The Impact of Geopolitical Conflicts on Global Tax Policies

Filipa Correia | IAFEI Co-Chair International Tax WG, Executive Director EMEA at Crowe Global
Alessandro Valente | IAFEI Co-Chair International Tax WG International Liaison Partner and International Tax & Transfer Pricing at Crowe UAE

Confrontations between countries or areas motivated by territorial, political, or economic objectives are referred to as geopolitical conflicts. These confrontations might end up as military tensions, bringing with them trade wars, sanctions and diplomatic standoffs. The consequences that these geopolitical conflicts bring are felt across the global economy, influencing potentially trade routes, resource availability, investment flows, and financial markets.

In a globalized economy, our national tax systems are deeply interdependent, because corporations tend to operate across multiple jurisdictions, supply chains stretch across different continents, and financial flows cross borders in a blink of an eye. International agreements, such as those created by the OECD for example, try to standardize tax policies but these agreements have not yet achieved their full potential.

A Glimpse to the History

One of the most inclusive examples of a big geopolitical conflict that had an important impact on tax policies can be considered the Cold War. During the Cold War, geopolitical tensions divided the world into two significantly influenced tax and trade policies, reflecting in this way the growing rivalry between the Eastern and Western blocs.

Many Western nations used corporate tax policies to promote economic growth and competitiveness. For example, the United States lowered corporate tax rates in the 1980s under President Reagan as part of a broader strategy to stimulate investment and challenge the Soviet economic model. This action was in line with more general neoliberal policies that prioritize deregulation and tax cuts to promote the expansion of the private sector. In contrast, Soviet-aligned economies maintained centralized control over taxation, focusing on state-driven economic plans. Corporate tax policies, however, were much less relevant in these economies because the state owned most of the enterprises. Trade within the bloc was also governed by agreements under entities like the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance.

With the end of the Cold War, trade between previously rival blocs expanded rapidly. The end of the Cold War also coincided with the hyper-globalization period of the 1990s and 2000s with technological innovations, unilateral and multilateral trade liberalization, and geopolitical and institutional changes all gathered to bring economic integration to levels not seen before.

Geopolitical tensions force governments to reassess their fiscal strategies due to critical questions raising: How do nations balance the need for increased revenue during conflicts with the risk of stifling economic growth? Do global tax cooperation initiatives, such as the OECD's global minimum tax, survive or weaken during geopolitical crises? How do sanctions, defense budgets, and trade disruptions reshape national and international tax frameworks?

Mechanisms of Influence

Geopolitical conflicts, from trade wars to military standoffs, have far-reaching consequences that extend beyond just diplomacy and security. Among the mainly affected sectors is the global tax landscape. These conflicts influence tax policies through a variety of mechanisms, including disruptions in trade flows, shifts in cross-border investments, and the strategic reallocation of multinational profits. Understanding these mechanisms of influence is essential to understanding the connection between global politics and economic governance.

The most common mechanism for influencing the geopolitical actors in times of conflict are sanctions, a common geopolitical tool that not only restricts trade but also destabilizes the tax bases of targeted nations by shrinking economic activity and redirecting capital to less transparent jurisdictions. At the same time, increased political risks force companies to change their operating footprints, which frequently forces governments to modify their tax structures to either minimize losses or take advantage of new opportunities. Furthermore, these actions influence negatively also the global tax collaboration, making it more difficult to tackle urgent problems like tax evasion and profit shifting.

Here is an overview of the actions by which geopolitical tensions shape global tax policies:

a) Sanctions

Sanctions disrupt tax revenues, trade flows, and fiscal stability in several connected ways, creating economic challenges for targeted nations because sanctions often restrict a country's ability to export or import goods, directly impacting trade volumes. This is particularly severe when key sectors, such as energy or technology, are targeted. Complete trade sanctions can reduce bilateral trade by as much as 90%. Additionally, trade sanctions reduce the flow of taxable economic activities, including imports and exports. For countries that rely on trade charges and tariffs, the sanctions very quickly lower the government revenue. The economic slowdown brought on by sanctions also reduces employment and business activity in general, which weakens the tax base even more.

What is more, sanctions also increase borrowing costs and limit access to international financial markets, exacerbating fiscal instability. In some cases, sanctions lead to a rise in informal or black-market activities as businesses and individuals attempt to circumvent restrictions. This shift reduces the effectiveness of tax collection mechanisms and weakens fiscal governance.

However, the effects of sanctions can lead to inflation, currency depreciation, and reduced foreign direct investment, all of which negatively affect government finances and fiscal health. In response to increasing sanctions, many countries have proactively strengthened their reserves to safeguard their stock markets against potential shocks, signaling a shift toward more resilient economic defense strategies in the face of growing geopolitical tensions.

b) Defense Spending and Taxation

Increased defense budgets during periods of conflict often necessitate changes in tax policies to secure additional government revenue. Many countries in these situations are increasing their military expenditure to upgrade and modernize their military capabilities, and the main source of state revenue is taxation. In times of crisis, when the need to increase military spending is greatest, revenue from indirect taxation can be generated swiftly and without threatening political support for the country's leadership. Indirect taxation is less obvious, requires less tax collection capability, and is therefore simpler to implement.

c) Regional Tax Alliances

Geopolitical alliances significantly influence member nations' tax policies, particularly regarding harmonization or divergence during crises. These impacts arise from collective decision-making frameworks, economic interdependencies, and the need to respond to shared challenges.

d) Disrupted Supply Chains

During geopolitical conflicts, and not only the trade routes might also become disrupted. This significantly undermines customs and VAT systems since it reduces trade volumes, increases administrative challenges, and fosters informal trade. Governments must adapt by diversifying revenue sources and improving customs enforcement to mitigate these impacts.

Consequences for Global Taxation Frameworks

In times of geopolitical conflicts, multilateral tax agreements, such as the OECD's global minimum tax initiative, can be seriously disrupted by introducing political, economic, and strategic challenges that prevent international cooperation. Countries involved in geopolitical conflicts may prioritize national sovereignty and economic strategies over global tax cooperation, viewing multilateral agreements as threats to their fiscal autonomy or competitive advantages. For instance, low-tax jurisdictions might resist uniform tax standards to maintain their appeal to multinational corporations. Moreover, geopolitical tensions, such as trade disputes or political rivalries, can erode trust among the nations, making consensus on complex tax reforms challenging.

Without trust, countries tend to hesitate to commit to agreements, fearing non-compliance or exploitation by others. This can lead to the formation of rival blocs with differing priorities, undermining the universality required for initiatives like the global minimum tax, which depends on broad international support.

As in the conflict situation, timing is the key; nations often focus on immediate economic or security concerns rather than concentrating and devoting to long-term tax collaboration efforts. In such cases, resources and political capital may be diverted to address defense or trade disputes, delaying the tax policy reforms like this.

These are just examples to demonstrate how geopolitical conflicts can impede the development, adoption, and implementation of multilateral tax agreements. For these agreements to work, a dialogue needs to exist, through which it is possible to build trust and accommodate diverse national interests to achieve effective global tax cooperation.

Conclusion

In conclusion, geopolitical wars have a far-reaching impact on the global economic and fiscal landscapes, going well beyond immediate and more obvious military and diplomatic issues. The interplay between these conflicts and tax policies brings out and shows clearly the fragility of international cooperation in times of crisis.

Defense spending, supply chain disruptions, sanctions, and regional alliances all have an impact that might disrupt the functioning of multilateral agreements like the OECD's global minimum tax proposal and calls into question currently setting up tax structures. These disruptions show weaknesses but also bring out the need for stronger methods in collaboration.

To solve emerging issues like tax evasion, profit shifting, and economic inequality, nations must keep a careful balance between the wish to preserve their sovereignty and the need to promote international cooperation. Building trust, ensuring inclusiveness, and maintaining open dialogue are critical to forging effective solutions in an interconnected yet increasingly polarized world.

Filipa Correia is Regional Executive Director for EMEA within Crowe and related firms (Crowe Valente in Milan).With a legal background from Portugal and post-graduate studies in tax law from Coimbra and SDA Bocconi, she has over 20 years of international legal and tax advisory experience. Filipa has served in senior leadership roles within Crowe and related firms, focusing on international tax policy and corporate law. She is a multilingual expert and has published articles on BEPS and global tax governance.

Alessandro Valente is International Liaison Partner for International Tax & Transfer Pricing at Crowe UAE in Dubai. With academic backgrounds in Law, Political Science, and Business Management, he has held roles in top law firms and advisory firms across Europe and the Middle East. Alessandro specializes in transfer pricing, international tax policy, and dispute resolution, and frequently speaks at global conferences. He is active in professional associations such as CFE Tax Advisers Europe and IAFEI, and has authored over 40 publications on international tax topics.