Research Article | Education | Volume : 1 | Issue : 1 | January 2026

Debt-Trap or Development? A Critical Analysis of the Geopolitical Implications of China's Belt and Road Initiative in Southeast Asia

Smt. Premalatha Munoli, Assistant Professor, Government First Grade College, Bidar. Karnataka, India

Abstract

This paper is mainly about how China's Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) is affecting the politics and development of Southeast Asia. Many people talk about it as a "debt trap" while others see it as a way for growth, but both sides are not always right. The results of BRI actually depend on many things — like what China really wants, how the local governments manage the projects, and also how big powers like the US and India are involved in the region. To understand this better, the paper looks at examples from Sri Lanka, Malaysia, and Laos. These cases show that BRI can bring real benefits like better roads and trade links, but there are also serious risks such as increasing debts, losing control over national assets, and political tensions in the area. In the end, this study talks about how the newer version of BRI, sometimes called "BRI 2.0", is trying to fix some of these issues. It also discusses what this change could mean for the future of the Indo-Pacific, especially for countries like ours that are watching these developments closely.

Keywords; *Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), Debt-Trap Diplomacy, Geopolitics, Southeast Asia, China, Infrastructure Development, ASEAN, Indo-Pacific Strategy.*

Introduction

Launched by Chinese President Xi Jinping in 2013, the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) is known as one of the biggest and boldest infrastructure and investment projects in modern times. Many people even say it is larger than the Marshall Plan which came after World War II. The main idea of BRI is to bring back the old trade routes that once connected Asia, Europe, and Africa, both by land and sea. By doing this, China hopes to make global trade more connected and change how the world economy works. Southeast Asia plays a very key role in this because of its important sea routes, especially near the Strait of Malacca, which is one of the busiest sea lanes in the world. This region is like the heart of the 21st Century Maritime Silk Road part of the BRI. As we all know, such a big project has created many debates and mixed opinions. Supporters, including China and some countries who joined, believe that BRI is a great chance for development. They say it can help reduce the huge gap in infrastructure which, according to the Asian Development Bank, needs around $1.7 trillion every year just to keep growing. On the other hand, many critics think it is not that simple. They say BRI is more like a way for China to trap poor countries in too much debt so that later, when they cannot pay back, China can ask for special Favors or control. This idea is called "Debt-Trap Diplomacy," and it was first talked about by an Indian scholar named Brahma Chellaney. But in my opinion, and what this paper tries to say, is that this "Debt-Trap or

Development" argument is too limited. It is not only one or the other. The truth is more in between. The results of BRI in Southeast Asia depend on many things. Mainly three. First, China's loans are not always managed in one clear way; they are often mixed and commercially driven. Second, it depends on how strong or weak the local government and economy of the receiving country are. Third, it is affected by the increasing competition between China and the US with its allies in the Indo-Pacific area. Because of this, the BRI acts like a mirror—it shows and sometimes even increases the problems already existing inside the countries it invests in. So, it is not about China winning or losing in one big plan. It is more about how each country handles the sudden big amount of money and the political links that come with it. This study will look at six main parts. First, it will explain the economic and political logic behind the BRI. Then, it will discuss what other researchers have said about the "debt-trap" idea. Next, it will look closely at some main BRI projects in Southeast Asia. After that, it will connect BRI to the great power rivalry going on in the region. The fifth part will talk about the updated version called "BRI 2.0." Lastly, it will give a final view on what BRI's future might look like and how it can shape the region in the long run.

Literature Review

The discussion on the Belt and Road Initiative, or what we call BRI, has become quite large and divided among many writers and experts. Most of the studies and reports can be grouped into three types. The first group supports BRI and believes it can help in development. They say that BRI is mainly a project for improving infrastructure, which is still a big need in many parts of Asia and Africa. According to them, China is helping by giving funds for roads, railways, ports, and even digital systems. This can make trade easier, bring more foreign investment, and maybe reduce poverty. This idea also matches the Chinese government's message about "win-win growth" and "shared future." In Southeast Asia, this positive view is seen when countries try to match BRI projects with the ASEAN Master Plan on Connectivity 2025, which also talks about better regional cooperation and stronger economic ties. The second group of writers and policymakers, is more doubtful about China's role. They talk about something known as the "debt-trap diplomacy" theory, first made popular by Brahma Chellaney. It says that China gives very big loans for projects that may not even succeed, just to make poor countries fall into debt. Then, when these countries cannot pay back, China gets control over their important places or asks for special favours. The case of Sri Lanka's Hambantota Port, which was given to a Chinese company for 99 years, is often used as an example of this. Many Western leaders also say that Chinese loans are not clear and could become a danger to the freedom of smaller countries.

In between these two opinions, some new researchers are now trying to give a more balanced view. They say that BRI's effect is not the same everywhere and depends on local situations, government policies, and how projects are managed. So, it is better to study it carefully, not just as good or bad, but as something that can change with conditions. Nowadays, many experts are saying that the idea of "Debt Trap Diplomacy" (DTD) by China is not fully correct. A third group of researchers believe that this story is made too simple and does not show the full picture. They argue that most of the debt problems in many Belt and Road (BRI) countries are not mainly because of China's loans, but because of their own old financial troubles and wrong use of borrowed money. For example, in the case of Sri Lanka's Hambantota Port, studies have shown that the project was actually started by the Sri Lankan government for their own political reasons. Chinese loans were only a small part of Sri Lanka's total foreign debt, and the later lease of the port was not really a "debt-for-land" deal, but a way to get more foreign money in reserve. This shows that countries like Sri Lanka also have their own power and choice in such projects, and sometimes local leaders push these big plans to gain political or economic benefit. Also, many scholars say that China's development finance system is not one big organized plan as people think. It is made up of many banks and state companies, each having their own goals and business interests. At the same time, there is also a larger view which connects the BRI to global politics. In this view, the BRI is seen as China's main plan to build a more China-centered regional order, which challenges the U.S.-led world system that came after the Cold War. In reaction to this, the United States has made its "Indo-Pacific Strategy" and other groupings like the Quad and AUKUS, to protect the idea of a "free and open" region with shared democratic values. Japan has also started its "Partnership for Quality Infrastructure" (PQI), focusing on openness and sustainability, but it still finds it hard to match China's large and fast projects. So, many writers now see the BRI not only as an economic program but also as a big part of the power struggle that will shape the global order in the 21st century.

Methodology

This paper tries to study and compare how China's Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) is affecting Southeast Asia. It mainly uses a qualitative method with case studies to look closely at the political, economic, and strategic sides of this issue. This type of study helps to understand the situation better instead of simply saying whether BRI is a "debt trap" or a "development chance." The research is mainly based on reading and collecting information from many secondary sources. I have used data from academic journals, research papers from well-known institutes like Chatham House, Lowy Institute, and Carnegie Endowment, and also reports from the World Bank, Asian Development Bank, and other official government documents. Some important statements like the US Indo-Pacific Strategy and ASEAN-China meetings were also taken into account. I also checked reliable news sources to get a clear idea of the situation.

Deconstructing the BRI's Economic and Geopolitical Logic

To really understand the impact of the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), we have to first look at its two main sides. One side is about economy, and the other is about politics and global influence. Officially, China explains BRI through what they call the "five connectivities" — policy coordination, facilities connection, free trade, financial cooperation, and people-to-people relations. On paper, this looks like a friendly plan for international development and cooperation. The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) has also accepted this idea and tried to connect its own plan called Master Plan on ASEAN Connectivity (MPAC) 2025 with BRI. This shows that both sides are interested in improving transport, trade, and regional links. From China's point of view, BRI has many important economic uses inside the country too. It helps China use its extra capacity in industries like steel and construction. It also opens new foreign markets for Chinese goods and helps in securing resources and energy supplies. Another important goal is to promote the use of China's currency, the Renminbi, in global trade. All these things help China continue its growth even when its home economy is slowing down. But BRI is not only about money and business. It is also a big part of President Xi Jinping's "China Dream", which talks about making China a strong and respected world power again. By building roads, ports, and railways in other countries, China is trying to connect more regions to its economy and slowly create a system where other countries depend more on China. This naturally challenges the old world order that was mostly led by the United States after the Cold War. Controlling key infrastructures like ports or cross-border trains also gives China some strategic advantage for both economy and even future military movements in the Indo-Pacific region. This big idea of "connectivity" has both good and bad sides for Southeast Asian countries. On one hand, the BRI brings better transport, more trade, and faster economic growth. But on the other hand, it can slowly reduce the political independence of these nations and even weaken the "centrality" of ASEAN as a group. For example, projects like the China-Laos Railway make the region's trade and travel move more towards China instead of building stronger links among ASEAN countries themselves. This makes some smaller or poorer ASEAN nations more dependent on China's help and investment. So, even though many ASEAN leaders talk positively about BRI in public, in private they also worry about losing their control and freedom in the long run. This is why the region shows a mix of feelings — some admire China's development plan, while others quietly fear its growing power.

BRI Projects and Their Geopolitical Fallout

When we look closely at some main BRI projects in different parts of the region, we can see that the results are quite mixed. Some projects are doing well, while others are facing many issues. This clearly shows that there is no single kind of BRI story for everyone. Each place has its own situation, and the results mostly depend on how the local conditions are and how the host country manages things. As we all know, in our country and also in other Asian countries, local people and their government play a big role in how any foreign project turns out. So, it becomes clear that every nation's own capacity and decision-making power shape how these projects finally perform.

While Sri Lanka is not in Southeast Asia, the Hambantota Port case is very important to understand the whole discussion about debt and China. As we all know, this project was not forced by China. It was actually supported by Sri Lankan President Mahinda Rajapaksa because he wanted to develop his own home area. Many people think it was because of Chinese loans, but in reality, the loans from China were only about 10% of Sri Lanka's total foreign debt in 2017. The final deal was also not a simple debt-for-equity swap. Instead, Sri Lanka gave a 99-year lease of the port to a Chinese company and received $1.1 billion. The government used this money to pay off other debts and increase its foreign reserves. This case shows that the country itself has a lot of say in such big projects, and things are not always as they are shown in the news.

In Malaysia, the East Coast Rail Link (ECRL) is another interesting case. It was first estimated to cost more than $13 billion and became controversial because of corruption allegations against former Prime Minister Najib Razak. After a new government came in 2018, Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad stopped the project, saying it was too expensive and the terms were not good. Later, after long talks, the project restarted but on much better terms. The cost was cut by about one-third and more opportunities were given to local companies. This shows that when the government changes and decides carefully, even big projects with China can be negotiated and improved. For Laos, a small landlocked country, the $6 billion high-speed railway from Vientiane to China could change things a lot. It can make Laos "land-linked" instead of landlocked, reduce transport time, and improve trade and tourism. But this project is very expensive compared to Laos's GDP. Now the country is in big debt, with China holding almost half of it. Many reports say that even if Laos grows fast, it will struggle to pay back without China giving debt relief. Here, the risk of debt trap is very real. It is not because China wants to trap Laos, but because of too much investment, weak governance, and unclear loan rules. Other countries in

Southeast Asia have different experiences. In Cambodia, the government welcomed China's projects like the Phnom Penh-Sihanoukville Expressway. Travel time became shorter and tourism improved. Cambodian leaders say the "debt trap" idea is wrong. In Indonesia, projects like the Jakarta-Bandung High-Speed Railway are useful, but there are problems like cost increase, land issues, and worry about Chinese workers while many local people are unemployed. In the Philippines, BRI projects during President Duterte's time gave small economic benefits. But there were also problems like illegal Chinese money coming in, especially online gambling, which created social and security issues.

Regional Responses and Strategic Competition

As we all know, the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) is not something that works alone. It is becoming a big part of the competition between countries in the Indo-Pacific region. Many big powers are watching it closely and thinking how to respond. At the same time, countries in Southeast Asia are feeling the pressure to make tough choices. Sometimes it is not easy for them, because every option has its own risks and benefits. We can commonly see that these nations are trying to balance their interests while keeping good relations with all sides. So, the BRI is not just about building roads or ports; it is also about politics, strategies, and careful planning by everyone involved.

The United States has responded to the BRI primarily through its overarching Indo-Pacific Strategy. This framework prioritizes security and governance over direct, large-scale infrastructure financing. Its core approach is to strengthen a network of alliances and partnerships—most notably the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue (Quad) with Australia, India, and Japan, and the AUKUS security pact with Australia and the United Kingdom—to uphold a "free and open" regional order. Washington has consistently framed the BRI as a source of regional instability, opaque dealings, and "predatory economics," seeking to offer a values-based alternative centered on international law and transparency. As a major traditional investor in Southeast Asian infrastructure, Japan has promoted its "Partnership for Quality Infrastructure" (PQI). Launched in 2015, this initiative emphasizes principles of transparency, long-term economic viability, debt sustainability, and high environmental and social standards. It offers a direct contrast to the perceived shortcomings of early BRI projects. Despite its strong reputation and significant financial commitments, research indicates that the BRI has successfully "crowded out" Japanese infrastructure projects in the region, particularly in key battleground countries like Cambodia, Thailand, and Indonesia, where China's speed and scale have proven highly competitive. Caught between the immense economic gravity of China and its long-standing security relationships with the United States, most Southeast Asian nations have adopted a pragmatic hedging strategy. They aim to maximize the economic benefits offered by the BRI while simultaneously maintaining robust security and diplomatic partnerships with the US and its allies to preserve their strategic autonomy and avoid over-dependence on any single power. This delicate balancing act is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain as Sino-US competition intensifies, forcing ASEAN states to navigate a complex landscape where economic and security imperatives often pull in opposite directions.

Beyond the Binary to a Contingency-Based Model and "BRI 2.0"

From what we can see, the results of China's Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) in Southeast Asia are not fixed or certain. Many things decide whether a project will help development or lead to debt problems. For example, the government in the host country, how clear and open the deal is, whether the project really makes economic sense, and if local people can take part and watch over it. Even the World Bank says that BRI can only give good results if the countries receiving money make real changes in how they manage their policies and debts. Because of criticism from other countries and some big failures, China has changed its way a bit. In 2019, at the Second Belt and Road Forum, President Xi Jinping started talking more about "high-quality," "green," and "sustainable" projects. People call this new approach "BRI 2.0." It is different from the first big projects that often made countries borrow too much money. Now, China is trying smaller, more focused projects that are easier to handle and more useful in the long run.

This new BRI is also looking at modern sectors like green energy, digital systems, and health cooperation. In Southeast Asia, we can already see China investing a lot in renewable energy, electric vehicles, and critical minerals, with countries like Thailand, Indonesia, and Malaysia becoming important hubs. This move is not just about environment or reputation. As we all know, the US and Europe are putting trade barriers on Chinese green technologies, like EVs and solar panels. So China is trying to grow in new markets and set up production in places like Southeast Asia. The region really needs money for green projects — some say around $1.5 trillion. It also has important resources, like Indonesia's nickel for EV batteries. By investing a lot here, China is not only selling its products but also setting up its technologies, standards, and supply chains in the region's economy. This can give China long-term influence in a way that is more subtle than just giving loans, and it might last longer than the first BRI projects.

Conclusion

The debate about "Debt-Trap or Development?" is very popular, and many people in our country talk about it. But, I think this idea alone cannot fully explain what is really happening with the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) in Southeast Asia. As we all know, BRI is very big and complicated, and it gives many different results. Some projects can really help countries develop and grow, but at the same time, there are big risks. Problems like heavy debt, damage to the environment, and loss of control over the country are commonly seen in countries where government and institutions are not very strong. From what I studied, the impact of BRI depends a lot on three things: what China wants, how the countries receiving help manage it, and the bigger picture of global politics. For example, Malaysia could successfully change the terms of a big project, while Laos is struggling with very heavy debt. This shows that countries are not just taking Chinese money quietly—they can also make choices, resist, and change how things happen. Now, BRI is not stopping. There is something called "BRI 2.0," which seems more careful and smarter. It tries to reduce past mistakes and focuses on new areas like green technology and digital standards. For Southeast Asian countries, the main challenge is how to balance the good opportunities from China with the need to stay independent in a world where big countries are competing a lot. In the end, the real effect of BRI will not only be seen in new railways or buildings, but in how it changes the freedom, stability, and future choices of countries in the region.

References

Abi-Habib, Maria. "How China Got Sri Lanka to Cough Up a Port." *The New York Times*, 25 June 2018,

ASEAN Secretariat. "ASEAN-China Joint Statement on Synergising the Master Plan on ASEAN Connectivity (MPAC) 2025 and the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI)." *ASEAN*, 3 Nov. 2019.

Barney, Keith, et al. "Trapped in Debt? China's Role in the Laos Economic Crisis." *Lowy Institute*, Apr. 2025.

Brautigam, Deborah. "The Chinese 'Debt Trap' Is a Myth." *The Atlantic*, 6 Feb. 2021,

Chellaney, Brahma. "China's Debt-Trap Diplomacy." *Project Syndicate*, 23 Jan. 2017.

Chheang, Vannarith. "How Has China's Belt and Road Initiative Impacted Cambodia?" *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, 13 Dec. 2023.

Du, Julan, and Yifei Zhang. "Does the 'One Belt, One Road' Initiative Promote Chinese Firms' Export?" *China Economic Review*, vol. 47, 2018.

Fulton, Jonathan. "The Gulf between the Indo-Pacific and the Belt and Road Initiative." *Regional Politics Quarterly*, vol. 3, no. 2, 2018.

Jones, Lee, and Shahar Hameiri. *Debunking the Myth of 'Debt-trap Diplomacy': How Recipient Countries Shape China's Belt and Road Initiative*. Chatham House, Aug. 2020.

Kurlantzick, Joshua. "Domestic Politics in Southeast Asia and Local Backlash Against the Belt and Road Initiative." *Foreign Policy Research Institute*, 1 Oct. 2020.

Maçães, Bruno. *Belt and Road: A Chinese World Order*. Hurst, 2019.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan. "G7 Ise-Shima Principles for Promoting Quality Infrastructure Investment." *MOFA*, 27 May 2016.

Nedopil, Christoph. "China Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) Investment Report 2023." *Green Finance & Development Center, Fudan University*, Jan. 2024.

Nishitateno, Shuhei, and Yasuyuki Todo. "Economic and Political Impacts of the Belt and Road Initiative on Western Nations in Infrastructure Investment Competitions." *RIETI Discussion Paper Series*, 25-E-034, Apr. 2025.

Parker, David, and Gabrielle Chefitz. "The Game of Loans: How China Bought Hambantota." *Center for Strategic and International Studies*, 1 July 2018.

Rana, Pradumna B., and Ji Xianbai. "Has China's 'Debt-Trap Diplomacy' Been Discredited?" *The Diplomat*, 2 Sept. 2020.

The White House. "Indo-Pacific Strategy of the United States." *The White House*, Feb. 2022.

World Bank. "Belt and Road Economics: Opportunities and Risks of Transport Corridors." *World Bank Group*, 2019.

Zou, Keyuan. "China's Belt and Road Initiative: A Preliminary Assessment." *The Copenhagen Journal of Asian Studies*, vol. 36, no. 2, 2018.