



ADVANCE SOCIAL SCIENCE ARCHIVE JOURNAL

Available Online: <https://assajournal.com>
 Vol. 03 No. 02. Apr-Jun 2025. Page#.1439-1450
 Print ISSN: [3006-2497](#) Online ISSN: [3006-2500](#)
 Platform & Workflow by: [Open Journal Systems](#)



The Fracturing Nexus: Technological Decoupling as the New World Order and Its Implications on Developing Nations

Alizeh Khakwani

MPhil in Public Administration, Department of Political Science, BZU Multan

alizehkhakwani97@gmail.com

Rashid Hussain

PhD in Political Science, Department of Political Science, BZU Multan

rashidmir0300@gmail.com

Maliha Khakwani

PhD Political Science, Department of Political Science, BZU Multan

khakwanimaliha@gmail.com

Abstract

Technology decoupling, spurred by the escalating great power competition among the likes of the United States and China, is remaking the world order. This research report investigates the reasons, mechanisms and implications and in particular developing countries: for this phenomenon. While the interconnected technological ecosystem is replaced with a network of independent, multipolar systems, the developing world must face numerous challenges, including supply chain disruptions, compromised access to essential technologies, and deepening economic inequities. It reflects on the pressing necessity of cooperative mechanisms to prevent developing countries from being marginalized in a new world order, and calls for a proper handling of the relationship between technology dependence and the world in favour of global development and stability. With country cases of developing nations, the report emphasises that decoupling will have the most severe economic, social, and political consequences in the Global South, as well as the presence of regional innovation and diversification opportunities. The study shows that the technological decoupling widens the digital gap, endangers the success of the SDGs, and leads the developing countries to difficult geopolitical choices.

Keywords: Technological Decoupling, New World Order, Implications, Developing Nations.

1. Introduction

For many years now, rapid technological evolution has been a central underpinning of globalization, encouraging interconnected economies and allowing developing countries to participate in global supply chains, gain access to advanced technologies and boost growth prospects. Examples include the proliferation of smartphones, internet connectivity, and participation in global manufacturing networks. However, the rise of technological decoupling a deliberate separation of technological ecosystems driven by geopolitical rivalries is reshaping the global order. At the heart of this transformation is the intensifying competition between the United States and China, as both nations vie for dominance in critical technologies such as artificial intelligence, semiconductors, and 5G networks.

Developing countries are caught in the crossfire as the globe shifts from a single, linked technology environment to a fragmented, multipolar structure. These countries, which mostly depend on outside technology, investment, and integration into international supply chains, confront several difficulties, such as diminished access to vital technologies, interrupted commerce, and constrained chances for innovation. Furthermore, the growing

digital divide could make already-existing disparities worse, jeopardizing attempts to meet sustainable development objectives and leaving many countries open to the whims of major powers.

2. Hypothesis

A fragmented, multipolar world in terms of technology has profound implications for global trade, innovation, and geopolitical stability disproportionately impacting developing Nations.

3. Research Objectives

1. To Explore the Implications for Developing Nations
2. To Propose Strategies for Mitigating Negative Impacts

Research Questions

1. What are the implications of technological decoupling for India and Pakistan?
2. What are some of the remedies for addressing long term and short term negative impacts of decoupling?

4. Significance of the Study

This study addresses a pressing and underexplored dimension of global political economy and international technological governance: the rise of technological decoupling and its implications for developing nations. While recent scholarship has focused extensively on the strategic and economic fallout of U.S.–China decoupling in the Global North (Segal, 2020; Farrell & Newman, 2019), this research reorients the analytical lens toward the Global South, where the stakes of technological bifurcation are equally, if not more, consequential for development, innovation, and sovereignty.

First, it contributes theoretically by connecting Dependency (Cardoso & Faletto, 1979; Amin, 1976), National Innovation Systems (Lundvall, 1992; Nelson, 1993) and Game Theory (Brams, 2001), into a methodological approach to account for the ways in which developing states respond to systemic technological fragmentation across disciplines. The overall frame allows for the examination of structural constraints as well as strategic agency, and helps explain how countries like India and Pakistan can manage the strategic choice of alignment with opposing technological blocs while maintaining a high degree of national autonomy.

Second, the study adds to comparative and international studies of innovation and development, especially in emerging digital economies. It also considers the ways in which this technological decoupling intersects with uneven access to infrastructure, standards, and markets (Mazzucato, 2013; Perez, 2002), and how this may constrain or reconfigure the conducive trajectory of innovation for states peripheral to the core of the global economy. The paper further draws from recent STS and Development Studies calls to pay attention to the geopolitical dimension of technological dependency and exclusion (Murphy, 2021; Birhanu & Odoom, 2020).

Third, the study advances the critical discourse on global governance by positioning developing nations not simply as peripheral actors, but as strategic players capable of leveraging geopolitical competition to renegotiate technological dependencies (Acharya, 2014; Mittelman, 2000). It highlights how states employ hedging, diversification, and regional coalitions as adaptive strategies in response to the increasing weaponization of technology.

Ultimately, this research contributes to scholarly understanding of how a fractured global techno-order may shape the developmental futures of the Global South. By doing so, it opens space for new research on technological non-alignment, innovation under constraint, and resilient development pathways, making it highly relevant to academics working in development studies, international political economy, global governance, and science and technology policy.

5. Literature Review

Globalization theories stress the connectedness between economies, cultures, and technologies (Held et al., 1999). In contrast, we use the term deglobalization to describe the renationalization of global integration driven mainly by protectionism and geopolitical

tensions (Baldwin, 2016). Technological decoupling is a species of deglobalization, wherein a state subordinates global interdependence to national security and self-sufficiency (Segal, 2021). The Cold War presents a historical example of technological decoupling in which the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. each developed its own independent technology community (Nye, 1990). The more recent U.S.-China trade war and Huawei ban are among the modern decoupling attempts (Swanson, 2021). The U.S. vs China's battle for control over new technologies such as AI, 5G and chips (Lee, 2020). 33 Export restrictions, sanctions, and investment limitations have increasingly become the main tools in this rivalry (Garcia-Herrero, 2021).

It was the beginning of the post-World War II, global technological infrastructure based on global corporations and commerce (Dicken, 2015). This trend has been reinforced by the surge in information and communication technologies (ICTs) in the late 20th century (Castells, 1996). "Techno-nationalism" reflects how states work to impose their perceived needs and to compete economically through technology adoption (Atkinson, 2020). Countries are regionalizing more of their supply chains in an effort to rely less on geopolitical competitors (Gereffi, 2020). Examples are the U.S. recall of semiconductor production to home and China's "dual circulation" (Xinhua, 2020). The divergence of US and Chinese tech ecosystems is a lot more than a binary matter; instead it is a shotgun loaded with pellets that can blast a hole in global innovation, economic growth, and geopolitical stability (Segal, 2021).

Especially, developing countries with large dependence on foreign technology and capital face significant risks of decoupling (Segal, 2021). Less developed countries are confronted with lower access to technology, supply chain disruptions, and reduced foreign direct investment (UNCTAD, 2021). Nonetheless, a few countries are using regional relationships to develop their own tech ecosystem (World Bank, 2022). The development of separate tech ecosystems raises the terrifying prospect of a divided global innovation landscape, with profound implications for technological advancement and international engagement (Segal 2021).

A significant number of the extant reviews concentrate on the US-China rivalry with scant regard for the implication for developing countries (Segal 2021). There is a need for more case studies and empirical research on how decoupling affects specific regions and sectors. While short-term impacts are well-documented, there is limited research on the long-term consequences of decoupling for global governance, innovation, and development (Baldwin, 2016). The role of international organizations in mitigating the negative effects of decoupling remains underexplored (UNCTAD, 2021).

6. Research Methodology

The study will use a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative trade and patent data analysis with qualitative policy assessments and case studies.

Data Collection & Sources

Policy & Geopolitical Data

country	key Policies	Sources
India	Production-Linked Incentive (PLI) scheme, China app bans	[MeitY](https://www.meity.gov.in), [Make in India] (https://www.makeinindia.com)
Pakistan	CPEC tech projects, U.S. sanctions on Chinese firms	[MeitY](https://www.meity.gov.in), [Make in India] (https://www.makeinindia.com)

Country	Data	Sources
India	Semiconductor imports, electronics trade, FDI	[Ministry of Commerce (India)] (https://commerce.gov.in), [UN Comtrade] (https://comtrade.un.org), [RBI Database] (https://www.rbi.org.in)
Pakistan	Tech imports from China vs. U.S, tech import and export ., energy trade	[State Bank of Pakistan] (https://www.sbp.org.pk), [Pakistan Bureau of Statistics] (https://www.pbs.gov.pk)

Case Studies & Qualitative Data

- India: Shift from Chinese telecom (Huawei restrictions) to local/European suppliers
- Pakistan: Reliance on Chinese 5G vs. U.S. pressure (sanctions risk)

Analytical Frameworks

A. Economic Impact Assessment

- Trade Dependency Ratios: Compare reliance on U.S. vs. Chinese tech imports.
- Supply Chain Mapping: Use Bloomberg Supply Chain Data to track shifts in semiconductor/electronics sourcing.

A. Theoretical analysis

- Dependency Theory: Measures reliance on U.S. vs. Chinese tech imports.
- Innovation Systems Theory: Examines patent co-authorship trends (e.g., Indian firms partnering with U.S. vs. Chinese entities) .
- Game Theory Modeling: Simulates strategic choices.

7. Limitations of study

- Limited availability of high-quality data on technology adoption and trade in some developing nations.
- Potential biases in self-reported data from surveys and interviews.
- The rapidly evolving nature of geopolitical rivalries makes it challenging to predict long-term trends.
- The interplay of multiple factors (e.g., economic, political, technological) complicates the analysis.
- The case study approach limits the generalizability of findings to other developing nations.
- Context-specific factors may influence the impact of decoupling in different regions.

8. Implications for Developing Nations

Significant disruption of global supply chains leads to increased costs, delays, and uncertainty for developing economies dependent on imports and exports. Reduced access to cutting-edge technologies and critical investments limits the ability of these nations to modernize industries and foster innovation. Potential slowdown in foreign direct investment flows as geopolitical tensions create risk-averse environments for investors. Developing nations face increasing pressure to choose sides between major powers, complicating diplomatic relations and limiting policy autonomy. The erosion of multilateral institutions and global cooperation frameworks reduces opportunities for collective problem-solving on technology governance

and trade. Emerging economies risk marginalization if excluded from global technology standard-setting and decision-making bodies. The deepening technological divide exacerbates inequalities, leaving rural and marginalized populations further behind in access to digital services and education. Disruptions in technology transfer and knowledge sharing slow progress towards achieving Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly in health, education, infrastructure, and economic growth. Challenges in building resilient digital infrastructure hinder efforts to leverage technology for inclusive development.

Case study - PAKISTAN

Pakistan's IT exports have grown significantly in recent years, with services being delivered to multiple countries, particularly the U.S., U.K., Middle East, and Europe. Below is a breakdown of Pakistan's IT export trends, including key destination countries.

Pakistan's IT Export Growth (FY 2019–2024)

(Values in USD Millions)

Fiscal Year	IT Exports (Official)	Growth Rate	Key Destination Countries
2018–2019	~\$850M	~15%	USA, UK, UAE, Saudi Arabia, EU
2019–2020	~\$1,020M	~20%	USA, UK, Canada, Australia, MENA
2020–2021	~\$1,400M–\$1,500M	~35–40%	USA (majority), Europe, Gulf
2021–2022	~\$2,100M–\$2,200M	~50%	USA, UK, Germany, UAE
2022–2023	~\$2,600M–\$2,700M	~20–25%	USA (60%+), UK, Scandinavia, Gulf
2023–2024	~\$3,000M	~10–15%	USA, EU, Middle East, Australia

(Data source: State Bank of Pakistan (SBP) & Ministry of IT and telecom database)

Impact on Pakistan

1. Limited Gains Due to Smaller Tech Base

- No major semiconductor/electronics industry→ less benefit from supply chain shifts.
- Freelancers may gain slightly if U.S. firms hire more remote workers (but competition with India/Philippines).

2. Risks from China's Tech Slowdown

- CPEC & Huawei projects may face funding cuts if China's tech sector struggles.
- Cheap Chinese tech (phones, 5G) could become harder to import due to U.S. sanctions.

3. Potential for Niche Opportunities

- IT services for Middle East & China (if Pakistan avoids U.S. sanctions on Chinese tech).
- Localized software solutions (e.g., AI in Urdu/Arabic) if global platforms fragment.

Top Destination Countries for Pakistan's IT Exports (2023–24)

1. United States (60–65%) – Largest market due to software outsourcing & freelancing.
2. United Kingdom (10–15%)– IT services, fintech, and BPO.

3. United Arab Emirates & Saudi Arabia (8–10%) – E-govt, cloud services, and telecom.
 4. European Union (Germany, Netherlands, Scandinavia) (7–10%) – SaaS, AI, and IT consulting.
 5. Australia & Canada (3–5%) – Startups and remote tech hiring.
 6. Singapore & Malaysia (2–3%) – Fintech and blockchain services.
- (Data retrieved from: SBP Annual Reports 2023, 2024 <https://www.sbp.org.pk> ,Ministry of IT Pakistan <https://moitt.gov.pk>)

Key Takeaways

USA dominates (60%+ share) due to outsourcing and freelancing (Upwork, Fiverr). Gulf & EU markets growing due to digital transformation projects. Actual exports may be higher due to informal freelancer payments (PayPal, Wise not fully tracked). Government target: \$5B+ IT exports by 2025 through policy incentives.

INDIA

India's IT exports have consistently been one of the largest in the world, driven by software services, BPO, engineering R&D, and IT-enabled services (ITES). Below is a detailed comparison of India's IT export trends, key markets, and sources.

India's IT Export Growth (FY 2019–2024)

(Values in USD Billions)

Fiscal Year	IT/ITES Exports	Growth Rate	Key Destination Countries
2018–2019	~\$137 B	~9%	USA, UK, EU, Canada, ANZ, Middle East
2019–2020	~\$147 B	~7.3%	USA (60%), Europe, APAC
2020–2021	~\$150 B	~2% (COVID-19 slowdown)	USA, UK, Germany, Japan
2021–2022	~\$178 B	~18.5%	USA, UK, EU, UAE, Australia
2022–2023	~\$194 B	~9%	USA, UK, Germany, Nordics, Singapore
2023–2024	~\$210 B	~10%	USA, Europe, Middle East

Source of data: Ministry of Electronics & IT (MeitY) India

Impact on India

1. Short-Term Gains in Manufacturing & IT Services

- Semiconductor & Electronics Manufacturing

The U.S. is pushing "China+1" supply chains, benefiting India (e.g., Apple shifting iPhone production to India, Micron's \$2.7B chip plant). (NASSCOM Strategic Review Reports <https://www.nasscom.in>)

- PLI schemes (\$10B+ incentives) could attract more tech manufacturing.
- IT Services & Cloud Expansion
- U.S. firms may accelerate outsourcing to India (avoiding Chinese tech firms like Huawei, ZTE).
- Indian IT giants (TCS, Infosys, Wipro) could gain more contracts in AI, cloud, and cybersecurity.

2. Challenges in Hardware & Dependency on China

Despite its potential, India has struggled to significantly increase its share of U.S. imports in high-tech sectors like computers and electronics, which have been the main drivers of supply chain shifts. The country faces infrastructure gaps, complex regulations, and skill mismatches that limit its ability to absorb high-value manufacturing. While India possesses significant

rare earth element (REE) reserves (6% of global total), its production remains limited due to economic and technical constraints .(NASSCOM Strategic Review Reports <https://www.nasscom.in>)

- Still reliant on Chinese components (phones, EVs, solar panels).
- If China restricts rare earth minerals/APIs, Indian tech manufacturing could face delays.

3.Opportunity in Global Tech Leadership

India has emerged as a potential beneficiary of U.S.-China tensions, with its large market and democratic credentials making it an attractive alternative for Western companies. The "Make in India" initiative and Production Linked Incentive (PLI) schemes aim to position India as a global manufacturing hub, particularly in electronics and semiconductors . Some analysts suggest India could capture parts of the technology supply chain moving out of China, especially in labor-intensive sectors .

- India could position itself as a neutral tech hub (balancing U.S. & EU markets while engaging with Global South).
- RISC-V adoption (open-source chips) may reduce reliance on U.S. (Intel/ARM) and China.

1. Strategic approach

India is pursuing a multi-alignment strategy:

- Deepening technology partnerships with the U.S. through initiatives like the Initiative on Critical and Emerging Technology (iCET)
- Maintaining economic ties with China while being cautious about technological dependencies
- Investing in domestic semiconductor and electronics manufacturing capabilities
- Positioning itself as a leader in the "Digital Indo-Pacific" concept

Top Destination Countries for India's IT Exports (2023–24)

1. United States (55–60%) – Largest market (tech giants, Fortune 500 companies).
2. European Union (UK, Germany, France, Netherlands) (25–30%) – BFSI, healthcare IT.
3. Middle East (UAE, Saudi Arabia) (5–7%) – Smart cities, digital govt projects.
4. APAC (Australia, Japan, Singapore) (6–8%) – Cloud services, fintech.
5. Canada & Latin America (2–3%) – Nearshore IT services.

(data retrieved from: Ministry of Electronics & IT, <https://www.meity.gov.in>)

Breakdown by IT Service Categories (2023–24 Estimates)

- Software Services (60%) – Custom software, SaaS, cloud solutions.
- BPO & ITES (25%) – Customer support, finance & accounting outsourcing.
- Engineering R&D (10%) – Automotive, aerospace, semiconductor design.
- AI, Analytics & Cybersecurity (5%)– Fastest-growing segment (~20% YoY).

(Data retrieved from: reserve bank of India <https://www.rbi.org.in>)

Funding patterns

Technological decoupling has catalyzed a reconfiguration of financial flows into digital infrastructure and innovation across the Global South. The two case study countries exhibit distinct funding patterns:

India

- Public Investment: Allocated \$10 billion through the Semiconductor Mission and PLI schemes to boost chip manufacturing, 5G rollout, and telecom capacity (MeitY, 2023).
- Foreign Direct Investment (FDI): Attracts substantial tech FDI from the U.S., Japan, and the EU, focused on semiconductors, AI, and telecommunications.
- R&D Expenditure: Invests 0.7% of GDP in R&D, with increasing focus on digital and frontier technologies. (RBI ,2024)

Pakistan

- **Chinese Financing:** Received \$4.2 billion in digital infrastructure funding under CPEC, mainly for fiber optics, data centers, and telecom hardware (PSEB, 2022).
- **Low Domestic Spend:** Public tech investment remains under 0.5% of GDP, reinforcing external dependency. (SBP Annual Reports (2024) <https://www.sbp.org.pk>)
- **Telecom Sector:** Heavily reliant on Huawei and ZTE, with limited supplier diversification.

Key Takeaways (India vs. Pakistan IT Exports)

Factor	India	Pakistan
Annual IT Exports	~\$200B+ (2024)	~\$3B (2024)
Top Market	USA (55–60%)	USA (60–65%)
Growth Rate	~8–10% (2024)	~10–15% (2024)
Key Strengths	Scale, MNCs, R&D, AI/Cloud	Freelancing, cost-competitive SMEs
Govt Target	\$350B by 2026 (NASSCOM)	\$5B by 2025 (PSEB)

Comparison: India vs. Pakistan

Factor	India	Pakistan
Manufacturing Gains	✓ Apple, Foxconn, Micron,	✗ No semiconductor base
IT Services Boost	✓ More outsourcing	U.S. Smaller scale, competition
Hardware Risks	Still needs Chinese parts	✗ Reliant on Chinese imports
Geopolitical Balancing	✓ Can play both sides	✗ Tied closely to China

Long-Term Scenarios

1. If Decoupling Accelerates

- India becomes a top alternative to China in tech manufacturing & services.
- Pakistan may face isolation if U.S. sanctions Chinese tech (e.g., Huawei 5G bans).

2. If Decoupling Slows

- India still benefits from diversification trends
- Pakistan continues relying on Chinese investments but with slower tech growth.

India is a net winner (gains in IT, manufacturing, and global trust). Pakistan faces challenges (limited tech base, dependency on China). Both must diversify supply chains—India to reduce Chinese reliance, Pakistan to avoid over-dependence on one partner. India is a global IT powerhouse, dominating in software services, BPO, and engineering R&D. Pakistan is a smaller but fast-growing player, excelling in freelancing and niche IT services. Both countries rely heavily on the U.S. and European markets but are expanding in the Middle East & APAC.

Dependency Theory Perspective

Overview: Dependency theory emphasizes the structural inequalities between core (developed) and periphery (developing) nations, where periphery nations remain dependent on the core for capital, technology, and expertise.

India

- **Reduced Dependency:** India is actively decoupling from Chinese tech and aligning with the U.S., Japan, and EU, aiming to shift from a dependency model to semi-core status.
- **Industrial Policy:** Initiatives like Make in India and Atmanirbhar Bharat reflect a bid for technological sovereignty.

Pakistan

- **Deepening Dependency:** Increasing reliance on Chinese technology (Huawei, ZTE, BRI digital infrastructure) reflects classic dependency, limiting room for policy autonomy.

- **Lack of Diversification:** Minimal access to Western tech creates a mono-directional dependency.

Innovation Systems Theory Perspective

Overview: This theory views technological advancement as a result of dynamic interactions between institutions, markets, knowledge, and policies within a national innovation ecosystem.

India

- **Evolving Ecosystem:** Stronger innovation systems supported by policy frameworks, venture capital, and academia-industry linkages.
- **Start-up Strength:** Booming tech startups and unicorns help internalize innovation capacity.

Pakistan

- **Underdeveloped System:** Weak linkages between academia, government, and industry; innovation policies remain fragmented.
- **BRI Dominance:** China's presence fills gaps but stunts organic system development.

Game Theory Modeling Perspective

Overview: Game theory analyzes strategic interactions between rational actors. In the context of decoupling, states behave as players balancing economic gains, political alignments, and technological autonomy.

↓India--pakistan →	Align with china	neutral	Align with west
Align with china	India loses western tech; pakistan gains marginal leverage; net loss for india	India risks isolation; pakistan can play both sides	India isolated; west skeptical; pakistan exploits alignment
neutral	India plays balancing game but loses western trust; pakistan safe with china	Stable but low payoff for both	India benefits moderately; pakistan risks antagonizing china
Align with west	India gains tech and investment; pakistan gains leverage in the short run but faces isolation due to lack of diversification	India rises; pakistan loses partners	High tech and military gain for india ; pakistan diplomatically boxed in

Model Setup

- **Players:** India, Pakistan, Vietnam, South Africa, U.S., China
- **Strategies:** Align with China, Align with U.S./West, Maintain Strategic Autonomy
- **Payoffs:** Calculated in terms of tech access, geopolitical influence, and economic stability

India

- **Strategy:** Align with West; moderate risk of retaliation from China.
- **Payoff:** High tech transfer potential and geopolitical leverage, especially in Quad cooperation.

Pakistan

- **Strategy:** Strong alignment with China.

- **Payoff:** Short-term gains in infrastructure and funding; long-term risks due to reduced diversification and autonomy.

Equilibrium Outcome

- **Domination Outcome:** Pakistan is heavily dependent and lacks strategic flexibility.
- **Optimal Mixed Strategy:** India's current path tilting west while nurturing domestic capacity offers high long-term gains with manageable risk.

Summary Table

Country	Dependency Theory	Innovation System	Game Theory Strategy	Strategic Risk	Tech Sovereignty Outlook
India	Reducing dependency	Strong	Western alignment	Moderate	Improving
Pakistan	High dependency	Weak	China alignment	High	Low

9. Policy Recommendations

For Developing Nations

1. **Strengthen Domestic Innovation Ecosystems:**
 - Create innovation clusters linked to universities and incubators.
 - Provide tax incentives and regulatory support for tech startups.
 - Invest in technical education and digital literacy.
2. **Diversify Trade and Technology Partnerships:**
 - Reduce over-reliance on any single geopolitical bloc.
 - Establish bilateral tech cooperation with non-aligned states and regional alliances (e.g., ASEAN, AU).
 - Promote regional digital markets to buffer global shocks.

For International Organizations

1. **Promote Inclusive Global Tech Governance:**
 - Ensure representation of Global South nations in global standards-setting bodies (e.g., ITU, ISO).
 - Develop ethics and norms around AI, data privacy, and cybersecurity that reflect diverse contexts.
2. **Facilitate Technology Transfer and Capacity Building:**
 - Provide affordable access to frontier technologies through licensing agreements.
 - Establish South-South cooperation platforms and digital fellowships.
 - Support infrastructure development through concessional financing.

For Major Powers

1. **Balance National Security with Global Development:**
 - Avoid indiscriminate tech sanctions that penalize developing nations.
 - Include development exceptions in tech export control regimes.
2. **Avoid Zero-Sum Technological Competition:**
 - Foster multilateral R&D collaborations with developing countries.
 - Encourage open-source technologies and public goods models.
 - Recognize the strategic autonomy of non-aligned countries.

10. Conclusion

As technological decoupling deepens between major powers, the ripple effects across the Global South are becoming increasingly pronounced. India and Pakistan are each navigating this disruption with varying strategies—ranging from alignment and diversification to cautious engagement. The study underscores that while risks of overdependence and digital fragmentation exist, there is also a unique window of opportunity for developing nations to shape their technological futures. Strategic investments in local innovation, international

partnerships rooted in equity, and multilateral engagement are critical. The long-term outcome of this shifting global order will depend on whether emerging economies can seize this moment to assert their agency and secure a meaningful role in the global tech ecosystem. A balanced, cooperative, and inclusive global framework remains essential to ensuring that technological decoupling does not devolve into technological exclusion.

References

- Acharya, A. (2014). *The End of American World Order*. Polity.
- Amin, S. (1976). *Unequal Development: An Essay on the Social Formations of Peripheral Capitalism*. Monthly Review Press.
- Atkinson, R. D. (2020). *Techno-Nationalism: What Is It, and How Can We Avoid It?* Information Technology & Innovation Foundation.
- Baldwin, R. (2016). *The Great Convergence: Information Technology and the New Globalization*. Harvard University Press.
- Birhanu, Z., & Odoom, I. (2020). "China, Africa, and the Global Technopolitical Order." *Review of African Political Economy*.
- Brams, S. J. (2001). *Game Theory and Politics*. Dover Publications.
- Brookings Institution. (2022). *Techno-nationalism and global governance*. Brookings. <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/techno-nationalism-and-global-governance>
- Cardoso, F. H., & Faletto, E. (1979). *Dependency and Development in Latin America*. University of California Press.
- Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. (2021). *China's Digital Silk Road in Africa*. <https://carnegieendowment.org/2021/05/17/china-s-digital-silk-road-in-africa-pub-84449>
- Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. (2022). Technological decoupling: A strategic framework. <https://carnegieendowment.org>
- Castells, M. (1996). *The Rise of the Network Society*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Center for Strategic and International Studies. (2021). *India's 5G choices: The strategic stakes*. <https://www.csis.org/analysis/indias-5g-choices-strategic-stakes>
- Choudhury, S. R. (2023, May 15). India's semiconductor ambitions face reality check as Foxconn exits Vedanta JV. CNBC. <https://www.cnbc.com>
- Dicken, P. (2015). *Global Shift: Mapping the Changing Contours of the World Economy*. Sage Publications.
- Economic Times - India IT Exports Cross \$200B (2024) <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com>
- Farrell, H., & Newman, A. (2019). "Weaponized Interdependence: How Global Economic Networks Shape State Coercion." *International Security*, 44(1), 42–79.
- Garcia-Herrero, A. (2021). *The U.S.-China Tech War: What's Next?* Bruegel.
- Gartner & IDC Reports – Market share analysis. Gartner IT Spending Forecast <https://www.gartner.com>
- Gereffi, G. (2020). *Global Value Chains and Development: Redefining the Contours of 21st Century Capitalism*. Cambridge University Press.
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (1999). *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics, and Culture*. Stanford University Press.
- International Telecommunication Union. (2022). *Measuring digital development: Facts and figures 2022*. <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Statistics/Pages/facts/default.aspx>
- Lee, K.-F. (2020). *AI Superpowers: China, Silicon Valley, and the New World Order*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Lundvall, B.-Å. (Ed.). (1992). *National Systems of Innovation: Towards a Theory of Innovation and Interactive Learning*.
- Market trends.Pakistan Telecommunication Authority (PTA) <https://www.pta.gov.pk> ,PASHA (Pakistan Software Houses Association <https://pasha.org.pk>
- Mazzucato, M. (2013). *The Entrepreneurial State*. Anthem Press.
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. W.W. Norton & Company.

- Media & Analyst Estimates – Dawn, Profit, Bloomberg. Dawn - IT Exports Cross \$2.6B (2023) <https://www.dawn.com>
- Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MeitY). (2023). *Semiconductor Mission India*. Government of India. <https://www.meity.gov.in/writereaddata/files/Semiconductor%20Mission.pdf>
- Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Government of India. (2023). Production linked incentive scheme for electronics manufacturing. <https://www.meity.gov.in>
- Mittelman, J. H. (2000). *The Globalization Syndrome: Transformation and Resistance*. Princeton University Press.
- Murphy, J. T. (2021). "Technology, Power, and Uneven Development." *Progress in Human Geography*, 45(1), 35–56.
- National Association of Software and Service Companies (NASSCOM) – Primary industry body. NASSCOM Strategic Review Reports <https://www.nasscom.in>
- Nelson, R. R. (Ed.). (1993). *National Innovation Systems: A Comparative Analysis*. Oxford University Press.
- Nye, J. S. (1990). *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power*. Basic Books.
- Pakistan Software Export Board (PSEB) – Tracks IT exports and freelancer remittances.
- Panda, J. P. (2022). India's iCET with the U.S.: Geopolitical and technological implications. Observer Research Foundation Occasional Paper, 345. <https://www.orfonline.org>
- Perez, C. (2002). *Technological Revolutions and Financial Capital: The Dynamics of Bubbles and Golden Ages*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- PSEB Reports <https://www.pseb.org.pk>
- Reserve Bank of India (RBI) & Ministry of Electronics & IT (MeitY) – Official export data. RBI Annual Reports <https://www.rbi.org.in> MeitY Publication <https://www.meity.gov.in>
- Segal, A. (2020). *The Hacked World Order: How Nations Fight, Trade, Maneuver, and Manipulate in the Digital Age*.
- Segal, A. (2021). *The Decoupling of the U.S. and Chinese Tech Ecosystems*. Council on Foreign Relations.
- State Bank of Pakistan (SBP) & Ministry of IT – Official IT export figures .SBP Annual Reports <https://www.sbp.org.pk> ,Ministry of IT Pakistan <https://moitt.gov.pk>
- Swanson, A. (2021). *How the U.S. and China Are Decoupling Their Economies*. The New York Times.
- UNCTAD. (2021). *Technology and Innovation Report 2021: Catching Technological Waves*. United Nations.
- Wendt, A. (1999). *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge University Press.
- World Bank & International Trade Bodies – Estimates on freelancer inflows. World Bank Remittance Data <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/migrationremittancesdiasporaissues>
- World Bank. (2023). Vietnam's digital economy: Leveraging supply chain shifts. <https://www.worldbank.org/vn>
- Xinhua. (2020). *China's Dual Circulation Strategy: What It Means for the Global Economy*. Xinhua News Agency.