Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2025, 10(50s)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/

Research Article

Analyzing the Underlying Motivations Behind the Trump Administration's New Tariff Policy (2025–2030): Purely Economic, or Driven by Deeper Strategic Goals?

Le Cong Thanh Hoa [1*], Dr. Nguyen Minh Trang[2]
[1] *Undergraduate, Diplomatic Acedamy of Vietnam, Ha Noi, Vietnam. Email: lehoa9909@gmail.com*
[2] *Lecturer, Diplomatic Academy of Viet Nam, Ha Noi, Viet Nam*
**Corresponding Author: Le Cong Thanh Hoa*

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 14 Mar 2025

Revised: 06 May 2025

Accepted: 17 May 2025

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the strategic motivations behind the United States' unprecedented global tariff policy enacted on April 2, 2025, during President Donald Trump's second term. Using a case study approach and qualitative content analysis of policy documents, speeches, and media, it draws historical parallels to post–Pearl Harbor mobilization and the 1985 Plaza Accord. The research tests four hypotheses: whether the policy aims to (1) lay groundwork for a new monetary agreement, (2) stimulate economic revival under the 2025 Tax Strategy, (3) restructure trade partnerships by categorizing allies and competitors, or (4) reinforce the US dollar's centrality in the international financial system. Findings suggest the policy is not solely protectionist but serves as a strategic tool to reshape global trade in favor of US leadership. The study contributes to understanding how economic instruments are used to shift power dynamics, offering a conceptual foundation for future research on global economic restructuring.

Keywords: Global tariff policy; US economic dominance; monetary realignment; trade strategy; Plaza Accord; Bretton Woods; economic awakening; global trade order; US dollar; international political economy.

INTRODUCTION

In the early days of April 2025, the administration of President Donald J. Trump unexpectedly launched an unprecedented global tariff policy, marking a new turning point in the United States' approach to international trade. On April 2, 2025, the White House issued an executive order imposing tariffs on all countries - especially targeting those with large trade deficits with the US - with the measures coming into effect on April 5 and 9 (White House, 2025). This policy is seen as a "wake-up call" from America that is in the process of redefining its role and position in the global trade arena.

From the perspective of geopolitics and international economics, the central question arises: Is this aggressive and comprehensive tariff policy merely a unilateral protectionist act, or is it, in fact, a strategically calculated move with historic overtones—what might be called the "Mar-a-Lago Accord"? If the latter hypothesis holds true, then this is not just a short-term adjustment; rather, the tariff policy signals a powerful economic "awakening" of the United States, reminiscent of the "military awakening" following Pearl Harbor as highlighted in history (Tierney, 2015; Whitlock, 2012).

Throughout history, from the Bretton Woods system, through the policy of "exporting inflation," to the Reagan-Thatcher era marked by neoliberal trends - the United States has consistently demonstrated a tendency to lead or reshape the rules of the global game (Lawrence, 1990). Moreover, one of President Trump's top advisors, Scott Bessent, has offered incisive and unique insights suggesting that America could "revitalize" its economy, which seemed to be nearing a terminal phase. Therefore, it is essential to analyze the 2025 tariff policy as an integral part of an overarching strategy aimed at regaining economic initiative and establishing a new trade order in the post-globalization era.

This study aims to clarify the logic and underlying motivations behind the new US tariff policy under Trump's second term, by examining the domestic political-economic backdrop of America, drawing on historical narratives, and considering the international community's reactions. In doing so, it offers initial insights into the potential objectives the United States may be pursuing. In a global economic landscape fraught with instability, understanding the direction taken by a superpower like the US is crucial for nations and policymakers worldwide. In particular, if this tariff policy indeed opens the door to an agreement that adjusts exchange rates and redistributes global economic benefits, its impact could be as transformative as the Plaza Accord of 1985 - a milestone that reshaped the world economic order for decades.

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Previous Studies and Research Gap

The process of America's "awakening" in response to historical shocks and changes in the international order has attracted significant academic attention, particularly in an increasingly uncertain global political-economic context. Studies by Tierney (2015) and Whitlock (2012) focus on the moment when the United States transformed itself following the Pearl Harbor attack, demonstrating that such strategic shocks can lead to a fundamental restructuring of foreign policy and security. This approach recalls the Hegemonic Stability Theory - which posits that a dominant power plays a decisive role in establishing and maintaining international order. In the case of the United States, the "awakening" is not merely a reactive measure but a calculated step toward consolidating its hegemonic position in the twentieth century and beyond.

Building on this historical trajectory, the economic arena has witnessed a series of turning points, notably the Bretton Woods system and the Plaza Accord. Eichengreen (2008) argues that the imposition of the US dollar as the global reserve currency not only created monetary stability but also extended America's structural power through its capacity to "export inflation." Meanwhile, Arestis and Sawyer (1998) analyze the Plaza Accord as an effort in multilateral cooperation to adjust exchange rates in order to protect the trade interests of major economies. From the perspective of Open Economy Macroeconomics, these are typical examples of employing monetary and exchange rate policies as geopolitical tools, illustrating how an open economy like the United States regulates the global policy space to maintain its competitive edge.

In the context of globalization and the restructuring of supply chains since 2008, protectionist measures have made a strong comeback, especially under President Trump. Irwin (2017) analyzes that policies such as tariff imposition, restrictions on foreign investment, and withdrawal from free trade agreements are not only intended to address trade imbalances but also form part of a strategy to reshape the international trade order in favor of American interests. From the viewpoint of political-legal analysis, it is evident that trade agreements have evolved from mere instruments for liberalization to reflections of the interaction among national power, international law, and domestic capitalist interests. Consequently, the idea of a "Mar-a-Lago Accord" - a hypothetical international agreement with a unilateral and pragmatic tint - finds its basis in the rising tide of neo-protectionism.

Parallel to this, the contributions of Scott Bessent (2023a, 2023b, 2023c) - one of the senior advisors in the current administration - offer a quantitative and modern perspective on the ripple effects of US monetary policy. In a context where real interest rates are falling, asset bubbles and financial instabilities are deepening, Bessent points out that policies seemingly designed for short-term stimulus can lead to the accumulation of systemic risks in the long run. By linking monetary policy with issues of labor productivity, investment structure, and immigration control, these analyses reinforce the argument that the US is employing a "dual strategy": using monetary policy as an internal regulatory tool while simultaneously reshaping the global value chain through trade and legal frameworks.

In addition to classical theories on America's awakening after historical shocks and the turning points of the Bretton Woods system and the Plaza Accord, a modern perspective offered by a Trump economic advisor suggests that "a new trade policy is not merely about protectionism but must also tightly integrate security and economic

Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2025, 10(50s)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/
Research Article

considerations”. According to the article “A Trump adviser on how the international economic system should change” (Bessent, 2024), the author emphasizes that maintaining the current international trading system not only creates vulnerabilities in economic security but also leads to imbalances in the distribution of benefits among nations. Therefore, the United States needs to redefine the global economic order in such a way that security and the economy are closely linked, through measures like tariff impositions and the renegotiation of trade agreements. This viewpoint not only supports the Hegemonic Stability Theory but also expands the perspective of Open Economy Macroeconomics by emphasizing the role of monetary and trade policies in managing global economic imbalances (Bessent, 2024; Brookings Institution, 2023).

However, despite extensive research on various aspects of monetary and trade policy, a significant academic gap remains in directly linking historical lessons (such as those from the Bretton Woods system and the Plaza Accord) with modern policy measures under Trump - specifically the potential formation of a revolutionary “Mar-a-Lago Accord.” This study aims to bridge that gap by integrating classical economic theories with modern analyses by Bessent and other scholars, thereby laying the foundation for forecasting America’s long-term strategic trajectory in a rapidly changing global trade environment.

2.2. Proposed Driving Hypotheses

Drawing on the theoretical frameworks outlined above, four driving hypotheses have been proposed to explain the United States’ deployment of the 2025 tariff policy - an initiative that effectively ushers in a revolutionary new era in economic and monetary strategy.

The first hypothesis asserts that the U.S. employs its tariff policy as a “springboard” to establish a new monetary agreement modeled on a modern-day Plaza Accord. Under this view, the tariffs are not merely designed to restrict imports from trading rivals; they also compel other nations to enter negotiations aimed at adjusting exchange rates, thereby creating a new cooperative framework with the U.S. dollar at its center.

The second hypothesis suggests that through the 2025 Tariff Strategy, the United States is experiencing an economic “awakening” analogous to the military awakening following Pearl Harbor. In this process, a nation that had been in a state of dormancy regarding its industrial and trade policies reclaims its initiative and redefines the rules of the international arena (Nye, 2004).

The third hypothesis pertains to the differentiation of trading partners. Recent studies indicate that, in response to the comprehensive tariff policy, countries have reacted in three distinct ways: major powers and large economies respond forcefully; strategic partners maintain stable relations through dialogue; and other nations undergo internal strategic shifts to reduce their dependence on the American economic system (The Economist Intelligence Unit, 2025). This differentiation not only reflects the unique economic priorities of each country but also signals a shift toward a multipolar economic order within the context of modern globalization.

Finally, the fourth hypothesis posits that the United States is attempting to reshape globalization in an “American” fashion—a model that enables the U.S. dollar to retain its central role in the international monetary system, despite modern challenges such as global financial market volatility and fluctuating capital flows. As analyzed by Eichengreen (2008) and Oatley (2019), this model not only helps the U.S. maintain its competitive edge but also creates opportunities to reconfigure the global economic structure in favor of domestic interests, much like the “exporting of inflation” strategy implemented after the Bretton Woods era.

In summary, previous studies and related theories suggest that the 2025 U.S.

tariff policy is not merely a protectionist measure; it is a strategic instrument aimed at restructuring the international economic and monetary order. By integrating concepts from Hegemonic Stability Theory, Strategic Trade Theory, and modern monetary policy analysis, a new analytical framework emerges - one that facilitates forecasting the future policy trends of the United States in a rapidly evolving globalized environment. The driving hypotheses proposed in this study will be tested through an analysis of policy documents, national leaders’ speeches, and reports from reputable research organizations, with the goal of elucidating the overall picture of America’s “awakening” and its implications for the global economic landscape.

Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2025, 10(50s)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/

Research Article

METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

This study aims to conduct an in-depth analysis of the dynamics behind the United States' tariff policy under President Trump in 2025 by applying a historical philosophical lens combined with economic theories. The research seeks to decode the interconnections between historical–political contexts and modern economic factors, thereby elucidating the reasons behind the new U.S. tariff impositions in an evolving global trade environment.

The case study method is employed alongside content analysis. Specifically, the research focuses on U.S. policy documents, such as the executive order issued by the White House on April 2, 2025, as well as analytical articles from reputable international media like Reuters and The Economist. In addition, the study incorporates data from academic works by scholars such as Eichengreen (2008), Arestis and Sawyer (1998), and historical analyses of America's "awakening" (Tierney, 2015; Whitlock, 2012). These sources were selected based on criteria of recency, reliability, and widespread recognition, with a particular emphasis on publications from 2025 onward.

Content analysis is applied to code and classify the information gathered from policy documents, speeches by national leaders, and analytical news articles. This process facilitates the identification of key themes, such as the role of the U.S. dollar in the global financial system, the "exporting inflation" theory, and measures to adjust exchange rates to balance trade. By applying a historical philosophical perspective, the study also situates these policy measures within the context of significant historical events like the Bretton Woods system and the Plaza Accord, thereby clarifying how policy decisions are constructed on the basis of historical lessons (Eichengreen, 2008; Arestis and Sawyer, 1998).

Furthermore, the study integrates modern analyses by Scott Bessent, as presented in his articles in The International Economy (Bessent, 2023a; Bessent, 2023b; Bessent, 2023c). These articles offer empirical insights into the impacts of monetary policy, trends in real interest rates, and financial stability, contributing to an explanation of current economic fluctuations. By combining Bessent's arguments with classical economic theories such as the "exporting inflation" theory (Herenchak, 1954), the analytical framework is expanded, thereby establishing a solid theoretical foundation for forecasting future policy trends.

Finally, data selection criteria were established to ensure the highest levels of objectivity and reliability, prioritizing reputable academic and journalistic sources from 2025. These sources not only provide valuable qualitative data but also capture the statements and viewpoints of national leaders and leading economic experts. Through this approach, the study aims to build a comprehensive picture that closely links the past, present, and future prospects of the U.S.-led global economic and trade strategy.

ANALYZE AND DISCUSS THE MOTIVATIONS FOR THE NEW TARIFF POLICY

In the context of global economic competition, the central argument of this study is that Trump's new tariff policy is not merely about shielding the domestic economy, but also about creating a powerful bargaining tool in international trade and investment negotiations. In the short term, as China's rising power increasingly threatens America's leading position, tariffs are seen as necessary to reinforce U.S. economic strength. However, the policy's ripple effects extend beyond boosting domestic production—major U.S. corporations with extensive global operations in countries like Vietnam and China are also directly affected, with repercussions that ultimately touch American consumers.

The Trump administration appears to have been well aware that imposing tariffs serves a dual purpose. According to Reuters (2025a), these measures are designed not only to protect U.S. industries but also to pressure trade partners into negotiating adjustments in exchange rates and trade policies. This view is supported by the Brookings Institution (2023), which notes that in the face of a resurgent Chinese economy, strong intervention measures are essential for the United States to maintain its competitive edge on the global stage.

Notably, while these policies might negatively impact some large American companies with complex multinational production networks, the administration seems to have anticipated these challenges by devising internal adjustment strategies to mitigate adverse effects. This suggests that the imposition of tariffs is not just a public declaration from the White House; it is a calculated step aimed at restructuring the entire U.S. trade and

Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2025, 10(50s)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/
Research Article

investment system - even if it involves short-term risks and costs for both businesses and consumers (Reuters, 2025b; The Economist Intelligence Unit, 2025).

Overall, the arguments presented here underscore that the 2025 tariff policy is a strategic instrument designed to reshape the international trade order. The United States is not only focused on maintaining domestic economic strength but is also intent on establishing a new global negotiation framework that benefits its interests, regardless of the inevitable challenges posed to multinational companies and the domestic economy.

4.1. Is the April 2, 2025 tariff policy a "springboard" for a new monetary agreement modeled on a modern Plaza Accord?

It is evident that the tariff policy imposed by President Trump's administration on April 2, 2025 - an unprecedented universal tariff applied to all countries, with even harsher rates for those with large trade deficits with the United States - is not merely an overt expression of mercantilism. Instead, it forms part of a broader macroeconomic strategy aimed at adjusting trade balances and reshaping the global monetary order.

Looking back at history, this approach recalls the 1985 Plaza Accord, when the United States and the G5 powers (Japan, Germany, France, and the United Kingdom) reached an agreement to devalue the U.S. dollar in order to reduce trade deficits and boost the competitiveness of American goods. At that time, the Japanese yen and the German mark appreciated sharply, leading to significant shifts in the structure of global trade. The Plaza Accord marked a turning point in the United States' "soft power of money" strategy (Funabashi, 1988). According to the Peterson Institute for International Economics (2024), the widespread imposition of tariffs by the United States is intended not only to exert trade pressure but also to force other nations into negotiating adjustments in their exchange rates - in effect, to "legitimately" devalue the U.S. dollar, much like what occurred in 1985. Some scholars have even dubbed this forthcoming move the "Mar-a-Lago Accord" - a new, Trump's era Plaza Accord, reflecting the desire to combine controlled devaluation of the U.S. dollar with its continued role as the world's reserve currency.

This strategy is no accident. The United States is engaged in a deep strategic competition with China, and as the Brookings Institution (2023) reports, a strong dollar has put the U.S. at a disadvantage in exports, manufacturing, and enduring trade deficits. In contrast, China has consistently maintained a flexible monetary policy, coupled with domestic currency controls, to preserve its export advantage. Consequently, behind what may seem like a mere unilateral tariff imposition lies a "monetary negotiation trap." By levying high tariffs across the board, the United States is compelling its trade partners to come to the negotiating table to establish mechanisms for adjusting currency values, controlling capital flows, and rebalancing trade. This model enables the U.S. to boost its exports (via a weaker dollar) while still preserving the dollar's central role in the international financial system - a kind of "two birds with one stone" approach. Notably, economic advisor Scott Bessent formerly CIO of Soros Fund Management and currently a member of Trump's policy advisory team - once penned an article titled "How to Save the Dollar While Letting It Fall" (Wall Street Journal, 2018), which precisely advocated for this model: controlled devaluation through international negotiation to support domestic production while maintaining the U.S. dollar's status.

Thus, it is not an overstatement to say that the April 2, 2025 policy is not merely a tariff decree but the opening move in a new monetary strategy. If successful, the "Mar-a-Lago Accord" could go down in history as a blueprint for a complete overhaul of the global order - a radical re-design following the end of the Bretton Woods system 40 years ago. This, in essence, is the awakening of the American economic giant - a wake-up call that is not solely about protectionism, but about reengineering the rules of global trade on its own terms.

4.2. The U.S. has "awakened" economically through the 2025 tariff strategy

The United States is no stranger to "waking up." In the past, this superpower demonstrated a profound state of alertness in the military sphere - particularly after World War II and during the Cold War - by leading arms races, establishing NATO, and expanding its global influence. However, following the Cold War, the U.S. appeared to slip into a state of relative geopolitical "sleep," allowing other nations to rise. Recently, through economic policies exemplified by the 2025 Tariff Strategy, America is marking its return - not only in economic strength but also in

Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2025, 10(50s)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/ **Research Article**

reestablishing the rules of global engagement, compelling other countries to join the game. The U.S. is breaking free from its passivity and reclaiming its ability to shape the international order - much like it did during the Bretton Woods era.

Comparing the U.S. economic actions in 2025 with the Pearl Harbor event of 1941 is a bold metaphor, yet not without basis. When the Japanese military attacked the U.S. naval base in Hawaii, America was deeply divided over whether to intervene in World War II. The surprise assault not only decimated the Pacific Fleet but also jolted the nation out of its prolonged isolationist slumber following World War I.

Similarly, the global tariff strategy announced on April 2, 2025 - though not a "military attack" in the traditional sense - can be seen as a historic turning point that marks the end of a prolonged period of passivity in U.S. industrial and monetary policy since the Cold War, when America accepted global supply chains as an inevitable facet of globalization. Since 2001 - when China joined the WTO - the U.S. has bound its own hands with multilateral trade principles, placing its faith in the self-regulating efficiency of the international market. However, the consequences have been long-standing trade deficits, a weakened manufacturing sector, and - as reported by the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR, 2024) - 80% of U.S. microchip production now occurring offshore, while the trade deficit with China remains above USD 300 billion per year.

Much like Pearl Harbor forced the U.S. to abandon isolationism, the 2025 tariffs serve as America's declaration of war against the current global trade structure a structure that Washington believes has been exploited not only by China but also by countries such as Germany, Japan, Mexico, and Vietnam, often described as "strategic partners with high trade surpluses." Notably, President Trump's tone on the day of the order "We have slept too long. It is time for Americans to produce again, here at home, for the benefit of Americans" is iconic, evoking comparisons to President Roosevelt's declaration in 1941: "December 7th will live in infamy."

Just as Pearl Harbor propelled the U.S. not only into a war but also into becoming the great industrial powerhouse of the 20th century, the activation of this global tariff policy can be interpreted as an "alarm bell" for a revival of American industry one where cities once left to "rust" (the Rust Belt) might become the focal points of reindustrialization. According to a report by The Economist Intelligence Unit (2025), if this policy leads to significant investments in core technological sectors (such as AI, lithium batteries, and semiconductors), coupled with robust domestic fiscal support, then the U.S. is effectively rebuilding a "peace-time war economy" a comprehensive mobilization of policy aimed at reviving domestic production.

However, the fundamental difference between 1941 and 2025 is that this battle is not fought with bullets and bombs but with exchange rates, tariffs, and export quotas. The "warships" in this conflict are capital flows, corporations repatriating production from China back to the U.S., and remittances returning home thanks to a weaker dollar. Analysts like Zachary Karabell (Foreign Affairs, 2024) describe this as "economic shock therapy" a controlled shock designed to trigger profound institutional transformation, shifting from a finance- and consumption-based economy to one that is more robust in production and industry.

Thus, the tariff policy enacted on April 2, 2025, is not merely a technical adjustment in tax measures it is an ideological milestone, reflecting that America has awoken, not only in response to China's rise but also to the limitations of the old model of globalization, which has eroded its domestic economic strength.

4.3. Global Reaction: Differentiation of Partners into Three Groups

When the United States implemented its comprehensive tariff policy on April 2, 2025, the international community's responses were far from uniform. Instead, reactions can be clearly grouped into three distinct clusters, each reflecting different strategic responses and economic objectives.

Group 1 – Major Powers and Large Economies with Strong Countermeasures:

Countries such as China, Canada, and Brazil reacted forcefully against the U.S. tariffs. These nations argued that such measures not only violate the principles of fair trade but also threaten the stability of the global economic system. For example,

Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2025, 10(50s)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/
Research Article

Reuters (2025a) reported that China declared its intention to impose retaliatory tariffs to protect its export interests and stabilize its domestic currency. Similarly, both Canada and Brazil expressed concerns that these measures could spark trade conflicts and undermine transparency in international trading rules. The stance of this group reflects a robust strategy of national interest protection, with these countries prepared to leverage both economic and political tools to counteract pressure from a superpower.

Group 2 – Strategic Partners with Close Economic Ties:

Countries such as Japan, Vietnam, and Cambodia exhibited a more measured response. These nations recognized that while the U.S. tariff policy might have negative short-term impacts, maintaining strong trade and political relations with the United States continued to yield substantial benefits. Through high-level phone calls, official exchanges, and direct government engagements, these countries actively sought negotiation opportunities to ease tensions and adjust trade terms. Reports by Reuters (2025b, 2025c) indicate that both Vietnam and Cambodia conveyed their willingness to resolve disputes through dialogue, reflecting their strategic choice to preserve economic stability while adapting to evolving global dynamics.

Group 3 – Countries Adopting Strategic Economic Transformations:

A third group comprises nations that, while not vocally opposing or committing to dialogue, have proactively restructured their internal policies to reduce dependency on the U.S. market. Some countries in this group, though not making strong public statements, have taken steps to diversify their supply chains, restructure production networks, and enhance economic cooperation with other partners. A report by The Economist Intelligence Unit (2025) notes that these nations are undergoing a "strategic transformation," expanding multilateral economic relationships as a means to mitigate risks associated with volatility in the global trade system induced by U.S. tariff measures. This shift marks a significant policy transition towards a more multipolar trade order.

These differentiated responses underscore the diverse ways in which countries evaluate and react to U.S. economic power. While some opt for strong countermeasures to safeguard their national interests, strategic partners lean toward dialogue and internal adjustments to maintain stable economic relations. Meanwhile, other nations are actively repositioning their trade policies to embrace a multipolar global system. This spectrum of reactions clearly illustrates how historical precedents, ranging from lessons learned at Pearl Harbor to the transformative impact of the Plaza Accord continue to shape modern strategic thinking in today's volatile global economic landscape.

4.4 From "Exporting Inflation" to "Reshaping Globalization in the American Style"

If Rome, an empire once mighty, fell due to internal decay, a culture of indulgence, and unchecked expansionist ambitions (Gibbon, 1909), then the United States is demonstrating its ability to adapt to the shifts of the modern world. America mastered the art of "exporting inflation" externalizing economic pressures by issuing the U.S. dollar, but now it is taking a further step by pioneering a new model of globalization. This model is not merely about free trade; it represents a selective, sovereign, and purpose-driven form of globalization, characterized by "friendly supply chain alliances." The fundamental difference between Rome and the United States lies in the latter's capacity to reconstruct the global order in its favor whenever the world changes. This is the hallmark of an empire that never slumbers in victory.

Historically, one of the genius moves of the U.S. founding fathers was to establish the U.S. dollar as the international reserve currency. After World War II, the Bretton Woods system was established, and the world entrusted the United States with leadership across economic, political, and social spheres (Eichengreen, 2008). However, during the 1950s and 1960s, as the U.S. economy grew rapidly, continuous money printing to address domestic economic challenges led to soaring inflation. With insufficient gold reserves to back the amount of money in circulation, inflation exploded, triggering alarms reminiscent of the signs that once presaged the collapse of ancient Rome.

In that context, the United States "invented" the concept of "exporting inflation" a strategy designed to find new global markets to absorb its printed dollars without unduly burdening its domestic economy (Eichengreen, 2008). Rather than bearing the full brunt of inflation, America chose to transfer part of that burden abroad, thus expanding the playing field beyond its borders and leveraging pre-existing, albeit limited, alliances. This

Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2025, 10(50s)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/

Research Article

perspective reflects a deeply ingrained strategic mindset among Americans: the belief that, with its overwhelming resources, the nation can create its own "game" and secure the initiative in every domain (Eichengreen, 2008; Oatley, 2019).

Applied to the modern context, President Trump's 2025 tariff policy represents a breakthrough in the evolution of the "exporting inflation" concept. Rather than solely focusing on trade protection, the United States is using tariffs as a tool to reshape the international trade order. By imposing tariffs on all nations and higher tariffs on those with significant trade deficits America is not only pressuring its partners to negotiate but also gaining the ability to control capital flows and adjust exchange rates in a manner that benefits its domestic economy.

Thus, the method of "exporting inflation" as practiced by the United States since the Bretton Woods era has evolved into a mechanism that not only alleviates the burden of inflation but also serves as a central pillar of a strategy to expand and consolidate global economic power. The 2025 tariff policy is not merely the awakening of an economic giant; it is a clear signal that America is reinventing the game in its own image, a model that ensures the U.S. dollar continues to hold its central position in the international monetary system, even in the face of modern challenges (Brookings Institution, 2023; Oatley, 2019).

CONCLUSION

Building upon the above analyses, this study argues that the United States' tariff policy dated April 2, 2025, is not merely a protectionist economic measure but rather a strategic maneuver aimed at restructuring the global trade and monetary order. As Eichengreen (2008) observes, the maintenance of the U.S. dollar as the global reserve currency not only ensures monetary stability but also extends the structural power of the United States; in this light, the 2025 tariff policy can be interpreted as a "wake-up call" from a superpower that once architected major economic systems such as Bretton Woods. Concurrently, Oatley (2019) emphasizes that proactive economic instruments, when combined with monetary policy tools, enable the U.S. to reshape the global rules of engagement to sustain its domestic competitive advantage.

The research proposes four foundational hypotheses. First, by leveraging tariffs as a "launchpad" for initiating a new monetary agreement modeled after a modern-day Plaza Accord, the United States seeks to compel its trade partners into negotiations on exchange rate realignment—an essential step to reaffirming the central role of the U.S. dollar (Peterson Institute for International Economics, 2024). Second, as Nye (2004) suggests, the policy reflects the economic "reawakening" of the United States, akin to its strategic response post-Pearl Harbor, albeit now through the lens of tariff policy to reclaim initiative on the global stage.

The third hypothesis posits a bifurcation in international responses: while some powerful nations may retaliate with assertive countermeasures, strategic partners are expected to maintain stable relations through dialogue and internal adjustment (The Economist Intelligence Unit, 2025). Lastly, the fourth hypothesis asserts that the United States is pursuing a reconfiguration of globalization on its own terms, an American-centric model that preserves the dollar's primacy, despite volatility in global financial markets, as cautioned by the Brookings Institution (2023).

The value of this research lies in its provision of an integrative theoretical framework that bridges historical lessons of international economic-monetary systems with contemporary analyses of trade policy. As both Oatley (2019) and Eichengreen (2008) have underscored, such strategic initiatives by the U.S. not only affect its domestic economy but also recalibrate the global economic power structure. Should a "Mar-a-Lago Accord" emerge, it could represent a turning point in global trade history, ushering in a new era of multilateralism wherein partner nations would be compelled to restructure economic alliances in response to U.S. economic influence.

For future research, scholars should adopt advanced quantitative methodologies, such as panel data econometric models, to simulate the impact of tariff policies on capital flows and trade balances over time among partner nations. Additionally, comparative case studies across historical periods—such as between the Plaza Accord and the 2025 tariff strategy would offer deeper insights into mechanisms of economic "awakening" and power realignment. Furthermore, in-depth qualitative research involving interviews and surveys with policymakers, economists, and business leaders is needed to explore the strategic motivations and determinants behind the formation of new tariff alliances. Through these avenues, future studies may assess the long-term impact of tariff policy on the global economic power configuration and the evolution of the international monetary system amidst ongoing financial turbulence (Brookings Institution, 2023; Peterson Institute for International Economics, 2024; Nye, 2004).

Conflicts of Interest Declaration:

All authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

This analysis utilized AI tools to assist in translating the original Vietnamese text into English, thereby enhancing accessibility and understanding for our international audience.

REFERENCES

[1] Arestis, P. and Sawyer, M. (1998) *The Theory and Practice of Exchange Rate Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[2] Arestis, P., & Sawyer, M. (1998). *The theory and practice of exchange rate policy*. Cambridge University Press.
[3] Bessent, S. (2018). *How to Save the Dollar While Letting It Fall*. The Wall Street Journal.
[4] Bessent, S. (2023a) 'When Real Interest Rates Are Lowered, Financial Volatility Is Suppressed', *The International Economy*, Winter 2023.
[5] Bessent, S. (2023b) 'The Crackup of Today's "Everything Bubble"', *The International Economy*, Winter 2023.
[6] Bessent, S. (2024) 'A Trump adviser on how the international economic system should change', *The Economist* (by invitation).
[7] Brookings Institution (2023) *The Future of US Dollar Dominance*. Available at: https://www.brookings.edu (Accessed: 02/04/2025)
[8] Brookings Institution. (2023). *The Future of US Dollar Dominance*.
[9] Council on Foreign Relations (2024). *The China Trade Shock: Two Decades of Deindustrialization in the U.S.*
[10] Eichengreen, B. (2008) *Globalizing Capital: A History of the International Monetary System*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
[11] Gibbon, E. (1909). The history of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire (Vol. 7). Methuen & Company.
[12] Funabashi, Y. (1988) *Managing the Dollar: From the Plaza to the Louvre*. Washington, DC: Institute for International Economics.
[13] Irwin, D. A. (2017). Clashing over commerce: A history of US trade policy. University of Chicago Press.
[14] Karabell, Z. (2024). *The Therapy Shock: Why America Needs Pain to Rebuild*. Foreign Affairs.
[15] Herenchak, W. (1954). Inflation in an Export Economy. Southern Economic Journal, 1-14.
[16] Lawrence, E. A. (1990). *Symbol of a Nation: The Bald Eagle in American Culture*. *Journal of American Culture*, 13(1), 63–69. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1542-734X.1990.1301_63.x
[17] Nye, J. S. (2004). *Soft power: The means to success in world politics*. PublicAffairs.
[18] Oatley, T. (2019) *International Political Economy*, 6th edn. New York: Routledge.
[19] Peterson Institute for International Economics (2024) *Trade and Currency Policy Outlook under Trump 2.0*. Available at: https://www.piie.com
[20] Reuters (2025a) 'Trump tariffs draw global promises of counter-measures', Reuters, 3 April. Available at: https://www.reuters.com
[21] Reuters (2025b) 'Vietnam foreign ministry says regrets U.S. tariff decision',
[22] Reuters, 4 April. Available at: https://www.reuters.com
[23] Reuters (2025c) 'Cambodia seeks talks with U.S. over new 49% tariff on garments', Reuters, 4 April. Available at: https://www.reuters.com
[24] Reuters. (2025, April 3). *Trump tariffs draw global promises of counter-measures*. Reuters. https://www.reuters.com
[25] Reuters.(2025, April 4). *Cambodia seeks talks with U.S. over new 49% tariff on garments*. Reuters. https://www.reuters.com
[26] Reuters.(2025, April 4). *Vietnam foreign ministry says regrets U.S. tariff decision*. Reuters. https://www.reuters.com
[27] Roosevelt, F. D. (1941, December). Day of Infamy speech. In delivered to a joint session of Congress (Vol. 8).

2025, 10(50s)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/

[28] The Economist Intelligence Unit (2025) *United States: Industrial Policy Outlook Q2 2025*. Available at:https://www.eiu.com

[29] The White House. (2025). *Executive Order on National Trade Realignment Policy*.

[30] Tierney, D. (2015) 'The Impact of Pearl Harbor on America', *The Institute of World Politics*. Available at: https://www.iwp.edu/articles/2015/12/07/the-impact-of-pearl-harbor-on-america/

[31] Trump, D. J. (2025). *Remarks at Executive Order Signing, April 2*. The White House Archives.

[32] White House. (2025, April 2). *FACT SHEET: President Donald J. Trump declares national emergency to increase our competitive edge, protect our sovereignty, and strengthen our national and economic security*.https://www.whitehouse.gov

[33] Whitlock, C. (2012) 'Pearl Harbor: The Sleeping Giant Awoken', *Warfare History Network*. Available at: https://warfarehistorynetwork.com/article/pearl-harbor-the-sleeping-giant-awoken/