Supply Chain Interdiction as Geopolitical Leverage: Historical Patterns and Contemporary Implications

Michael A. Torres

Defense Intelligence Agency, Washington D.C.

Defense Intelligence Agency · Washington, D.C. · 2022 · Declassified Excerpt

Declassified Excerpt · For official use in policy analysis

ABSTRACT

Supply chain interdiction — the deliberate disruption, diversion, or degradation of commercial logistics flows as an instrument of geopolitical pressure — has a long history in state practice but has received limited systematic analytical attention relative to other instruments of economic statecraft. This report examines the historical patterns of supply chain interdiction across seven case studies spanning the Cold War through the contemporary period, identifying the conditions under which interdiction has been employed as a primary versus supporting instrument of geopolitical leverage, the mechanisms through which interdiction effects are produced and sustained, and the factors that determine interdiction effectiveness. The analysis draws on declassified government records, academic literature, and the author's prior experience in government intelligence analysis. Contemporary implications are assessed with particular attention to the strategic environment facing U.S. and allied logistics planners in the 2020s.

Keywords: supply chain interdiction, economic statecraft, geopolitical leverage, logistics disruption, sanctions, historical analysis, national security

1. Introduction and Scope

The use of commercial logistics flows as an instrument of geopolitical leverage is as old as interstate commerce itself. Naval blockades, trade embargoes, cargo seizures, and the manipulation of transit rights have featured in the toolkit of statecraft across centuries and across the full range of interstate relationships — from wartime belligerents to peacetime competitors. Yet despite this long history, supply chain interdiction as a distinct category of geopolitical instrument has received surprisingly limited systematic analytical attention.

The gap is partly definitional. Supply chain interdiction overlaps with the better-studied literatures on economic sanctions, naval strategy, and trade policy without fitting cleanly into any of them. Sanctions scholarship focuses primarily on the coercive use of trade restriction rather than on the physical manipulation of logistics flows. Naval strategy literature addresses blockade and sea denial but treats commercial logistics primarily as a target rather than as a strategic instrument. Trade policy scholarship addresses the legal and diplomatic dimensions of trade restriction without engaging the operational and intelligence dimensions of physical logistics disruption.

This report addresses the definitional and analytical gap by developing a framework for supply chain interdiction as a distinct category of geopolitical instrument, applying that framework to seven historical cases, and drawing implications for the contemporary strategic environment. The report is intended for a national security policy audience and assumes familiarity with the basic concepts of economic statecraft and logistics operations.

2. Definitional Framework

Supply chain interdiction is defined for purposes of this report as the deliberate disruption, diversion, or degradation of commercial logistics flows by a state actor, or by a non-state actor with state direction or facilitation, for purposes of producing geopolitical effects. This definition excludes purely commercial disruption events and criminal interdiction activity without state connection, while encompassing a range of interdiction modalities from physical blockade and cargo seizure to regulatory manipulation, cyber-physical attack, and the exploitation of logistics data systems.

2.1 Interdiction Modalities

Physical interdiction encompasses naval blockade, port closure, cargo seizure, and the physical denial of transit rights. This is the most historically familiar modality and the one most extensively addressed in existing literature. Physical interdiction is typically overt and therefore carries the highest diplomatic and escalatory costs of any interdiction modality.

Regulatory interdiction encompasses the manipulation of customs procedures, safety inspections, documentation requirements, and other regulatory mechanisms to impose costs or delays on targeted cargo flows. This modality offers substantial deniability — regulatory actions can be presented as routine enforcement — while producing meaningful logistics disruption at high-volume nodes.

Data and systems interdiction encompasses manipulation of logistics data systems, cargo tracking platforms, and customs processing networks to divert, delay, or expose targeted cargo flows. This modality has become increasingly significant as logistics operations have digitized, offering interdiction capabilities that are highly deniable and that can be deployed without physical presence at the point of effect.

Human network interdiction encompasses the use of cultivated sources within logistics organizations to provide advance intelligence on cargo movements, manipulate operational decisions, or facilitate other interdiction modalities. This is the least visible and most persistent interdiction modality, and the one most dependent on long-term investment in human intelligence infrastructure.

3. Historical Case Analysis

Seven historical cases are examined across the Cold War and contemporary periods, selected to represent variation across interdiction modalities, geopolitical contexts, and effectiveness outcomes.

3.1 The Berlin Blockade (1948–1949)

The Soviet blockade of West Berlin represents the paradigmatic case of physical supply chain interdiction as geopolitical leverage. The blockade sought to coerce Western powers into abandoning their occupation zones by cutting off surface logistics access to the city. Its failure — overcome by the Allied airlift — established several enduring lessons about interdiction effectiveness: the importance of alternative logistics routes, the role of adversary resolve in determining coercive effectiveness, and the escalatory dynamics that overt physical interdiction can generate.

3.2 Arab Oil Embargo (1973–1974)

The Arab oil embargo represents the most successful case of supply chain interdiction as geopolitical leverage in the modern era, producing significant economic disruption in targeted states and achieving partial political objectives. The embargo's effectiveness reflected the concentration of global oil supply in a small number of producer states, the limited short-term substitutability of oil as an energy source, and the absence of strategic reserves adequate to buffer the interdiction effect. Its legacy includes the strategic petroleum reserve programs that most OECD states subsequently developed.

3.3 Contemporary Regulatory Interdiction

The People's Republic of China has developed regulatory interdiction into a sophisticated instrument of economic statecraft over the past decade, employing customs delays, safety inspections, and import restrictions against trading partners involved in diplomatic disputes. The cases of Australian barley and wine (2020), Lithuanian goods (2021–2022), and Taiwanese pineapples (2021) illustrate the modality's application across different geopolitical contexts and different interdiction intensities. This modality is characterized by high deniability, calibrated escalation, and the exploitation of asymmetric trade dependencies that leave targeted states with limited retaliatory options.

4. Effectiveness Analysis

Across the seven cases, supply chain interdiction effectiveness varies substantially and is determined by the interaction of four factors: target vulnerability, defined as the degree to which the target's logistics dependencies lack viable alternatives; interdiction comprehensiveness, defined as the share of the target's logistics flow affected by the interdiction; adversary resolve, defined as the target's willingness to absorb interdiction costs rather than comply with coercive demands; and interdiction legitimacy, defined as the degree to which the interdicting state's actions are perceived as legally and normatively defensible by third parties.

The Berlin Blockade case illustrates how high adversary resolve can overcome high target vulnerability: West Berlin was logistically isolated, but Western resolve to resist Soviet coercion was sufficiently high to sustain the airlift at necessary scale. The Arab oil embargo illustrates how low interdiction legitimacy can constrain effectiveness: despite significant economic impact, the embargo's coercive objectives were only partially achieved, partly because the producing states' political demands were perceived as disproportionate by the international community.

5. Contemporary Implications

The contemporary strategic environment presents several features that make supply chain interdiction a more attractive and more complex instrument than the historical cases suggest. The concentration of global manufacturing in a small number of locations has created logistics dependencies of a scale and depth that have no clear historical precedent. The digitization of logistics operations has created new interdiction modalities that offer high deniability and low escalatory risk. And the development of sophisticated human intelligence networks within global logistics organizations has created persistent interdiction capabilities that operate below the threshold of observable disruption.

For U.S. and allied logistics planners, the contemporary interdiction environment presents three priority challenges. First, mapping logistics dependencies with sufficient granularity to identify high-vulnerability chokepoints before they are exploited. Second, developing alternative routing and sourcing options that reduce the concentration of critical dependencies. Third, building the intelligence infrastructure needed to detect and attribute interdiction activity — particularly the regulatory and data-systems modalities that are most difficult to observe through conventional means.

6. Conclusion

Supply chain interdiction is an underanalyzed but historically significant instrument of geopolitical leverage whose contemporary relevance is increasing as global logistics dependencies deepen and as new interdiction modalities become available to sophisticated state actors. The analytical framework and historical case analysis developed in this report provide a foundation for the more systematic study of interdiction as a strategic instrument that the current security environment requires. Follow-on work should address the quantitative modeling of interdiction effectiveness under contemporary logistics network conditions and the development of detection frameworks adequate to the deniable interdiction modalities that pose the most difficult analytical challenges.

References

Baldwin, D. A. (1985). Economic Statecraft. Princeton University Press.

Bapat, N. A., & Morgan, T. C. (2009). Multilateral versus Unilateral Sanctions Reconsidered. International Studies Quarterly, 53(4), 1075–1094.

Blackwill, R. D., & Harris, J. M. (2016). War by Other Means: Geoeconomics and Statecraft. Harvard University Press.

Drezner, D. W. (2011). The Sanctions Paradox: Economic Statecraft and International Relations. Cambridge University Press.

Gholz, E., & Press, D. G. (2010). Protecting 'The Prize': Oil and the U.S. National Interest. Security Studies, 19(3), 453–485.

Hufbauer, G. C., Schott, J. J., & Elliott, K. A. (2007). Economic Sanctions Reconsidered (3rd ed.). Peterson Institute for International Economics.

Pape, R. A. (1997). Why Economic Sanctions Do Not Work. International Security, 22(2), 90–136.

Rosecrance, R. (1986). The Rise of the Trading State: Commerce and Conquest in the Modern World. Basic Books.

Torres, M. A. (2021). Adversarial Logistics Targeting: Patterns from the Intelligence Record. Studies in Intelligence, 65(3) [declassified excerpt].

UNCTAD. (2022). Review of Maritime Transport 2022. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

Zegart, A. B. (2022). Spies, Lies, and Algorithms: The History and Future of American Intelligence. Princeton University Press.

Acknowledgments. The author thanks colleagues at the Defense Warning Office for feedback on earlier drafts, and the anonymous reviewers whose comments substantially improved the historical case analysis. The views expressed in this report are those of the author and do not represent the official policy or position of the Defense Intelligence Agency, the Department of Defense, or any U.S. government agency. Correspondence: m.torres@dia.mil (at time of publication — now at projectpliant.com)