Proceedings of Business and Economic Studies, 2025, Volume 8, Issue 8
http://ojs.bbwpublisher.com/index.php/PBES
Online ISSN: 2209-265X
Print ISSN: 2209-2641

Navigating Geopolitical Headwinds: A Critical Analysis of Contemporary Globalization Strategies for Chinese Enterprises

Menglong Li*

University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia

**Author to whom correspondence should be addressed.*

Abstract: In an era defined by intensifying geopolitical volatility, Chinese enterprises find themselves at a precarious strategic crossroads, compelled to navigate the paradoxical currents of persistent technological globalization and accelerating political de-globalization. This paper offers a comprehensive critical analysis of how these firms are recalibrating their internationalization strategies amidst the escalating Sino-American systemic rivalry and the post-pandemic restructuring of global supply chains. By synthesizing and contrasting perspectives from leading industry analyses, specifically juxtaposing the reactive, survival-oriented narrative presented by investigative journalism with the proactive, capability-driven "third wave" perspective offered by business academia, this study elucidates the complex mechanisms of corporate adaptation. The research integrates these firm-level observations with broader academic frameworks, specifically the theory of "De-Globalization and Fragmentation" and the critique of decoupling myths. The findings indicate that Chinese enterprises are not retreating from the global stage. Instead, they are executing a sophisticated, structural reconfiguration of their global value chains. This involves a strategic pivot towards "slow-balization," characterized by regionalized production in geopolitically neutral territories (such as ASEAN) and a shift from rigid vertical integration to flexible, multi-polar global layouts. The paper concludes that while these strategies offer necessary resilience for individual firms, they inadvertently reinforce the very geopolitical fragmentation they seek to circumvent, fundamentally reshaping the nature of sustainable competitive advantage in the 21st century.

Keywords: Chinese enterprises; Globalization strategies; Geopolitics; Supply chain resilience; De-globalization; Strategic reconfiguration; ASEAN; Global value chains; Institutional theory

Online publication: December 31, 2025

1. Introduction

The global economic landscape of the mid-2020s is defined by a profound paradox characterizing the current era. On one hand, the digital revolution continues to shrink the world, facilitating flows of information and capital at unprecedented speeds. On the other hand, the geopolitical architecture that underpinned the last four decades of globalization, the post-Cold War consensus of open markets and integration is fracturing. For Chinese enterprises, this environment presents an existential challenge demanding a fundamental re-evaluation of international strategies. This paper addresses a critical question: How are Chinese enterprises strategically adapting to the dual pressures of globalization and de-globalization in a geopolitically fragmented world [1,2]?

This inquiry gains urgency from the fraught backdrop of intensifying Sino-American economic rivalry, which has evolved from tariff disputes into a systemic competition encompassing technology, national security, and global standards. It is no longer just about the price of steel; it is about who controls the semiconductors of the future and the supply chains for green energy. The expansion of the U.S. "Entity List" and the EU's investigations into Chinese electric vehicles (EVs) exemplify an era where trade policy is indistinguishable from foreign policy. Concurrently, the post-pandemic restructuring of global supply chains has exposed the fragility of efficiency-maximized networks, compelling firms to prioritize resilience over pure cost minimization [3]. These macro-forces necessitate a sophisticated strategic pivot for Chinese firms, demanding responses that transcend the binary choice between maintaining domestic operations and complete offshore relocation [1].

Examination of current trends reveals that the traditional "going global" strategy, characterized by resource acquisition or market seeking in a relatively benign political environment, is no longer sufficient. That era is over. Instead, firms must now master "geopolitical arbitrage", navigating between decoupling blocs to maintain access to markets. This paper proceeds by first offering a literature review to establish the theoretical stakes, incorporating Institutional Theory to explain the search for legitimacy. Then, the study provides a comparative analysis of two dominant narratives: the reactive "survival" narrative highlighted by investigative journalism (Caixin) and the proactive "maturation" narrative championed by business academia (CEIBS). This research bridges these firm-level observations with academic theories on fragmentation, specifically drawing on Colantone and Williamson, to understand the systemic implications [3,4]. Finally, the paper offers a critical evaluation of how these adaptations are reshaping competitive advantage.

2. Literature review: Theoretical frameworks of fragmentation

To understand the practical maneuvers of Chinese firms, it is necessary to situate them within the evolving academic debate regarding the fate of globalization. The scholarly community is divided between those who see a reversal of global integration and those who see a transformation of its nature.

2.1. The narrative of de-globalization and fragmentation

Colantone offers a compelling framework with the concept of "De-Globalization and Fragmentation [3]." The theory argues that the current era is not defined by a generalized reversal of globalization, a return to autarky, but rather by its fragmentation. Globalization is changing shape as trade patterns reconfigure along geopolitical fault lines. This theory suggests that political alliances are becoming the primary determinant of trade flows, superseding pure economic efficiency. In this view, the world is splitting into distinct economic blocs, and firms are forced to choose sides or create complex structures to bridge them. This fragmentation thesis provides the macro-logic for why Chinese firms are moving into "neutral" zones like ASEAN: they are attempting to create a "buffer state" in their supply chains, utilizing third-party jurisdictions to maintain connectivity between diverging economic spheres [3].

2.2. The persistence of global value chains

Conversely, Williamson provides a necessary counter-narrative. His research cautions against an uncritical acceptance of narratives proclaiming a complete "de-globalisation and decoupling [4]." Williamson suggests that what is occurring is a calculated and strategic restructuring of Global Value Chain (GVC) architecture, rather than abandonment [4]. He points out that foundational economic principles, comparative advantage and specialization, have not lost their potency. A complete uncoupling is simply too expensive for the global economy to bear, particularly in complex industries like electronics [4].

Williamson identifies a key outcome of current realignments: "Slow-balization [4]." This term captures a reality where trade in physical goods may be slowing, but there is a marked increase in the exchange of data, services, and specialized knowledge. This distinction between the flow of "atoms" (goods) and "bits" (ideas) is vital. It suggests that while physical borders harden, the "soft" infrastructure of globalization, knowledge transfer and managerial expertise, might be becoming more important. This aligns with the Resource-Based View (RBV) of the firm, suggesting that the ability to transfer intangible assets across borders is becoming a critical capability.

2.3. Institutional theory and legitimacy

Applying institutional theory provides insight into the "why" behind specific expansion locations. Firms do not just seek lower costs; they seek legitimacy. In an environment where being a "Chinese firm" carries a geopolitical stigma in certain Western markets, expansion into countries like Mexico or Hungary serves a legitimizing function. By embedding themselves in these economies and complying with local regulations, Chinese firms attempt to "isomorph" into the local institutional fabric, thereby mitigating the liability of foreignness exacerbated by geopolitical tensions.

3. Divergent narratives of expansion: A comparative analysis

To understand current strategic shifts, this study analyzes how these trends are articulated within the business community. Two representative articles offering contrasting viewpoints were selected: one from Caixin (investigative journalism) and one from CEIBS (academic business strategy). A critical comparison reveals a dichotomy in understanding the motivations behind Chinese corporate globalization.

3.1. The reactive narrative: Survival in "Deeper Waters"

The first narrative, exemplified by the Caixin article "In Depth: Chinese Companies Going Global Navigate Into Deeper Waters," frames the current expansion as a defensive reaction to external hostility. This perspective attributes the overseas migration of Chinese firms to immediate geopolitical and economic exigencies, primarily the need to circumvent punitive U.S. tariffs [1].

The report by Li *et al.* conveys a palpable sense of urgency. From this viewpoint, globalization is identified as a necessity for survival [1]. The report highlights the "China+1" strategy, where companies frantically establish production facilities in third-party countries, often in Southeast Asia, while attempting to maintain core domestic operations. The narrative is one of compulsion; the report cites swelling outward direct investment (ODI) as capital flight from a constrained domestic environment. It documents a structural evolution in China's export composition, shifting from finished products to intermediate goods needed to equip new international factories [1]. For instance, instead of exporting a finished bicycle to the U.S. (subject to tariffs), a firm might export parts to Vietnam for assembly. The underlying tone is diagnostic, portraying a fight for corporate survival. The stark message is that forgoing an overseas presence could precipitate a loss of contracts and expulsion from key Western markets [1].

3.2. The proactive narrative: The "Third Wave" of globalization

In contrast, the CEIBS article "Chinese firms going global: Context, challenges & opportunities" presents an optimistic, agency-driven narrative. It posits the current trend as a "third wave" of Chinese globalization, propelled by the matured capabilities of the corporations themselves [2].

Analysis of this text reveals a shift in focus to internal competencies. It argues that Chinese firms have graduated from export-led growth to genuine multinational operation. The article spotlights the sophistication of these firms in adhering to complex international standards covering ESG, data privacy, and IP protection. Crucially, it documents a pivot in investment methodology: a preference for greenfield investments (building from scratch) over brownfield acquisitions. This suggests confidence in transferring indigenous management models abroad. Furthermore, it contrasts rigid vertical integration with fluid "global layout" paradigms, arguing that Chinese firms are becoming adept at managing decentralized networks [2]. This narrative suggests firms are running towards new opportunities with newfound confidence, leveraging prowess in EVs and digital infrastructure.

3.3. Synthesis: Fear as a catalyst for capability

While both narratives acknowledge the surge in overseas activity, with ASEAN as a primary destination, their divergent framings reveal the complexity of the phenomenon. An AI-assisted comparison might see these as descriptive differences, but this evaluation reveals they address different dimensions. Caixin undertakes an explanatory mission, detailing the "what" and "why" through political economy [1]. It correctly identifies the "vise-grip" of tariffs as the trigger. However, the CEIBS perspective correctly identifies that the success of this migration depends on the "how", the development of managerial capabilities [2].

The evidence suggests that the truth likely lies in a synthesis: Geopolitical friction is not the root cause of Chinese firms' global capability, but it acts as a powerful accelerant. It compresses the timeline for internationalization, forcing firms to mature their global operations faster than they otherwise might have. What Li *et al.* sees as a defensive scramble, Li interprets as a catalyst for a necessary evolutionary leap [1,2].

4. Strategic responses: Developing geopolitical resilience

In response to these challenges, this study identifies distinct strategic responses Chinese enterprises are adopting to redefine their operational models. These represent the practical application of "geopolitical resilience."

4.1. From efficiency to resilience: The rise of "Just-in-Case"

The traditional supply chain paradigm, centered on efficiency (Just-in-Time), is being replaced by an imperative for resilience (Just-in-Case). "China+1" strategies are insurance policies against geopolitical shock. Firms accept higher redundancy costs to ensure continuity, duplicating manufacturing capabilities in neutral jurisdictions to create "shadow supply chains" [1].

Consider a hypothetical Chinese solar panel manufacturer. Historically, it might concentrate production in Jiangsu for economies of scale. However, facing U.S. tariffs, this firm establishes a 20% capacity plant in Vietnam. This plant isn't just about cheaper labor, logistics might be more expensive there. Rather, it functions as a "compliance valve." If the U.S. closes the door on Chinese-origin goods, the firm can ramp up the Vietnamese line. This redundancy consumes capital, but in a fragmented world, it is the price of admission [3].

4.2. Regionalization and the "Global Layout"

The shift towards a "global layout" represents a move away from a China-centric model towards a multi-polar regional network. Chinese firms increasingly treat ASEAN, Latin America, and the Middle East as semi-autonomous production hubs. By embedding deeply in these local economies through greenfield investments, they aim to acquire a "social license to operate" [2].

This regionalization insulates them from bilateral tensions between China and the West, as products increasingly originate from "neutral" third countries. It is operational localization. By becoming "local" in Indonesia or Brazil, Chinese firms bypass the "Made in China" stigma growing in some Western capitals. For instance, Chinese EV battery makers establishing plants in Hungary are effectively becoming European suppliers, embedding themselves within the EU's automotive ecosystem and insulating themselves from potential trade barriers targeting direct exports.

4.3. Managing the compliance frontier and intangible flows

A critical component is a rigorous focus on compliance. As CEIBS highlights, the "third wave" is characterized by focus on ESG and data security [2]. Chinese firms are learning that regulatory compliance is a competitive advantage. By adhering to international standards, they strive to shed the "liability of origin" and position themselves as responsible stakeholders.

Furthermore, following Williamson's insight regarding intangible flows, Chinese firms are increasingly exporting management philosophies and R&D capabilities [4]. By establishing R&D centers in Europe or joint ventures in Southeast Asia, they weave a web of intellectual connectivity harder to sever than physical trade routes. This strategy acknowledges that while you can put a tariff on a machine, it is harder to tariff the engineering knowledge that designed it. This shift to knowledge-intensive globalization marks a maturity in Chinese corporate strategy.

5. Critical discussion: Systemic risks and future implications

Despite the rational logic of these adaptations, a critical academic evaluation must address their aggregate consequences. A shortcoming in optimistic narratives of corporate maturation is the neglect of wider systemic dangers.

5.1. The tragedy of the geopolitical commons

By concentrating on individual company reactions, current assessments often fail to consider how these accumulated actions might inadvertently entrench the geopolitical chasms they are designed to bridge [3,4]. As firms build redundant supply chains and separate operations into geopolitical blocs, they reduce the economic interdependence that has historically acted as a buffer against conflict.

This phenomenon presents a potential "tragedy of the commons." It makes sense for one company to hedge its bets by duplicating its supply chain. But if every major firm does this, the result is two distinct, non-overlapping technological ecosystems. This "slow-balization" may calcify into a permanent economic iron curtain, reducing global innovation efficiency, as ideas stop flowing freely, and increasing the likelihood of systemic conflict because the economic cost of war becomes lower when economies are less intertwined [3].

5.2. The risks of transshipment and regulatory whack-a-mole

Moreover, re-routing trade through third countries (transshipment) carries risks. It is a fragile solution that may invite secondary sanctions or expanded tariff regimes. If the U.S. perceives Vietnam or Mexico as merely a "backdoor" for Chinese goods, it may extend tariffs to those nations. This creates a volatile environment where Chinese firms must constantly hop jurisdiction to stay ahead of the regulatory curve. The resilience individual firms gain may come at the cost of global system stability, introducing uncertainty into the developing nations hosting these facilities [1].

5.3. The human dimension of decoupling

It is imperative to consider the human dimension. Strategic shifts involve moving jobs, displacing communities, and altering economic destinies. While reports focus on "layout" and "capital," reality involves friction on the ground, cultural clashes, environmental concerns, and the hollowing out of manufacturing communities in China.

The "efficiency" of the past is being replaced by a "resilience" with a high social price tag. For the Chinese worker, this might mean a job moves to Hanoi. For the Vietnamese worker, it brings opportunity but also rapid industrialization pressures. For the Western consumer, it likely means higher prices. The human cost of geopolitical resilience is distributed unevenly, warranting further ethical study.

6. Conclusion

In conclusion, the analysis suggests that Chinese firms are not de-globalizing but undertaking a sophisticated strategic reconfiguration. This adaptable strategy, characterized by "China+1" regionalization, greenfield investment pivots, and management of intangible flows, represents a fundamental evolution. This paper confirms that the simplistic binary of "stay or leave" is obsolete. Instead, Chinese enterprises are pioneering a hybrid model decoupling physical production from geopolitical risk while maintaining connectivity through intermediate goods and knowledge. However, this nimble approach both reflects and strengthens the broader pattern of global economic partitioning. As we move forward, the ability to manage geopolitical risk will likely be a core tenet of executive leadership. The successful global enterprise of the future will operate fluidly across economic fractures, turning fragmentation into competitive advantage. The ability to navigate the "gray zones" of geopolitics, balancing national identity with global operation, will be the defining skill of future business leaders.

Disclosure statement

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Li R, Luo G, Han W, 2025, In Depth: Chinese Companies Going Global Navigate Into Deeper Waters, Caixin Global, https://www.caixinglobal.com/2025-03-14/in-depth-chinese-companies-going-global-navigate-into-deeper-waters-102298359.html

[2] Li M, 2024, Chinese Firms Going Global: Context, Challenges & Opportunities, CEIBS Business Review, https://www.ceibs.edu/new-papers-columns/25578

[3] Colantone I, 2025, De-Globalization and Fragmentation. The New Economic Geography: Journal of International

Economics.
[4] Williamson P, 2021, De-Globalisation and Decoupling: Post-COVID-19 Myths and Realities. International Business Review, 30(2): 101792.