Blueprint Academic Publishers

Journal of Frontiers in Humanities and Social Sciences
Journal ISSN: 3005-513X
4(1)
Received: January 03, 2026
Accepted: March 04, 2026
Published: March 11, 2026

Navigating the Storm: Geopolitical Disruptions Reshaping Global Leadership in the Financial Sector

Tarus B. Kipchumba

Moi Teaching and Referral Hospital, P.O. Box 3-30100, Eldoret, Kenya

Abstract

The contemporary global financial landscape is undergoing an unprecedented transformation driven by escalating geopolitical tensions, economic sanctions, and the fragmentation of international financial systems. This systematic literature review examines how geopolitical disruptions are fundamentally transforming global leadership in the financial sector. Adopting PRISMA guidelines, the study analyzed 156 peer-reviewed and gray literature records (2000–2025) retrieved from Scopus, Web of Science, EconLit, African Journals Online, DOAJ and Google Scholar, supplemented by policy reports and citation snowballing. The evidence reveals five interconnected transformations: the fragmentation of global financial infrastructure via sanctions; the rise of regional blocs challenging Bretton Woods governance; the redefinition of leadership competencies toward geopolitical literacy; the weaponization of technology through CBDCs and techno-nationalism; and the erosion of cooperative regulatory frameworks. The review demonstrates that these disruptions propagate through interconnected transmission channels such as market volatility and operational security risks creating emergent systemic threats. While fragmentation generates efficiency losses, it simultaneously catalyzes resilience investments and institutional innovations. However, asymmetric profitability dynamics advantage large institutions, while African economies face acute challenges from externally imposed de-risking. Ultimately, financial leadership is evolving from the specialized technocrat toward a strategic generalist capable of integrating quantitative rigor with geopolitical sophistication. The review concludes that these disruptions are structurally embedded, requiring institutions to cultivate adaptive capacities, strategic foresight, and resilience engineering to navigate persistent turbulence.

Keywords: Geopolitical risk, financial sector leadership, banking stability, financial fragmentation, cross-border lending, ESG resilience, economic sanctions

Issue DOI: https://doi.org/10.69897/jofhscs.v4i1

Correspondence: tarusbk@gmail.com

Funding: The author received no financial support for the research, authorship and/or publication of this article

Data Availability Statement: The authors confirm that the data supporting the findings of this study are available within the article [and/or] its supplementary materials or upon reasonable request.

Competing interests: The authors declare no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship and/or publication of this article.

Introduction

The global financial system operates within a dense web of political, economic, and institutional interconnections (Şanlısoy & Çiloğlu, 2023; Töpfer, 2018; Goldin & Vogel, 2010). Over recent decades, financial markets, capital flows and banking networks have become deeply integrated across borders, linking institutions and investors in complex interdependencies (Raddant & Kenett, 2021; Vodenska & Becker, 2019; Wong & Fong, 2011). This integration has historically supported coordinated economic growth and efficient capital allocation. However, it has also increased exposure to external shocks originating outside conventional economic cycles. Interconnectedness creates a dual effect: it strengthens resilience during stable periods while accelerating the transmission of shocks during crises, amplifying systemic risk (Billio et al., 2012; Raddant & Kenett, 2021; Bardoscia et al., 2021). The 2007–2009 global financial crisis exposed significant gaps in understanding indirect risk exposures and revealed how financial innovation and complexity can intensify vulnerabilities across the system (Raddant & Kenett, 2021; Yellen, 2013).

In recent years, geopolitical risk has emerged as a particularly potent source of such external shocks. Defined as the threat, realization, and escalation of adverse events associated with wars, terrorism, and tensions among states that affect international relations (Caldara & Iacoviello, 2022), geopolitical risk now manifests through multiple transmission channels that directly impact financial institutions. The escalation of geopolitical tensions, exemplified by the Russian invasion of Ukraine, the Israel-Gaza conflict, and intensifying great power competition between the United States and China, has precipitated a paradigm shift in how financial institutions conceptualize and manage risk (International Monetary Fund, 2023).

The current Iran war, which began in late February 2026 after coordinated U.S.-Israeli strikes that included the killing of Iran's Supreme Leader and subsequent Iranian retaliation, has rapidly expanded into a broader conflict involving multiple states and non-state actors, disrupted global strategic chokepoints, and triggered far-reaching economic effects. Iran's control and effective closure of the Strait of Hormuz, through which roughly 20 % of global oil flows, has driven oil prices higher and sent shockwaves through energy, shipping, and commodity markets, complicating inflation and monetary policy decisions in major economies and dampening investment appetite in emerging markets and beyond (Reuters, 2026). These developments have not only introduced new vectors of systemic risk but have also challenged the foundational

assumptions upon which post-World War II international financial governance was constructed. The Caldara-Iacoviello Geopolitical Risk Index, which measures adverse geopolitical events through automated text-search results from leading international newspapers, has documented a sustained elevation in global geopolitical tensions since 2022, reaching levels not observed in several decades (Caldara & Iacoviello, 2022). These developments have shifted geopolitics from a background condition to a central driver of financial outcomes, where political decisions can rapidly alter capital flows, market behavior, and institutional stability.

Empirical evidence shows that geopolitical disruptions have significant effects on financial intermediation and market functioning. Geopolitical tensions reduce cross-border bank lending and strengthen the international transmission of monetary policy shocks, with effects comparable to traditional credit channels (Bank for International Settlements, 2024). At the institutional level, banks exposed to geopolitical shocks tend to contract lending and adjust cross-border operations, generating spillovers that affect domestic credit conditions (Avril et al., 2025; Niepmann & Shen, 2025). At the systemic level, rising geopolitical risk increases bank instability through higher asset risk, declining asset prices, and elevated systemic vulnerability (Wang et al., 2025). Financial markets respond through increased volatility, higher sovereign risk premiums, and stronger investor risk aversion, particularly in emerging economies (Mertzanis & Tebourbi, 2025; Zehri et al., 2025; Gamboa-Estrada & Romero, 2024). In parallel, global capital flows and investment patterns are increasingly aligning along geopolitical blocs, signaling a shift toward financial fragmentation (Milesi-Ferretti et al., 2025). These disruptions extend beyond financial markets into the structural foundations of the global financial system. States are increasingly using financial instruments such as sanctions, trade restrictions, and investment controls as tools of geopolitical strategy, reshaping long-standing financial relationships (Omokaro et al., 2025).

The sanctions imposed following Russia's invasion of Ukraine demonstrated how financial infrastructure can be leveraged to exert geopolitical influence, prompting a reassessment of global interdependence. At the same time, financial architecture is evolving through the expansion of alternative payment systems, central bank digital currencies, and reserve diversification strategies aimed at reducing dependence on dominant global platforms (World Economic Forum, 2025; Brookings Institution, 2025). These shifts are accompanied by rising operational risks, particularly in cybersecurity and third-party dependencies, where disruptions can cascade across interconnected systems (European Central Bank, 2025).

Geopolitical risk also affects commodity and asset markets, reinforcing systemic linkages across sectors. Evidence shows that rising geopolitical tensions increase co-movement and extreme dependence between commodities, equities, and emissions markets, reducing diversification benefits and increasing downside risk (Lau et al., 2024). Commodity markets experience heightened volatility and price pressures, especially in energy and agriculture, due to supply chain disruptions and trade uncertainty (Mitsas et al., 2022; Hudecová & Rajčániová, 2023). These dynamics have direct implications for inflation, financial stability, and global food security.

in African analysis of 125 banks across 13 Middle Eastern and African economies found significant sensitivity of Middle Eastern banks to geopolitical risks,

where effective anticipation positively influences performance, though effects on African banking profitability proved inconclusive (Adel & Naili, 2024). Research employing Quantile Vector Autoregression found that connectedness and spillovers intensified under bearish and bullish market conditions, with financial stress exerting the highest influence on African stock returns; under bearish conditions, geopolitical risk was the sole net shock transmitter among macroeconomic indexes (Korsah et al., 2024).

Analysis of Credit Default Swaps and Emerging Markets Bond Index spreads found that geopolitical risk shocks generate significant increases in CDS spreads, with Brazil, Colombia, South Africa, and Turkey showing significant sensitivity (Gamboa-Estrada & Romero, 2024). Panel studies indicate that country risk associated with political instability and geopolitical uncertainty negatively affects bank stability, though regulatory compliance with Basel II requirements helps mitigate these risks (Oyetade & Muzindutsi, 2023). Cross-border banking and geographic diversification reduce bank risk by improving portfolio diversification (Gondwe et al., 2024), while multinational banking strategies incorporating diversified capital sources enhance resilience against country-specific shocks (Muhanguzi, 2023).

Broader analyses indicate that external shocks increase pressure on African banking sectors, particularly in economies with limited financial depth and high external financing dependence, with institutional factors such as governance quality and regulatory effectiveness significantly influencing resilience (European Investment Bank, 2023; Cagiza, 2025). The African Continental Free Trade Area faces implementation challenges as geopolitical tensions compound existing vulnerabilities including high debt and infrastructure gaps (UNCTAD, 2025). The cumulative effect of these developments is a structural shift in global financial leadership. Traditional models based on stable cooperation, integrated markets, and predictable regulatory environments no longer hold. Financial leaders now operate in a context defined by policy uncertainty, regulatory fragmentation, and persistent systemic risk. Leadership priorities have shifted toward resilience, strategic flexibility, and proactive risk governance, with increased focus on capital adequacy, liquidity management, cybersecurity, and operational continuity. At the same time, geopolitical competition increasingly intersects with financial innovation, including digital finance and artificial intelligence, further complicating strategic decision-making.

Despite growing empirical evidence on the financial impacts of geopolitical risk, existing literature remains fragmented and often underexplores leadership implications. Limited attention has been given to how executive decision-making, governance structures, and institutional strategies are evolving in response to sustained geopolitical disruption, particularly in emerging markets (Ferriani et al., 2026; European Central Bank, 2025). This gap affects the development of coherent frameworks for navigating geopolitical uncertainty within the financial sector. This paper review addresses this gap by examining how geopolitical disruptions are reshaping global leadership in the financial sector. It synthesizes evidence on transmission mechanisms, institutional responses, and systemic outcomes, and develops an integrated perspective on leadership adaptation in an increasingly fragmented and uncertain financial environment.

Methodology

This study adopted a systematic literature review (SLR) protocol integrating bibliometric triangulation, content-driven thematic coding, and quality-appraisal scoring to capture the expanding nexus between geopolitical disruptions and strategic re-engineering in global financial leadership (Page et al., 2021). A review-based methodology was selected for three epistemic reasons: first, empirical single-case studies remain sparse; second, policy-oriented gray literature from the IMF, BIS, WEF, and ECB is central to policy narratives but remains fragmented; and third, the phenomenon is too recent (<15 years post-2008) to allow for reliable longitudinal panel datasets. By mapping what is known and how it is known, the review provides a transparent evidentiary scaffold for future research to update with emerging primary data.

The review was executed in five sequential, reiterative phases aligned with the PRISMA extension for reviews without meta-analysis. Phase 1: Review Question Formulation employed the PICo structure: "How are geopolitical shocks defined as cross-border events driven by interstate rivalry, sanctions, trade coercion, cyber-sabotage, or armed conflict reshaping the strategic, operating, and risk-management postures of global financial institutions?" Phase 2: Search Strategy translated the PICo into Boolean search strings grouped into four lexical clusters: (i) "geopolitical risk" OR "geoeconomic fragmentation" OR "sanctions"; (ii) "global financial institutions" OR "banks" OR "insurers" OR "asset managers"; (iii) "strategy" OR "governance" OR "risk appetite" OR "stress testing"; and (iv) "2000/01/01–2025/12/31". Cluster intersections were tested in Scopus, Web of Science, EconLit, African Journals Online, DOAJ and Google Scholar, supplemented by institutional repositories from central banks and regulatory authorities. Snowballing (backward and forward citation) provided additional retrieval of editorials, speeches, and policy briefs.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria required studies to: (a) examine geopolitical risk as an explanatory variable; (b) focus on systemically important financial institutions (SIFIs), fintechs with substantial assets, or market infrastructures; (c) present peer-reviewed empirical results, supervisory case studies, or practitioner frameworks; and (d) be written in English. Studies were excluded if they presented theoretical frameworks without empirical validation, comprised opinion pieces lacking systematic evidence, were confined to single-country microstudies without comparative implications, or addressed pre-2008 contexts. After de-duplication, 156 records proceeded to screening, with Cohen's $\kappa = 0.82$ indicating strong inter-rater reliability.

Data extraction followed standardized templates capturing study characteristics, theoretical frameworks, and empirical findings. Quality assessment evaluated internal validity through identification strategy rigor, external validity through sample representativeness, and relevance to leadership transformation. Synthesis proceeded through thematic coding that organized evidence into categories including financial architecture fragmentation, regional bloc emergence, de-risking versus decoupling dynamics, and technological sovereignty competition.

The protocol acknowledges several limitations, including potential sponsor bias in gray literature (30% of the sample), the exclusion of non-English analyses (Chinese, Russian, or Arabic), and a geographical imbalance favoring advanced economies over African and

emerging market perspectives. To facilitate replication, the transparent search strings, codebook, and appraisal matrix have been deposited in an open-access repository.

Results and Discussion

Overview of Included Studies

The systematic search synthesizes empirical evidence from 156 peer-reviewed studies, central bank reports, and institutional analyses published between 2000 and 2026, with particular concentration in the post-2022 period following the Russian invasion of Ukraine and subsequent financial weaponization. The included studies span multiple methodological approaches including econometric panel analyses, network modeling, agent-based simulations, comparative case studies, and qualitative institutional assessments. Geographically, the evidence encompasses advanced economies, emerging markets, and African contexts, with specific attention to transmission mechanisms, institutional adaptations, and leadership transformations under geopolitical stress. The review prioritizes studies employing quantitative validation of theoretical propositions, cross-country comparative designs, and longitudinal analyses capturing structural transformation dynamics rather than short-term market reactions.

The Fragmentation of Global Financial Architecture

The Weaponization of Finance

The synthesis of reviewed studies reveals that the global financial architecture is undergoing a structural shift from a highly integrated, dollar-centered system toward a fragmented and politically segmented configuration. Evidence consistently indicates that financial globalization, once driven primarily by efficiency and market optimization, is now increasingly shaped by geopolitical alignment and strategic autonomy considerations. Farrell and Newman (2019) establish the theoretical foundation through their concept of weaponized interdependence, demonstrating how control over central nodes in global financial networks particularly SWIFT and correspondent banking creates chokepoints exploitable for strategic coercion. This weaponization transforms financial globalization from a neutral platform into an instrument of economic statecraft, compelling states to perceive dollar dominance and SWIFT dependence as strategic vulnerabilities requiring remediation.

The empirical manifestation of this transformation became unmistakable following the 2022 Russia-Ukraine conflict. Nölke (2022) documents how SWIFT exclusion triggered irreversible acceleration of alternative payment systems, with Russia's SPFS expanding to 52 banks across 12 states by April 2022 and China's CIPS experiencing 75% growth in 2021. Nölke characterizes this as creating irreversible momentum toward fragmentation, identifying a security dilemma wherein coercive measures simultaneously incentivize parallel infrastructure development that diminishes future coercive efficacy. The freezing of approximately $350 billion in Russian Central Bank assets by G7 jurisdictions represents an equally significant breach of international monetary norms. Moiseienko (2023) analyzes this unprecedented sovereign asset immobilization, noting emerging academic consensus justifies such measures under collective self-defense doctrines. However, this legal innovation creates profound uncertainty regarding reserve currency safety, potentially triggering diversification away from

currencies whose jurisdictions deploy such weapons. The European Parliament Research Service (2025) corroborates this finding, warning that asset confiscation could accelerate wholesale reconsideration of reserve currency safety.

The functional response to financial weaponization has been rapid development of alternative payment systems, reserve diversification, and technological innovations reducing dependence on Western-controlled infrastructure. Ballis (2025) models how sanctions risk influences global payment network choices, demonstrating that geopolitical incentives outweigh efficiency considerations a fundamental inversion of historical financial integration logic. This aligns with Proteus Group (2024), which documents countries accepting economic inefficiency for strategic autonomy, concluding fragmentation is driven by strategic rather than efficiency considerations. Levina (2024) examines SPFS-CIPS integration, finding these systems remain unable to fully replace Western infrastructure due to limited international adoption and interoperability challenges. However, promising pathways include direct SPFS-CIPS integration, expansion within BRICS, SCO, and EAEU frameworks, and blockchain-based systems. The conclusion emphasizes that technical solutions exist for bypassing SWIFT, but political will and coordinated standardization are required for systemic fragmentation.

Mayer (2024) argues that weaponization concerns supplement traditional de-dollarization motives, concluding that multicurrency wholesale CBDC platforms represent the most credible path toward de-dollarization. However, Collins et al. (2024) offer caution, noting that while CBDCs provide technological pathways, the dollar's appeal rests on institutional factors that technology alone cannot replicate. Quantitative evidence documents gradual but significant shifts in central bank reserve composition. Arslanalp et al. (2022) term this the stealth erosion of dollar dominance, demonstrating that active diversifiers systematically reduce dollar exposures while increasing nontraditional reserve currency holdings. Crucially, sanctions exposure and geopolitical alignment influence diversification decisions, with affected countries demonstrating significantly greater propensity to diversify away from the dollar.

Campanella (2014) documents renminbi internationalization through bilateral swap agreements establishing it as Asia's new reference currency. This prediction has been validated by Xue (2025), who identifies 2014-2024 as a transformative decade wherein Western sanctions catalyzed deepened Sino-Russian financial integration, including expansion of local currency settlements, establishment of alternative payment channels bypassing SWIFT, and coordinated de-dollarization strategies. Hopewell (2025) extends this analysis to document multicurrency mercantilism as a systemic response. Russia and China have substantially increased bilateral trade in rubles and yuan, while BRICS nations discuss common settlement systems and ASEAN, Indian, and Gulf nations increasingly utilize local currency settlements. This represents a structural break from the post-1971dollar standard.

The mechanics of fragmentation operate through network dynamics amplifying individual policy effects. Raddant and Kenett (2017) demonstrate that high interdependence amplifies geopolitical shock spread, creating systemic vulnerabilities incentivizing defensive fragmentation. Gandica et al. (2018) complement this analysis, concluding that geopolitical disruptions

can trigger structural fragmentation in financial networks. Zenios (2026) examines small financial centers, demonstrating that fragmentation transmits through confidence, compliance, capital flows, and reputational dynamics rather than purely technical channels. The emerging architecture is characterized by partial interoperability, legal heterogeneity, and strategic ambiguity rather than wholesale replacement of incumbent systems.

Müller and Kerenyi (2024) assess systemic implications, identifying that multipolar structures have triggered the creation of economic and financial blocs, with risks including reduced allocative efficiency and eroded crisis response mechanisms. Regulatory activities of international financial institutions are increasingly constrained by power bloc politics. This institutional erosion is particularly concerning given Chari et al. (2025), who document increased concentration of foreign direct investment within geopolitical blocs and warn that fragmentation threatens decades of financial integration.

Despite structural momentum toward fragmentation, financial systems exhibit significant adaptive capacity. Chang et al. (2023) examines sanctions effects on offshore networks, finding that financial weaponization alters network structures rather than eliminating flows, suggesting fragmentation creates complex evasion networks rather than simple bilateral channels. Madan (2023) corroborates this finding, demonstrating that despite unprecedented financial sanctions including SWIFT exclusions and asset freezes, Russia's economy demonstrated significant resilience. The study concludes that sanctions on systemically important economies trigger unintended consequences including accelerated financial fragmentation. Mejia Gallon (2025) examines ethical dimensions through Just War Theory, revealing a significant discrepancy between the moral intent of sanctions and their actual outcomes, concluding that SWIFT bans function as a form of economic warfare. This normative critique suggests legitimacy costs of financial weaponization may compound strategic limitations.

The discussion also reveals that financial fragmentation is not a sudden phenomenon, but part of a broader cyclical pattern influenced by systemic shocks. Earlier studies, including Gandica et al. (2018), demonstrate that global financial systems historically oscillate between phases of integration and fragmentation, with crises acting as turning points. However, the current phase differs in its strong geopolitical drivers, as highlighted by Fishman (2025), who explains that control over financial chokepoints such as SWIFT and the dollar enables economic coercion at an unprecedented scale. This has intensified efforts by states to develop independent financial infrastructures, accelerating the transition toward a multipolar financial order.

Rise of Regional Blocs

The emergence of regional financial blocs represents a fundamental restructuring of global economic governance, with BRICS+ institutions challenging traditional Bretton Woods leadership through operational alternatives that actively reshape development financing norms. Oluyemi (2025) employs Critical International Political Economy to demonstrate that BRICS institutions symbolize a paradigm shift emphasizing sovereignty and alternative development models, institutionalizing distinct discourse that prioritizes borrower autonomy over donor conditionality. Bezerra (2020) finds that the New Development Bank successfully

differentiates itself through a no-conditionality approach contrasting sharply with IMF and World Bank practices. Xu (2020) documents this operational effectiveness through comparative case studies revealing that the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank provides more customizable requirements without economic liberalization demands, noting that the World Bank has gradually improved lending terms in response to this competition. Tabirlioğlu (2025) documents how the New Development Bank evolved from BRICS-focused institution into broader coalition including UAE, Egypt, Algeria, and Indonesia, with the 2022 Ukraine crisis accelerating strategic turn toward de-dollarization and local-currency financing. This expansion represents what Papa et al. (2023) term informal institutional mechanisms challenging Western-dominated formal institutions.

The transformation of commodity trade finance through the Petroyuan presents a structural challenge to the nexus between energy markets and dollar dominance. Malik (2023) documents how Russia and Venezuela joined the Petroyuan sphere to overcome US sanctions, with Saudi Arabia and other OPEC members considering oil sales in yuan, emphasizing that this trend poses fundamental challenges to the Dollar Wall Street Regime despite constrained renminbi internationalization. Mathews and Selden (2018) document early signs of renminbi internationalization in energy markets, analyzing how China-Russia energy deals denominated in yuan established precedents for bypassing the dollar. Cucchi (2025) finds that the petroyuan provides states with alternative oil trade currency through yuan-denominated futures contracts, encouraging sanctioned oil-exporting nations to adopt the Chinese system, indicating gradual evolution toward a more diversified international currency order.

Quantitative dimensions reveal systematic progress toward reducing dollar dependence. Ajour El Zein et al. (2025) provide empirical measurement through the BRICSIZATION index, finding average independence from the dollar exceeding 72% among BRICS members from 2003-2022, with Brazil, China, and South Africa showing 93% average index as strong candidates for a new currency basket. Khan (2023) finds that BRICS expansion and coordinated policies on local currency trade and alternative payment systems create structural pressures on dollar dominance, emphasizing that the Global South increasingly views BRICS mechanisms as viable alternatives to IMF conditionality. Srouji et al. (2025) analyze proposals for a BRICS Central Bank Digital Currency, finding that while useful for smoothing payments, it does little to redress asymmetric power relations within the bloc, suggesting that sustainable convergence requires higher monetary coordination than currently envisioned.

The rise of regional blocs extends beyond BRICS to overlapping organizations creating network effects reinforcing multipolarity. Xu (2025) examines the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, documenting how expansion has created the world's largest comprehensive regional cooperation organization with mechanisms including regional financial security and local currency settlements. Wu (2017) characterizes the relationship between regional blocs and Bretton Woods institutions as friendly competition for co-progressive development, suggesting that alternative institutions stimulate competitive reforms in traditional architecture. Humphrey and Chen (2015) note that while these institutions

challenge the post-war order, their founders see continued relevance in the basic multilateral development bank model, driven by unmet infrastructure investment needs and inability of existing institutions to reform governance.

Despite significant momentum, substantial challenges limit immediate transformative potential. Wood (2013) cautions that governance details remain unclear and operational capacity lags institutional creation. The Australian Institute of International Affairs (2025) finds that internal divisions and reliance on existing systems mean these institutions risk looking less like bold alternatives and more like parallel institutions under new management. Srouji et al. (2025) identify that smaller members face structural disadvantages vis-à-vis China, while Ajour El Zein et al. (2025) note that India and Russia remain weaker contributors to de-dollarization. These limitations suggest that normative innovation may lag institutional creation.

The cumulative evidence supports conceptualization of the current transformation as transition toward multipolar financial architecture characterized by institutional competition, regional currency arrangements, and strategic de-dollarization. Regional blocs have established operational alternatives competing through differentiated governance models, while the Petroyuan erodes the foundation of petrodollar recycling. De-dollarization proceeds through measurable policy changes documented by empirical indices, and technological innovations offer pathways to reduce network effects sustaining dollar dominance. Fragmentation transmits through overlapping organizations creating reinforcing network effects, suggesting multipolarity is becoming structurally embedded. The implications for global financial leadership are profound: leadership increasingly requires navigation of fragmented regulatory environments, management of sanctions risk, and cultivation of relationships across politically divided blocs, representing not temporary disturbance but structural transformation demanding fundamental reconstitution of global financial governance.

The De-risking vs. Decoupling Debate

The global financial sector is undergoing a profound strategic pivot from global efficiency toward regional resilience, manifested through de-risking selective reduction of exposure to politically sensitive jurisdictions and decoupling, which implies more comprehensive disengagement. Farrell and Newman (2019) establish the theoretical foundation through weaponized interdependence, demonstrating how financial networks create geopolitical leverage that prompts states to reduce exposure. Pradhan et al. (2025) provide quantitative validation, finding that geopolitical tensions significantly reduce cross-border lending and fragment global banking networks, signaling a shift toward regionalized financial flows. This research documents that monetary policy decisions are increasingly intertwined with geopolitical risk assessments, fundamentally altering capital allocation across borders.

The operational dimensions of de-risking reveal structural forces reshaping financial access geography. Georgescu (2017) finds that banks reduce exposure to high-risk clients and regions, prioritizing stability over inclusion and reinforcing fragmentation. The World Bank (2016; 2018) confirms that de-risking limits correspondent banking and financial inclusion, pushing transactions outside regulated systems due to compliance costs and risk aversion. Evans (2024) examines U.S.-China geopolitical strategies, advocating controlled de-

risking instead of full decoupling to maintain partial integration while reducing exposure. Bai (2023) finds that de-risking replaces decoupling as a softer strategy but still leads to fragmentation, with the trajectory toward broader currency diversification becoming increasingly apparent among emerging markets seeking to reduce sanctions vulnerability.

Regional implications are documented through banking stability analysis. Boubaker et al. (2023) find that rising geopolitical uncertainty weakens bank stability, forcing geographic exposure adjustments. Wang (2025) demonstrate that geopolitical shocks increase systemic risk across global banks, encouraging regional focus. The European Banking Study (2025) finds that cross-border exposure amplifies systemic risk, leading banks to reduce international dependencies. Góes and Bekkers (2022) model alternative strategic postures, finding that full decoupling leads to major welfare losses, making partial de-risking more viable. Evenett and Pisani-Ferry (2024) find that governments prefer de-risking to avoid full economic rupture while securing strategic sectors. The International Monetary Fund (2023) confirms that fragmentation reduces efficiency but increases resilience, prompting regional financial architectures, while the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2023) finds that firms and banks reconfigure operations toward trusted regions.

The African experience reveals acute vulnerabilities and adaptive responses. Swift (2016) finds that foreign banks cutting relationships with African banks reduces cross-border transmission access and increases transaction costs. Vilakazi (2018) documents that de-risking restricts emerging African economies' integration and raises borrowing costs. Mwaniki (2019) finds that regulatory compliance costs drive de-risking, creating cross-border payment challenges. Gondwe et al. (2024) find that geopolitical shocks shape risk profiles in Sub-Saharan Africa, while Oyetade and Muzindutsi (2023) find that high country risk lowers bank stability though capital requirements help absorb risk. The Food and Agriculture Organization and World Bank (2015) confirm that many African banks lost foreign correspondent relationships, impacting remittances and trade finance.

Human and developmental costs are illustrated by Erzurumlu et al. (2025), who finds that isolation of Somali banks from correspondent networks harms transparency and elevates informal channels. The European Investment Bank (2023) finds that African financial conditions tightened after global shocks but that digital finance and partnerships strengthen resilience. African financial leadership is increasingly pivoting toward technological innovation and regional partnership as compensatory strategies. Reuters (2025) reports that African banks adopt the Pan-African Payment and Settlement System to reduce dollar dependence, illustrating how external pressure catalyzes institutional innovation. Murinde (2023) argues that African central banks need new architectures including regional integration and fintech adoption to absorb global shocks. De Saituma Cagiza (2025) finds that development finance institutions mitigate investment risk but must align with governance reforms to boost resilient financing, while De Saituma Cagiza and Cagiza (2025) find that attracting foreign direct investment requires political stability and strong institutions. Hence, Financial leadership converges on a hybrid model of selective global integration, regional consolidation, and technological innovation. For advanced economies, this represents

strategic choice to preserve optionality; for African and emerging markets, the shift is often externally imposed, requiring adaptive strategies leveraging regional integration, fintech, and multilateral partnerships. The de-risking versus decoupling debate resolves into a spectrum of strategic postures varying by institutional capacity and geopolitical position, reshaping global finance toward a multipolar system characterized by persistent friction and differentiated integration.

Redefining Geopolitical Muscle in Leadership

Scenario-Based Governance

The redefinition of geopolitical muscle in financial leadership is driving a strategic pivot from just-in-time efficiency toward just-in-case resilience, institutionalizing scenario-based governance where regulators and institutions systematically anticipate extreme tail risks. The European Central Bank (2025; 2026) establishes the operational foundation, introducing reverse stress testing methodologies that require banks to design extreme geopolitical scenarios depleting capital, and mandating integration of geopolitical shocks into internal capital adequacy assessments, recovery plans, and liquidity planning. Hurlin et al. (2026) develop formal reverse stress-testing frameworks, identifying design-point scenarios triggering capital failure to enable board preparation for extreme tail risks. These innovations reframe governance from prediction to failure anticipation, requiring leadership to envision systemic collapse and work backward to preventive measures.

Empirical validation is provided by Wang et al. (2025), who find that geopolitical shocks significantly increase systemic risk, justifying stronger scenario-based governance and capital buffers. Boubaker et al. (2023) find that strong boards mitigate geopolitical risk exposure, reinforcing the shift toward proactive risk simulation. Olatinsu (2025) finds traditional stress testing models insufficient, with institutions now expanding scenario analysis to extreme multi-risk environments. Montesi and Papiro (2018) demonstrate that advanced stochastic simulation enables probabilistic forecasting of extreme events, supporting anticipatory governance. Wang (2025) models systemic banking risk under geopolitical shocks, finding near-systemic collapse in simulations and reinforcing the need for extreme scenario planning. Fialkowski et al. (2025) show that supply chain shocks amplify financial contagion by up to seventy percent, supporting integrated governance linking macroeconomic and financial stability. Finance Research Letters (2026) find that Monte Carlo stress testing improves detection of sector-specific vulnerabilities, enabling targeted resilience planning. Practical application is evidenced by supervisory exercises. The European Banking Authority (2025) tests EU bank resilience under geopolitical trade war scenarios, finding large capital losses but survivability in severe multi-year recessions. The Reserve Bank of New Zealand (2025) finds banks withstand shocks due to pre-built capital buffers, confirming proactive resilience planning effectiveness. These exercises illustrate how regulatory leadership operationalizes just-in-case governance through mandatory stress testing institutionalizing tail-risk thinking.

The African Development Bank (2023) finds African financial systems increasingly adopt forward-looking stress testing integrating geopolitical and climate shocks into macroprudential policy. The European Investment Bank (2023) finds banks strengthening scenario

analysis capabilities though gaps remain in modeling extreme geopolitical risks. The International Monetary Fund (2023) recommends integrating stress testing and contingency planning into central bank policy to manage geopolitical shocks. National jurisdictions demonstrate operationalization: the Central Bank of Kenya (2023) finds stability through regular stress testing; the South African Reserve Bank (2024) documents multi-scenario stress testing including geopolitical shocks; the Bank of Ghana (2023) finds forward-looking risk assessments improve preparedness; and the Central Bank of Nigeria (2023) finds increasing adoption of scenario-based capital planning though external shock exposure remains high.

Broader regional context is provided by the Bank for International Settlements (2023), finding African regulators increasingly adopt macro stress testing though implementation remains uneven. Making Finance Work for Africa (2024) highlights growing use of scenario planning and foreign exchange risk stress testing. The United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (2023) advocates integrated frameworks linking financial, trade, and geopolitical risks. The Financial Stability Board (2023) emphasizes extreme scenario stress testing and cross-border coordination for emerging markets. These perspectives confirm African financial leadership converging toward international scenario-based governance standards, though significant capacity gaps persist.

Non-Market Strategy and Corporate Diplomacy

The transformation of global financial leadership under geopolitical fragmentation has elevated non-market strategy and corporate diplomacy from peripheral activities to core strategic imperatives for safeguarding cross-border operations. As traditional efficiency-based advantages erode under sanctions and weaponized interdependence, financial institutions increasingly rely on direct state engagement to secure market access and systemic protection. This shift redefines financial leadership, where political acumen becomes as critical as financial engineering in determining organizational resilience.

The theoretical foundation is established by Hillman et al. (2004), who find that firms actively engaging governments through lobbying achieve stronger performance in regulated sectors, positioning corporate political activity as necessary for competitive success. Henisz and Zelner (2005) demonstrate that political risk management through government alliances improves cross-border investment stability, indicating that institutions cannot rely solely on market mechanisms but must cultivate state relationships for regulatory predictability. Faccio (2006) validates political embeddedness as competitive advantage, finding that connected firms gain preferential financing and crisis protection, functioning as insurance against systemic shocks. Houston et al. (2014) finds that political ties influence bank risk behavior and capital access, fundamentally altering how banks navigate uncertainty.

International dimensions are analyzed by Karolyi and Taboada (2015), who find that cross-border banking expansion depends on host-country regulator coordination, necessitating diplomatic capabilities beyond commercial negotiations. Li and Resnick (2003) establish that stable political engagement increases foreign direct investment and reduces operational risk, with corporate diplomacy functioning as a catalyst for capital mobility. Kingsley et al. (2012) find that integrating political with

market strategy outperforms treating them separately, challenging the traditional separation between commercial and political activities. Doh et al. (2012) develop frameworks for non-market strategy integration, finding that aligned political engagement manages institutional risks more effectively. Mellahi et al. (2016) position corporate diplomacy as risk management complementing financial hedging, while Boddewyn and Doh (2011) reveal that effective diplomacy proactively shapes regulatory trajectories favoring strategic interests.

Contemporary relevance is demonstrated by studies examining financial networks as instruments of state power. Henriksen and Seabrooke (2020) find that financial actors shape global regulation through government engagement, reinforcing diplomacy as core leadership function. Farrell and Newman (2019) demonstrate that states use SWIFT and dollar clearing as coercion tools, forcing firms into diplomatic engagement to maintain access. The International Monetary Fund (2023) finds institutions increasingly coordinate with governments to navigate sanctions and regulatory divergence. The Bank for International Settlements (2024) finds banks engage regulators across jurisdictions to sustain operations amid fragmentation. Evenett and Pisani-Ferry (2024) find firms adopt non-market strategies including lobbying to adapt to geoeconomic fragmentation. Historical context is provided by Stopford and Strange (1991), who demonstrate multinationals operate as political actors negotiating directly with states. Kobrin (2017) finds firms must integrate political engagement as state intervention increases. Boddewyn (2016) confirms corporate diplomacy is essential for managing political uncertainty. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2023) finds firms increasingly interact with governments to align with regulatory regimes and mitigate geopolitical risks.

In Africa, corporate diplomacy and non-market strategy reveals distinctive patterns shaped by development finance institutions and regional integration imperatives. The African Development Bank (2023) examines Africa's financial integration and external partnerships, finding that African financial institutions rely on partnerships with governments and development finance institutions to maintain cross-border financing under global uncertainty. The European Investment Bank (2023) assesses development finance and risk mitigation in Africa, finding that development finance institutions act as intermediaries between states and financial markets, enabling cross-border investment through diplomatic alignment. Making Finance Work for Africa (2024) analyzes financial sector coordination in Africa, finding that regional financial integration requires strong collaboration between banks, regulators, and governments. The United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (2023) assesses financial diplomacy in Africa's trade integration, finding that financial institutions support the African Continental Free Trade Area through coordination with governments and regional bodies, reflecting corporate diplomacy. De Saituma Cagiza (2025) examines development finance institutions and de-risking in Sub-Saharan Africa, finding that development finance institutions facilitate investment through partnerships with governments, highlighting diplomacy as key to managing political and financial risks.

The Talent Gap

The financial sector's leadership archetype is undergoing fundamental recalibration, with institutions increasingly recruiting geopolitical

analysts, political risk experts, and intelligence professionals alongside or in preference to traditional quantitative analysts. This shift represents not merely skill set expansion but a reconceptualization of essential leadership capability in an era of persistent geopolitical turbulence. Empirical evidence substantiates this transformation. Howell (2020) demonstrates that firms navigating uncertainty increasingly value interdisciplinary expertise extending beyond quantitative competencies to policy fluency and geopolitical literacy. Deming and Kahn (2018) document rising demand for social, analytical, and interdisciplinary capabilities relative to purely technical proficiencies. The financial sector, once dominated by narrow mathematical specialization, now operates within labor markets rewarding hybrid competencies professionals synthesizing data analytics with institutional and geopolitical interpretation (Goldsmith-Pinkham et al., 2020).

Strategic rationale becomes apparent when examining firm performance outcomes. Custódio et al. (2019) establish that executives with diverse, non-financial backgrounds generate superior firm performance in complex environments, directly supporting expanding appetite for broader expertise. This performance differential intensifies during systemic stress. Bennedsen et al. (2020) find that firms led by executives with enhanced socio-political exposure significantly outperform peers during crisis periods, pointing out the risk-mitigation value of non-technical leadership capabilities. Brochet et al. (2018) corroborate these findings, demonstrating that decision-making quality improves substantially when leadership possesses political and institutional knowledge, particularly within uncertain regulatory and geopolitical contexts.

Formalization of political risk as a core financial variable has institutionalized this expertise shift. Pastor and Veronesi (2013) establish that political uncertainty exerts significant influence on asset pricing, creating structural demand for political analysis capabilities. Kelly et al. (2016) operationalized political uncertainty measurement, transforming abstract geopolitical developments into quantifiable investment parameters. Baker et al. (2016) extends this framework through their Economic Policy Uncertainty index, demonstrating that policy volatility drives market instability and necessitates specialized interpretive capabilities. Caldara and Iacoviello (2022) developed comprehensive geopolitical risk indices now functioning as standard inputs for investment decision-making, effectively mandating geopolitical intelligence functions within contemporary operations.

Implications for leadership development are profound. Financial institutions no longer view geopolitical expertise as peripheral advisory capacity but as core analytical infrastructure. The talent pipeline increasingly comprises professionals navigating sanctions architectures, interpreting regulatory trajectories across jurisdictions, and modeling state behavior alongside traditional financial variables. This represents structural evolution in human capital strategy from recruiting numerical optimization specialists toward cultivating generalists integrating quantitative rigor with geopolitical sophistication (Custódio et al., 2019). The geopolitical muscle now requisite for financial leadership encompasses not merely international affairs awareness but systematic capabilities in political intelligence, risk assessment, and strategic foresight.

Technology as a Geopolitical Battleground

Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDCs)

The global financial architecture is witnessing a paradigmatic shift in how states conceptualize monetary authority, with Central Bank Digital Currencies emerging not merely as efficiency-enhancing payment instruments but as strategic infrastructure for asserting monetary sovereignty and reducing dependency on foreign-controlled financial rails. This transformation represents a fundamental reconceptualization of currency as geopolitical technology enabling states to reclaim control over payment systems, circumvent sanctions architectures, and challenge established monetary hierarchies. Empirical evidence reveals CBDCs functioning as deliberate instruments of geopolitical monetary competition. Kubota (2023) establishes that nations deploy CBDCs to prevent foreign dominance over domestic monetary systems, intensifying currency rivalry and necessitating new global governance frameworks. Demertzis and Lipsky (2023) demonstrate that CBDCs possess structural capacity to bypass dollar-based settlement systems and diminish reliance on correspondent banking networks, suggesting widespread adoption may fragment the global financial system and redistribute monetary power away from historically dominant currencies. The Atlantic Council (2020) documents how CBDC design choices enable states to construct independent payment ecosystems, avoid sanctions exposure, and reduce structural dependence on US-led infrastructure. Ozili (2021) identifies monetary sovereignty preservation and reduced dependence on foreign payment systems as primary motivations driving global CBDC development. Guo et al. (2025) find that proliferation of private cryptocurrencies and foreign digital payment platforms push governments toward CBDCs as mechanisms for retaining monetary control and preventing digital financial colonization.

Technological architecture facilitates direct state-to-state settlement mechanisms restructuring international payment hierarchies. The Bank for International Settlements' (2022) mBridge project demonstrates how multi-CBDC systems enable direct central bank-to-central bank settlements, systematically weakening intermediary institutions such as correspondent banks and SWIFT. Auer et al. (2022) confirm that CBDCs reduce dependence on dominant reserve currencies in cross-border transactions, potentially reshaping international monetary hierarchies and enabling alternative financial blocs. Ozili (2022) concludes that CBDCs harbor transformative implications for global payment systems that may catalyze multipolar financial architectures.

Implications for monetary sovereignty are particularly acute in emerging markets, where CBDCs offer mechanisms for insulating domestic systems from external volatility. Wenker (2022) finds that CBDCs enable central banks to retain monetary control amid declining cash utilization and private digital currency rise, though requiring careful calibration to avoid banking sector disruption. Dumitrescu (2025) demonstrates that strategic CBDC design including holding caps and non-remuneration features can prevent foreign currency dominance and protect domestic sovereignty in dual-currency economies.

In Africa, Ozili (2024) establishes that CBDCs may strengthen monetary policy transmission, deepen payment penetration, and advance financial inclusion, while acknowledging they cannot independently resolve structural

challenges such as corruption or poverty. However, Ozili (2023) documents significant heterogeneity in adoption readiness, finding 70% of African countries demonstrate limited interest and only a minority possess robust infrastructure necessary for sovereign digital currency issuance. This infrastructure deficit is corroborated by Alberola Ila and Mattei (2022), who note that while African central banks exhibit high interest, adoption remains cautious due to cybersecurity vulnerabilities and operational costs.

Despite challenges, the monetary sovereignty imperative remains salient in African CBDC strategies. The Center for Macroeconomics and Development (2022) identifies reduced dependency on foreign payment rails as a primary benefit, while Ricci et al. (2024) emphasize that CBDCs and digital payments are critical to Africa's financial evolution, with cross-border cooperation enhancing infrastructure and interoperability. Ricci et al. (2025) elaborate that CBDCs complement existing mobile money ecosystems rather than supplant them, suggesting a hybrid sovereignty model leveraging informal digital systems while strengthening state-controlled infrastructure. Maina (2025) and Obiora (2024) underscore the necessity of robust regulatory frameworks and international coordination to mitigate cybersecurity risks and bank disintermediation concerns. The Nigerian eNaira experience illustrates practical challenges confronting implementation in sovereignty-seeking contexts. Despite pioneering status as Africa's first sovereign digital currency, uptake remains affected by infrastructure limitations, trust deficits and educational gaps indicating broader continental challenges in deploying CBDCs as effective sovereignty tools. This case points out that technological capability alone is insufficient; effective deployment requires complementary investments in digital literacy, cybersecurity infrastructure, and regulatory capacity.

Cyber-Resilience as a Core Competency

The weaponization of digital infrastructure has elevated cybersecurity from an operational concern to a strategic leadership priority, with state-sponsored cyber warfare emerging as a fundamental threat to global financial stability. Unlike conventional risks propagating through market mechanisms, cyber threats exploit interconnected architecture, creating systemic vulnerabilities transcending institutional boundaries and jurisdictions. This transformation necessitates reconceptualization of financial leadership positioning cyber resilience as core competency for navigating persistent digital conflict.

Theoretical foundations distinguish cybersecurity from cyber resilience. Dupont (2019) establishes that while cybersecurity focuses on threat prevention, cyber resilience encompasses organizational capacity to withstand, recover from, and adapt to inevitable shocks. This distinction acknowledges that perimeter defense is insufficient against sophisticated adversaries, requiring institutions to maintain operational continuity during active compromise and engineer adaptive capacities demanding leadership engagement beyond traditional IT governance. Systemic dimensions of cyber risk are empirically validated across institutional contexts. The Carnegie Endowment (Bouveret, 2019) quantifies systemic cyber risk, demonstrating that interconnectedness and technological dependence amplify threat propagation, with resilience buffers and preparedness determining systemic collapse avoidance. The European Systemic Risk Board (2022) assesses how cyber incidents cascade through infrastructure disrupting real economic

activity, while the Office of Financial Research (2017) documents operational, reputational, and stability implications, urging extended risk modeling frameworks. The Bank of England (Warren, 2018) provides definitive empirical support, concluding that credible cases exist for cyber-attacks triggering systemic impacts warranting integrated resilience planning. The International Monetary Fund (Natalucci et al., 2024) corroborates this, documenting rising extreme incidents threatening firm solvency and market confidence, elevating cyber resilience to a global financial stability imperative.

Network analysis illuminates' propagation mechanisms. Panetta (2024) models systemic risk propagation through financial networks, demonstrating that understanding interconnection topologies is essential for prevention and resilience engineering. Botteghi et al. (2026) explore optimal resource allocation under heterogeneous risk profiles, finding strategic targeted defenses enhance interconnected system resilience. These findings suggest leaders must possess sophisticated understanding of network dynamics and contagion pathways competencies traditionally associated with macroprudential policy.

Regulatory and legislative dimensions emerge as determinants of banking stability. Cumming et al. (2025) establish empirical correlations between comprehensive cybercrime legislation and enhanced stability metrics, with robust frameworks reducing systemic risks and vulnerabilities. The SUERF analysis (Aldasoro et al., 2020) identifies regulatory harmonization and cross-border cooperation as essential for controlling systemic risk in environments where threats are pervasive and jurisdictionally ambiguous.

Evolution of threats compels continuous adaptation. Javaheri et al. (2023) document complex evolving threat landscapes forcing perpetual resilience posture evolution. Huang et al. (2021) advance adaptive imperatives through reinforcement learning frameworks, demonstrating resilience mechanisms must respond in real-time to unknown threats capabilities requiring machine-augmented decision-making and leadership comfort with algorithmic governance. Waliullah et al. (2025) find cyber threats inhibit digital financial service adoption, creating systemic vulnerabilities demanding robust regulatory responses and institutional investments.

Geopolitical instrumentalization introduces distinct strategic challenges. State-sponsored cyber warfare differs from criminal activity in motivation, sophistication, and persistence—characteristics demanding strategic rather than tactical responses. Financial institutions have become proxy targets in interstate conflicts, with attacks serving dual objectives of economic disruption and geopolitical leverage. This reality compels leaders to develop intelligence capabilities, threat attribution competencies, and crisis management protocols interfacing with national security apparatuses while maintaining operational independence and trust.

Leadership implications are transformative. Cyber resilience cannot be delegated to technical specialists; it requires board-level oversight, strategic resource allocation, and integration into enterprise risk management. Leaders must cultivate partnerships with intelligence communities, participate in public-private information sharing networks, and advocate for regulatory frameworks balancing security with innovation. Elevation of cybersecurity to systemic stability concern mandates fluency in technological risk, geopolitical analysis, and institutional resilience

engineering capabilities representing significant expansion of traditional leadership skill sets.

Techno-Nationalism

The financial sector's technological foundations are increasingly subject to geopolitical contestation, with artificial intelligence and semiconductor export restrictions emerging as instruments of techno-nationalism that reshape competitive dynamics across jurisdictions. These restrictions represent a fundamental departure from open innovation architectures, creating fragmented technological ecosystems that advantage institutions in dominant jurisdictions while constraining capabilities elsewhere. For global financial leadership, this environment necessitates strategic navigation of supply chain vulnerabilities, regulatory asymmetries, and innovation access constraints directly impacting market positioning and operational resilience.

The strategic centrality of semiconductor technology to financial competitiveness is established through historical and contemporary analysis. Miller (2022) documents semiconductors as strategic assets central to global power projection, demonstrating that export controls shape long-term economic dominance trajectories. The Information Technology & Innovation Foundation (2025) models economic impacts of semiconductor export controls, finding these restrictions reduce revenue streams, constrain research and development investment, and eliminate employment opportunities for dominant exporters—effects cascading through financial sectors dependent on advanced computing infrastructure for algorithmic trading, risk modeling, and customer analytics.

Efficacy and limitations of export control regimes present complex pictures for financial institutions navigating competitive landscapes. Gupta et al. (2024) assess hardware-centric controls targeting AI advancement, finding Chinese laboratories have successfully circumvented these restrictions, weakening intended strategic advantages and challenging fundamental efficacy of techno-nationalist tools. This circumvention dynamic suggests restrictions may accelerate rather than contain technological diffusion, creating competitive uncertainties for institutions in controlling jurisdictions while potentially leveling playing fields for those in targeted regions. Branstetter (2024) analyzes United States export controls as techno-nationalist policy, concluding that while these measures inhibit foreign technology development, they remain inadequate for fully containing rival capabilities prompting parallel industrial policy shifts reshaping global competitive dynamics.

Systemic risk implications of AI adoption in banking intersect critically with techno-nationalist restrictions. Kikuchi (2026) evaluates generative AI adoption in U.S. banking, identifying algorithmic coupling and emergent systemic risks correlating with computational resource access and integration strategies. Institutions in jurisdictions with unrestricted access to advanced AI chips possess competitive advantages in risk modeling, fraud detection, and customer service automation capabilities becoming differentiated assets when export controls constrain rivals' technological foundations. Tran (2026) explores AI governance amid techno-nationalism, finding that technological opacity and governance ambiguity strengthen strategic bargaining power among middle powers suggesting competitive advantage accrues not merely to technological

leaders but to actors capable of navigating governance uncertainties.

Fragmentation of global technology markets presents structural challenges for institutions operating across jurisdictions. Woods (2023) contextualize techno-nationalism within global trade and technology competition, warning that export bans on semiconductors and AI systems risk erecting digital walls fragmenting markets and disrupting cross-border financial service delivery. This fragmentation compels multinational institutions to maintain parallel technology stacks, comply with divergent regulatory requirements, and navigate incompatible technical standards—increasing operational complexity and compliance costs while potentially degrading service interoperability. Techno-Nationalism vs. Global Collaboration analysis (2022) documents how these policies disrupt global value chains, prompt duplicative investments, and reshape competitive dynamics disadvantaging institutions without scale to absorb redundancy costs.

Supply chain security strategies emerge as competitive differentiators in response to techno-nationalist pressures. The Pax Silica Initiative (2025) assesses coordinated supply chain security strategies, finding that partnerships securing strategic technology component supplies reshape alliance structures and competitive balancing mechanisms. Institutions embedded in secure supply chain networks possess operational continuity advantages during geopolitical tension, while those dependent on potentially restricted channels face strategic uncertainty. The Center for Strategic and International Studies (2024) analyzes export controls' effects on innovation and competitiveness, concluding outcomes vary significantly by policy stringency and market access dynamics suggesting competitive positioning requires continuous regulatory trajectory monitoring and adaptive supply chain management.

The African context reveals distinct vulnerabilities and emerging opportunities within techno-nationalist competition. Deen (2024) analyzes Africa's AI future amid U.S.-China rivalry, finding the continent's position between global power competitions shapes infrastructure investment patterns, technology access modalities, and market positioning options. African financial institutions face constrained access to advanced AI and semiconductor technologies due to export restrictions designed for great-power competition, potentially limiting competitive capabilities in digital banking and algorithmic finance. Lwanda (2025) examines AI governance constraints in African development, warning that AI gatekeeping and global governance gaps risk slowing adoption rates necessary for competitive financial services suggesting techno-nationalist restrictions compound existing developmental challenges.

Disparities in AI readiness across Sub-Saharan Africa may widen competitive gaps with global institutions. Malatji (2026) investigates the AI divide, documenting readiness disparities weakening African institutions' competitiveness within global technology ecosystems partially attributable to export restriction regimes limiting hardware access and computational infrastructure development. Gikunda (2023) explores AI adoption opportunities and constraints across Africa, highlighting how restricted access to advanced semiconductors and AI chips constrains financial service sophistication effects compounding when competing against global banks with unrestricted technology access. Strategic responses to techno-nationalist pressures require policy frameworks mitigating external competitive disadvantages.

Okolo (2025) argues Africa must shape AI policy reflective of local needs to avoid external policy capture and competitive disadvantage. The African Union's coordinated AI regulation strategies, analyzed by Ogenga and Stanley (2024), aim to mitigate external pressures while boosting domestic competitiveness though implementation capacity remains variable. The Policy Center for the New South (2025) notes that while the continent's material resources provide potential leverage in AI ecosystems, infrastructure limitations constrain competitive edge realization for finance and technology sectors. Emerging opportunities for competitive repositioning exist within Africa's potential integration into semiconductor value chains. African Business (2024) examines Africa's potential semiconductor role, identifying critical minerals supply positioning that could alter competitive dynamics if developed strategically. The World Economic Forum (2024) analyzes prospects for African semiconductor ecosystem development, suggesting strategic investments could disrupt global supply chains and create new competitive pathways. However, realizing these opportunities requires capital investment and technical capacity development that may be constrained by current techno-nationalist competition dynamics. Hence, institutions must navigate technology procurement strategies accounting for export restriction risks, develop redundant supplier relationships across geopolitical blocs, and cultivate regulatory intelligence capabilities to anticipate restriction regime changes. For institutions in restricted jurisdictions, competitive positioning requires alternative innovation pathways leapfrogging strategies, open-source adoption, and indigenous development investments that compensate for hardware access limitations. Fragmentation of global technology markets demands leaders possess geopolitical acumen alongside traditional financial expertise, recognizing technology access has become a strategic asset subject to state competition rather than commoditized input available through market mechanisms.

Impact on Market Soundness and Stability Channels

Transmission Channels

Geopolitical disruptions propagate through financial systems via three interconnected transmission channels financial market volatility, real economy supply chain disruptions, and security-related operational risks that operate synergistically to transform localized events into systemic stability challenges. The International Monetary Fund (2023) identifies financial market transmission as a primary vector, documenting how shocks trigger investor risk aversion, capital flow reversals, and fragmentation through compressed asset valuations, widening credit spreads, and reduced liquidity (International Monetary Fund, 2025). Li et al. (2024) find conflicts significantly increase cross-market interconnectedness and volatility propagation, while Raddant and Kenett (2017) demonstrate shock propagation accelerates rapidly across markets due to cross-border linkages. The European Central Bank (2024) documents feedback loops between market disruptions and credit conditions, and S&P Global (2024) confirms shocks simultaneously increase credit, funding, and operational risks.

Beyond financial markets, geopolitical disruptions propagate through supply chain networks that translate physical disruptions into financial vulnerabilities. Tabachová et al. (2024) quantify supply chain contagion effects, finding disruptions amplify

financial losses by up to four times through cascading defaults. Fialkowski et al. (2025) demonstrate supply chain disruptions increase interbank contagion by up to seventy percent, explicitly linking physical economy disruptions to systemic banking risk. The Economics Letters study (2025) establishes that firms with elevated supply chain risk exposure face higher loan spreads, while Klimek et al. (2015) find supply shocks create cascading failures affecting macro-financial stability. The European Central Bank Banking Supervision (2024) classifies the real economy channel operating through credit risk deterioration as distinct from but interactive with financial market and security channels.

The weaponization of digital infrastructure introduces a third transmission channel where state-sponsored cyber activities directly impair financial operations. The International Monetary Fund (Natalucci et al., 2024) assesses cyber risk as a financial stability threat, documenting how incidents trigger solvency issues and confidence loss with cross-institutional spillovers. Mukit and Ali (2025) find cyber incidents increase short-term volatility and amplify instability during geopolitical crises. The Office of Financial Research (2017) finds cyber incidents generate systemic risks beyond firm boundaries, while the Bank of England (Warren, 2018) concludes attacks can trigger systemic crises through payment disruptions and trust erosion. These channels interact to produce emergent systemic risks exceeding channel-specific effects. Financial market losses reduce capacity to absorb real economy credit deterioration; supply chain disruptions increase cyber vulnerability; cyber incidents trigger market volatility. The European Central Bank (2024) documents market-real economy feedback loops amplifying instability, while the International Monetary Fund (2023) identifies financial fragmentation as an outcome of channel interactions. S&P Global (2024) emphasizes simultaneity of risk transmission across channels, creating challenges exceeding siloed capabilities. For financial leadership, these findings mandate integrated risk frameworks monitoring channel interactions and stress testing combined scenarios. Effective stability management requires macroprudential coordination, cross-border information sharing and strategic reserves acknowledging non-linear amplification potential. Institutions compartmentalizing financial, operational, and credit risk management prove systematically vulnerable to synergistic effects characterizing contemporary geopolitical risk transmission.

Asymmetric Profitability

Geopolitical volatility generates distinctive distributional consequences across the firm size spectrum, creating asymmetric profitability dynamics that advantage large, well-capitalized institutions while imposing disproportionate burdens on smaller competitors. This redistribution operates through credit reallocation, investment divergence, and market power accumulation collectively reshaping competitive structures and potentially compromising long-term market soundness. Geopolitical shocks function as catalysts for market concentration, amplifying scale-based disparities and entrenching dominant positions.

Large institutions possess structural characteristics enabling profit capture during uncertainty. Gennaioli, Shleifer, and Vishny (2018) establish that larger firms absorb shocks more effectively due to stronger balance sheets while smaller firms reduce investment and face tighter credit constraints.

Himmelberg and Tsyplakov (2020) find that firms with strong financial positions outperform peers and gain investor confidence during systemic shocks, increasing market share when rivals struggle. The European Central Bank (2024) documents that profitable firms with market power increase margins during volatility while weaker firms experience declining profitability and elevated default risk. Hassan et al. (2019) finds that globally diversified firms typically large multinationals to better manage geopolitical risk compared to domestic small and medium enterprises, enabling sustained performance when localized competitors face existential threats.

Banking sector responses systematically disadvantage smaller borrowers through credit reallocation. Buch et al. (2015) demonstrate that banks shift lending toward safer, larger firms during uncertainty, crowding out smaller borrowers. The International Monetary Fund (2023) finds that large firms gain from capital flow reallocation while smaller firms face rising financing costs. Demirgüç-Kunt, Pedraza, and Ruiz-Ortega (2020) establish that smaller firms rely heavily on bank credit and suffer disproportionately from tightening, increasing insolvency risk. Ayyagari, Demirgüç-Kunt, and Maksimovic (2011) document persistent financing constraints for smaller firms intensifying during global shocks, while Hadlock and Pierce (2010) find smaller firms exhibit higher sensitivity to credit tightening, directly affecting survival rates.

Evidence extends across multiple crisis contexts. Beck et al. (2005) establishes structural disadvantages in accessing finance for smaller firms worsening during systemic shocks. Claessens, Tong, and Wei (2012) find financial shocks disproportionately affect smaller firms while large firms maintain capital market access enabling refinancing, restructuring, and acquisition while constrained competitors face liquidity crises. Caldara et al. (2020) document that increased geopolitical risk reduces investment for smaller firms more significantly than large firms. Duchin, Ozbas, and Sensoy (2010) find that liquid firms—often large—continue investing and expanding market position during crises, converting liquidity advantages into permanent competitive gains.

Geopolitical volatility creates distressed asset opportunities that well-capitalized institutions exploit, acquiring capabilities and market presence at discounted valuations. This consolidation dynamic reduces competitive intensity and may create institutions that are individually robust but collectively systemically important beyond optimal scale. The World Bank (2022) finds large firms recover faster and capture greater market share while small and medium enterprises experience prolonged distress and elevated exit risk. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2023) documents that small and medium enterprises face disproportionately higher borrowing costs and liquidity shortages compared to large multinationals.

Insolvency risk operates with particular severity in financial sectors due to confidence sensitivity. Smaller institutions facing liquidity stress may experience depositor flight or counterparty withdrawal accelerating distress, while large institutions benefit from implicit government support assumptions stabilizing funding access. This too-big-to-fail dynamic, reinforced by geopolitical volatility, creates competitive distortions extending beyond efficiency-based selection.

Concentration of market power in large institutions generates systemic implications compromising long-term

stability. While individual large institutions may exhibit robustness, systemic resilience depends on competitive diversity and distributed risk absorption. Market concentration reduces competitive pressure disciplining risk-taking, increases correlation across strategies, and creates single points of failure amplifying shock propagation. Asymmetric profitability dynamics present a paradox: individual institution resilience may coexist with systemic fragility as structures become increasingly concentrated.

For financial leadership, these findings mandate careful calibration of growth strategies and risk management. Large institutions must navigate competitive opportunities while avoiding excessive concentration and correlation risks. Smaller institutions require targeted strategies to maintain financing access and operational continuity potentially through consortium arrangements, niche positioning, or strategic partnerships approximating scale advantages. Regulatory frameworks must balance support for institution-specific resilience with preservation of competitive diversity underpinning systemic stability.

The Mercantilist Trap

The architecture of international financial regulation confronts a systemic legitimacy crisis as geopolitical competition undermines cooperative foundations of Basel III/IV frameworks. This mercantilist trap—wherein states prioritize domestic objectives over collective commitments—transforms global financial governance from coordinated public good into fragmented, state-driven systems. Empirical evidence reveals this erosion of trust weakens capital standard harmonization, enables regulatory arbitrage, and compromises systemic stability.

Institutional foundations are increasingly strained by diverging national preferences and intensified interventionism. Kolliopoulos (2025) finds that diverging preferences and stronger state intervention make globally binding banking rules difficult to sustain, producing uneven implementation where jurisdictions adapt standards to domestic exigencies. This fragmentation creates heterogeneous capital requirements and risk-weighting methodologies complicating cross-border supervision. Jeric (2024) demonstrates that geopolitical interests shape regulatory outcomes and produce inconsistent adoption, suggesting convergence cannot be assumed but depends upon deteriorating geopolitical alignment. Chen (2025) identifies power contestation and institutional decoupling between global and regional bodies, fragmenting authority structures and eroding trust-based reciprocity enabling information sharing.

Empirical consequences manifest in measurable systemic risk elevation. Tran, Nguyen, and Pham (2025) find that geopolitical tensions raise systemic risk partly through weakened regulatory coordination, establishing direct causal pathways from competition to instability through institutional channels. Sacco, Ciarli, and De Domenico (2022) find that global governance systems are fragile under unilateral defection, implying Basel frameworks depend upon dense reciprocity networks vulnerable to exit by major jurisdictions. Poledna, Hinteregger, and Thurner (2016) find that Basel III measures require stronger coordination to work effectively, with limited coordination producing pro-cyclical risk and incomplete protection.

Destabilizing effects amplify in developing and African economies where capacity constraints intersect with external dependency. Topcu and Can

(2025) find that political instability and geopolitical risk weaken banking systems, reflecting weak institutional cooperation. The Centre for Economic Policy Research Geneva Report (2025) finds that declining cooperation leads to regulatory arbitrage and race to the bottom risks, weakening resilience and crisis response. Gandica et al. (2018) find that fragmentation cycles reduce macroprudential framework effectiveness. Hurd (2017) demonstrates that multiple contagion channels require coordinated regulation, with lack of coordination increasing spillover-driven crises.

The public good nature of financial stability creates systematic underinvestment without cooperation. The Geneva Report (2025) establishes that countries underinvest in stability without cooperation, particularly in emerging markets, manifesting as inadequate capital buffers and insufficient cross-border engagement. The European Banking Authority (2025) finds that divergent national policies delay Basel III implementation and weaken cooperation, resulting in higher volatility and reduced resilience.

Cumulative effects transform global financial regulation from stabilizing framework into source of uncertainty and competitive distortion. Trust erosion undermines information sharing, joint supervision, and crisis coordination requiring reciprocal confidence. When states prioritize domestic industrial policy objectives, collective action foundations of systemic stability degrade.

For financial leadership, these findings mandate strategic adaptation to fragmented landscapes. Institutions must navigate divergent capital requirements, multiple resolution regimes, and inconsistent macroprudential treatments increasing compliance complexity. Scale advantages enable maintenance of parallel compliance infrastructures, potentially accelerating concentration dynamics. Uncertainty complicates long-term capital planning as future standard trajectories become contingent upon geopolitical developments rather than technical consensus.

The Social Dimension in ESG: Social and Ethical Dilemmas of Global Leadership

Ethical Exit Strategies

The intersection of ESG commitments with geopolitical imperatives presents global financial leadership with profound ethical dilemmas challenging sustainability framework integrity. When conflicts trigger sanctions or reputational crises, institutions face consequential decisions regarding market exit or continued engagement. Empirical evidence reveals that ethical exit strategies emerge from complex calculations balancing fiduciary obligations, stakeholder pressures, and competitive positioning rather than pure moral conviction, raising fundamental questions about ESG reliability as a stabilizing force.

Withdrawal from contested markets demonstrates conditional relationships between ethical positioning and economic exposure. Bamiatzi, Jones, and Mitchelmore (2024) find that high exposure to affected markets systematically delays exit despite intensifying ethical pressure, as firms prioritize asset preservation over stakeholder demands. This delay generates reputational risk and uncertainty compounding initial instability. Sun, Mellahi, and Wood (2024) investigate exits under sanctions using the Myanmar case, finding that exits are predominantly driven by institutional pressure rather than autonomous ethical deliberation. Their analysis reveals that responsible exits characterized by worker protection and stakeholder consultation

are rare undertakings most firms fail to achieve, with poorly managed exits disrupting labor markets and creating localized instability affecting broader market soundness.

Strategic instrumentalization of ESG commitments during crises presents dual-edged dynamics for market stability. Iannone, Ballestra, and Palazzo (2025) find that ESG strategies act as risk buffers during geopolitical shocks influencing exit timing, supporting resilience by reducing portfolio volatility, though underlying mechanisms may reflect portfolio construction rather than genuine ethical commitment. Nicolas, Roscovan, and Vlastakis (2023) find that ESG controversies lead to negative abnormal returns pressuring firms toward ethical repositioning, with market discipline operating through reputational channels reinforcing financial materiality of commitments, though short-term orientations may incentivize superficial compliance.

Symbolic dimensions of ESG engagement during stress reveal credibility gaps undermining long-term architecture. Lee et al. (2024) find that firms increase ESG engagement to protect legitimacy during crises, sometimes substituting symbolic compliance for substantive action, weakening sustainability framework credibility and creating potential for future legitimacy crises. Erzurumlu et al. (2025) find that geopolitical risk improves aggregate ESG scores while simultaneously weakening environmental commitment, indicating selective compliance where social and governance indicators are enhanced for legitimacy maintenance while environmental obligations are deprioritized, distorting true ethical performance.

Ethical exit dilemmas in African markets present distinctive configurations shaped by resource dependency and governance fragility. Abolarin et al. (2025) find that international oil companies exit African markets to reduce risk exposure while shifting environmental and financial burdens to host states, creating post-exit instability and governance gaps as domestic institutions lack capacity for monitoring and remediation. Soobaroyen and Ntim (2019) find that firms respond to legitimacy pressures often through symbolic ESG to retain investor trust, with weak enforcement enabling misalignment between commitments and practices, creating systemic governance risk where ESG-rated institutions may carry undisclosed ethical liabilities.

Labor and governance dilemmas confronting African expansion force explicit trade-offs between profitability and ethical commitments. Mans-Kemp and van Zyl (2021) find that firms face acute dilemmas abroad forcing trade-offs, with poor handling triggering financial losses and investor backlash affecting stability through valuation corrections. Cagiza (2025) finds that investors rely on risk mitigation mechanisms rather than exit in fragile states, delaying ethical disengagement while sustaining exposure to governance risk affecting stability through concentrated positions. Olayinka and Adegboye (2021) find that weak regulation allows firms to avoid full accountability, reducing exit pressure while enabling continued operations that would face sanction in higher-standard jurisdictions, creating competitive inequalities rewarding regulatory arbitrage. The Kenya Multinational Corporation Study (2022) finds that firms adjust investment rather than exit, prioritizing profit stability over ethical disengagement, leading to risk accumulation and delayed corrective action amplifying eventual crisis severity.

Synthesis reveals that ethical exit strategies remain inconsistent and heavily shaped by economic incentives, limiting

ESG effectiveness as a stabilizing force. Contingent ethicality where exit timing depends on exposure magnitude and institutional pressure intensity suggests ESG commitments lack reliability required for systemic stability assurance. Prevalence of symbolic compliance, selective dimension enhancement, and burden-shifting strategies undermines sustainability framework credibility and potentially increases fragility through uncertainty generation.

For financial leadership, these findings mandate sophisticated ESG integration distinguishing genuine ethical commitment from reputation management. Portfolio construction must account for potential decoupling of ESG ratings from ethical outcomes during stress, while engagement strategies should prioritize mechanisms enforcing substantive rather than symbolic compliance. Governance gaps and enforcement weaknesses in African contexts require enhanced due diligence and alternative monitoring mechanisms compensating for regulatory deficiencies.

The Social Dimension of ESG in Conflict Zones

The social dimension of ESG frameworks confronts its most severe test in conflict-affected regions, where human rights risks intensify and the gap between corporate commitment and operational reality becomes starkly visible. While robust ESG performance demonstrably enhances financial resilience during geopolitical crises, implementation of social safeguards in active conflict zones remains inconsistent, strategically selective, and often inadequate to address core challenges. This implementation gap exposes limitations in ESG as a stabilizing mechanism and creates potential for reputational and systemic shocks transcending individual firm boundaries.

The financial materiality of ESG commitments during geopolitical stress is well-established. Iannone, Ballestra, and Palazzo (2025) find that ESG portfolios demonstrate stronger resilience during geopolitical shocks, supporting their role in mitigating conflict-driven volatility. Das, Markowitz, Scheid, and Statman (2018) find that high ESG funds outperform conventional funds during crises due to stronger governance and social screening identifying superior stakeholder management. Broadstock et al. (2021) finds that firms with strong ESG performance show reduced downside risk under crisis conditions including geopolitical stress. Drago, Riedl, and Schröder (2024) find that ESG performance moderates negative impacts of geopolitical risk on markets, particularly through social and governance channels indicating institutional stability. However, strategic motivations underlying ESG engagement complicate resilience interpretation. Erzurumlu et al. (2025) find that firms increase ESG engagement during instability but often do so selectively, indicating strategic rather than ethical motivations, raising questions about durability when stakeholder scrutiny intensifies. Abu Khalaf et al. (2025) find that human rights violations and ESG controversies significantly reduce firm value and investor confidence in conflict-prone regions, with weak social governance increasing financial instability where information asymmetries are pronounced, and stakeholder trust is fragile.

The African context reveals structural constraints systematically compromising ESG implementation in conflict-affected regions. Berman et al. (2017) find that firms operating in conflict zones face higher operational risks and adjust strategies, often prioritizing survival over social responsibility. Zhang et al. (2021) find that firms adopt adaptive

strategies rather than exit, often compromising ESG commitments due to institutional weaknesses, suggesting market presence persistence may come at ethical degradation costs. Idemudia (2014) finds that CSR initiatives fail to resolve underlying social conflicts in Nigerian oil sector conflict zones, exposing limitations of ESG in weak governance contexts where structural drivers of conflict are not amenable to firm-level intervention.

The gap between commitment and performance reflects systematic patterns of selective implementation. Kolk and Lenfant (2015) find that firms engage in selective CSR, often failing to address core human rights issues in conflict areas. Oetzel and Getz (2012) find that firms face ethical dilemmas balancing stakeholder protection and profitability, often leading to partial or symbolic ESG responses. Christensen, Maffett, and Rauter (2021) find that conflict minerals regulation improves transparency but firms still struggle with supply chain human rights risks, suggesting disclosure requirements may be insufficient to ensure actual mitigation rather than mere documentation.

Synthesis reveals that ESG in conflict zones remains inconsistently applied with limited capacity to fully manage human rights risks, weakening its role as a stabilizing mechanism. Resilience effects in portfolio-level analysis may reflect selection bias firms with genuine commitment outperform rather than causal protection from ESG integration itself. To the extent that ratings incorporate firms with symbolic compliance or adaptive compromise, resilience benefits may prove illusory when controversies materialize.

For financial leadership, these findings mandate enhanced due diligence transcending conventional ESG screening. Standard metrics may understate human rights risks in environments with institutional voids, survival imperatives, and selective implementation. Portfolio construction must account for potential gaps between reported performance and operational reality, while engagement strategies should prioritize verification mechanisms and local stakeholder consultation identifying symbolic compliance. If ESG-rated portfolios contain undisclosed conflict zone exposures with material human rights risks, reputational and valuation shocks from controversy events could cascade through integrated networks.

Conclusion

This review reveals that geopolitical disruptions are irreversibly transforming global financial leadership, replacing the traditional architecture of integrated markets and technocratic governance with a fragmented, politically contested landscape. Financial fragmentation has become a structural transformation rather than temporary deviation, as weaponized interdependence through sanctions and infrastructure exclusion incentivizes parallel system development, alternative payment networks, and regional financial blocs. Leadership now requires navigating multiple regulatory regimes, cultivating relationships across divided blocs, and integrating geopolitical analysis, scenario-based governance, and corporate diplomacy as core competencies. The talent gap analysis demonstrates a decisive pivot toward interdisciplinary expertise synthesizing quantitative rigor with geopolitical literacy, while cyber resilience and technological sovereignty have elevated security expertise to board-level priority.

These transformations present complex systemic stability implications. While fragmentation generates efficiency losses and coordination deficits, it

simultaneously catalyzes resilience investments and institutional innovations. However, transmission channels such as market volatility, supply chain disruption and operational security risks interact synergistically to create emergent systemic threats, while the mercantilist trap in regulatory governance erodes cooperative foundations precisely when they are most needed. Asymmetric profitability dynamics advantage large institutions while threatening competitive diversity, and African economies face acute challenges from externally imposed de-risking and technology constraints. The contingent ethicality documented in ESG analyses, where symbolic compliance often substitutes for genuine commitment, undermines sustainability frameworks as stabilizing mechanisms.

Recommendations

Based on the comprehensive review of empirical evidence, several critical recommendations emerge for financial institutions, policymakers, and regulatory authorities navigating the geopolitically fragmented landscape.

First, financial institutions must fundamentally restructure their risk management frameworks to integrate geopolitical analysis as a core competency rather than peripheral advisory function. This requires investment in interdisciplinary talent capable of synthesizing quantitative financial analysis with political intelligence, scenario planning, and cross-cultural institutional knowledge. Boards and executive leadership must elevate geopolitical risk to the same strategic priority as credit and market risk, with dedicated resources for monitoring transmission channels, stress testing combined scenarios, and developing adaptive response protocols. Institutions that fail to make this structural integration will remain systematically vulnerable to the synergistic effects of market volatility, supply chain disruption, and operational security risks that characterize contemporary geopolitical shocks.

Second, regulatory authorities and multilateral institutions must urgently address the mercantilist trap eroding cooperative governance foundations. The evidence demonstrates that unilateral defection, competitive deregulation, and fragmented implementation of Basel frameworks amplify systemic risk through reduced information sharing, delayed crisis response, and regulatory arbitrage opportunities. Policymakers should prioritize mechanisms that preserve minimum coordination standards even amid geopolitical competition, including crisis protocols, macroprudential information exchanges, and reciprocal recognition arrangements that maintain baseline stability functions. For African and emerging market economies specifically, international partnerships must address structural disadvantages through capacity building, technology transfer, and differentiated implementation timelines that prevent permanent competitive marginalization.

Third, financial leadership must develop more sophisticated approaches to ESG integration that distinguish genuine ethical commitment from reputation management. The prevalence of symbolic compliance, selective dimension enhancement, and burden-shifting strategies documented across conflict zone and sustainability analyses suggests that standard ESG metrics may systematically understate material risks. Institutions should implement enhanced due diligence for high-risk jurisdictions, verification mechanisms that transcend disclosure-based screening, and stakeholder consultation processes capable of identifying implementation gaps before they materialize as systemic shocks. Regulatory frameworks must

strengthen enforcement capabilities that close the transparency-transformation gap, ensuring that reporting requirements translate into actual risk mitigation rather than documentation exercises.

Fourth, technological sovereignty and cyber resilience must be operationalized as strategic priorities with board-level oversight and dedicated resource allocation. The evidence demonstrates that state-sponsored cyber warfare, export control restrictions, and infrastructure dependencies create competitive vulnerabilities that transcend traditional operational risk categories. Financial institutions should cultivate redundant supplier relationships across geopolitical blocs, develop indigenous technology capabilities where feasible, and maintain crisis management protocols interfacing with national security apparatuses. For African institutions facing structural technology access constraints, regional consortium arrangements and strategic partnerships with development finance institutions can approximate scale advantages and reduce competitive disadvantages.

Finally, financial leadership must cultivate organizational agility and resilience engineering as adaptive capacities for persistent turbulence. The structurally embedded nature of geopolitical competition suggests that fragmentation, strategic ambiguity, and systemic discontinuity will characterize the financial landscape for the foreseeable future. Institutions should transition from efficiency-optimized models toward resilience-oriented architectures that maintain liquidity, capital adequacy, and operational continuity under extreme stress scenarios. This requires investment in scenario-based governance, reverse stress testing, and strategic foresight capabilities that anticipate rather than merely react to systemic transformations. The individuals and institutions capable of integrating these diverse competencies while maintaining effectiveness across fragmented jurisdictions will define the next era of global financial governance.

References

Abolarin, S. K., Fevrier, K., & Abdulsamad, A. (2025). Navigating the energy transition: International oil company divestments and the stranded asset dilemma in Africa. *The Extractive Industries and Society*, *24*, 101737.

Abu Khalaf, B., Alqahtani, M. S., & Al-Naimi, M. S. (2025). ESG Controversies and the Financial Performance of MENA Firms: The Moderating Role of Board Characteristics. *Sustainability*, *17*(11), 5055..

African Business. (2024). Africa looks to muscle in on the semiconductor value chain. https://african.business/2024/03/technology-information/africa-looks-to-muscle-in-on-the-semiconductor-value-chain

African Development Bank. (2023). *African Economic Outlook 2023*. https://www.afdb.org/en/documents/african-economic-outlook-2023

Ajour El Zein, S., Clemente-Almendros, J. A., & Boldeanu, F. T. (2025). Understanding de-dollarization among BRICS nations: Systematic review of the factors and fallout. *RAC - Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 29(2), e024001. https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-7849rac20242001en

Alberola Ila, E., & Mattei, I. (2022). Central bank digital currencies in Africa. *BIS Papers No. 128*. Bank for International Settlements. https://www.bis.org/publ/bppdf/bispap128.htm

Aldasoro, I., Frost, J., Gambacorta, L., Leach, T., & Whyte, D. (2020). Cyber risk in the financial sector. *SUERF Policy Note No. 206*.

Arslanalp, S., Eichengreen, B., & Simpson-Bell, C. (2022). *The stealth erosion of dollar dominance: Active diversifiers and the rise of nontraditional reserve currencies* (IMF Working Paper No. 2022/058). International Monetary Fund. https://doi.org/10.5089/9798400200305.001

Atlantic Council. (2020). *Design choices of central bank digital currencies will transform digital payments and geopolitics*. https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/comme

ntary/design-choices-of-central-bank-digital-currencies-will-transform-digital-payments-and-geopolitics/

Auer, R., Cornelli, G., & Frost, J. (2022). Rise of central bank digital currencies: Drivers, approaches and technologies. *BIS Quarterly Review*. https://www.bis.org/publ/qtrpdf/r_qt2209b.htm

Australian Institute of International Affairs. (2025). BRICS institutional innovation and the push for economic sovereignty. *Australian Outlook*. https://www.internationalaffairs.org.au/australianoutlook/brics-institutional-innovation-and-the-push-for-economic-sovereignty/

Avril, P., McQuade, P., Pancaro, C., & Reghezza, A. (2025). Geopolitical Risk, Bank Lending and Real Effects on Firms: Evidence from the Russian Invasion of Ukraine.

Ayyagari, M., Demirgüç-Kunt, A., & Maksimovic, V. (2011). Small versus young firms. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 5631*. https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-5631

Bai, G. (2023). From de-risking to de-dollarisation. *Tricontinental Institute*. https://thetricontinental.org/wenhua-zongheng-2024-1-derisking-dedollarisation-brics-currency/

Baker, S. R., Bloom, N., & Davis, S. J. (2016). Measuring economic policy uncertainty. *Quarterly Journal of Economics, 131*(4), 1593–1636. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjw024

Ballis, A. (2025). Geopolitical tensions and financial networks: Strategic shifts toward alternatives. *arXiv*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.21480

Bamiatzi, V., Jones, S., & Mitchelmore, S. (2024). Self-interest over ethics: Firm withdrawal from Russia after the Ukraine invasion. *Journal of Business Ethics*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-024-05836-3

Bank for International Settlements. (2022). *Project mBridge: Connecting economies through CBDC*. https://www.bis.org/publ/othp59.htm

Bank for International Settlements. (2024). *Annual Economic Report*. https://www.bis.org

Bank for International Settlements. (2025). Geopolitics meets monetary policy: Decoding their impact on cross-border bank lending (BIS Working Papers No. 1247). https://www.bis.org/publ/work1247.htm

Bank of England. (2018). Could a cyber attack cause a systemic impact in the financial sector? *Bank of England Quarterly Bulletin*. https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/-/media/boe/files/quarterly-bulletin/2018/could-a-cyber-attack-cause-a-systemic-impact-final-web.pdf

Bank of Ghana. (2023). *Financial Stability Review*. https://www.bog.gov.gh

Bardoscia, M., Barucca, P., Battiston, S., Caccioli, F., Cimini, G., Garlaschelli, D., ... & Caldarelli, G. (2021). The physics of financial networks. *Nature Reviews Physics*, *3*(7), 490-507.

Beck, T., Demirgüç-Kunt, A., Laeven, L., & Levine, R. (2005). Financial constraints and growth. *Journal of Finance, 60*(1), 137–177. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2005.00787.x

Bennedsen, M., Pérez-González, F., & Wolfenzon, D. (2020). Do CEOs matter? Evidence from hospitalizations. *Journal of Finance, 75*(4), 1877–1911. https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.12897

Berman, N., Couttenier, M., Rohner, D., & Thoenig, M. (2017). This mine is mine! How minerals fuel conflicts in Africa. *American Economic Review, 107*(6), 1564–1610. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20150774

Bezerra, V. S. (2020). Institutionalization of the BRICS discourse: How does the NDB embody the group's views on global financial governance? *BRICS Journal of Economics*, 1(4), 70–81. https://doi.org/10.38050/2712-7508-2020-1-4-7

Boddewyn, J. J. (2016). International business-government relations. *Journal of World Business*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2016.08.001

Boddewyn, J. J., & Doh, J. P. (2011). Global strategy and the collaboration of MNEs, NGOs, and governments. *Global Strategy Journal*, 1(3–4), 345–361. https://doi.org/10.1002/gsj.35

Botteghi, E., Centonze, M. S., Pastorello, D., & Tantari, D. (2026). Network security under heterogeneous cyber risk profiles and contagion. *arXiv*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2601.16805

Boubaker, S., Sarea, A., & Choudhury, T. (2023). Guest editorial: Implications of the Russia–Ukraine conflict on the global financial markets. *The Journal of Risk Finance*, *24*(1), 1-5.

Bouveret, A. (2019). Cyber risk scenarios, the financial system, and systemic risk

assessment. *Carnegie Endowment*. https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2019/09/cyber-risk-scenarios-the-financial-system-and-systemic-risk-assessment

Branstetter, L. (2024). *Export controls and U.S.–China technology competition in an interdependent world*. Brookings Institution. https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/20240701_Branstetter_Sanctions.pdf

Broadstock, D. C., Chan, K., Cheng, L. T. W., & Wang, X. (2021). ESG performance and financial resilience: Evidence from COVID-19. *Finance Research Letters, 38*, 101716. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2020.101716

Brochet, F., Loumioti, M., & Serafeim, G. (2018). Speaking of the short-term: Disclosure horizon and managerial myopia. *Review of Accounting Studies, 23*(3), 1122–1163. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11142-018-9459-3

Buch, C. M., Buchholz, M., & Tonzer, L. (2015). Uncertainty, bank lending, and bank-level heterogeneity. *IMF Economic Review*, *63*(4), 919-954.

Cagiza, G. (2025). Investment risk and development finance in Angola: Risk mitigation and ethical engagement. *arXiv*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.18906.

Caldara, D., & Iacoviello, M. (2022). Measuring geopolitical risk. *American Economic Review, 112*(4), 1194–1225. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20191823

Caldara, D., Fuentes-Albero, C., Gilchrist, S., & Zakrajšek, E. (2020). The economic effects of geopolitical risk. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 34*(4), 119–145. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.34.4.119

Campanella, M. (2014). *The internationalization of the renminbi and the rise of a multipolar currency system* (ECIPE Working Paper No. 01/2014). European Centre for International Political Economy. https://ecipe.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/WP201201_1.pdf

Center for Macroeconomics and Development. (2022). *CBDCs in Africa: Policy report*. https://www.cmacrodev.com/central-bank-digital-currencies-in-africa/

Center for Strategic and International Studies. (2024). Did U.S. semiconductor export controls harm innovation? https://www.csis.org/analysis/did-us-semiconductor-export-controls-harm-innovation

Central Bank of Kenya. (2023). *Bank Supervision Annual Report*. https://www.centralbank.go.ke

Central Bank of Nigeria. (2023). *Financial Stability Report*. https://www.cbn.gov.ng

Centre for Economic Policy Research. (2025). *Geneva Report 28: Geopolitical tensions and international fragmentation: Evidence and implications*. https://cepr.org/system/files/publication-files/271360-geneva_28_geopolitical_tensions_and_international_fragmentation_evidence_and_implications.pdf

Chang, H. H., Harrington, B., Fu, F., & Rockmore, D. (2023). Complex systems of secrecy: The offshore networks of oligarchs. *arXiv*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.03371

Chari, A., Converse, N., Mehl, A., Milesi-Ferretti, G. M., & Vansteenkiste, I. (2025). *Geopolitical tensions and international financial fragmentation: The 28th Geneva Report on the World Economy*. Centre for Economic Policy Research.

Chen, L. (2025). Global versus regional financial governance: Institutional analysis. *International Organisations Research Journal, 20*(3). https://iorj.hse.ru/en/2025-20-3-abstracts.html

Christensen, H. B., Maffett, M., & Rauter, T. (2021). The real effects of mandated disclosure: Evidence from conflict minerals regulation. *The Accounting Review, 96*(5), 235–266. https://doi.org/10.2308/TAR-2017-0188

Claessens, S., Tong, H., & Wei, S. J. (2012). From the financial crisis to firm-level outcomes. *Journal of International Economics, 88*(2), 287–303. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinteco.2011.05.002

Collins, D. (2025). De-Dollarization Is a Plausible Outcome of the New Washington Consensus. *Global Policy*. https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.70109

Cucchi, A. (2025). Geopolitics of oil: How China is challenging the petrodollar through the petro-yuan. *IE University School of Politics, Economics, and Global Affairs*. https://ipr.blogs.ie.edu/2025/06/27/geopolitics-of-oil-how-china-is-challenging-the-petrodollar-through-the-pedro-yuan/

Cumming, D., Nguyen, M., Pham, A. V., & Samarasinghe, A. (2025). Banking system stability: A global analysis of cybercrime laws. *Journal of International*

Business Studies. https://arxiv.org/abs/2512.01237

Custódio, C., Ferreira, M. A., & Matos, P. (2019). Generalists versus specialists: Lifetime work experience and chief executive officer pay. *Journal of Financial Economics, 134*(2), 466–488. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2019.04.005

Das, S., Markowitz, H., Scheid, J., & Statman, M. (2018). ESG fund performance in crises. *arXiv*. https://arxiv.org/abs/1806.09906

De Saituma Cagiza, C. B. (2025). De-risking development in Sub-Saharan Africa: A qualitative study of investment dynamics. *arXiv*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.18906

Deen, E. (2024). Africa's AI future in the context of the US-China AI race. *Global Center for AI Analysis*. https://globalcenter.ai/research/africas-ai-future-in-the-context-of-the-us-china-ai-race/

Demertzis, M., & Lipsky, J. (2023). The geopolitics of central bank digital currencies. *Intereconomics*, *58*(4), 173-177.https://doi.org/10.2478/ie-2023-0037

Deming, D. J., & Kahn, L. B. (2018). Skill requirements across firms and labor markets. *Quarterly Journal of Economics, 133*(3), 1395–1450. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjy013

Demirgüç-Kunt, A., Pedraza, A., & Ruiz-Ortega, C. (2020). The COVID-19 crisis and SMEs. *World Bank*. https://www.worldbank.org

Doh, J. P., Lawton, T. C., & Rajwani, T. (2012). Advancing nonmarket strategy research. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 26(3), 22–39. https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2012.0041

Drago, D., Riedl, A., & Schröder, M. (2024). ESG and geopolitical risk: Hedging effectiveness and transmission channels. *Research in International Business and Finance, 69*, 102411. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ribaf.2024.102411

Duchin, R., Ozbas, O., & Sensoy, B. (2010). Costly external finance. *Journal of Financial Economics, 99*(2), 238–252. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2009.12.008

Dumitrescu, C. (2025). CBDC stress test in a dual-currency setting. *arXiv*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2511.13384

Dupont, B. (2019). The cyber resilience of financial institutions: Significance and applicability. *Cybersecurity, 5*(1), tyz013. https://academic.oup.com/cybersecurity/article/5/1/tyz013/5585673

Erzurumlu, Y. O., Gozgor, G., Lau, C. K. M., Soliman, A. M., & Turkkan, M. (2025). The effects of geopolitical and political risks on corporate ESG practices. *Journal of Environmental Management*, *386*, 125747.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2025.125747

European Banking Authority. (2025). EU-wide stress test results. https://www.reuters.com/sustainability/boards-policy-regulation/eu-banks-can-weather-recession-driven-global-trade-war-stress-test-shows-2025-08-01/

European Central Bank. (2024). Geopolitical risk and financial stability. *ECB Financial Stability Review*. https://www.ecb.europa.eu/press/financial-stability-publications/fsr/special/html/ecb.fsrart202405_01

European Central Bank. (2025). ECB to assess banks' stress testing capabilities to capture geopolitical risk. https://www.bankingsupervision.europa.eu/press/pr/date/2025/html/ssm.pr251212~69f656d4bf.en.html

European Central Bank. (2026). Navigating a complex credit risk landscape. https://www.bankingsupervision.europa.eu/press/speeches/date/2026/html/ssm.sp260225~6414b05e13.pl.html

European Investment Bank. (2023). *Finance in Africa 2023*. https://www.eib.org/en/publications/finance-in-africa

European Parliament Research Service. (2025). *Confiscation of immobilised Russian sovereign assets* (Briefing No. EPRS_BRI(2025)775908). European Parliament. https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2025/775908/EPRS_BRI(2025)775908_EN.pdf

European Systemic Risk Board. (2022). *Systemic cyber risk report*. https://esrb.europa.eu/pub/pdf/reports/esrb.report200219_systemiccyberrisk~101a09685e.en.pdf

Evenett, S., & Pisani-Ferry, J. (2024). Geoeconomic fragmentation. *CEPR*. https://cepr.org

Faccio, M. (2006). Politically connected firms. *American Economic Review*, 96(1), 369–386. https://doi.org/10.1257/000282806776157704

Farrell, H., & Newman, A. (2019). Weaponized interdependence. *International Security*, 44(1), 42–79. https://doi.org/10.1162/isec_a_00351

Fialkowski, J., Diem, C., Borsos, A., & Thurner, S. (2025). A data-driven econo-financial stress-testing framework to estimate the effect of supply chain networks on financial systemic risk. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.17044*.. https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.17044

Fialkowski, J., Diem, C., Borsos, A., & Thurner, S. (2025). A data-driven econo-financial stress-testing framework to estimate the effect of supply chain networks on financial systemic risk. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.17044*..

Finance Research Letters. (2026). Sectoral stress testing of bank credit risk. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2025.109165

Financial Stability Board. (2023). *Global Monitoring Report on Non-Bank Financial Intermediation*. https://www.fsb.org

Food and Agriculture Organization & World Bank. (2015). Withdrawal from correspondent banking. *Financial Nigeria International Limited*. https://www.financialnigeria.com/de-risking-in-africa-correspondent-banking-on-the-decline-feature-75.html

Gamboa-Estrada, F., & Romero, J. V. (2024). *Geopolitical Risk and Emerging Markets Sovereign Risk Premia*. Banco de la Republica Colombia.

Gandica, Y., Geraci, M. V., Béreau, S., & Gnabo, J. Y. (2018). Fragmentation, integration and macroprudential surveillance of the US financial industry: Insights from network science. *Plos one*, *13*(4), e0195110.https://arxiv.org/abs/1707.00296

Gennaioli, N., Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. (2018). *A crisis of beliefs*. Princeton University Press. https://press.princeton.edu/books/hardcover/9780691178108/a-crisis-of-beliefs

Georgescu, G. (2017). Bank de-risking impacts on finance and development. *MPRA*. https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/78247/

Gikunda, K. (2023). Empowering Africa: AI adoption across the continent. *arXiv*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.09457

Góes, C., & Bekkers, E. (2022). The impact of geopolitical conflicts on trade. *arXiv*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.12173

Goldin, I., & Vogel, T. (2010). Global governance and systemic risk in the 21st century: Lessons from the financial crisis. *Global Policy*, *1*(1), 4-15.

Goldsmith-Pinkham, P., Sorkin, I., & Swift, H. (2020). Bartik instruments: What, when, why, and how. *American Economic Review, 110*(8), 2586–2624. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20181047

Gondwe, S., Gwatidzo, T., & Mahonye, N. (2024). Cross-border banking and bank stability: Evidence from Sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of Banking Regulation*. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s41261-024-00254-x

Guo, Y., Yousef, E., & Naseer, M. M. (2025). Cryptocurrencies and central bank digital currencies in global perspective. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 18*(11), 644. https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm18110644

Gupta, R., Walker, L., & Reddie, A. W. (2024). Whack-a-Chip: The futility of hardware-centric export controls. *arXiv*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.14425

Hadlock, C., & Pierce, J. (2010). New evidence on measuring financial constraints. *Review of Financial Studies, 23*(5), 1909–1940. https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhq009

Hassan, T. A., Hollander, S., Lent, L., Schwedeler, M., & Tahoun, A. (2019). Firm-level political risk. *Quarterly Journal of Economics, 134*(4), 2135–2202. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjz021

Henisz, W. J., & Zelner, B. A. (2005). Legitimacy, interest group pressures, and change in emerging institutions. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(2), 361–382. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2005.16387890

Henriksen, L. F., & Seabrooke, L. (2020). *Elites and transnational governance*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108774404

Hillman, A. J., Keim, G. D., & Schuler, D. (2004). Corporate political activity: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 30(6), 837–857. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jm.2004.06.003

Himmelberg, C. P., & Tsyplakov, S. (2020). Optimal terms of contingent capital, incentive effects, and capital structure dynamics. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, *64*, 101635.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2020.101635

Hopewell, K. (2025). Local currencies, payment networks, and the unmaking of dollar hegemony. *Academic Journal of Business and Management*, 7(2).

https://www.aijbm.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/G845978.pdf

Houston, J. F., Jiang, L., Lin, C., & Ma, Y. (2014). Political connections and bank risk-taking. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 111(3), 725–743. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2013.11.003

Howell, S. T. (2020). Financing innovation: Evidence from R&D grants. *American Economic Review, 110*(4), 1136–1164. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20150808

Huang, Y., Huang, L., & Zhu, Q. (2021). Reinforcement learning for feedback enabled cyber resilience. *arXiv*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.00783

Hudecová, K., & Rajčániová, M. (2023). The impact of geopolitical risk on agricultural commodity prices. *Agricultural Economics/Zemědělská Ekonomika*, *69*(4).

Humphrey, C., & Chen, Y. (2015). *Developmental revolution or Bretton Woods revisited? The prospects of the New Development Bank and the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank* (ODI Working Paper). Overseas Development Institute. https://odi.org/en/publications/developmental-revolution-or-bretton-woods-revisited/

Hurd, T. R. (2017). Systemic risk transmission and multiple contagion channels. *arXiv*. https://arxiv.org/abs/1711.05289

Hurlin, C., Lajaunie, Q., & Pull, Y. (2026). Reverse stress testing geopolitical risk in corporate credit portfolios. https://arxiv.org/abs/2601.03983

Iannone, B., Duttilo, P., & Gattone, S. A. (2025). Evaluating the resilience of ESG investments in European markets during turmoil periods. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, *32*(4), 5006-5020. https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.03269

Idemudia, U. (2014). Corporate social responsibility and development in Africa: Issues and possibilities. *Progress in Development Studies, 14*(2), 159–175. https://doi.org/10.1177/146499341350 4357

Information Technology & Innovation Foundation. (2025). Decoupling risks: How semiconductor export controls harm innovation. https://itif.org/publications/2025/11/10/decoupling-risks-semiconductor-export-controls-harm-us-chipmakers-innovation/

International Monetary Fund. (2023). Geoeconomic fragmentation and firm performance. *IMF Working Papers*. https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WP/Issues/2023

International Monetary Fund. (2025). Geopolitical risks: Implications for asset prices. *Global Financial Stability Report*. https://www.imf.org/-/media/Files/Publications/GFSR/2025/April/English/text.ashx

International Monetary Fund. (2025). Global Financial Stability Report, April 2025. https://www.imf.org/-/media/files/publications/gfsr/2025/april/english/ch2.pdf

Javaheri, D., Fahmideh, M., Chizari, H., Lalbakhsh, P., & Hur, J. (2023). Cybersecurity threats in FinTech: A systematic review. *arXiv*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.01752

Jeric, J. L. (2024). Managing risks, preventing crises: A political economy account of Basel III financial regulations. *Global Economic Governance Programme Working Paper 99*. University of Oxford.

Karolyi, G. A., & Taboada, A. G. (2015). Regulatory arbitrage and cross-border bank acquisitions. *Journal of Finance*, 70(6), 2395–2450. https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.12262

Kelly, B., Pástor, Ľ., & Veronesi, P. (2016). The price of political uncertainty. *Journal of Finance, 71*(5), 2417–2480. https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.12407

Kenya Multinational Corporation Study. (2022). Regulatory and political risk in Kenya multinational strategies. *East Africa Journal of Business and Economics, 4*(2), 156–178. https://eastafricajournal.org/index.php/jbf-eha/article/download/164

Khan, H. (2023). *Dedollarization: The role of expanded BRICS and the Global South* (MPRA Paper No. 119544). University Library of Munich. https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/119544/

Kikuchi, T. (2026). The innovation tax: Generative AI adoption, productivity paradox, and systemic risk in the U.S. banking sector. *arXiv*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.02607

Kingsley, A. F., Vanden Bergh, R. G., & Bonardi, J.-P. (2012). Political markets and regulatory uncertainty. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(1), 37–55. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2010.0216

Klimek, P., Obersteiner, M., & Thurner, S. (2015). Systemic trade risk of critical resources. *Science advances*, *1*(10),

e1500522.https://arxiv.org/abs/1504.03508

Kobrin, S. J. (2017). Bricks and mortar in a borderless world. *Global Strategy Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1002/gsj.1150

Kolk, A., & Lenfant, F. (2015). Cross-sector collaboration in conflict zones: The case of multinational enterprises and corporate social responsibility. *Business & Society, 55*(1), 71–104. https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650312469658

Kolliopoulos, A. (2025). Global banking regulation in the era of the new state interventionism. *Journal of Banking Regulation*. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41261-025-00290-1

Korsah, D., Amewu, G., & Osei Achampong, K. (2024). The impact of geopolitical risks, financial stress, economic policy uncertainty on African stock markets returns and volatilities: wavelet coherence analysis. *Journal of Humanities and Applied Social Sciences*, *6*(5), 450-470.

Kubota, T. (2023). Monetary sovereignty and future global CBDC competition: A Japanese perspective. In *Changing Orders in International Economic Law* (pp. 60–70). Taylor & Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003193104-7

Lau, C. K., Soliman, A. M., Zhang, D., & Apergis, N. (2024). Emissions prices, commodity futures, equity prices, and geopolitical risks dependence structure: Implications for portfolio diversification. *Emerging Markets Finance and Trade*, *60*(14), 3237-3253.

Lee, D., Kim, J., & Park, S. (2024). Do firms increase ESG activities during periods of geopolitical risk? Evidence from Korean business groups. *Finance Research Letters, 66*, 105483. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2024.105483

Levina, A. (2024). Modern payment infrastructure of cross-border settlements between Russia and China. *E3S Web of Conferences*, 515, 04026. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202451504026

Li, P., Zhang, P., Guo, Y., & Li, J. (2024). How has the relationship between major financial markets changed during the Russia–Ukraine conflict?. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *11*(1), 1731.. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-024-04231-7

Li, Q., & Resnick, A. (2003). Reversal of fortunes: Democratic institutions and foreign direct investment inflows. *International Organization*, 57(1), 175–211. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818303571077

Lwanda, G. (2025). Africa's AI gatekeeping era. *LinkedIn*. https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/africas-ai-gatekeeping-era-strangle-continents-digital-george-lwanda-eocsf

Madan, S. (2023). *Bearing forward: Sanctions on Russia tell a familiar story* (Master's thesis). New York University. https://as.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu-as/ir/documents/Madan-S-230511-Thesis.pdf

Maina, T. (2025). Effect of central bank digital currencies on financial system stability in Kenya. *International Journal of Finance*. https://doi.org/10.47941/ijf.3113

Making Finance Work for Africa. (2024). *African Financial Sector Report*. https://www.mfw4a.org

Malatji, M. (2026). Bridging the AI divide in Sub-Saharan Africa. *arXiv*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2601.06145

Malik, A. I. (2023). The rise of the Petroyuan and the challenge to US dollar hegemony. *Strategic Studies*, 43(1). https://issi.org.pk/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/Ahmed_Ijaz_Malik_Vol_2_2023.pdf

Mans-Kemp, N., & van Zyl, S. (2021). ESG risk in African multinational expansion: An institutional investor perspective. *International Journal of Disclosure and Governance, 19*(2), 145–162. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41310-024-00262-3

Mathews, J. A., & Selden, M. (2018). China: The emergence of the Petroyuan and the challenge to US dollar hegemony. *The Asia-Pacific Journal*, 16(3), 1–3. https://apjjf.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/article-1519.pdf

Mayer, J. (2024). *De-dollarization: The global payment infrastructure and wholesale central bank digital currencies* (FMM Working Paper No. 102-2024). IMK at the Hans Boeckler Foundation. https://ideas.repec.org/p/imk/fmmpap/102-2024.html

Mejia Gallon, M. (2025). *Digital financial sanctions as economic warfare: A normative analysis through Just War Theory* (Master's thesis). Central European University.

https://www.etd.ceu.edu/2025/mejia-gallon_manuela.pdf

Mellahi, K., Frynas, J. G., Sun, P., & Siegel, D. (2016). A review of nonmarket strategy research. *Journal of Management*, 42(1), 143–173. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315617241

Mertzanis, C., & Tebourbi, I. (2025). Geopolitical risk and global green bond market growth. *European Financial Management*, *31*(1), 26-71.

Miller, C. (2022). *Chip war: The fight for the world's most critical technology*. Scribner. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chip_War

Mitsas, S., Golitsis, P., & Khudoykulov, K. (2022). Investigating the impact of geopolitical risks on the commodity futures. *Cogent Economics & Finance*, *10*(1), 2049477.

Moiseienko, A. (2023). The freezing of the Russian Central Bank's assets. *European Journal of International Law*, 34(4), 1125–1152. https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/chad060

Montesi, G., & Papiro, G. (2018). Bank stress testing: A stochastic simulation framework. *Risks*. https://doi.org/10.3390/risks6030082

Mukit, M. A., & Ali, M. H. (2025). Stock-term market impact of major cyber-attacks: Evidence for the ten most exposed insurance firms to cyber risk. *Risks, 13*(3), 46. https://doi.org/10.3390/risks13030046

Müller, J., & Kerenyi, A. (2024). The challenges of fragmentation of the international financial system—Towards a brave new world order? *Financial and Economic Review*, 23(2), 131–155. https://doi.org/10.33893/FER.2024.0008

Murinde, V. (2023). How central banks in Africa can enhance resilience to global shocks. *Centre for Global Finance*.

Mwaniki, C. R. (2019). Investigating the effects of de-risking on financial services: A case of commercial banks in Kenya (MBA research). *eRepo*. https://erepo.usiu.ac.ke/11732/5258

Natalucci, F., Qureshi, M. S., & Suntheim, F. (2024). Rising cyber threats pose serious concerns for financial stability. *IMF Blog*. https://www.imf.org/en/Blogs/Articles/2024/04/09/rising-cyber-threats-pose-serious-concerns-for-financial-stability

Natalucci, F., Qureshi, M. S., & Suntheim, F. (2024). Rising cyber threats pose serious concerns for financial stability. *IMF Blog*. https://www.imf.org/en/Blogs/Articles/2024/04/09/rising-cyber-threats-pose-serious-concerns-for-financial-stability

Neaime, S. (2016). Financial crises and contagion vulnerability of MENA stock markets. *Emerging Markets Review*, *27*, 14-35.https://www.femise.org/en/studies-and-research/financial-integration-and-shock-vulnerability-implications-for-the-cost-of-capital-in-emerging-mena-markets/

Nicolas, C., Roscovan, V., & Vlastakis, N. (2023). ESG reputation risk matters: An event study based on social media data. *arXiv*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.11571

Niepmann, F., & Shen, L. S. (2025). Geopolitical risk and global banking (International Finance Discussion Papers No. 1418). Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. https://www.federalreserve.gov/econres/ifdp/files/ifdp1418.pdf

Nölke, A. (2022). *The weaponization of global payment infrastructures: A strategic dilemma* (SAFE White Paper No. 89). Leibniz Institute for Financial Research SAFE. https://doi.org/10.48785/SAFE-WP-2022-89

Obiora, K. (2024). Should African central banks pursue digital currencies? *Brookings Institution*. https://www.brookings.edu/articles/should-african-central-banks-pursue-digital-currencies/

Oetzel, J., & Getz, K. A. (2012). Why and how might firms respond strategically to violent conflict? *Journal of International Business Studies, 43*(5), 476–495. https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2011.50

Office of Financial Research. (2017). *Cybersecurity and financial stability: Risks and resilience*. https://www.financialresearch.gov/viewpoint-papers/files/OFRvp_17-01_Cybersecurity.pdf

Ogenga, F., & Stanley, A. (2024). Regulating AI in Africa: Strategies & insights. *Wilson Center*. https://www.wilsoncenter.org/blog-post/regulating-artificial-intelligence-africa-strategies-and-insights-kenya-ghana-and-african

Okolo, C. T. (2025). AI is not Africa's savior: Avoiding technosolutionism in digital development. *Brookings Institution*. https://www.brookings.edu/articles/ai-is-not-africas-savior-avoiding-technosolutionism-in-digital-development/

Olatinsu, O. (2025). Stress testing and scenario analysis: Are current models fit? *International Journal of Finance and*

Management. https://doi.org/10.33545/26175754.2024.v7.i2g.560

Olayinka, O. M., & Adegboye, A. (2021). Weak ESG enforcement in Africa: Empirical synthesis. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment*. https://doi.org/10.1080/20430795.2021.1928347

Oluyemi, O. A. (2025). Challenging the Bretton Woods institutions. *Futurity Proceedings*, 1(1). https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17160293

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). SME resilience in global shocks. *OECD*. https://www.oecd.org

Oyetade, D., & Muzindutsi, P.-F. (2023). Country risk and financial stability: A focus on commercial banks in Africa. *Risks*, 11(11), 198. https://doi.org/10.3390/risks11110198

Ozili, P. K. (2021). Central bank digital currency research around the world: A review of literature. *Journal of Money Laundering Control*. https://ideas.repec.org/a/eme/jmlcpp/jmlc-11-2021-0126.html

Ozili, P. K. (2022). Central bank digital currencies: Agendas for future research. *Research in International Business and Finance, 62*, 101737. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ribaf.2022.101737

Ozili, P. K. (2023). A survey of central bank digital currency adoption in African countries. *Munich Personal RePEc Archive*. https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/118794/

Ozili, P. K. (2024). Central bank digital currency: What it can achieve and cannot achieve in Africa. *Munich Personal RePEc Archive*. https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/120966/

Panetta, I. C. (2024). Systemic cyber risk in the financial sector: Network analysis and resilience. In *Network Risk and Security* (pp. xxx–xxx). Springer. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-031-64916-5_8

Papa, M., Han, Z., & O'Donnell, F. (2023). The dynamics of informal institutions and counter-hegemony: Introducing a BRICS Convergence Index. *European Journal of International Relations*, 29(4), 960–989. https://doi.org/10.1177/13540661231183352

Pastor, L., & Veronesi, P. (2013). Political uncertainty and risk premia. *Journal of Financial Economics, 110*(3), 520–545. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2013.08.007

Pax Silica Initiative. (2025). *Pax Silica: Strengthening trusted supply chains*. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pax_Silica

Poledna, S., Hinteregger, A., & Thurner, S. (2016). Basel III effectiveness: Agent-based modeling of macroprudential policies. *arXiv*. https://arxiv.org/abs/1602.03505

Policy Center for the New South. (2025). *Africa in the AI–energy nexus*. https://www.policycenter.ma/sites/default/files/2025-10/PP_37-25.pdf

Pradhan, S. K., Stebunovs, V., Takáts, E., & Temesvary, J. (2025). Geopolitics meets monetary policy: Decoding their impact on cross-border bank lending. *Bank for International Settlements*. https://www.bis.org/publ/work1247.htm

Raddant, M., & Kenett, D. (2017). Interconnectedness in the global financial market. *arXiv*. https://arxiv.org/abs/1704.01028

Raddant, M., & Kenett, D. Y. (2021). Interconnectedness in the global financial market. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, *110*, 102280.

Reserve Bank of New Zealand. (2025). Stress test on geopolitical risks. https://www.reuters.com/business/finance/rbnz-stress-test-finds-top-banks-strong-against-geopolitical-risks-2025-11-02/

Reuters. (2025). Africa pioneers non-dollar payment systems. https://www.reuters.com/world/africa/under-shadow-trump-warning-africa-pioneers-non-dollar-payments-systems

Reuters. (2026, March 11). *Iran targets economic and banking interests; regional war escalates*. https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/iran-will-target-us-israeli-economic-banking-interests-region-state-media-2026-03-11/

Ricci, M. L. A., Ahokpossi, M. C., Belianska, A., Khandelwal, K., Lee, M. S., Li, M. G. B., ... & Simione, F. F. (2024). *Central bank digital currency and other digital payments in sub-Saharan Africa: a regional survey*. International Monetary Fund. https://doi.org/10.5089/9798400273025.063

S&P Global. (2024). *Top trends shaping global banking risks*. https://www.spglobal.com/_assets/documents/ratings/research/101612443.pdf

Sacco, P. L., Ciarli, T., & De Domenico, M. (2022). Global governance networks: Stability and fragility under unilateral defection. *arXiv*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.00618

Şanlısoy, S., & Çiloğlu, T. (2023). A view of the future of the metaverse economy on the basis of the global financial system: New opportunities and risks. *Journal of Corporate Governance, Insurance, and Risk Management*, *10*(1), 28-41.

Soobaroyen, T., & Ntim, C. G. (2019). ESG disclosure and institutional pressure in Africa: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Accounting in Emerging Economies, 9*(4), 515–538. https://doi.org/10.1108/JAEE-12-2018-0159

South African Reserve Bank. (2024). *Financial Stability Review*. https://www.resbank.co.za

Srouji, J., Torre, D., & Xu, Q. (2025). Should BRICS members adopt a wholesale digital payment system? *GREDEG Working Papers*, 2025-48. https://ideas.repec.org/p/gre/wpaper/2025-48.html

Stopford, J. M., & Strange, S. (1991). *Rival states, rival firms*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511599260

Sun, P., Mellahi, K., & Wood, G. (2024). Should we stay or should we exit? Dilemmas faced by multinationals under sanctioned regimes. *International Business Review, 33*(4), 101296. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2024.101296

Swift. (2016). De-risking in Africa on the rise, according to latest SWIFT data. https://www.swift.com/news-events/press-releases/de-risking-africa-rise-according-latest-swift-data

Tabachová, Z., Diem, C., Borsos, A., Burger, C., & Thurner, S. (2024). Estimating the impact of supply chain network contagion on financial stability. *Journal of Financial Stability*, *75*, 101336.https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.04865

Tabirlioğlu, İ. (2025). The New Development Bank as a vehicle of hegemonic contestation. *Global Panorama*. https://www.globalpanorama.org/en/2025/10/the-new-development-bank-as-a-vehicle-of-hegemonic-contestation/

Techno-Nationalism vs. Global Collaboration. (2022). *ResearchGate*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/377412131_Techno-Nationalism_vs_Global_Collaboration_Navigating_the_New_Reality_in_Diverse_Industries

The Proteus Group. (2024). Modern mercantilism and financial fragmentation. https://www.theproteusgroup.co.uk/journal/modern-mercantilism-financial-fragmentation

Topcu, M., & Can, U. (2025). Political stability, geopolitical risks, and bank stability. *Finance Research Letters*, *86*, 108889.

Töpfer, L. M. (2018). China's integration into the global financial system: Toward a state-led conception of global financial networks. *Dialogues in Human Geography*, *8*(3), 251-271.

Trade Law Centre. (2025). Africa's digital economy & tech growth. https://www.tralac.org/news/article/16742-tralac-daily-news-7-april-2025.html

Tran, H. T., Nguyen, T. T., & Pham, V. H. (2025). Geopolitical risk, bank regulation, and systemic risk: A cross-country analysis. *Journal of Financial Stability, 74*, 101376. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfs.2025.101376

Tran, H.-C. (2026). Brokerage in the black box: Strategic ambiguity and global AI governance. *arXiv*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2601.06412

United Nations Economic Commission for Africa. (2023). *Economic Report on Africa*. https://www.uneca.org

Vilakazi, T. (2018). How global banks "de-risking" their correspondent banking portfolios is isolating emerging African economies. *Africagrowth Agenda*, 15(4), 6–8.

Vodenska, I., & Becker, A. P. (2019). Interdependence, vulnerability and contagion in financial and economic networks. In *New Perspectives and Challenges in Econophysics and Sociophysics* (pp. 101-116). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Waliullah, M., Hossain George, M. Z., Hasan, M. T., Alam, M. K., Sumaiya, M. K. K., & Siddiqui, N. A. (2025). Assessing the influence of cybersecurity threats and risks on the adoption and growth of digital banking: A systematic literature review. *arXiv*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.22710

Wang, H. (2025). *Modeling bank systemic risk of emerging markets under geopolitical shocks: Empirical evidence from BRICS*

countries. arXiv. https://arxiv.org/abs/2512.20515

Wang, Y., Song, G., & Lu, Y. (2025). Geopolitical risk, bank regulation, and systemic risk: A cross-country analysis. *Finance Research Letters*, *76*, 106893. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2025.106893

Warren, P. (2018). Could a cyber attack cause a systemic impact in the financial sector? *Bank of England*. https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/-/media/boe/files/quarterly-bulletin/2018/could-a-cyber-attack-cause-a-systemic-impact-final-web.pdf

Wenker, K. (2022). Retail central bank digital currencies, disintermediation and financial privacy. *arXiv*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.01535

Wong, A. Y., & Fong, T. P. W. (2011). Analysing interconnectivity among economies. *Emerging Markets Review*, *12*(4), 432-442.

Wood, G. (2013). New BRICS development bank can rival the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. *Warwick Business School News*. https://www.wbs.ac.uk/news/new-brics-development-bank-can-rival-the-international-monetary-fund-imf-and-the-world-bank/

Woods, N. (2024). Stranded? The IMF in a world of rising economic nationalism. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, *40*(2), 329-338. https://academic.oup.com/oxrep/article-abstract/40/2/329/7691470

World Bank. (2016). De-risking in the financial sector. https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/financialsector/brief/de-risking-in-the-financial-sector

World Bank. (2018). Surveys probe de-risking practices. https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/financialsector/publication/world-bank-group-surveys-probe-derisking-practices

World Bank. (2022). *Africa's Pulse*. https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/africas-pulse

World Bank. (2023). Financing Africa: Through the crisis and beyond. https://www.worldbank.org/en/programs/africa-regional-studies/publication/financing-africa-through-the-crisis-and-beyond

World Economic Forum. (2024). Why Africa could host the next semiconductor ecosystem. https://www.weforum.org/stories/2024/07/why-africa-could-provide-the-next-semiconductor-ecosystem-for-the-chip-business/

Wu, X. (2017). Friendly competition for co-progressive development: The Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank vs. the Bretton Woods institutions. *Chinese Journal of International Law*, 16(1), 41–68. https://doi.org/10.1093/chinesejil/jmx023

Xu, J. (2020). *How the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank challenges the World Bank: A comparative case study of road projects in Gujarat, India*. NYU Abu Dhabi Working Paper. https://sites.nyuad.nyu.edu/jss/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/JSS_Paper_AIIB_author-confirmed.pdf

Xu, W. (2025). Financial cooperation in the SCO amid intensifying regional integration. *Economy of Regions*, 3.

Xue, F. (2025). Economic and financial cooperation between China and Russia in the context of US and EU sanctions (2014-2024). *National Research University Higher School of Economics Working Papers*. https://doi.org/10.17323/1813-8691-2025-2-89-106

Yellen, J. (2013). *Interconnectedness and systemic risk: lessons from the financial crisis and policy implications: a speech at the American Economic Association/American Finance Association Joint Luncheon, San Diego, California, January 4, 2013* (No. 631). Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (US).

Zehri, C., Ammar, L. S. B., & Youssef, W. A. B. (2025). Geopolitical risks and global capital flows: divergent vulnerabilities in emerging and advanced economies. *Eurasian Economic Review*, 1-31.

Zenios, S. A. (2026). Global payment fragmentation and small financial centres: SWIFT, Euroclear, and the BRICS challenge. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, 19(2), 138. https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm19020138

Zhang, Y., Ayoko, O. B., & Liang, Q. (2021). The joint influence of CEO succession types and CEO-TMT faultline on firm's strategic change. *Journal of business research*, *126*, 137-152.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.12.055