



Geoeconomic Rivalry and Trade Realignment: The Impact of US–China Strategic Competition on Emerging Economies

Muhammad Taqi¹, Aneeqa Zia², Dr. Malik Muhammad Ali³ & Muhammad Azhar Qureshi⁴

¹Lecturer, Department of Management Sciences, TIMES University, Multan, Pakistan,

Email: muhammadtaqi@t.edu.pk

²Lecturer, Department of Management Sciences, TIMES University, Multan, Pakistan,

Email: aneeqazia1234@gmail.com

³Assistant Professor, Department of International Relations, TIMES University Multan Pakistan,

Email: ali_ir91152@yahoo.com

⁴Principal, Punjab Colleges Muzaffargarh, Punjab, Pakistan, Email: Azhar.accmgarh@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: December 20, 2025

Revised: January 25, 2026

Accepted: February 03, 2026

Available Online: February 11, 2026

Keywords:

US–China rivalry; geoeconomics; trade realignment; emerging economies; geostrategic globalization; global value chains; economic fragmentation; strategic trade; power transition; alignment and hedging

Corresponding Author:

Muhammad Taqi

Email:

muhammadtaqi@t.edu.pk



ABSTRACT

The escalating geoeconomic competition between the US and China is redefining the structure of globalization and creating new systems of trade realignment in the developing world. This theoretical paper is based on the conceptualization of emerging economies as strategic swing states that are relevant in both economic and political spheres of rivalry interacting at the pivotal point. Combining the knowledge of power transition criterion, strategic trade theory, and the idea of geostrategic globalization, the paper claims that trade realignment is not a short-term consequence of tariff conflicts but a structural expression of competition interdependence. The paper constructs an analytical framework that characterizes restructuring of trade by three interconnected processes which include policy-induced restructuring (tariffs, export controls and industrial subsidies), corporate strategic recalibration (hedging and alignment strategies in global production networks) and alignment-based economic clustering (bloc-oriented trade and investment patterns motivated by strategic alliance). The analysis also helps to explain the scope conditions according to which these mechanisms work and why the results are lower in the emerging economies basing on the institutional capacity, industrial strategy, and geopolitical location. The research not only adds to the existing literature on international political economy by linking literatures on both security-focused and trade-focused orientations, but it also reinvigorates the concept of globalization as a system of transformation with partial fragmentation in lieu of collapse. The paper will conclude that, although geoeconomic rivalry can create opportunities of diversification and upgrading in the emerging markets, it also endangers dependency and volatility, and therefore strategic hedging and domestic building capacities might be the key to long-term resilience.

Introduction

The growing strategic competition between the United States and China has become the major structural characteristic of the modern international political economy (khan Durrani, 2025). What started as an issue of trade tariffs and intellectual property has become a battle in many aspects such as technology, finance, supply chains, strategic resources and institutional power. In contrast to the past periods of economic tension, the present standoff is incorporated into a larger power change process, whereby an emerging China is facing the status quo of the dominant United States (Nuruzzaman, 2022). This competition does not only exist in the context of bilateral relations but is also transforming global trade architecture, investment flows and development paths in regions. In this regard, emerging economies are finding themselves in a critical but dangerous situation as the forces and opportunities created through this geoeconomic competition affect their economic approaches, diplomatic orientation, and industrial policies (Blarel, 2024).

The post-cold war period in the past was marked by the neoliberalization of the world based on the assumptions of interdependence, efficiency and market-based resource distribution. The process of producing networks across national borders became widespread and multinational companies maximized their production networks, trade liberalization intensified institutional integration with structures like the World Trade Organization (Ekelund et al., 2026). But according to the recent scholarship on the topic of "geostrategic globalization," this liberal paradigm is being supplanted by a more interventionist and security-focused logic, in which states are more likely to weaponize trade, technology, and finance in order to achieve strategic goals. Loss of trust between Washington and Beijing has already resulted in the export controls, investment screening, friendshoring activities, and subsidization of industries, speeding up the fragmentation of the global economy. This change indicates that the globalization was particular to efficiency is over and economic realignment is power-driven (Schneider-Petsinger et al., 2019).

The trade war that was launched in 2018 was a landmarking moment in this shift. The highly integrated production networks were revealed to be vulnerable as a result of tariff increase, retaliation and supply chain reconfiguration. Although, in the early analyses, very little attention was paid to any other form of spillover effects, the later developments have indicated that there are other economic costs that are incurred directly by both the United States and China (Hassan, 2025). Trade diversion, capital reallocation and manufacturing geography change were observed in emerging economies where firms aimed to reduce the geopolitical risk. With this new frontier, Southeast Asian or South Asian, Latin, and even African countries started becoming the target of diverted foreign direct investment and new production operations, and at the same time were pressured to align politically either with one or the other side (Airaud et al., 2025).

The business consequences of this competition are not limited to competition in the market. The boost of military alliances, infrastructural diplomacy and technology coalitions all points to the wider reworking of the international order. Research on South Asia, such as that, also brings out the importance of the changing quadrilateral relationship between the United States, India, China, and Pakistan in influencing regional security decisions and economic collaboration (YOGANANDHAM, 2025). The same recalibration can be seen in other places of the Indo-Pacific and further, where the emerging states find their way in balancing between the balancing and bandwagoning strategies in the competition of great power. These changes further stress that the realignment of the trade cannot be done without the geopolitical strategy as the economic relationships are becoming the indicator of political orientation and strategic choice (Liu, 2025).

Theoretically, the power transition theory and the realist international relations theories indicate that systemic competition between a hegemonic and an emerging power creates uncertainty and

institutional instability. However, the comparative advantage-based classical trade theory can do little to explain the effects of strategic competition on long-run industrial capacity and geopolitical advantage (Ji & Tong, 2025). The newer dynamic models underline the idea of direct benefits of trade surpluses, accumulation of capital and technological modernization to national power, thus provoking a challenge to the conventionalist view of free trade to uniformly increase mutual benefits. Making economic exchange intertwined with strategic rivalry, policy decisions are considered not only in terms of the efficiency standards but also autonomy, resilience, and security are factors (Wang, 2025).

Although an increasing amount of literature on the topic of US-China competition has been established, there are still several gaps in grasping the general implications of the issue on emerging economies. The available research is focused mostly on bilateral relations between Washington and Beijing, or on regional case studies of a small focus (Ling, 2025). Little focus has been placed on the systematic examination of the geoeconomic rivalry in altering trade pattern, foreign directed investment flows and industrial restructuring in a broader range of developing and middle-income nations. In addition, the role of strategic agency of these economies is frequently disregarded by empirical tests which depict them as the victims of the great power pressures instead of the actors who seek diversified alignment strategies (van Niekerk, 2025).

The other critical research gap would be the combination of the economic and geopolitical point of view. Research on security relations often ignores effects of trade and investment whereas economic research does not take into account consequences of power politics. However, the modern reality shows that the decisions of the supply chain, technology collaboration, and investment in infrastructure are incorporated into the strategic calculations (Wang, 2023). The developing economies need to decide whether they should take benefit of the short run economic advantages of diversion of trade or take into consideration long run risk of dependency, exposure to sanctions or political involvement. It is thus necessary to have a holistic framework that will cut across international political economy and strategic studies to reflect the multidimensional nature of trade realignment (Qadri, 2024).

This question is more than an academic issue. To the policy makers in the growing markets, it is essential to be aware of how geoeconomic rivalry works so that they can be able to formulate effective development policies. Choices on whether to engage in infrastructure projects, whether to accept foreign investment or use digital standards have ramifications on technological independence and economic self-sufficiency (Grosse, 2025). Simultaneously, any error of misjudgment of the strategic alignment can place economies at a risk of retaliatory tariffs, export limitations, or financial instability. The globalization process is becoming increasingly more intricate and fragmented; thus, new states have to walk the fine line of diversification and dependency (El Hajoui et al., 2025).

Trade re-alignment has also impacted the economy of the world in terms of the changed trends of global production. MNCs are turning to hedging strategies through offshoring parts of the production to third world countries as others are more in line with industrial policies supported by the state (Dar & Javid, 2025). This reorganization has made it possible to allow some of the emerging economies to become part of high-value parts of supply chains. These benefits are however unevenly distributed and could be subject to geopolitics other than comparative advantage as such. Therefore, the classical concept of export-led growth has to be re-evaluated in the circumstances of strategic fragmentation (Lee, 2022).

Moreover, the convergence of technology and trade has increased the level of stakes in the alignment decisions. The semiconductor, artificial intelligence and critical minerals export controls disclose that the mechanism of dominion over technological chokepoints is a tool of power

(Zhang, 2024). Emerging economies, which are resource extractors, electronics assemblers, or providers of digital infrastructure, might find themselves attracted into other competing technological systems. Separating standards and platforms will put a country in a parallel system, which will affect the long-term productivity trends and innovation capacity (Shambaugh, 2018).

Moreover, the capital flows and currency arrangements are also being transformed with financial realignment. The trends in strategic decoupling, changes in the use of reserve currencies, and partial sanctions regimes change the face of international finance (Khan, 2022). The new markets that mostly depend on foreign funding are highly volatile since the geopolitical tensions are upsetting investors. Ability to attract diversified investment and at the same time retain macroeconomic stability becomes a key point of difficulty in this world of strategic uncertainty (Rahman, 2025).

The larger implications of development are enormous. Although trade diversion can drive short term exporting growth, the reliance on politically inclined supply chain relocation can be weak in the case of geopolitical environment change (Zou, 2025). Strategic infrastructure investments are also associated with increased connectivity but they can also create issues of debt sustainability. In such a way, the overall welfare effect of geoeconomic competition on the emerging economies is unclear and should be subjected to systemic empirical research (Thakur, 2025).

The research paper collects these gaps by looking at the impact of US-China strategic competition on realignment of trade, pattern of foreign direct investment and pattern of strategic alignment behavior amongst emerging economies. It no longer views these states as marginal actors but as strategic swing economies whose policy decisions are part of determining the changing world order (Schindler & Rolf, 2025). The analysis aims to offer a multidimensional interpretation of economic fragmentation and the developmental impact of the latter by incorporating the input of the power transition theory together with geostrategic globalization and strategic trade models (Jean, 2024; MONNAPPA).

Finally, globalization metamorphosis in the environment of massive power competition is a structural change in the international system. Emerging economies are at the crossroads of competing spheres of economical opportunities, they have a complicated terrain of opportunities and threats to get through (Ramos, 2025). The success of geoeconomic fragmentation leading to diversified growth pathways or dependency will be determined by the kind of strategies adopted by both the great powers and the developing states. It is thus imperative to understand these dynamics so as to project the future outlines of international trade, development and power distribution in the world in the twenty first century (Mehling, 2025).

Research Objectives

The main aim of this research is to inferentially analyze the effects of increasing geoeconomic competition between the United States and China to transform trade institutions, financial flows, and pattern of strategic alignment within the emerging economies. This study seeks to shed light on the systemic implications of strategic competition on developing nations and middle-income nations by going beyond a bilateral viewpoint of Washington and Beijing that is integrated into world production systems.

In particular, the research aims at attaining the following objectives:

- *To test the hypothesis of effect of US-China strategic rivalry on trade diversion, export reorientation, and structural realignment in emerging economies in a purely empirical way.*

- *To understand the influence of geoeconomic rivalry on the patterns of foreign direct investment and strategic alignment choice in emerging markets and to evaluate the wider developmental consequences of such realignment.*

Research Questions

The general aim of the research paper is to analyse the impact of growing geoeconomic competition between the US and China in transforming trade patterns, flows of investments and strategic orientations in new economies. By so doing, the study transcends the bilateral studies of US-China competition but rather addresses the effects of the third-country, especially in the developing and middle-income states that are becoming key strategic intermediaries in an increasingly disaggregating global economy.

The research question that will be the focus of this study is:

RQ1: What are the implications of deepening US-China geoeconomic competition on the patterns of trade realignment in the emerging economies?

RQ2: What effect does strategic competition between the United States and China have on the foreign direct investment flows and economic alignment strategies in emerging markets?

Literature Review

The increase in literature on the US-China strategic competition is a sign of a fundamental change in the perception of the relationship between economics and geopolitics in the twenty first century by scholars. Instead of considering trade and investment as a tool of equal benefits shared by all, recent research begins to think of them as an arm in an overall power struggle. According to Zou (2025), the modern trade war is not just the battle over tariffs but a clash of structure of industrial capacity, technological hegemony, and long-term geopolitical hegemony. Through the creation of the dynamic game model of trade, Zou (2025) shows that the long-term existence of trade surpluses and capital accumulation is directly connected to strategic power, which undermines the traditional comparative advantage theory.

On the same note, Schindler and Rolf (2025) argue that globalization is transforming instead of dying. They present a notion of the geostrategic globalization to refer to a new era that has been defined by state intervention, industrial policy, and restructuring of a supply chain. To mitigate the geopolitical risk to multinational corporations, Schindler and Rolf (2025) claim that companies are moving towards either hedging strategies, the strategy of production diversity in several countries, or alignment strategies, when a company closely follows state production goals. This business redefinition has serious consequences on the emerging economies, which would be appealing to the deflected investments, but it would be subject to alignment strain as well.

Regarding regional security, Khan (2021) highlights the quadangular pattern that is emerging in South Asia as US-India strategic cooperation is getting stronger, with China-Pakistan relationship getting more intense under the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI). Khan (2021) explains that this arrangement heightens the vulnerability of security dilemmas as well as strategic rivalry to be transferred into the economic realms. The paper brings to the fore the role of infrastructure project like the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) as part and parcel of greater geostrategic calculations, and that economic integration cannot be decoupled of power balancing processes.

The author, Ramos (2025) expands on the basis of the argument by considering the recalibration of South Asia under the US-China rivalry. According to Ramos (2025), regional states shift in the balance and bandwagoning strategies as dictated by economic benefits and security concerns. The paper highlights that the emerging economies are active participants and not passive actors as they

are trying to maximise autonomy in the face of systemic competition. This opinion is in line with the realist theory of international relations, which suggests that changes of power create an atmosphere of uncertainty and force states to change their foreign policy orientations.

Offensive realism has been used extensively in providing the theoretical basis of this discussion. Mearsheimer (2014) argues that it is only natural that emerging powers will desire regional hegemony, and the existing powers will react by forming containment alliances. Ramos (2025) incorporates this logic into modern context of relation of Indo-Pacific made countries by stating that the United States consolidates partner relations like the Quad to support the growing prominence of China. In the meantime, China is using its economic tools, such as BRI financing and partnerships with regions to stabilize the regional status.

Outside regional literature, researchers have examined the technological aspect of competition. Zou (2025) emphasizes the role of export controls of semiconductors and advanced technologies, as the national strategic tools to restrict the development of rivals. Zou (2025) points out that the limitation of technology transfer catalyzes the acceleration of decoupling and compels both nations to spend much on the development of in-country industrial capacity. This change is a difference to the neoliberal globalization where interdependence was presumed to lower the propensity of conflict.

Schindler and Rolf (2025) also note that the neoliberal era of globalization which was marked by production networks that were market driven and low or no intervention by the state was substituted by an interventionist paradigm. States have become the active processors of production geographies by means of subsidies, tariffs, and control measures. Consequently, supply chains have restructured along geopolitical aspects giving rise to what they term as a fragmented yet not collapsed global economy. This reorganization has a direct impact on new markets which are alternative manufacturing centres.

According to Khan (2021), as the US and China continue to develop rivalry, smaller states gain opportunities and limitations. Whilst others will be enjoying the diversity of foreign investment and diversion of trade, others will be under pressure to fit in politically. This is the same concern raised by Ramos (2025), who also notes that strategic alignment decisions have economic implications, such as possible exposure to sanctions or preferential access to the market.

There is a second branch of literature that criticizes the classical theory of comparative advantage under geopolitical competition. Zou (2025) insists that the concepts of free trade ignore the strategic significance of the domestic industrial capacity. In cases where protectionist or nationalist economic policies are rationally pursued by the government, national security and technological leadership become priorities. This thesis attacks decades of liberal economic orthodoxy, and offers a conceptual foundation to modern efforts at industrial policy in Washington and Beijing.

Another area covered by the literature is corporate behavior in the strategic uncertainty. According to Schindler and Rolf (2025), there are two corporate responses, hedging by means of diversification or alignment with state strategic goals. This difference is especially applicable when analyzing emerging economies that could be of interest to relocate supply chain as companies attempt to reduce risk. The sustainability of these kinds of relocation is, however, unclear in case geo-political conditions change.

Regardless of these contributions, there are still some gaps in systematically studying the overall reaction of emerging economies to geoeconomic fragmentation. Khan (2021) and Ramos (2025) offer more region-specific information, but pay attention mostly to South Asia. Zou (2025) focuses on bilateral US-China politics, whereas Schindler and Rolf (2025) lay stress on corporate strategy as opposed to the development outcomes at the state level. This means that, there exists little cross-

regional comparative evidence on trade realignment and investment flows among a variety of emerging markets.

Furthermore, the long-term developmental effects of trade diversion have not been sufficiently discussed, although it has been realized in some of the sectors. Zou (2025) proposes capital accumulation and industrial upgrading to define the strategic advantage but there is a low amount of empirical evaluation on whether emerging markets can attain sustainable upgrading by diverted FDI. In a similar way, Schindler and Rolf (2025) recognize the phenomenon of fragmentation yet fail to adequately evaluate the developmental implications of the latter on the countries with middle-income status.

The convergence of economic and security space also makes it more difficult to analyze. According to Khan (2021), it is impossible to separate economic projects like CPEC and security issues. Ramos (2025) also cautions to strengthen the great power competition strategies because this will only enhance arms race and make vulnerable regions unstable. Such results highlight the necessity to use integrated frameworks between international political economy and security studies.

On the whole, the literature comes to the point that US-China rivalry is changing the structure of global economic governance but does not focus and approach the same issue in a similar manner. Whereas theoretical approaches focus on the strategic logics of trade and capital accumulation (Zou, 2025), regional studies are more focused on alignment dynamics (Khan, 2021; Ramos, 2025), and globalization scholarship more on the issue of corporate adaptation (Schindler and Rolf, 2025). Nevertheless, an empirical study that connects such strands, especially in relation to trade realignment and FDI relocation in the emerging economies is not yet well developed.

This work seeks to build on these academic works but goes further to solve their weaknesses by incorporating the concepts of strategic trade theory, geostrategic globalization, and alignment dynamics into one analytical paradigm. It aims to contribute to the current literature by analyzing the diversion in trade, the flows of investments, and the strategic positioning in various emerging economies, to give a systematic evidence on how great power rivalry is reshaping the development paths in the twenty first century.

Theoretical Foundations of US–China Geoeconomic Rivalry

Power Transition, Security Logic, and Economic Statecraft

The latest stage of the US-China rivalry can be viewed as a systemic struggle of powers where the economic tools are becoming more of a strategic goal rather than the one that is aimed at maximising the welfare. The South Asian literature shows that competition among great powers often does not remain within the confines of the main players but rather spreads to the periphery and changes the strategic outcomes of adjacent states, creating balancing behavior, coalition forming, and the feeling of insecurity in the subsystems (Khan, 2021; Ramos, 2025). In this regard, trade, technology, and infrastructure also turn into the continuation of the strategic rivalry, as the ability to control important networks and access partners are able to cause the regional power of balance and credibility of deterrence relations (Khan, 2021).

Also according to realist approaches, the more the competition, the more the likelihood of securitization of policies thus, areas that were once viewed as part of the economy are redefined as issues of national security. This change is reflected in the manner in which the Indo-Pacific and the surrounding regions are presented as key points in which the balance of influence will be settled, and secondary states will be pressured to reorganize their foreign policy alignment to prevent marginalization or gain patronage (Ramos, 2025). As a result, emerging economies are not just

influenced by rivalry; they are tactical ground where the rivalry is manifested in the form of partnerships, inducements, and constraints that are spilled over into trade preferences and investment routes (Khan, 2021; Ramos, 2025).

Strategic Trade, Industry strength and Competition Dynamics

One fundamental theoretical assertion in new scholarship in political economy is that competition modifies the very end of trade policy. Rather than believing that specialization is generally beneficial to joint welfare, strategic trade methods posit that industrial power, technological pre-eminence, and capital structure progress into a geopolitical benefit as time goes by (Zou, 2025). Following this rationale, Superiority of persistent trade if surpluses and upgrade product is a strength of strategic power, and reliance on a global supply chain, or on chronic deficits are considered frailty of autonomy and bargaining power (Zou, 2025).

This framing is a key reason why both great powers are gradually moving toward an increased reliance on tariffs, subsidies, export controls and investment screening as instruments of short-term bargaining instead of as structural measures to alter long-run industrial paths. That is, the policy goal turns into the relative advantage instead of mutual gain and the field of competition is extended not just to the trade but to the industrial ecosystems and the technology frontiers (Zou, 2025). In the case of the emerging economies, it means that global trade patterns are not spontaneous market events; partially they are policy-driven rebalances that redistribute opportunity and risk along with their strategic priorities guided by the competing powers (Zou, 2025).

Geostrategic Globalization and the Restructuring of Interdependence

From Neoliberal Globalization to Geostrategic Globalization

The argument of geostrategic globalization is used to capture the idea that globalization is not de-globalizing but re-configuring under a different, more demanding, more interventionist geopolitical context (Schindler and Rolf, 2025). In contrast to the previous period when multinational production networks were created mostly on the basis of the market logics cost reduction and the efficiency, the modern period is characterized by the risk management, national security concerns, and policy-based relocation pressures (Schindler and Rolf, 2025). This change is important since it re-contextualizes trade realignment as a structural change and not a short-run interruption.

In this view, states are actively engaged in the process of rewriting the geography of production by means of concerted policies, i.e. subsidies, export restrictions, friendshoring, etc., which are supposed to minimize dependence on geopolitical opponents and enhance trusted supply networks (Schindler and Rolf, 2025). The outcome is that there will be a trend of both selective incorporation and selective disengagement: the overall measurements of the level of globalization might be holding steady, but the stratagems of value chains and Investment path will undergo alterations that akin progressively to geopolitical orientations (Schindler Rolf, 2025).

Multinational Companies as Arbitrators of Disintegration

One of the best things that have been contributed by the geostrategic globalization literature is the focus on corporate agency. Accordingly, Schindler and Rolf (2025) suggest that multinational corporations address the issue of geopolitical risk by employing two broad strategies: to hedge, by operating in both sides of the US-China divide, or to align, by promoting its own goals through subsidies and political protection. All these are not just company-level strategies, but collectively they determine whether fragmentation speeds up or remains restricted, therefore, affecting the pace and extent of economic reorganization in the world (Schindler and Rolf, 2025).

To the emerging economies, corporate strategy is one of the key channels of transmission of rivalry. When they hedge, companies tend to split production to the third countries in order to gain less exposure even though they retain some China-related capacity which may lead to the emergence of the opportunity to build alternative nodes in production networks by selected emerging markets (Schindler and Rolf, 2025). By aligning firms can sharpen Bloc based supply chain structuring raising the chances that trade and investment flows are turned into politically conditioned and less reversible, raising strategic stakes of emerging economies which would have to manage dependencies and access risks (Schindler and Rolf, 2025).

Emerging Economies as Strategic Swing States in Trade Realignment

Alignment Choices: Balancing, Bandwagoning, and Economic Consequences

The South Asian regional studies indicate that secondary states usually encounter a strategic dilemma, i.e., whether to balance between diversifications of partnerships or bandwagon by associating with one of the major powers to get economic and security advantages (Khan, 2021; Ramos, 2025). These alignment decisions are not abstract but they define the degree of trade exposure, the financing options available in infrastructural investments, the relationship in defense procurement and the ability to manoeuvre diplomatically. In the rivalry conditions, alignment signals may have a role in determining market access, technology alliance and the predictability of cross-border investment flows (Ramos, 2025).

Khan (2021) highlights the strategic relationship between the US and India and China and Pakistan which will alter the dynamics of the rivalry in the region and will create opportunities and risks to the players in the region. It means that the process of trade realignment is not only a commercial trend but partially economic translation of alignment politics, whereby supply routes, infrastructure flows, and favored relationships are a result of calculative maneuvers of strategic rivalry and regional security (Khan, 2021). Therefore, the emerging economies will have to consider the advantages of alignment (finance, access, security assurance) and the disadvantages (dependence, retaliatory pressure, loss of autonomy) (Ramos, 2025).

Theoretical Processes of a connection between rivalry and trade re-alignment

Comprising these strands, the literature contributes to three main theoretical mechanisms whereby trade realignment in emerging economies is being propelled by US-China rivalry. The first is the policy shock mechanism in which the attractiveness of places and their suppliers of tariffs, export controls and subsidies shifts trade routes and places of production out of the direct US-China path (Zou, 2025; Schindler and Rolf, 2025). Second is the corporate risk mechanism, in which multinational companies restructure supply chains to protect against geopolitical risk or favour state agendas and thus redistribute production and middle-level trade to the third countries (Schindler and Rolf, 2025). Third is the alignment mechanism where the diplomatic positioning of emerging economies influences the economic opportunities by creating preferential access, strategic integration of infrastructure, and exposure to coercive action (Khan, 2021; Ramos, 2025).

Combined, these mechanisms make emerging economies be regarded as strategic swing states in a restructured global economy. Instead of being passive receivers of external shocks, they are the active places of contention and adjustment, where trade-related patterns are indicative of the interaction of great-power policy instruments, corporate relocation choices, and domestic strategy alignment (Schindler and Rolf, 2025; Zou, 2025; Khan, 2021; Ramos, 2025). This theoretical framing gives the basis of purely conceptual paper capable of derivation of propositions, interpretation of the path of fragmentation and policy implications without necessarily estimating empirically.

Analytical Framework: Mechanisms of Geoeconomic Trade Realignment

The main thesis of this paper holds the view that realignment of trade in the emerging economies is an internal structural event of escalating geoeconomic competition among the great powers. Contrary to classical models of trade, which take trade patterns to be as a consequence of comparative advantage, and market processes, this paradigm assumes that such strategic competition reorganizes the incentive structure underlying world exchange. Trade realignment is thus an interaction that is layered between state policy intervention, corporate adaptation and alignment politics.

The initial process by which competition brings about trade restructuring is the policy-based restructuring. When large powers utilize tariffs, controls over export, industrial subsidies and even through regulatory screening, they which affect the relative cost structure of global output. Such interventions misalign value chains in place and provide incentives to firms to diversify sources of materials and production activities. These changes are not caused by price alone but by calculating the risks and consideration of compliance. When the availability of high-technology, financial structure, or critical markets are subject to political loyalty or compliance with regulation, companies react by shifting parts of their operations to those jurisdictions that seem politically neutral or strategically inclined.

The second one works via corporate strategic recalibration. Multinational corporations are integrated into the geopolitical setting and have to survive in the context of increased uncertainty. With the growing competition, companies insure themselves through geographical diversification of production, less reliance on a single node, and parallel supply chains. Instead, other companies tend to be more consistent with the industries under the state leadership to obtain subsidies and protection of the policy. Both the strategies have visible effects on the trade flows with changes in the intermediate goods, assembly procedures, and export markets towards the emerging economies that can absorb new production fronts. Corporate behavior, therefore, is an export channel of the translation of geopolitical rivalry into the reconfiguration of trade.

The third process is alignment based economic structuring. The emerging markets are not passive receivers of the redirection of trade but they are acting in the strategy of recalibration. Governments can strengthen economic relations with one of the powerful countries to obtain an infrastructure investment, access to technology or obtain security guarantees. These types of alignment decisions impact tariff preferences, harmonization of regulations and investment flows. Backed by trade network, such political affinities are reflected over time, resulting to bloc-oriented clustering. Through this alignment, fragmentation is further perpetuated because economic integration becomes more of a strategic trust condition as opposed to a commercial one.

All these mechanisms lead to the idea that the realignment of trade is not accidental and temporary. It has its structural embeddedness in the transforming structure of competitive interdependence. The world economy partly gets disintegrated into overlapping spheres, where the emerging economies are situated at the periphery or at the boundaries of such spheres. Trade patterns are therefore a reflection of movement of power politics and production geography.

Scope Conditions and Structural Boundaries

The development of theoretical frameworks that are advanced here is under particular conditions of scope. First, it presupposes a long-term and institutionalized competition among the key powers and not a one-time diplomatic tension. Trade realignment only attains structural features when it is entrenched within regulatory regimes, systems of industrial policy and alliances.

Second, the model presupposes that the global production networks are never too small to allow relocation and diversification. In a world of decoupling, realignment would be replaced by a process of outright separation, and in a world of complete cooperation, the pressure of diversification would be reduced. This theory is thus applicable to a state of partial disintegration-what can be termed as organized competition without full systemic discontinuity.

Third, the impact of competition is mediated by the national institutional capacity in the emerging economies. Diversified export structure, good governance and industrial upgrading strategies enable the states to change the trade diversion into sustainable developmental benefits. In contrast, those countries that strongly rely on primary commodities or do not have institutional resilience can have volatility without structural change.

Lastly, the framework does not presuppose homogenous results in every region. The manner, in which emerging economies become fragmented, is predetermined by the geographic proximity, the presence of the established alliance engagements, the connectivity of the infrastructure, and the historic pattern of trade. The theory as such foresees dissimilar responses as opposed to uniform adjustment.

Implications for the Global Political Economy

The description of structural change given in this paper indicates that globalization is in a new stage where there is competition among its interdependence. There is still economic exchange, but the organization is more and more in terms of geopolitical borders. The emerging order is more like layered regionalization instead of universal integration in one institutional framework, whereby, the production networks are parallel and the regulatory regimes are partially overlapping.

This shift has implications of power distribution. In case trade surpluses, technological upgrading, and industrial consolidation can increase the strategic capability, then trade realignment can in the long run change relative power trajectories. Emerging economies with a successful redirected investment to modernize in terms of technology may become more systemic. Nonetheless, these stakeholders trapped in low-value parts of fragmented supply chains might continue to be marginal members of competing blocs.

Further, the continuation of competitive interdependent brings in systemic instability. Similar technological standards, different regulatory regimes, and trade blockage can decrease efficiency and raise resilience of reliable networks. The contradiction of efficiency and security makes itself the hallmark of the modern political economy.

Emerging Economies Policy Implications

To the emerging economies, the strategic environment mentioned above is an opportunity and a constraint. Diversion of trade and relocation of investments can open opportunities to the industrial modernization, growth of employment and diversification of exports. Nevertheless, excessive commitment to one bloc can put the economies at risk of counteractions, sanction risk, and less autonomy in policies.

Hedging approach such as trade partnership diversification keeping regulatory flexibility can be more long term resilient. However, hedging cannot be done without domestic industrial policy that tries to modernize the technological capacity and institutional quality. Emerging economies thus should manage to strike a balance between strategic alignment decisions and internal capacity building.

The policy implication here is that trade realignment must not be ambiguous as a passive windfall, but it should be seen as a strategic opportunity and this should be managed by the institution. In the absence of such management, fragmentation can replicate dependency as opposed to autonomy.

Theoretical Contribution

This research contributes to the literature in three major ways. Firstly, it combines the theory of power transition, strategic trade theory, and geostrategic globalization in one conceptual framework. This way it closes the gap between the international relation and the political economy scholarship.

Second, it alters the analytical point of view on bilateral US-China relationships into the structural position of emerging economies as strategic swing states in disaggregated globalization. Instead of viewing such economies as peripheral spectators, the framework views them as adaptive agents whose choices on alignment affect the outcomes of the system.

Third, it does not regard realignment on trade as exogenous, but a byproduct of structural rivalry; and not a short-lived by-product of tariff escalation. This hypothetical rebranding is part of wider arguments on the change, rather than the end, of globalization in the twenty-first century.

Conclusion

The US-China geoeconomic rivalry is a structural shift in the development of the global political economy. Trade, investment and technology exchange are no longer influenced by efficiency considerations but it is now being influenced by strategic calculations and alignment politics. The emerging economies are in a strategic but a dangerous location in terms of this change, being both beneficiaries of displacement and targets of strategy.

This work offers a highly detailed theoretical account of the role that competitive interdependence plays in reorganizing globalization by its conceptualization of trade realignment as a product of policy-induced restructuring, corporate recalibration, and alignment-based economic clustering. The new order is neither completely integrated nor completely detached; it is discontinuous and at the same time interdependent, strategic and economically bound up.

The future of this system will be determined by the continuation of the competition, the flexibility of multinational corporations, the ability of the developing economies to overcome fragmentation without losing their independence. These dynamics are very crucial to understand the changing architecture of international trade and how power will be distributed in the international system in the future.

References

1. Airaud, F., de Soyres, F., Gaillard, A., & Santacreu, A. M. (2025). Recent Evolutions in the Global Trade System: From Integration to Strategic Realignment. *European Central Bank. September*.
2. Blarel, N. (2024). Navigating US–China Rivalry in a Multi-aligned Middle East: Understanding India’s shifting strategy towards the region. *Journal of Asian Security and International Affairs*, 11(4), 536-556.
3. Dar, Z. A., & Javid, S. (2025). Navigating the turbulent waters: An in-depth study of US-China geopolitical rivalry. *Law, Economics and Society*, 1(1), p1-p1.
4. Ekelund, N. H., Fjellner, L., & Engelbrekt, K. (2026). The Changing Character of US-China Economic Relations: From Competition to Geopolitical Rivalry, 2018–23. *Asia Policy*, 21(1), 127-153.

5. El Hajoui, Y., Ez-Zetouni, A., & El Baouchari, N. (2025). Geoeconomic Shifts, Trade Wars, and Global Sustainability: A Dynamic CGE Analysis of US-China-EU Impacts. *Journal of Global Sustainability and Development (JGSD)*, 0 [10.57017/jgsd. v2. i2. 03].
6. Grosse, T. G. (2025). The Geoeconomics of US–China Rivalry and Its Implications for Europe. *Studia Europejskie/Centrum Europejskie Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego*(4), 37-66.
7. Hassan, J. (2025). *Sourcing under pressure: Geoeconomic risk, firm dependence, and the US-China trade conflict* Open Access Te Herenga Waka-Victoria University of Wellington].
8. Jean, S. (2024). *How Geopolitical Tensions Reshape Trade Patterns: Geoeconomic Fragmentation, or China's Big Manufacturing Push?* Institut français des relations internationales (Ifri)].
9. Ji, X., & Tong, X. (2025). Beyond Trade Wars: The Multidimensional Battleground of US–China Geoeconomic Rivalry in the Asia-Pacific. *East Asian Policy*, 17(02), 107-125.
10. Khan Durrani, S. (2025). US China War Impact On Globalization. *Journal of Religion and Society*, 4(01), 185-198.
11. Khan, Z. (2022). The effects of US–China competing strategies in Asia-Pacific on India and Pakistan rivalry in the South Asian region. *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics*, 7(4), 888-906.
12. Lee, S. (2022). Changes in Interdependence, US-China Strategic Competition, and the New Dynamics of the East Asian Regional Order. *Asian Journal of Peacebuilding*, 10(2), 333-353.
13. Ling, S. (2025). Realignment in Asia? US Regional Allies' Responses to China–US Competition. *The Chinese Journal of International Politics*, 18(4), 473-495.
14. Liu, Y. (2025). Interplay of Geopolitical Dynamics and International Trade Flows: An Analysis of Emerging Economies.
15. Mehling, M. A. (2025). *In the Vortex of Great Power Competition: Climate, Trade, and Geostrategic Rivalry in US-China-EU Relations*. MIT Center for Energy and Environmental Policy Research.
16. MONNAPPA, K. Strategic Recalibration: India, China, and the US in an Era of Geoeconomic Friction.
17. Nuruzzaman, M. (2022). Conflicts, strategic divergences and the survival of economic groupings: Will China–India rivalry make BRICS obsolete? *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics*, 7(4), 1025-1044.
18. Qadri, S. (2024). The impact of the us-china-russia rivalry on the architecture of international security at the global and regional levels. *Pakistan Journal of International Affairs*, 7(1).
19. Rahman, M. (2025). Tech Supremacy and Economic Warfare: The US-China Trade Battle in the 21st Century. *Multitech Journal of Applied Sciences*, 2(4), 249-274.
20. Ramos, D. (2025). Strategic Competition and Regional Recalibration: South Asia in the Shadow of United States–China Rivalry. *Journal of Policy Options*, 8(2), 1-8.
21. Schindler, S., & Rolf, S. (2025). Geostrategic globalization: US–China rivalry, corporate strategy, and the new global economy. *Globalizations*, 22(6), 897-914.
22. Schneider-Petsinger, M., Wang, J., Jie, Y., & Crabtree, J. (2019). US–China strategic competition. *The Quest for Global Technological Leadership*. London: Chatham House. *The Royal Institute of International Affairs*.
23. Shambaugh, D. (2018). US-China rivalry in Southeast Asia: power shift or competitive coexistence? *International Security*, 42(4), 85-127.
24. Thakur, A. (2025). The rise of economic warfare in a multipolar world: Strategic competition beyond the battlefield. *Human Geography*, 19427786251400306.

25. van Niekerk, A. J. (2025). Rise of the East: Economic Implications of the Geopolitical Shift. In *West to East: A New Global Economy in the Making? Achieving the SDGs* (pp. 1-36). Springer.
26. Wang, P. B. M. (2025). US-China competition and ASEAN Unity: Why economic resilience matters. *AEI Insights*, 10(1), 15-30.
27. Wang, Y. (2023). Geopolitical considerations in Sino-US trade relations. *Journal of Business and Economic Options*, 6(3), 17-25.
28. Yoganandham, G. (2025). Beyond donald trump-us trade wars and emerging economies with reference to causes, global impacts, economic shifts, future economic and trade dynamics in transforming world economies-an empirical assessment. *Journal For Basic Sciences*, ISSN NO: 1006-8341.
29. Zhang, K. H. (2024). Geoeconomics of US-China tech rivalry and industrial policy. *Asia and the Global Economy*, 4(2), 100098.
30. Zou, H.-F. (2025). *Strategic Trade, Industrial Power, and Geopolitical Rivalry: A Two-Country Differential Game of the US-China Conflict*.