How Geopolitical Risks Reshape Global Supply Chains: Evidence from the Pandemic, Ukraine Crisis, and Red Sea Crisis

Bei Jiang *

Lushanbinjiang Experimental School, Changsha, China

* Corresponding Author Email: jiangbei745@gmail.com

Abstract. For decades, the global supply chain operated on the principle of economic efficiency, creating highly connected yet vulnerable networks. The successive outbreaks of geopolitical risks—the COVID-19 pandemic, the Russia-Ukraine war, and the Red Sea crisis—have exposed the profound weaknesses of this model. Using secondary data and a comparative case study approach, this paper analyzes the impact of these three crises on global supply chain structures and operational strategies. The research finds that businesses have increasingly prioritized supply chain resilience over cost efficiency, driving trends toward supply chain diversification and digital transformation. Concurrently, governments have enhanced self-sufficiency through strategic reserves and industrial protection policies. The study further reveals the growing influence of political alignment and ethical standards in supply chain decisions. This paper will also provide critical insights for understanding the restructuring of global supply chains, economic security, as well as the future trajectory of globalization in the post-pandemic era.

Keywords: Geopolitical Risks, Global Supply Chains, Supply Chain Resilience, Digital Transformation, Supply Chain Diversification.

1. Introduction

The global supply chain framework existed for decades under economic efficiency as its primary guiding principle. The globalized economy led corporations to minimize costs through lean production and just-in-time delivery systems and low-cost supply chain locations which resulted in highly efficient yet highly connected networks. The previous five years have brought three major geopolitical crises which exposed the deep weaknesses of this established supply chain model [1]. The COVID-19 pandemic, the Russia-Ukraine war, and the ongoing Red Sea crisis have tested global supply chains through unprecedented disruptions, forcing companies and governments to reassess their supply chain structures and management approaches [2-4].

This research investigates how different geopolitical risks affect global supply chain structures and strategic operations through their interconnected nature. The research uses secondary data to conduct comparative case studies which study how each crisis affected supply chains and how businesses and governments adapted their strategies. The research provides essential knowledge for understanding economic stability, national defense, and future globalization patterns. The paper follows a sequential structure which starts with pandemic analysis, followed by Ukraine war disruption assessment and Red Sea crisis evaluation, before presenting a comparative analysis of common patterns and enduring effects.

2. The COVID-19 Pandemic: Revealing Systemic Vulnerability

The COVID-19 pandemic revealed that the global supply chain system based on efficiency had become excessively vulnerable to disruptions.

The global manufacturing sector experienced complete shutdowns because factories in essential production centers throughout China remained closed due to widespread lockdowns. The combination of port congestion, reduced air freight services, and shipping container shortages resulted in extensive delays throughout worldwide logistics operations. The semiconductor,

healthcare, and consumer electronics industries faced critical shortages because their complex global supply chains revealed their dependence on single suppliers and insufficient inventory reserves.

Businesses started to value supply chain resilience more than they did cost efficiency as their main priority. The essential business strategy for companies involved spreading their supply base to prevent dependence on any single geographic area. The crisis speeded up the implementation of digital supply chain systems and automated processes. Companies used AI-based demand forecasting systems, IoT tracking technology, and warehouse robotics to improve their supply chain monitoring and adaptability.

National authorities understood that overseas production of essential goods created strategic risks for their countries. Governments acted through two main policies which involved building national reserves of medical supplies and vital components and establishing defensive measures for strategic industries. The "China+1" strategy emerged because of the crisis because companies started moving their manufacturing operations to Southeast Asian locations and domestic sites to minimize operational risks.

3. The Russia-Ukraine War: The Weaponization of Interdependence

The Russia-Ukraine war created a targeted geopolitical disruption which primarily affected energy and food security systems throughout the world.

The conflict blocked essential Black Sea shipping routes which resulted in worldwide shortages of Ukrainian and Russian wheat, sunflower oil, and fertilizer products that endangered food security in importing nations. The conflict revealed two essential metals shortages: neon for semiconductor production and palladium for catalytic converter manufacturing because of their dependence on Russian resources. The conflict revealed through its energy crisis that Europe heavily depends on Russian oil and gas supplies for its energy needs. The energy export strategy of Russia triggered an urgent and extensive transformation of European energy systems. Europe moved swiftly to acquire more liquefied natural gas from the United States and Qatar while it accelerated renewable energy development and built new pipeline routes to transform worldwide energy market patterns.

Western sanctions together with corporate withdrawals from Russia forced supply chains to undergo a mandatory transformation. The conflict led to a complete reorganization of trade patterns because Russia redirected its energy and raw material exports toward Asian markets while Europe established new trade relationships with alternative suppliers. The crisis demonstrated that supply chain choices now depend on political backing and ethical standards instead of financial considerations alone.

Moreover, the weaponization of trade routes and resource dependencies during the Russia-Ukraine conflict has set a precedent for how geopolitical tensions can be directly channeled through supply chains. For instance, the deliberate targeting of energy infrastructure and the use of gas supplies as a political lever underscored the strategic vulnerability of nations that rely heavily on a single source for critical imports. This has not only accelerated Europe’s shift toward energy diversification but also prompted a broader reevaluation of how nations secure access to essential commodities in times of geopolitical strife.

In addition, the war has intensified the use of economic statecraft—such as sanctions, export controls, and counter-sanctions—as tools of foreign policy. These measures have forced multinational corporations to navigate an increasingly fragmented regulatory landscape. Companies that once operated under the assumption of a unified global market now face the reality of bifurcated trade systems, where political allegiance often dictates market access. This shift is particularly evident in the technology and defense sectors, where export controls on semiconductors and dual-use technologies have reshaped global R&D partnerships and production networks.

The crisis has also highlighted the role of logistics resilience in conflict zones. Attacks on port facilities, rail networks, and shipping lanes have demonstrated that physical infrastructure is both a strategic asset and a vulnerability. In response, firms are increasingly investing in redundant logistics

corridors and real-time tracking systems to mitigate the risks associated with regional instability. These adaptations reflect a broader trend toward building supply chains that are not only efficient but also secure and adaptable to rapidly changing political conditions.

4. Policy Recommendations for Supply Chain Firms in an Era of Regional Conflict

Firms must invest in digital tools such as IoT sensors and blockchain to achieve end-to-end supply chain visibility. Furthermore, a deliberate "China+1" or regionalization strategy should be implemented to diversify sourcing and manufacturing bases across different geopolitical blocs, reducing over-reliance on any single region.

The practice of purely lean inventory should be reconsidered for critical components. Companies need to build strategic buffers of essential raw materials and finished goods to absorb shocks. Additionally, fostering deeper collaborations with key suppliers, including joint risk assessment and contingency planning, is crucial for building collective resilience.

Geopolitical risk assessment must become a core component of corporate strategy and supply chain management. Companies should establish dedicated teams to monitor global political developments and develop scenario-planning capabilities to respond swiftly to emerging crises, ensuring that supply chain decisions align with a broader understanding of political and ethical landscapes.

To effectively implement these recommendations, firms must adopt a multi-layered approach to risk management that integrates both technological and strategic dimensions. For instance, in enhancing supply chain visibility, companies can deploy AI-driven analytics platforms that integrate data from IoT sensors, satellite imagery, and social media to monitor real-time disruptions. These systems can provide early warnings about port closures, political unrest, or regulatory changes, enabling proactive adjustments to logistics and procurement plans.

In terms of diversification, the “China+1” strategy should be complemented by a broader “multi-shoring” approach that spreads production across multiple regions—such as Latin America, Eastern Europe, and Southeast Asia—to mitigate region-specific risks. This not only reduces dependency but also allows firms to leverage regional trade agreements and local incentives. For example, the European Union’s recent trade pacts with Vietnam and Mexico offer tariff advantages that can offset some of the costs associated with relocation.

Building strategic buffers requires a nuanced approach to inventory management. Rather than simply stockpiling goods, firms should adopt a dynamic inventory strategy that uses predictive analytics to adjust stock levels based on geopolitical risk indicators and demand volatility. This approach, often referred to as “just-in-case” inventory, balances the costs of holding excess stock against the risks of shortages.

Collaboration is another critical pillar. Firms should establish formal partnerships with suppliers through joint business continuity planning and shared digital platforms. These collaborations can include co-investment in regional warehouses, shared transportation assets, and transparent communication channels for crisis response. Such initiatives not only enhance operational resilience but also build trust and alignment across the supply network.

Finally, integrating political risk into corporate strategy requires organizational change. Companies should create a dedicated geopolitical risk unit within their strategic planning or supply chain departments. This unit should be responsible for developing risk dashboards, conducting war-gaming exercises, and engaging with external experts—such as political scientists and regional specialists—to anticipate and prepare for future disruptions. By embedding geopolitical awareness into decision-making processes, firms can better navigate the complex and volatile landscape of modern global trade [5]

5. Conclusion

This paper has demonstrated through three major crises that the era of efficiency-centric global supply chains is over. The COVID-19 pandemic exposed systemic vulnerabilities to large-scale disruptions, the Russia-Ukraine war highlighted the risks of strategic dependencies being weaponized, and the ongoing Red Sea crisis reinforces the persistent nature of these threats. The common response has been a strategic pivot towards resilience, characterized by diversification, digitalization, and a greater emphasis on national and economic security in supply chain decisions.

This study is primarily based on secondary data and comparative case studies, which may limit the depth of granular, firm-level insights. The evolving nature of geopolitical risks, particularly the Red Sea crisis, means that its long-term effects are not yet fully quantifiable.

Future research should employ quantitative methods and empirical firm-level data to measure the causal impact of specific geopolitical events on supply chain performance. Further studies could also explore the sustainability implications of reshoring and friend-shoring strategies and investigate the role of emerging technologies like AI in predictive geopolitical risk management for supply chains.

References

[1] Ivanov, Dmitry, and Alexandre Dolgui. "A Digital Supply Chain Twin for Managing the Disruption Risks and Resilience in the Era of Industry 4.0." Production Planning & Control, vol. 32, no. 9, 2021, pp. 775 - 788.

[2] Gereffi, Gary, and Xinyi Wu. "Global Value Chains and Development: A Reassessment." The Oxford Handbook of Global Value Chains, edited by Gary Gereffi et al., Oxford University Press, 2023, pp. 45 - 68.

[3] Miroudot, Sébastien. "Resilience versus Robustness in Global Value Chains: Some Policy Implications." In COVID-19 and Trade Policy: Why Turn Inward, edited by Richard Baldwin and Simon Evenett, CEPR Press, 2020, pp. 117 - 130.

[4] Chen, Yilin, and David Simchi-Levi. "The New Era of Supply Chain Resilience." MIT Sloan Management Review, vol. 63, no. 3, 2022, pp. 23 - 30.

[5] Zhang, Fan. "Companies need to be mindful five risk" global supply chain in China trade news of the 2024 - 05 - 09, 003.