of interdependence, international institutions, and markets. Collectively these views highlight the two-sidedness of these types of tools: as beneficial as they can be in the short-term strategic contexts, they have the potential to disrupt the economic stability on which the global prosperity is ceremonial.

3. Impact on Global Supply Chains

- **Key Sectors Affected**

The most direct impacts on the global chain of supply include trade wars and macro-economic sanctions that have been targeting the businesses in the areas that rely on the cross-border production networks, cross-border raw material sources, and global transfers of technology. The manufacturing sectors particularly the automobiles and electronics are very sensitive because they are dependent on the value chains which are multi-national. This trade war between the U.S. and China has broken the chain in semiconductor supply as well as the machinery supply chain, leaving all the firms to look for other sources. Sectors involving technology in particular are the most vulnerable to the output of any business because blocking a transfer of intellectual property, software and improved equipment brings close to stagnation and competition.[5] There are no severe after-effects on energy markets, either, as Russian sanctions have rearranged the delivery chain of oil and gas, renegotiated the premises of European energy security and contributed to an overall increase in global prices unpredictability. Agricultural commodities are not an exception with the tariffs messing up the supply and demand curves and increasing the cost of production and consumption.

Regional Dimensions

Regional effects of trade wars and sanctions are dependent upon reliance on global value chains. Economically developed countries might experience an upsurge in production costs and inflationary trends, but are able to either shift the supply chain or

[4] Drezner, Daniel W., *The Sanctions Paradox: Economic Statecraft and International Relations* (Cambridge University Press, 1999) p. 134.
[5] Sturgeon, Timothy J., *The New Global Supply Chain Landscape: Innovation, Upgrading, and Restructuring in Global Industries* (MIT Press, 2021) p. 92.

absorb it. The weaker economies, which are part of the world production as pursuers of middle products, face greater derailments which took place in Southeast Asia amid the U.S.-China trade war. Economies that are resource-dependent are exposed to sanctions on energy, metals or agricultural exports to experienced loss of revenues and fiscal instabilities as it has happened in the case of Russia and Iran. Conversely, other territories could be temporary winners; other countries such as Vietnam and Mexico were drawn to make an investment as a substitute manufacturing center in response to U.S- China tensions. In general, regional performance has shown that as disruptions are an aptitude, it becomes an expediency in diversification processes that helps to transform world supply networks.[6]

Effect on Market Stability

Economic penalties and trade wars inflict a ripple effect on the stability of the world market for the multitude of trade relations, the financial systems and pattern of investments at the same time. Increased tariffs discourage the trade by escalating every cost and competitive edge and retaliation breaks up the worldwide chain of supply. The Li game between the U.S and China, as was the case; marginalized bilateral trade levels and limited both nations to address additional partners like Vietnam resulting in diversion of trade yet the trade equilibrium was not maintained. Sanctions serve to increase this damage by cutting-off whole markets, e.g. made Russia unable to access Western economies, compelling its energy exports to Asia and redrawing the world in terms of commodities, which causes products to move.[7]

The economic aspect of stability is also insecure. The stock markets are usually volatile when they receive news of tariff announcements or sanction, as it shown on the stock market reflects the worry by investors on the chances of this causing supply, or loss of earnings. The same tendency can be seen in currency markets: the Chinese yuan has become miserable during the U.S.-China disputes, whereas the Russian Ruble precipitated dramatically due to Western sanctions. The action of limiting cross-border banking activities and excluding Russian banks off the SWIFT system has further limited the liquidity and destroyed the global network of finances.[8]

These measures have destabilized as well investment flows. The uncertainty in tariffs, supply chain changed and limitations in the transfer of technologies have made multinational corporations to delay or shift capital commitments. Companies which had already centralized their production in China started decentralizing their processes to Southeast Asia and Mexico and the sanctions against Russia ascertained a great deal of capital flight. This news brings out the same argument, where continued trade wrangles and sanctions not only cause short term shocks but also ruin confidence of long-term hinges on world markets. The overall consequence is an atmosphere of indecision which negates the predictability, inter-dependence and robustness which is necessary to stable international trade and investments.

---

[6] Baldwin, Richard, *The Great Convergence: Information Technology and the New Globalization* (Harvard University Press, 2016) p. 148.
[7] Obstfeld, Maurice, *Global Capital Markets: Integration, Crisis, and Growth* (Cambridge University Press, 2019) p. 89.
[8] Ghosh, Atish and Qureshi, Mahvash, "Currency Wars, Sanctions and Financial Stability" (2017) 13(2) *Journal of Financial Stability* 221.

Case Studies

The trade war that has started in 2018 involving the United States and China may be viewed as an example of how the intensifying of tariffs between two leading economies may affect the global supply chain and distress the market equilibrium. United States through its initiation of the conflict aimed to correct the problem of its trade deficit, including the theft of intellectual property and forced transfers of its technology but the conflict soon escalated in a series of retaliatory levies. Hundreds of billions of dollars' worth of goods were not spared, including agriculture, electronics, machinery as well as consumer goods.

The effects were felt both in the two economies: U.S. producers were losing their export revenue in China to soybean and Chinese producers had to pay more to buy imported machinery, the multinational companies had little choice but to move their production, not to China anymore. Uncertainty was experienced through financial markets with drastically fluctuating stock indexes and currency as world investors looked elsewhere respected digits.[9] As regardless as there were some areas (like Vietnam and Mexico) that were able to gain through the diversion in the training and investment, the aggregate result was to have more volatility, an step in the production expenses, and a lack of confidence in the predictability of the world-trade arrangement.

Another but equally disruptive case is the sanctions such as the United States, the European Union and allies placed on Russia in response to its actions in Ukraine. The sanctions were imposed on such areas as energy and finance spheres, as well as the defense and technologic ones striving to limit access of Russia to funds, markets, and the use of newest technologies. The cutoff of the Russian banks attached to the SWIFT system as well as constrained exporting of energy had far-reaching impacts especially on the energy security of Europe that relied on Russian oil and gas for long.[10] The immediate impact emerged of a rise in the international energy prices that propagated into the global inflationary strains which were even more experienced in the developing economies that were dependent on the imported fuel. Russia wanted to shift its exports towards Asia, specifically China and India but the restructuring incurred large expenses and also brought to light the risks of isolation by the developed markets and technologies in the long run. Economically speaking, the sanctions brought about capital flight, battery-depreciation of the Ruble (which was to be later revived on an interim basis based on capital controls) and an absence of predictability in world commodity markets such as oil to wheat.[11]

The comparison of these two cases highlights that there are similarities as well as differences between the implementation of the trade wars and the sanctions as they interfere with the stability in the globe. Both introduce uncertainty, which spills over trade flows, financial markets and investment decisions but they are different in the way they do it. The conflict between the U.S and China had to do with the mutually thrusted tariffs in a context of economic competition whereas the Russian one was

---

[9] Zhang, Xiaobo, "The Impact of the US–China Trade War on Global Value Chains" (2020) 58(6) *China Economic Review* 101.

[10] Connolly, Richard and Hanson, Philip, *Import Substitution and Economic Sovereignty in Russia* (Chatham House, 2016) p. 73.

[11] Selezneva, Ekaterina, "Sanctions and Russia's Energy Sector: Adaptation and Vulnerability" (2017) 41(5) *Europe-Asia Studies* 821.

characterized by selective prohibition imposed to disable the financial base of a hostile country due to geopolitical concerns. Although the former brought about the diversification and diversion of the supply chain, the latter transformed the world energy and commodity markets resulting in inflationary repercussions. Combined, these instances reveal that in either format: tariffs or sanctions the application of economic tools in coercive strategy nullifies predictability of globalization by obliging states and businesses to respond to such pressure by making expensive adjustments to supply chains and marketing policies.

Conclusion and Policy Suggestions

Economic sanctions and war based on trading have now been key features in the globalized economy characterized by the economy's statecraft re-constructing the supply chains and trade flows, and the stability of the global markets. Even though they are more likely to be practiced as an instrument of political/strategist benefit, the backlashes extend well beyond the targeted states, disrupting the global business and increasing the expenses, as well as breaking the predictability, the backbone the global business postulates on. As seen in the U.S- China trade war, the process of tariff escalation between any two large power could be disaggregating the production chains, reshaping and transnational in disrupting the outcome of the trade and showing how the sanctions against Russia brought about the outcome of the highly interdependent world economy by reducing the transfers of energy and commodities. The level of the issues in the two cases is similar in that they are all paradoxical in the way that the immediate interests may be won using it, yet it ends up neglecting the bigger picture of globalization that makes the system stable and grows over time.

It is the problem of satisfying the need of national security and at the same time ensuring economic sustainability in the world. The too many times application of coercive trade instruments causes a danger of escalating the movement into the accelerated imparting of fragmentation guiding nations and enterprises to craftily re-brand supply chains at untenable and costly prices in order to have confidence in the multilateral frameworks. The more sustainable problem would be to ensure that we are improving the multilateral dispute resolution and the transparency in the implementation of the sanctions, we are promoting our policies of diversification that will not over-rely a specific market or supplier. In the meantime, any portfolio diversification to invest in regional cooperation, in either digital trade infrastructure or even a renewable energy transition would serve to cushion an economy up in the air by conflicting trade agreements and sanctions. In the short term, economic coercion to advance the political objective should be retarded by considering its costs at the ultimate level of the end system and it is advisable that the markets and supply chains of the world should be stable in order to realize its prosperity.