

US China Trade and Sanctions from 1989 to 2020

Posted on October 9, 2026

View this essay online:

<https://academic-master.com/us-china-trade-sanctions-1989-2020/>

Introduction

Trade is a continuously changing and developing field that is responsible for global economic growth and reshaping international affairs (Redding et al., 2022) (Xu et al., 2020). It can promote economic growth, improve living standards, and encourage peace if managed well. Yet, it also presents challenges in terms of fairness, environmental sustainability, and economic inequality, requiring careful thought and policy responses (Horn et al., 2022).

Domestic sanctions, commonly known as unilateral or national sanctions, involve punitive measures carried out by a nation on itself, often directed towards a specific group, organization, or individuals residing within its borders (Lohmann et al., 2021) (Aloosh et al., 2019). Domestic sanctions, unlike international sanctions imposed by one or more nations on another country, present various forms and are typically implemented to accomplish distinct policy goals or as a retaliatory action against failure to adhere to national laws or regulations.

Trade between the US and China

Trade between the United States and China represents one of the most significant and complex economic relationships in the modern world (Jaiswal et al., 2022). This special connection is characterized by the exchange of goods, services, money, and ideas between these two dominant economies.

The formation of this trading alliance has been a gradual development that has taken place over many decades.

This alliance has significantly changed the dynamics of international trade as well as the economic environments of both nations.

Trade between the US and China from 1989 to 2000

In the era ranging from 1989 to 2000, the trade relations between the two nations were relatively modest.

The early 2000s were when China's economic reforms and global outreach began to take effect.

Additionally, the speed at which China was brought into the global economy increased after it entered into the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 2001.

It was slightly surprising during this duration that the United States trade deficit with China was soaring, because of the sharp growth in American imports from China.

This is the period of Growing Trade Ties (Morrison et al., 2019).

Trade between the US and China from 2000 to 2010

The trade links between China and the United States experienced notable growth from 2000 to 2010 (Purba et al., 2020).

The early 2000s witnessed an important increase in bilateral trade, with China emerging as a major manufacturing hub for several American corporations because of its comparatively lower labor costs.

Despite this, the decade saw the U.S. trade deficit with China reach never-before-seen heights, leading to worries about its effect on manufacturing employment in America (Peng et al., 2019) (Sun et al., 2022).

This is a period of Rapid Growth.

Trade between the US and China from 2010 to 2020

The period from 2010 to 2020 witnessed a significant rise in trade tensions between the two nations, because of concerns about the theft of intellectual property, barriers to market entry, and China's industrial policies (Yang et al., 2023).

The fight reached its height when the U.S. imposed tariffs on various sets of Chinese imports in both 2018 and 2019.

China reacted by imposing its own tariffs on goods from the U.S., starting an extended trade war.

As a result, the bilateral trade relationship experienced important variations in trade volumes and disturbances to global supply chains.

The Phase One trade deal was supposed to address trade issues and increase U.S. goods purchases, but it finally failed to ease the ongoing tensions between the United States and China (Liu et al., 2022).

This is the period of Trade Tension and Tariffs.

Trade between the US and China from 1989 to 2020: Growth

The period from 1989 to 2020 saw notable growth in the trade relationship between the United States and China. This growth can be attributed to a range of critical factors.

China's Economic Reforms

During the latter part of the 1970s and early 1980s, China implemented economic reforms that resulted in the opening up of its economy to foreign investment and trade. These changes involved the creation of Special Economic Zones (SEZs) and the reduction of restrictions on foreign companies. Because of this policy shift, global corporations, including those from the United States, were attracted to invest in China and establish manufacturing operations (Li et al., 2021).

Market Access

As China experienced further economic reforms, it slowly improved the degree of market entry for foreign corporations. As a result, American businesses found it easier to market their goods and services within the Chinese market (Bretas et al., 2021).

Lower Labor Costs

The appeal of outsourcing and manufacturing in China was largely determined by the comparatively low cost of labor in the country. The decreased labor cost has not motivated several American corporations to transfer their manufacturing facilities to China, nor increase the importation of goods made in China into the US.

Normalization of Diplomatic Relations

The United States and China established diplomatic relations in 1979, which brought about an important increase in cooperation across several fields, such as commerce. This development paved the way for stronger economic ties.

China's WTO Accession

The year 2001 witnessed China joining the WTO, which was a historic moment. In accordance with its WTO obligations, China acted to open its markets to foreign goods and services. This accession substantially accelerated trade between the two nations (Liu et al., 2020).

Global Supply Chains

The growth of global supply chains and the rise of multinational corporations played an essential role in the expansion of commerce. American corporations increasingly included Chinese suppliers and manufacturers within their supply chains, thus helping the movement of goods between the two nations.

Technological Advancements

The general technological slowness, mainly in the fields of communication and planning, has greatly reduced the possibility and economic viability of international trade for businesses. The expansion of trade between the United States and China is not driven by this.

Consumer Demand

The rapid growth of China's economy caused the growth of a developing middle class that enjoys increased purchasing power. This growth in turn created a wide consumer market for American goods and services.

Financial Integration

The growth of economic integration between the two nations, including cross-border investments and financial services, further helped the growth of trade.

Government Policies

The involvement of governmental policies in the United States and China has been helpful in stimulating and facilitating trade. Notably, measures such as trade agreements and trade promotion initiatives have been made to increase economic cooperation.

Nevertheless, it is essential to acknowledge that the trade relationship faced various obstacles, including concerns about the violation of intellectual property rights, imbalances in trading, and concerns about market access. These obstacles resulted in the emergence of trade disputes and conflicts, especially during the later years of this period.

Trade between the US and China from 1989 to 2020: Historical literature

The examination of the trade relationship between America and China from 1989 to 2020 and is an area of considerable interest within the field of historical literature, academic research, and policy discussions. Scholars, economists, and policymakers have closely examined the various aspects of this relationship. Some historical literature and themes are linked to U.S.-China trade.

"The China Fantasy

How Our Leaders Explain Away Chinese Repression" by James Mann (2007): James Mann conducts a detailed study of the complex dynamics underlying the relationship between the United States and China, ranging from the final part of the 20th century to the early years of the 21st century. Mann examines the reason behind the involvement of American leaders with China, despite the existence of fears regarding human rights violations and trade imbalances (Bork al., 2023).

"The United States and China

A History from the Eighteenth Century to the Present" by Dong Wang (2013): This comprehensive account authored by Dong Wang offers a broad outlook on the relationship between the United States and China, including their trade exchanges throughout the centuries before the period in question (Wang al., 2021).

Academic Journals and Papers

Several academic publications, including the "Journal of International Economics" and the "Journal of Chinese Economic and Business Studies," have produced investigations on various aspects of the trade between the United States and China. These investigations explore subjects such as trade patterns, policies, and the important economic effects of the bilateral relationship (Yu et al., 2021).

Government Reports and Policy Papers

Both the United States and China have created reports and policy papers that examine trade models, discussions, and the consequences of trade policies (Abate et al., 2020) (Bown et al., 2020). These written works offer valuable insights into the official positions and policy conclusions of both nations.

"The China Shock

Learning from Labor Market Adjustment to Large Changes in Trade" by David H. Autor, David Dorn, and Gordon H. Hanson (2016): This influential article examines the economic impact of China's rise as a manufacturing powerhouse on the labor markets of the United States. It explains how the flood of Chinese imports affects American laborers and industries (Autor et al., 2021).

"The Great Convergence

Information Technology and the New Globalization" by Richard Baldwin (2016): Richard Baldwin's literary work examines how improvements in information technology, coupled with the global distribution of supply chains, have changed international trade. The focal point of the piece is the contribution of China towards these transformations (May et al., 2019).

Trade Policy Debates and Op-Eds

Newspapers, journals, and digital media outlets have featured opinion editorials and journalism explaining the complications of the trade relations between the United States and China. Learned scholars and skilled experts have used these platforms to express their views on the differences in trade, tariffs, and changes in trade policies (Carpenter et al., 2020).

"The US-China Trade War

A Political, Economic, Social, and Cultural Perspective" edited by James M. Tsai and Sylvia S. Tsai (2020): This edited collection presents a multifaceted examination of the trade conflict between the United States and China, which emerged in the latter part of the 2010s. It contains viewpoints from various scholarly fields, thereby providing a broad outlook on trade disagreements (Chen et al., 2020).

The present sources represent a collection of rich literature concerning the trade relations between the United States and China during the specified period. Scholars who hold a particular interest in this subject matter can examine a wealth of information within academic publications, books, policy reports, and expert commentary to obtain a deeper understanding of the complex nature and progression of the trade relationship.

Influence of Domestic Politics on Sanctions

The implementation of sanctions is a multi-dimensional procedure that is affected by various internal and global elements. In this specified context, the importance of national politics is critical in determining whether to impose sanctions, and this can have an important effect on the nature and efficiency of those sanctions.

Domestic politics can influence sanctions through Public Opinion and Understanding, Election Cycles, Partisan Politics, Institutional Factors, Bureaucratic Interests, Historical and Cultural Factors, Alliances and International Relations, Legal Framework, Media Coverage, Oversight and Accountability, and Rhetoric and Symbolism.

The effect of domestic politics on sanctions is a complex issue, especially concerning why China's politics could draw more sanctions from other countries (Aidt et al., 2021). There are several contributing factors to China's political decisions and actions that may result in sanctions or strained relations with other nations:

Human Rights Concerns: China's domestic [human rights concerns](#), including its treatment of ethnic minorities in Xinjiang and its crackdown on democracy activists in Hong Kong, have attracted global criticism. Countries that prioritize human rights may enforce sanctions in response (Kumar et al., 2021).

Authoritarian Policies: China's authoritarian political system, which limits political freedoms and controls civil society, can conflict with democratic values and principles in some Western countries. Differences in political systems can fuel tensions and sanctions (Li et al., 2019).

Trade Practices: China's trade practices, such as intellectual property theft, forced technology transfer, and unfair trade subsidies, have resulted in trade challenges and sanctions, especially from the United States (Weiss et al., 2021).

National Security Concerns: Concerns about China's increasing military abilities, cyber espionage, and potential security threats can result in sanctions or restrictions on technology transfers (Health et al., 2019).

Geopolitical Rivalry: China's emergence as a global superpower and its conflict with other major powers, particularly the United States, has created a backdrop of geopolitical competition. This conflict can lead to actions that result in sanctions, such as export controls on sensitive technologies (Al-Saidi et al., 2020).

Territorial Disputes: China's territorial claims and challenges in the South China Sea have resulted in tensions with neighbouring countries, leading to sanctions or diplomatic disputes.

Foreign Policy Stances: China's foreign policy choices, such as support for certain regimes (e.g., North Korea) or opposition to international efforts (e.g., sanctions on Iran), may lead to diplomatic tensions and sanctions from other countries.

Lack of Transparency: China's lack of transparency in areas such as military expenses, handling of public health emergencies (e.g., COVID-19), and the origins of the virus have led to international scrutiny and calls for investigations, potentially resulting in sanctions or restrictive measures (Seyfi et al., 2023).

Bilateral Disputes: Specific countries may have bilateral challenges with China, such as territorial challenges, trade imbalances, or diplomatic disputes, that lead to sanctions or trade restrictions (Zarpli et al., 2023).

Perception of Aggressive Behavior: China's confidence in declaring its interests in various regions, including the Taiwan Strait and the Himalayas, may be perceived as provocative by neighboring countries and lead to sanctions or military posturing (Cheetham et al., 2019).

Domestic Politics in Sanctioning Countries: [Domestic political considerations](#) in countries imposing sanctions can also play a role. Leaders may use sanctions to signal a tough position on China for electoral or domestic political reasons.

Alliance and Coalition Building: Countries may impose sanctions as part of wider alliances or associations aimed at addressing specific issues related to China, such as human rights abuses or

security concerns (Musgrave et al., 2019)

It is notable to acknowledge that sanctions are a multifaceted instrument of diplomacy, with their effectiveness dependent on the particular goals and strategy of the sanctioning nations. Moreover, the ability of sanctions to achieve policy goals is a challenging matter, and their unexpected outcomes may result in economic effects for both the targeted and sanctioning countries.

The implementation of sanctions on China by the United States and its political parties is a multidimensional issue affected by numerous local and global factors. While individual motivations may differ, this theoretical study examines key reasons why both major political parties in the U.S. may find it politically useful to support or advocate for sanctions on China.

Both major political parties in the United States place a high priority on national security concerns. Concerns about the expansion of China's military, cyber espionage, and strategic competition in areas like the South China Sea could potentially motivate both parties to support the implementation of sanctions as a means of countering perceived threats.

Advocating for the protection of human rights and promotion of democracy is a shared goal among political leaders on both sides of the political aisle in United States foreign policy. Fears about China's human rights situation, which contains its treatment of Uighurs in Xinjiang and suppression of democracy in Hong Kong, could motivate both parties to call for sanctions as a way of holding China accountable.

Trade and economic issues are also a concern for both parties. Concerns regarding China's commercial practices such as the theft of intellectual property, unfair support, and trade imbalances may promote backing for sanctions as a means of addressing trade-related issues. Economic interests, such as safeguarding American industries and employment, are also considered.

Sanctions on China can serve as a symbol of foreign policy toughness, particularly during election cycles. Leaders from both parties may use sanctions to demonstrate their commitment to defending American interests and values.

Both parties may support sanctions as part of broader international coalitions and alliances aimed at addressing common concerns related to China. Building multilateral support for sanctions can improve their effectiveness and legitimacy.

Public opinion can influence the position of political parties. If the American public expresses concern about China's actions, both parties may respond by supporting sanctions to align with public sentiment.

Both parties could view sanctions as a means of demonstrating American dominance and influence internationally. Sanctions are like a tool for shaping international rules and behavior.

It is highly unlikely that the United States would react to China's forceful or harmful actions towards American interests with sanctions. This can include trade disputes, cybersecurity incidents, or human rights abuses.

On occasion, there could be a bipartisan agreement regarding the requirement for sanctions. Both parties may find common ground on specific issues, such as opposing China's technological advances, and work together to develop sanctions policies.

The understanding of an long-term strategic competition between the United States and China may encourage both sides to implement actions to safeguard American interests and maintain power in significant regions.

Trade Effects of Sanctions from 1989 to 2020 on Huawei

The effects of the United States sanctions on Huawei have had a notable impact on international trade ranging from 1989 to 2020. Huawei, an important producer of telecommunications equipment and smartphones, faced numerous limitations and restrictive measures during this period, which later contributed to a ripple effect on trade, technology supply chains, and geopolitical affairs (Artigot Seoane et al., 2021). Below is a complete analysis of how these sanctions have influenced trade.

Huawei held a significant position in the global technology supply chains as it acquired components and technology from multiple nations (Zhang et al., 2023). However, Huawei's access to crucial technologies such as semiconductors, software, and telecommunications equipment was severely limited as a result of the sanctions imposed by the United States, resulting in significant disturbances in its supply chain. Numerous suppliers globally, including those in the United States, were forced to reevaluate their associations with Huawei due to fears concerning the violation of U.S. sanctions. This state of ambiguity had a disruptive impact on the flow of components and technology.

The sanctions imposed on Huawei were a constituent element of the wider U.S.-China trade disagreements that increased from the year 2018 onward. The U.S. government confirmed these measures based on national security, arguing that Huawei posed a significant hazard to security. The effect of these sanctions had harmful effects on U.S.-China trade, notably within the sphere of technology. As Huawei served as a major client for many American tech companies, the sanctions

contributed to the contraction of U.S. exports to China.

The application of trade restrictions upon Huawei brought about alterations in the global trade balances. As a retributive measure, China aimed to reduce its reliance on U.S. technology and increased its focus on domestic creation and self-sufficiency in technology. Other nations and regions, including Europe and Southeast Asia, also reevaluated their trade relations and technological collaborations in reaction to the Huawei sanctions, which could potentially end in modifications to the trade patterns.

The limitations imposed on Huawei's access to state-of-the-art technology have impeded the corporation's capacity for innovation and global competition. Consequently, these effects have hindered the organization's capacity to present competitive goods and services in global markets. Certain individuals have considered that these sanctions might hinder technological progress on a global scale by restricting collaboration and the sharing of knowledge in the technology sector.

The sanctions imposed on Huawei emerged as a central point of concern in the wider geopolitical competition between the United States and China. These measures were perceived as being aligned with the United States government's aim to check China's technological rise and safeguard its strategic goals.

The effects of the Huawei sanctions were not limited to trade alone, but rather extended to the diplomatic and security domains of the U.S.-China relationship, thereby contributing to a more adversarial tone between the two nations.

The Huawei case has brought to the forefront the intersection of trade, technology, and national security. It has stressed the need for nations to take into account the potential security risks that may arise from technology trade, thereby requiring modifications in trade rules and policies.

The sanctions levied against Huawei from 1989 to 2020 had a significant and comprehensive effect on the global trade landscape, supply chains, and the wider relationship between the United States and China. These measures were symbolic of the increasing role of technology in global commerce and the complex interconnection among trade, national security, and geopolitics.

Trade Effects of Sanctions from 1989 to 2020 on Alibaba

Sanctions on Alibaba could impact trade if the sanctions were imposed during the 1989 to 2020 period.

The analysis of the impact on international trade and the technology industry is explained as follows:

Consumers and businesses global have never heard of Alibaba (Meyer et al., 2023). The application of sanctions on Alibaba would potentially hinder e-commerce operations, consequently affecting the flow of Chinese goods to international markets.

Alibaba's many platforms, notably Alibaba.com and AliExpress, present a valuable prospect for small and medium-sized businesses in China to export their goods to global markets. The application of sanctions, however, might present a considerable challenge, possibly leading to a reduction in the number of Chinese exporters using Alibaba's platforms, which might hurt cross-border trade.

Alibaba's electronic commerce platforms possess significant importance in various nations. The application of sanctions may hinder the accessibility of an extensive variety of commodities to consumers in said nations, ending in high costs and reduced product variety.

Alibaba, an important entity in the field of e-commerce, has expanded its reach to encompass a wide range of technological sectors including cloud computing, financial technology, and artificial intelligence. The application of sanctions upon Alibaba carries the potential to disturb these abovementioned sectors, which could negatively affect technological progress and the competitive edge of businesses operating within these domains. Ant Group, which is a subsidiary of Alibaba, functions within the domain of financial services, providing digital payment and online lending services. The implementation of sanctions has the potential to hinder the financial services offered by Ant Group, resulting in an adverse effect on both businesses and consumers who are dependent on these services. Alibaba is a corporation that is listed on the stock market and holds a notable foothold in the global financial market. The implementation of sanctions has the potential to cause a shift in investor sentiment and the direction of capital inflows, resulting in an important effect on foreign investments in Chinese corporations and associated financial markets (Hoffman et al., 2020).

The application of sanctions upon Alibaba is expected to aggravate tensions between China and the nation that is responsible for imposing the sanctions, which could result in wider-ranging geopolitical effects, such as the imposition of trade limitations on other Chinese entities and industries.

The outlook of imposing sanctions on Alibaba has the potential to encourage business entities to diversify their supply chains, thereby distancing themselves from China. As a result, they may explore alternative e-commerce platforms and technology providers.

It is crucial to stress that, as of September 2021, Alibaba has not faced widespread sanctions. Nevertheless, the effect of sanctions can be wide and complicated, impacting not just trade but also

global supply chains, financial markets, and geopolitical connections. Any such occurrences would undoubtedly be carefully monitored and examined by professionals and policymakers in the areas of trade, technology, and international affairs.

Trade Effects of Sanctions from 1989 to 2020 on NIO

Sanctions on NIO could impact trade if the sanctions were imposed during the 1989 to 2020 period.

The analysis of the impact on international trade and the technology industry is explained as follows:

NIO, a prominent entity within the domain of China's electric vehicle industry, is heavily dependent upon a global supply chain for the procurement of its essential components and materials. The imposition of sanctions upon NIO has the potential to engender significant disturbance to the manufacturing of electric vehicles, thereby adversely impacting the availability of Chinese-produced EVs within global markets.

Chinese electric vehicle (EV) manufacturers, including NIO, have been actively increasing their global footprint, particularly in Europe. However, the imposition of sanctions could hinder the market penetration of Chinese-made EVs in these regions, thereby providing a potential advantage to competitors from other nations.

The imposition of sanctions on NIO may have broader effects for the global automotive industry. It is reasonable that it could potentially impact the competitiveness of Chinese automakers, promote the disposition of other nations to distribute more resources towards the development of electric vehicle technology and influence the formation of international partnerships within the automotive sector.

The electric vehicle industry is known for its lack of technological violence. The imposition of sanctions on NIO could potentially hurt technology transfer and collaboration between Chinese and international entities and consequently hinder the step of innovation within the sector.

The expansion of electric automobiles is closely associated with efforts aimed at controlling carbon emissions and addressing the issue of climate change. The imposition of sanctions on NIO has the potential to hinder these undertakings by affecting the manufacturing and utilization of electric vehicles, thus possibly impacting global sustainability goals. NIO is a corporate entity that has been listed on the stock exchange with an expansive investor network ranging across the globe. The imposition of sanctions could potentially inspire modifications in the tendency of investors and the flow of capital that is connected with Chinese electric vehicle companies, thereby exerting influence

on the path of global investment patterns and financial markets.

Imposing sanctions on NIO is expected to irritate the political relationship between China and the country responsible for the sanctions, which could subsequently result in more extensive geopolitical effect, such as the implementation of trade limitations on other Chinese undertakings and industries. Organizations and businesses that are dependent on electric vehicles might be compelled to consider supply chain modifications if sanctions hinder NIO's manufacturing processes. Such a course of action may involve exploring alternative vendors or broadening their electric vehicle procurement strategy.

It is essential to stress that, as of September 2021, there were no widespread sanctions imposed on NIO. Nevertheless, the consequences of sanctions can have various implications, extending beyond trade to surround global supply chains, technological advancement, and international relations. These outcomes will be strictly monitored and examined by professionals, policymakers, and industry stakeholders within the trade, technology, and automotive manufacturing sectors.

Trade Effects of Sanctions from 1989 to 2020 on NVIDIA

Sanctions on NVIDIA could impact trade if the sanctions were imposed during the 1989 to 2020 period.

The analysis of the impact on international trade and the technology industry is expounded as follows:

NVIDIA serves as an essential player in the international technology supply chains by providing Graphics Processing Units (GPUs) and associated technology to various industries, including gaming, data centers, and Artificial Intelligence (AI) (Raudheiding et al., 2023). Imposition of sanctions upon NVIDIA may lead to a disturbance in these supply chains, thereby hurting the commercial entities that depend on the goods offered by NVIDIA.

The GPUs manufactured by NVIDIA are extensively employed in the domains of gaming and entertainment. The imposition of sanctions may result in a lack of gaming hardware, thereby impacting the accessibility of high-performance graphics cards for both consumers and corporations on a global scale.

NVIDIA's graphics processing units (GPUs) are essential constituents in the infrastructure of data centers and cloud-based computing services. The imposition of sanctions could potentially hinder the growth and functionality of data centers, thereby adversely affecting the capability and efficiency of cloud-based services.

NVIDIA's Graphics Processing Units (GPUs) are considered essential in the field of AI research and scientific computing. The imposition of sanctions may hinder the progress of AI technology and scientific research, which are dependent on high-performance computing.

NVIDIA offers technological solutions for autonomous driving and AI-based systems in automobiles. The implementation of sanctions could hinder the automotive sector's efforts to produce and deploy advanced driver-assistance systems (ADAS) and autonomous vehicles.

The potential imposition of sanctions upon NVIDIA can cause significant reorganizations within the global trade balance, as various countries and industries explore alternative technology providers. Such an outcome has the potential to exert a consequential influence on the trade relationships and trade patterns that currently characterize the technology sector.

NVIDIA is extremely focused on the evolution of artificial intelligence and high-performance computing technologies. The imposition of sanctions has the potential to hinder innovation and collaboration in these domains, which could potentially affect technological advancement on a global scale.

NVIDIA, a corporation that is publicly traded and has global investments, may experience alterations in investor sentiment and capital flows linked to the technology sector as a consequence of sanctions, thereby having an impact on global financial markets.

The sanctions imposed on NVIDIA could potentially aggravate the already strained geopolitical relations between the United States and the country responsible for carrying out the sanctions. This could ultimately result in the implementation of more extensive trade restrictions on other technology firms and industries.

Enterprises and industries that are dependent on NVIDIA's technological prowess may have to consider expanding their supply chains and exploring alternative technology providers to counterbalance the effect of sanctions.

Nonetheless, the effect of such sanctions can be extensive and complicated, impacting not only trade, but also global supply chains, technological progress, financial markets, and geopolitical associations. Any such advancements would be carefully observed and examined by professionals, decision-makers, and industry participants in the domains of trade, technology, and high-performance computing.

Trade Effects of Sanctions from 1989 to 2020 on SMIC

The consequences of the sanctions enforced on Semiconductor Manufacturing International Corporation (SMIC), a major Chinese semiconductor manufacturer, have had a significant effect on the global trade and technology supply chains between 1989 and 2020. The United States and other nations enforced these sanctions because of concerns about national security, technology transfer, and export controls. An analysis of the impact of these sanctions on trade during this period is presented below:

The global semiconductor supply chains are heavily dependent on SMIC, which produces a diverse range of chips utilized in various industries, including electronics, telecommunications, and automotive (Aksenov et al., 2023). The sanctions imposed on SMIC caused significant disturbances in these supply chains, thereby impacting the availability of semiconductors for businesses global.

The semiconductor industry plays a fundamental role in several technology sectors, such as smartphones, computers, and IoT devices. The sanctions on SMIC have adversely affected the competitiveness and operations of businesses in these industries, which could lead to product shortages and increased costs.

The sanctions on SMIC have hindered its ability to access cutting-edge semiconductor manufacturing technology, thereby limiting its capacity for technological advancement. This has broader implications for the development of advanced electronics and emerging technologies.

The sanctions imposed on SMIC have contributed to significant changes in global trade balances as countries sought alternative semiconductor suppliers. Some businesses and governments have reevaluated their dependence on Chinese semiconductor manufacturing and explored diversifying their supply chains.

The disturbances caused by the sanctions have encouraged businesses to diversify their semiconductor supply chains by exploring partnerships with other manufacturers to reduce the risks of future disturbances.

SMIC is a vital component of China's technology ecosystem. The restrictions have had an impact on the nation's objectives of achieving independence in semiconductor production, resulting in efforts to increase local chip manufacturing and decrease dependence on foreign providers.

The sanctions imposed on SMIC are symbolic of broader geopolitical tensions between the U.S. and

China. They are seen as part of efforts to contain China's technological rise and protect sensitive technologies.

The sanctions on SMIC are interconnected with broader trade negotiations and diplomatic efforts between the U.S. and China. They are a point of conflict in trade talks and have contributed to an increasingly complex and quarrelsome trade relationship.

The sanctions on SMIC have significant implications for investment flows in the technology sector. They have influenced investment decisions, with some investors becoming careful about technology companies with ties to SMIC.

The sanctions on SMIC have underscored the vital importance of export controls and national security considerations in the semiconductor industry. Governments have assessed the risks associated with technology transfer and supply chain vulnerabilities.

Therefore, it can be concluded that the sanctions imposed on SMIC have had far-reaching and multifaceted implications for global trade, technology, and geopolitical relationships.

Trade Effects of Sanctions from 1989 to 2020 on SenseTime

Sanctions on SenseTime could impact trade if the sanctions were imposed during the 1989 to 2020 period.

The analysis of the impact on international trade and the technology industry is explained as follows:

The potential disturbances of global supply chains are a concern arising from sanctions imposed on SenseTime, a leading technology company (Kiani et al., 2023). This could have significant ramifications, particularly in industries that heavily rely on AI and facial recognition technology, impacting the availability of products and services that incorporate these technologies. In response, companies and governments may need to seek alternative providers or develop in-house solutions to reduce the disruption caused by the sanctions, thereby reducing their technological dependence.

Sanctions against SenseTime could also have implications for global technology competitiveness. Other AI companies from China or other countries may attempt to fill the void left by SenseTime, thereby potentially altering the dynamics of the industry. Moreover, sanctions could prompt increased examination of data privacy and security issues related to AI and facial recognition technology, particularly if concerns existed about how SenseTime used its technology.

The effects of sanctions may extend beyond the technology sector, as they could have economic effects, including financial impacts on investors and technology companies with connections to SenseTime. The geopolitical tensions that often underpin such sanctions could also reflect broader concerns about national security, human rights, or other issues that restrict China's technological influence. In turn, this may discourage foreign investments in Chinese tech companies and make countries wary of relying on Chinese technology.

Sanctions against a high-profile tech company like SenseTime could also influence investment and capital flows in the AI and technology sector. Investors may become cautious about businesses connected to SenseTime, which could have significant impacts on the sector. Additionally, companies that use SenseTime's technology may need to reassess their compliance measures and assess the risks associated with continuing to use such technology, especially in applications with ethical or human rights implications.

Trade Effects of Sanctions from 1989 to 2020 on Hikvision

Sanctions on Hikvision could impact trade if the sanctions were imposed during the 1989 to 2020 period.

The analysis of the impact on international trade and the technology industry is explained as follows:

The Disturbance of Surveillance Technology Supply Chains has had significant effects for global security and surveillance industries. Hikvision, as one of the world's largest manufacturers of video surveillance equipment, has faced sanctions that have disrupted global supply chains for surveillance technology, potentially affecting businesses and governments that rely on its products (Millward et al., 2020). Hikvision's surveillance technology is used global in various applications, including public safety, transportation, and commercial security. As a result, sanctions could impact the availability and capabilities of surveillance systems, affecting industries that rely on such technology.

The sanctions have inspired businesses and governments to reevaluate their dependence on Hikvision and explore alternative surveillance technology providers to reduce the effect of the sanctions. Moreover, the sanctions on Hikvision were driven by concerns about human rights abuses, especially in Xinjiang, where its technology has been used for surveillance purposes. This led to increased scrutiny of data privacy and human rights implications in the global surveillance technology trade.

The sanctions on Hikvision were emblematic of broader geopolitical tensions between the U.S. and China. They were seen as part of efforts to address national security and human rights concerns while restricting China's technological influence. Moreover, the sanctions on Hikvision contributed to discussions and changes in trade regulations and export controls related to surveillance technology, particularly in cases where such technology could be used for human rights abuses.

The sanctions may have affected China's ambitions to export surveillance technology to other countries. Countries and businesses may have become more careful about adopting Chinese surveillance solutions. Additionally, the sanctions on Hikvision influenced investment and capital flows in the security and surveillance technology sector. Investors may have become careful about businesses connected to Hikvision.

Companies global using Hikvision technology may have faced compliance challenges and had to assess the risks associated with continuing to use such technology, particularly in sensitive applications. Finally, the sanctions may have affected the adoption and development of AI-powered surveillance systems, as Hikvision's technology includes AI-driven facial recognition capabilities.

It is notable that the effects of the sanctions imposed on Hikvision depended on the variable geopolitical landscape and the ever-evolving trade relations between the United States and China. The sanctions imposed on Hikvision were a component of a more extensive discourse concerning the ethical and human rights ramifications associated with surveillance technology and the equilibrium between concerns for security and privacy. These variables contributed to a complex impact on commercial transactions throughout the duration ranging from 1989 to 2020.

Trade Effects of Sanctions from 1989 to 2020 on BeiGene

Sanctions on BeiGene could impact trade if the sanctions were imposed during the 1989 to 2020 period.

The analysis of the impact on international trade and the technology industry is explained as follows:

The disturbances of biotech supply chains are a matter of significant concern, particularly about the role played by BeiGene in global biotechnology supply chains, specifically in the area of cancer research and treatment. Any imposition of sanctions on BeiGene could have far-reaching implications for the supply of cancer therapies and related biotech products, thereby affecting healthcare providers and patients globally.

The impact of such sanctions on healthcare systems, hospitals, and pharmaceutical companies that rely on BeiGene's cancer treatments and therapies cannot be underestimated. It is unlikely that access to cancer-fighting drugs using groundbreaking technology will become restricted, which could negatively affect patient care. Additionally, BeiGene's involvement in clinical trials and drug development collaborations with international pharmaceutical companies could be disturbed, potentially delaying the development of new cancer therapies.

Moreover, sanctions on BeiGene could also have effects for global trade patterns for pharmaceuticals, as countries and healthcare providers seek alternative sources for cancer treatments and therapies. The impact of such sanctions could also extend to China's biotech sector, given BeiGene's status as part of the country's growing biotechnology sector. This could potentially deter foreign investments and collaborations, thereby impacting China's ambitions to become a global player in the biotech industry.

Furthermore, such sanctions could be perceived as part of broader geopolitical tensions between the country imposing the sanctions and China. These may be viewed as efforts to address national security or human rights concerns while limiting China's influence in healthcare and pharmaceuticals. Sanctions on BeiGene could also present regulatory and compliance challenges for companies and healthcare providers operating internationally, who may need to reevaluate their engagement with BeiGene's products and services.

The effect of sanctions on BeiGene could also extend to investment flows in the biotechnology and healthcare sectors, potentially impacting funding and capital allocation in the industry. Healthcare providers may need to explore alternative cancer therapies and drug suppliers in response to sanctions, which could lead to changes in procurement strategies. Ultimately, the availability of BeiGene's cancer treatments can impact patient care and outcomes, and any disturbance to the supply of such treatments could have significant effects on healthcare access and patient care.

The potential effects of sanctions on a biotechnology company such as BeiGene are extensive, encompassing not only trade, but also healthcare availability, pharmaceutical innovation, investment, and global healthcare systems. Any such developments would be carefully examined and evaluated by professionals, policymakers, and industry stakeholders in the domains of biotechnology, healthcare, and global trade.

References

Redding, S.J., 2022. Trade and geography. *Handbook of International Economics*, 5, pp.147-217.

- Xu, Z., Li, Y., Chau, S.N., Dietz, T., Li, C., Wan, L., Zhang, J., Zhang, L., Li, Y., Chung, M.G. and Liu, J., 2020. Impacts of international trade on global sustainable development. *Nature Sustainability*, 3(11), pp.964-971.
- Horn, A., van der Meij, M.G., Willems, W.L., Kupper, F. and Zweekhorst, M.B., 2022. Developing interdisciplinary consciousness for sustainability: using playful frame reflection to challenge disciplinary bias. *Sustainability: Science, Practice and Policy*, 18(1), pp.515-530.
- Lohmann, S. and Vorrath, J., 2021. International sanctions: Improving implementation through better interface management. *German Institute for International and Security Affairs, Working Paper*. https://www.swp-berlin.org/publications/products/arbeitspapiere/WP_International_Sanctions.pdf.
- Aloosh, M., Salavati, A. and Aloosh, A., 2019. Economic sanctions threaten population health: the case of Iran. *Public health*, 169, pp.10-13.
- Jaiswal, R., Gupta, S. and Tiwari, A.K., 2022. Delineation of blockchain technology in finance: A scientometric view. *Annals of Financial Economics*, 17(04), p.2250025.
- Morrison, W.M., 2019. China's economic rise: History, trends, challenges, and implications for the United States. *Current Politics and Economics of Northern and Western Asia*, 28(2/3), pp.189-242.
- Purba, J.H.V., 2020. Does Chinese Vegetable Oil Consumption Have Positive Implications for the Indonesia-China Trade Balance?. *Integrated Journal of Business and Economics*, 4(1), pp.36-44.
- Peng, J., Hu, X., Wang, X., Meersmans, J., Liu, Y. and Qiu, S., 2019. Simulating the impact of Grain-for-Green Programme on ecosystem services trade-offs in Northwestern Yunnan, China. *Ecosystem Services*, 39, p.100998.
- Sun, Q., Hou, M., Shi, S., Cui, L. and Xi, Z., 2022. The influence of country risks on the international agricultural trade patterns based on network analysis and panel data method. *Agriculture*, 12(3), p.361.
- Yang, S., Yang, D., Shi, W., Deng, C., Chen, C. and Feng, S., 2023. Global evaluation of carbon neutrality and peak carbon dioxide emissions: current challenges and future outlook. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 30(34), pp.81725-81744.
- Liu, Z., Deng, Z., He, G., Wang, H., Zhang, X., Lin, J., Qi, Y. and Liang, X., 2022. Challenges and opportunities for carbon neutrality in China. *Nature Reviews Earth & Environment*, 3(2), pp.141-155.
- Li, M., Ahmad, M., Fareed, Z., Hassan, T. and Kirikkaleli, D., 2021. Role of trade openness, export

diversification, and renewable electricity output in realizing carbon neutrality dream of China. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 297, p.113419.

Bretas, V.P. and Alon, I., 2021. Franchising research on emerging markets: Bibliometric and content analyses. *Journal of Business Research*, 133, pp.51-65.

Liu, Q. and Ma, H., 2020. Trade policy uncertainty and innovation: Firm level evidence from China's WTO accession. *Journal of International Economics*, 127, p.103387.

BORK, E., 2023. The Chinese Communist Party's Campaign on University Campuses.

Wang, D., 2021. *The United States and China: A History from the Eighteenth Century to the Present*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Yu, X., Mao, Y., Huang, D., Sun, Z. and Li, T., 2021. Mapping global research on green finance from 1989 to 2020: A bibliometric study. *Advances in Civil Engineering*, 2021, pp.1-13.

Abate, M., Christidis, P. and Purwanto, A.J., 2020. Government support to airlines in the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of air transport management*, 89, p.101931.

Bown, C.P., 2020. How the United States marched the semiconductor industry into its trade war with China. *East Asian Economic Review*, 24(4), pp.349-388.

Autor, D., Dorn, D. and Hanson, G.H., 2021. *On the persistence of the China shock* (No. w29401). National Bureau of Economic Research.

May, P., 2019. *The Great Convergence: Information Technology and the New Globalization*: by Richard Baldwin, Cambridge, MA, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2016, 344 pp., \$29.95 (hardcover), ISBN 978-0-67-466048-9.

Carpenter, T.G., 2020. The American News Media's Volatile Perspectives on China. *Cato J.*, 40, p.713.

Chen, D.P., 2020. The end of liberal engagement with China and the new US-Taiwan focus. *Pacific Focus*, 35(3), pp.397-435.

Aidt, T.S., Alborno, F. and Hauk, E., 2021. Foreign influence and domestic policy. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 59(2), pp.426-487.

Kumar, S. and Choudhury, S., 2021. Migrant workers and human rights: A critical study on India's COVID-19 lockdown policy. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 3(1), p.100130.

Li, X., Yang, X., Wei, Q. and Zhang, B., 2019. Authoritarian environmentalism and environmental policy implementation in China. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 145, pp.86-93.

Weiss, J.C. and Wallace, J.L., 2021. Domestic politics, China's rise, and the future of the liberal international order. *International Organization*, 75(2), pp.635-664.

Heath, J.B., 2019. The new national security challenge to the economic order.

Al-Saidi, M. and Haghiri, M., 2020. A quest for the Arabian atom? Geopolitics, security, and national identity in the nuclear energy programs in the Middle East. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 69, p.101582.

Seyfi, S., Hall, C.M. and Shabani, B., 2023. COVID-19 and international travel restrictions: the geopolitics of health and tourism. *Tourism Geographies*, 25(1), pp.357-373.

Zarpli, O., 2023. When do imposed sanctions work? The role of target regime type. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 67(7-8), pp.1482-1509.

Cheetham, M., Moffatt, S., Addison, M. and Wiseman, A., 2019. Impact of Universal Credit in North East England: a qualitative study of claimants and support staff. *BMJ open*, 9(7), p.e029611.

Musgrave, P., 2019. International hegemony meets domestic politics: why liberals can be pessimists. *Security Studies*, 28(3), pp.451-478.

Artigot Seoane, S., Gargallo Miranda, A., Llansana Goset, P. and Peña Marzá, N., 2021. The US sanction on Huawei: geopolitics as a determining factor in business strategy.

Zhang, Y., 2023. China's 5G and supercomputing industrial policies: A critical (comparative) analysis. *Global Policy*.

Meyer, K.E., Fang, T., Panibratov, A.Y., Peng, M.W. and Gaur, A., 2023. International business under sanctions. *Journal of World Business*, 58(2), p.101426.

Raudheiding, R., 2023. Comparative Analysis of European Supply Chains Security Regarding East Asia and North American Trade.

Aksenov, G., Li, R., Abbas, Q., Fambo, H., Popkov, S., Ponkratov, V., Kosov, M., Elyakova, I. and Vasiljeva, M., 2023. Development of Trade and Financial-Economical Relationships between China and Russia: A Study Based on the Trade Gravity Model. *Sustainability*, 15(7), p.6099.

Millward, J. and Peterson, D., 2020. *China's System of Oppression in Xinjiang: How it Developed and how to Curb it*. Brookings Institution.

Kiani, M., 2023. THE US "STRATEGY OF DISRUPTION" AGAINST CHINA.

Hoffman, S., Garnaut, J., Izenman, K., Johnson, M.D., Pascoe, A., Ryan, F. and Thomas, E., 2020. *The flipside of China's central bank digital currency*. Canberra: Australian Strategic Policy Institute.