

The Trump Doctrine in Action: An Analysis of Grand Strategy, Trade Disruption, and Geopolitical Confrontation

August 2, 2025

Note: This paper was written with the assistance of an AI writing program.

Part I: The Ideological Bedrock: "America First" as Grand Strategy

The foreign policy of the Donald Trump administration represents a deliberate and fundamental departure from the post-World War II consensus that has guided American statecraft for over seven decades. It is not, as some critics contend, an absence of strategy, but rather a coherent, if heterodox, grand strategy rooted in a nationalist worldview. This doctrine, encapsulated by the slogan "America First," rejects the core tenets of the liberal international order, viewing the global system not as a community to be led but as an arena of zero-sum competition where the United States must aggressively reassert its interests against allies and adversaries alike.¹ The apparent chaos and disruption that characterize its implementation are not accidental byproducts but are central to its methodology, designed to shatter existing norms and create coercive leverage.

1.1 The Revolt Against the Liberal Order

The Trump Doctrine is, at its core, a revolt against the "rules-based international order" that has been the central organizing principle of U.S. foreign policy since 1945 and particularly since the end of the Cold War.² Proponents of this new strategy argue that the system of multilateral institutions, free trade agreements, and collective security arrangements has disproportionately benefited other nations at the expense of American workers, industries, and national sovereignty.⁴

The "America First" slogan itself is not new; it has deep historical roots in American political discourse, tracing back to President Woodrow Wilson's 1916 neutrality campaign and later adopted by the non-interventionist America First Committee that opposed U.S. entry into World War II.⁵ Its modern revival, first by political commentator Pat Buchanan and then decisively by Donald Trump, taps into a long-standing nationalist and protectionist undercurrent in American politics.⁵

This ideological framework is given intellectual weight by key administration advisors who have spent decades critiquing globalism. Peter Navarro, a prominent trade advisor, articulated a worldview in his book *Death by China* that frames the U.S.-China relationship as an existential economic and national security struggle. Navarro argues that China has systematically employed a range of illicit and protectionist practices—from currency manipulation and intellectual property theft to illegal export subsidies and lax environmental standards—to destroy America's manufacturing base.⁶ This perspective directly informs the administration's confrontational and penalty-oriented approach to trade with Beijing.

Similarly, United States Trade Representative Robert Lighthizer, a veteran of the Reagan administration's trade disputes, advocates for a policy of "strategic decoupling" from China.¹⁰ Lighthizer views persistent trade deficits not as a benign outcome of global market forces but as a direct and harmful transfer of wealth from the United States to a geopolitical adversary.¹⁰ He argues for the aggressive use of high tariffs to force a "balanced trade" relationship, a position that underpins the administration's global tariff campaign.¹⁰ The official policy that emerges from these intellectual currents is one that seeks to ensure fair economic relationships, restore American leadership through strength, combat adversaries, and promote peace through bilateral, transactional deal-making.¹²

1.2 The World as a Zero-Sum Arena

The "America First" doctrine operates on a starkly realist and transactional view of international relations. It perceives the world as an arena of perpetual competition among nations for power and advantage.¹ In this framework, alliances are not sacrosanct partnerships based on shared values but are temporary alignments of interest, subject to constant cost-benefit analysis.¹ This worldview necessitates a strong preference for bilateral negotiations, where the economic and military might of the United States can be maximally leveraged, over multilateral forums and

agreements, which are seen as constraints on American sovereignty and power.²

A central, though widely contested by mainstream economists, tenet of this doctrine is the belief that trade deficits are inherently detrimental to national economic health and security.⁴ This conviction, which treats international trade as a zero-sum game of winners and losers, serves as the primary justification for the administration's aggressive and widespread use of tariffs. The goal is to "correct chronic trade imbalances" which are framed as a direct threat to the nation.¹⁶

This strategic framework is not without internal contradictions. The administration's rhetoric often simultaneously calls for a reduction in foreign entanglements and military deployments while also demanding a more robust and dominant military capable of unilateral action.¹⁷ This reflects a deeper tension between an isolationist impulse to withdraw from global responsibilities and a nationalist desire to project strength and dictate terms to the rest of the world. The administration's actions, from imposing tariffs on close allies to pursuing personal diplomacy with autocratic leaders, are the practical expression of this unconventional and often paradoxical grand strategy. The redefinition of the U.S. national interest is a core outcome of this doctrine. The traditional post-war focus on upholding a stable global system, nurturing alliances, and promoting democratic norms is supplanted by a narrower, more tangible set of goals: maximizing short-term economic gains, measured primarily by trade balances, and enforcing national sovereignty, measured by border control.⁴ This paradigm shift from a "global leadership" model to a "nationalist protection" model treats the health of the international order as secondary to, and at times in direct conflict with, the immediate interests of the United States.

Part II: The Weaponization of Trade: The Global Tariff Campaign

The primary instrument for the execution of the "America First" grand strategy is the tariff. The Trump administration has weaponized trade policy on an unprecedented scale, moving it from the realm of commercial regulation to the forefront of national security and international diplomacy. By employing a range of unconventional legal authorities, the administration initiated a global tariff campaign that targeted nearly every U.S. trading partner, fundamentally altering the landscape of international commerce and deliberately creating a state of sustained economic conflict to extract concessions.

2.1 The Legal Arsenal: Bypassing the Old Rules

A key feature of the tariff strategy was the circumvention of established norms and institutions, such as the World Trade Organization and congressional oversight, through the use of expansive and controversial executive powers. This approach maximized speed and unpredictability, central elements of the administration's bargaining tactics.

The primary legal tool was the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), a 1977 law typically reserved for imposing sanctions on hostile states or terrorist groups.⁴ By declaring national emergencies related to issues like the trafficking of fentanyl or threats to economic stability, the administration repurposed IEEPA to justify the imposition of broad, universal tariffs on nearly all imports.⁴ This application of IEEPA was unprecedented and formed the legal backbone of the global tariff offensive.

In addition, the administration continued and expanded the use of Section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which allows for tariffs on national security grounds. While used in the first term to target steel and aluminum, its application was broadened in the second term to include products like copper and automobiles, further blurring the line between trade policy and national defense.⁴

These executive actions immediately faced significant legal challenges. The U.S. Court of International Trade ruled that the president had exceeded his authority in using IEEPA to implement general tariffs, a decision that was appealed by the administration.⁴ Despite the legal cloud, the tariffs remained in effect pending the outcome of the appeals process, reflecting a core strategic principle: act decisively to create new facts on the ground and litigate the consequences later.²¹

2.2 The War on All Fronts: A Regional Breakdown

The tariff campaign was global in scope, beginning with a universal 10% "reciprocal" tariff that served as a baseline for all countries not subject to a specific, negotiated rate.⁴ From this foundation, the administration engaged in a series of bilateral

confrontations and negotiations, creating a complex, multi-tiered system of differentiated tariff rates.

2.2.1 The Main Event: The U.S.-China Economic Conflict

The economic relationship with China remained the central focus of the administration's trade policy. The first-term trade war, which had targeted hundreds of billions of dollars in Chinese goods, culminated in the Phase One trade deal.²³ Under this agreement, China committed to increasing its purchases of U.S. goods and services by \$200 billion over 2017 levels during 2020 and 2021.²⁶ However, China failed to meet these commitments, ultimately purchasing only 58% of the targeted amount, with significant shortfalls in the manufacturing and energy sectors.²⁶

This failure provided the justification for a much more aggressive second-term strategy. Invoking IEEPA, the administration escalated tariffs on Chinese goods to punitive levels, at one point peaking at 145% before a temporary truce lowered the rate to 30%.⁴ The justifications expanded beyond trade imbalances to include China's alleged role in the fentanyl crisis.⁴ In response, Beijing implemented retaliatory tariffs that reached as high as 125% on U.S. goods.⁴ This marked a decisive shift from a strategy of targeted leverage to one of full-scale economic confrontation aimed at achieving a "strategic decoupling" of the world's two largest economies.¹⁰

2.2.2 The Neighborhood Watch: Remaking North American Trade

The administration's approach to its closest neighbors, Canada and Mexico, demonstrated its willingness to use trade policy as a lever for non-trade objectives. During the first term, the threat of steel and aluminum tariffs was a key tool in forcing the renegotiation of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) into the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA), which secured new rules for automobile manufacturing and increased U.S. access to Canada's dairy market.²⁸

In the second term, this tactic was intensified. The administration imposed tariffs on both countries under IEEPA, citing the need for cooperation in stemming the flow of fentanyl and illegal immigration.⁴ The tariff on Canadian goods was raised from 25% to

35% after the administration deemed Ottawa's efforts insufficient.¹⁸ Mexico was granted a 90-day reprieve from a threatened tariff increase after engaging in negotiations on border security.¹⁵

A crucial nuance in this regional strategy was the role of the USMCA itself. Goods that were compliant with the agreement's rules of origin were largely exempted from the new "fentanyl tariffs".²¹ This created a complex, two-tiered trade relationship where the existing trade pact acted as both a shield for compliant industries and a source of competitive advantage for Canada and Mexico over other nations facing the full brunt of U.S. tariffs.

2.2.3 The Alliance Under Strain: The Transatlantic Trade Dispute

The administration's trade policy also created significant friction with the European Union. Building on the first-term imposition of 25% tariffs on steel and 10% on aluminum—which had prompted EU retaliation against iconic American products like bourbon, motorcycles, and blue jeans—the second term began with threats of a much broader trade war, with potential tariff rates as high as 50%.³⁵

This pressure campaign culminated in a negotiated agreement. The U.S. and EU settled on a general tariff rate of 15% on most European goods, averting the worst-case scenario.¹⁶ The deal included important carve-outs, with zero tariffs on strategic goods like aircraft and semiconductor equipment.⁴¹ However, it also demonstrated the administration's transactional approach. The punitive 50% tariffs on European steel and aluminum remained in place, and as part of the agreement, the EU committed to purchasing \$750 billion in U.S. energy products over three years—a clear example of using tariff leverage to secure a specific commercial and geopolitical outcome.²⁰

The following table provides a consolidated overview of the tariff regime implemented by the Trump administration as of August 2025, illustrating the scope and differentiated nature of the policy across key trading partners.

Country/Bloc	Baseline "Reciprocal" Tariff (%)	Additional Sectoral Tariffs	Stated Justification	Status/Deal Reached

China	30% (after truce)	N/A (high baseline)	Trade Deficit, Fentanyl, IP Theft	60-day truce on further escalation, expiring Aug 12 ⁴
European Union	15% (effective rate)	50% on Steel & Aluminum	Trade Deficit	Deal reached; includes U.S. energy purchase commitments ²⁰
Canada	35% (non-USMCA goods)	50% on Steel & Aluminum; 25% on Autos	Fentanyl Trafficking	USMCA-compliant goods largely exempt ¹⁸
Mexico	25% (non-USMCA goods)	50% on Steel & Aluminum; 25% on Autos	Fentanyl, Immigration	90-day reprieve on increase; USMCA-compliant goods exempt ¹⁵
India	25%	Unspecified penalty for Russian oil purchases	High Indian Tariffs, Trade with Russia	Negotiations ongoing ¹⁶
Japan	15%	50% on Steel & Aluminum	Trade Deficit	Deal reached ¹⁶
South Korea	15%	50% on Steel & Aluminum	Trade Deficit	Deal reached ¹⁶
United Kingdom	10%	50% on Steel & Aluminum	Minimal Trade Conflict	Deal reached ¹⁶
Switzerland	39%	N/A	Financial Opacity, Trade Circumvention	No deal; high penalty rate ¹⁶
Countries Not Listed	10%	50% on Steel & Aluminum (if applicable)	Universal Reciprocity	Baseline rate applies ²²

2.3 The Economic Reckoning: An Empirical Assessment

Despite the administration's repeated assertion that foreign countries would bear the cost of the tariffs, a strong consensus among non-partisan economic analyses concluded that the burden fell overwhelmingly on U.S. consumers and businesses. This led to measurable negative impacts on economic growth, inflation, and household purchasing power.

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) conducted a comprehensive analysis of the tariffs implemented through May 2025. It projected that while the tariffs would reduce federal budget deficits by \$2.8 trillion over a decade, they would also shrink the U.S. economy, with real GDP being 0.6% lower by 2035 than it would have been otherwise.⁴⁵ The CBO also forecast a near-term spike in inflation, estimating an increase of 0.4 percentage points annually for 2025 and 2026, which would directly erode the purchasing power of American households.⁴⁷

An analysis by the Budget Lab at Yale University projected even more severe consequences. It estimated that the full suite of 2025 tariffs would cause the overall price level to rise by 2.1% in the short run, equivalent to an income loss of \$2,800 for the average household.⁴⁹ The Yale model also predicted that the tariffs would reduce real GDP growth by 0.9 percentage points and lead to the loss of 641,000 payroll jobs in 2025 alone.⁴⁹

These macroeconomic effects were driven by direct impacts on businesses and consumers. Companies reliant on imported materials and components, such as steel, aluminum, and specialized machinery, faced sharply higher input costs.⁵⁰ For example, a 50% tariff on imported steel not only raised costs for firms that used foreign steel but also allowed domestic steel producers to raise their prices due to the lack of foreign competition, creating a cascading inflationary effect.⁵⁰ Consumers faced the prospect of significantly higher prices for a wide range of goods, with the Yale study projecting short-run price increases of 44% for shoes, 40% for apparel, and 14% for motor vehicles.⁴⁹

While the tariffs did succeed in increasing federal revenue—rising to account for an estimated 5% of total federal revenue compared to a historical average of 2%—this increase was nowhere near sufficient to fulfill the administration's suggestion of replacing income taxes with tariff revenue.⁴ The economic consensus was clear: the

tariffs functioned as a large-scale tax increase on the American economy, with the costs passed down through supply chains to the final consumer.

The following table synthesizes the findings of the leading independent economic analyses on the domestic impact of the administration's tariff policies.

Economic Indicator	Congressional Budget Office (CBO)	Yale Budget Lab (TBL)	Other Analyses
Real GDP Impact	-0.6% by 2035 ⁴⁶	-0.9 pp growth in 2025; -0.5% long-run level ⁴⁹	Penn-Wharton: -6% long-run GDP ⁴⁸
Inflation Impact	+0.4 pp annually (2025-2026) ⁴⁷	+2.1% price level (short-run) ⁴⁹	Atlanta Fed: Companies pass on 50% of costs ⁵⁰
Avg. Household Cost	Reduced purchasing power ⁴⁷	-\$2,800 income loss (short-run) ⁴⁹	-\$2,400 less than otherwise ²⁰
Job Impact	N/A	-641,000 jobs in 2025 ⁴⁹	-14,000 manufacturing jobs after April tariffs ⁵⁰

The negotiated trade agreements should be understood not as permanent resolutions but as temporary truces in an ongoing economic conflict. The strategy of retaining high sectoral tariffs, such as the 50% levy on steel and aluminum, even within broader deals, and the use of short-term pauses and deadlines, such as the 90-day reprieve for Mexico, indicates a deliberate choice to maintain constant pressure.³³ This approach preserves the administration's ability to re-escalate disputes at any time, keeping trading partners perpetually off-balance. The objective is not to create a new, stable, rules-based system, but to establish a new dynamic of continuous renegotiation where the terms of trade are subject to the shifting priorities and discretionary power of the U.S. executive.

Part III: Confronting Global Crises: Russia, Ukraine, and NATO

The Trump Doctrine's principles of transactionalism, personal diplomacy, and coercive leverage extend beyond the realm of trade and directly shape its approach to the most pressing geopolitical challenges, notably the war in Ukraine and the future of the NATO alliance. The same tactical playbook used to prosecute the global tariff campaign is deployed in the arena of high-stakes security policy, with profound and often destabilizing implications for the international order and European security.

3.1 The Putin Paradox: Personalism and Policy

The administration's policy toward Russia is marked by a significant and persistent contradiction between the president's personal rhetoric regarding Vladimir Putin and the often-hardline actions taken by the U.S. government. President Trump has a long history of expressing admiration for the Russian leader, describing him as "savvy" and a "genius" and frequently highlighting his "very, very good relationship" with him.⁵¹ This personal affinity fueled his belief that he could quickly negotiate an end to the war in Ukraine upon returning to office.⁵¹

However, this rhetoric stands in stark contrast to the administration's evolving policy. As diplomatic efforts stalled and Russian attacks on Ukraine continued, the administration's posture hardened considerably. Trump began to publicly express "disappointment" in Putin and threatened to impose "severe tariffs" on Russia, as well as secondary sanctions on countries like India and China that continue to trade with Moscow.⁴⁴ This culminated in highly visible military posturing, including the announced repositioning of two nuclear submarines in response to what were termed "highly provocative" statements by Russian officials.⁵³

This pattern of contradictory signals was established during the first term. While Trump often downplayed the threat from Moscow and publicly accepted Putin's denials of election interference, his administration implemented a wide range of sanctions against Russian individuals and entities for malign activities, including cyberattacks, human rights abuses, and actions in Ukraine and Syria.¹⁷

Former National Security Council official Fiona Hill offers a critical lens through which to understand this paradox. She argues that Putin, a master of psychological manipulation, skillfully plays to Trump's ego and desire for personal validation. In their interactions, Putin often employs subtle mockery or goading that is "completely lost in the translation," which Trump misinterprets as genuine respect or a positive rapport.⁵⁷

This dynamic suggests that the president's personal assessment of the relationship may be fundamentally disconnected from the strategic reality, allowing Putin to exploit the personal channel while continuing his aggressive policies.

3.2 Diplomacy by Ultimatum: The Strategy to End the Ukraine War

The administration's strategy for resolving the war in Ukraine eschews traditional multilateral diplomacy and sustained military support in favor of a highly personalized approach centered on public ultimatums and economic coercion. The core tactic has been to set explicit, short-term deadlines for Putin to cease hostilities and enter negotiations, backed by the threat of crippling economic consequences.⁵¹

Upon taking office, Trump vowed to end the war within 24 hours, a promise predicated on his belief in his personal negotiating prowess.⁵⁴ When this failed to materialize, he issued a 50-day deadline for Russia to reach a peace deal, threatening severe tariffs if it was not met.⁵² As Russian attacks intensified, he dramatically shortened this ultimatum to just 10 to 12 days, signaling growing impatience.⁵¹ The threatened penalties included not only direct tariffs on Russia, potentially as high as 100%, but also secondary sanctions that would target any country continuing to purchase Russian exports, particularly oil.⁵¹

This approach reflects a consistent belief that economic leverage is the ultimate tool of statecraft, applicable to any geopolitical problem. It mirrors the tariff strategy used against trade partners, applying the same logic of coercive bargaining to a major military conflict. The focus has also shifted over time. While initially appearing to place pressure on both sides, the administration's rhetoric has increasingly expressed frustration with Putin for continuing the war despite what Trump described as "respectful and nice conversations," leading him to declare, "I'm not so interested in talking anymore".⁵¹

The historical context of the first Trump administration's engagement with Ukraine is crucial. The first impeachment scandal centered on the allegation that Trump withheld congressionally approved military aid to Ukraine while pressuring President Volodymyr Zelenskyy to announce investigations into his political rival, Joe Biden.⁵⁹ This episode established a precedent for viewing Ukraine and the levers of U.S. foreign policy, such as foreign aid, as tools to be used for personal and political advantage. This history informs the second-term strategy, where the goal is to force a settlement that can be

framed as a major personal victory for the president, achieved through the unilateral application of economic power.

3.3 The Future of NATO: From Security Alliance to Business Arrangement

The Trump administration's approach to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) represents a fundamental challenge to the 75-year-old alliance. The doctrine recasts NATO not as a foundational security pact based on shared democratic values and a commitment to collective defense, but as a transactional protection arrangement in which allies are viewed as clients who have become delinquent in their payments.⁶³

The central and most persistent demand is for allies to dramatically increase their defense spending. The administration has pushed for a new target of 5% of GDP—comprising 3.5% in core military spending and 1.5% in related security areas—a significant increase from the existing 2% goal.⁶⁴ This is framed as a matter of fairness, forcing European nations to pay their "fair share" for their own defense and relieving the perceived burden on the U.S. taxpayer.⁶⁴ At a June 2025 summit in The Hague, NATO members, with the exception of Spain, formally committed to this new target, a move Trump hailed as a "monumental win for the United States".⁶⁴

More fundamentally, the administration has repeatedly cast doubt on the U.S. commitment to Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, the cornerstone of the alliance that states an attack on one member is an attack on all. Trump has explicitly stated that he might not defend allies who "don't pay" their share, effectively making the U.S. security guarantee conditional on financial contributions.⁶³ This transactional approach undermines the very principle of collective security, which relies on the unconditional credibility of the mutual defense pact.

The reaction among European leaders has been one of deep alarm and a reluctant acceptance of a new strategic reality.⁶³ There is a broad consensus that Europe must accelerate its efforts toward "strategic autonomy," increasing its own military capabilities and defense industrial capacity to be less reliant on the United States.⁶⁸ However, this has also created divisions. Countries on NATO's eastern flank, such as Poland and the Baltic states, which spend a high percentage of their GDP on defense, are profoundly concerned about the reliability of the U.S. security guarantee in the face of Russian aggression.⁶⁸ Meanwhile, other major powers like France see the situation as a vindication of their long-standing calls for a more independent

European defense posture.⁶⁸ This dynamic forces European nations into a position where they must now actively "earn" their security through financial commitments and bilateral arrangements rather than assuming it as a given within the alliance framework.⁷¹ This transactional approach to alliances weakens them, which in turn creates greater instability and potential security burdens. By questioning the credibility of Article 5, the administration reduces the deterrent effect of the alliance against potential adversaries. This uncertainty compels allies to pursue independent or fragmented security solutions, which can undermine the unity and interoperability that are NATO's greatest strengths. This fragmentation could, in turn, create a more permissive environment for aggression, potentially leading to the very type of crisis that a strong, unified NATO was designed to prevent.

Part IV: The Trump Method: Vision, Chaos, or Both?

The central question surrounding Donald Trump's foreign policy is whether its disruptive nature stems from a clear strategic vision or from a clueless and emotional approach. An in-depth analysis of his methods, decision-making style, and the testimony of former senior officials reveals that this is a false dichotomy. The Trump method is best understood as the execution of a clear, albeit radical, vision through the deliberate and systematic application of chaos. The "mess and confusion" are not a bug in the system; they are the system itself—a methodology designed to achieve the nationalist goals of the "America First" doctrine.

4.1 The "Madman Theory" as Deliberate Tactic

A core component of the Trump method is the conscious application of the "madman theory" of international relations. This theory, often associated with President Richard Nixon's foreign policy, posits that a leader can gain coercive leverage by cultivating a reputation for being irrational, unpredictable, and volatile.⁷³ The logic is that threats that would seem incredible if made by a rational actor—such as initiating a devastating trade war or escalating a military conflict—become more credible if the adversary believes the leader is "mad" enough to follow through, making concessions

seem like the more prudent option.⁷⁵

President Trump has not only practiced this theory but has also explicitly endorsed it. During trade negotiations with South Korea, he reportedly instructed his negotiators to tell their counterparts: "this guy's so crazy he could pull out any minute... if they don't give the concessions now, this crazy guy will pull out of the deal".⁷³ This approach is visible across his foreign policy: the sudden imposition of tariffs, the abrupt shifts in policy via social media, the public threats against allies, and the oscillation between bellicose rhetoric and offers of personal negotiation all serve to keep other nations off-balance and enhance his perceived unpredictability.⁷⁶

However, scholars and analysts point to significant limitations and risks associated with this strategy. Its effectiveness depends on the adversary genuinely believing the "madness" is not a performance—a belief that can be undermined if the leader is seen to back down when his bluff is called.⁷³ Furthermore, the "madman" approach can generate substantial domestic political costs. The economic disruption and diplomatic instability it creates can lead to public disapproval and opposition from business communities, which in turn can weaken the leader's actual bargaining leverage by signaling to foreign powers that his policies may not be politically sustainable.⁷⁵

4.2 The Decider: A Centralized and Personalized Foreign Policy

Decision-making within the Trump administration is highly centralized and intensely personal, revolving around the president's instincts, relationships, and moment-to-moment judgments rather than a structured, institutional process.⁷⁷ Established foreign policy bodies like the State Department are often marginalized in favor of direct, leader-to-leader diplomacy or the use of personal envoys.¹⁴ This is part of a broader effort to sideline what are seen as entrenched bureaucratic interests, with institutions like the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) targeted for significant budget cuts or dismantlement.¹²

In this personalized system, immense weight is placed on the president's personal rapport with other world leaders. Trump has consistently expressed the belief that his one-on-one relationships, particularly with powerful autocrats like Vladimir Putin or Kim Jong-un, can transcend complex geopolitical realities and produce breakthrough deals.¹⁷ As the analysis of former official Fiona Hill suggests, this focus on personal

chemistry makes the president highly susceptible to flattery and manipulation by skilled counterparts who understand how to play to his ego.⁵⁷

This style is often described by critics not as strategic unpredictability but as a reflection of "hubris and a lack of discipline," where major foreign policy decisions can be driven by mood, pique, or short-term political calculations rather than long-term strategic planning.⁷⁷ Former National Security Advisor H.R. McMaster observed that while Trump's personality enabled him to make tough, convention-breaking decisions, it also frequently "prevented him from sticking to them," leading to policy inconsistency.⁷⁹

4.3 Voices from the Inside: A Synthesis of Former Officials' Critiques

The memoirs and public statements of former senior administration officials provide a crucial window into this decision-making environment. Their accounts consistently depict an administration "at war with itself," where policy formulation was a constant struggle between a cadre of nationalist-populist advisors seeking to enable the president's disruptive instincts and a group of more traditional national security professionals attempting to impose structure and restraint.⁷⁹

H.R. McMaster describes his tenure as a "turbulent and consequential" effort to provide coherent options to a "disruptive President" while navigating a "hectic and malicious environment".⁷⁹ He recounts how some political advisors actively worked to undermine the formal national security process to advance their own narrow agendas, while some cabinet officials, disturbed by the president's behavior, focused more on trying to control him than on collaborating to develop sound policy.⁷⁹

John Bolton, a foreign policy hawk who often shared the administration's hardline goals, nevertheless became a sharp critic of its methods. His disagreements centered on what he saw as Trump's lack of a coherent strategic process and his transactional desire to make deals with adversaries like Iran and North Korea primarily for the sake of personal political credit, which Bolton viewed as a threat to U.S. national security.⁸² Bolton's departure from the administration was seen as a key moment, signaling a decisive pivot away from a policy of "maximum pressure" and toward one of personal "dealmaking".⁸³

Fiona Hill offers perhaps the most nuanced psychological and strategic critique,

particularly regarding Russia policy. She portrays a president deeply fearful of nuclear war and fixated on his personal role as a global peacemaker, yet highly susceptible to manipulation by leaders like Putin who understand his personality and motivations.⁵⁷ She describes his approach as a "Shakespearian tragedy," in which a leader who genuinely wants to achieve a grand outcome—such as the abolition of nuclear weapons—is so flawed in his methods that he is likely to produce the very opposite of what he intends.⁸⁴

The entire foreign policy apparatus is thus constructed around the persona, instincts, and perceived negotiating genius of a single individual. This makes the strategy highly brittle and non-institutional. Its success is contingent not on the soundness of its principles but on the ability of one man's performance to intimidate or persuade his counterparts. It cannot be easily replicated or sustained by the institutions of government, and its effectiveness hinges entirely on whether other world leaders are more cowed by the president's unpredictability than they are confident in their ability to wait him out, call his bluff, or exploit his well-documented personal weaknesses.

Part V: Conclusion and Strategic Outlook

5.1 A Final Verdict: The Nature of the Trump Doctrine

The foreign policy of Donald Trump is neither "clueless" nor guided by a conventional "vision." To frame it as a binary choice between chaos and strategy is to miss the central point. The analysis presented in this report demonstrates that the Trump Doctrine is the expression of a consistent, nationalist, zero-sum worldview, implemented through a highly personalized and intentionally disruptive tactical playbook. The "mess and confusion" are not accidental byproducts of an emotional or uninformed leader; they are the core of the strategy itself, designed to shatter existing norms, create uncertainty, and generate coercive leverage.

The doctrine is coherent in its goals: to reverse the perceived economic and sovereign losses suffered by the United States under the post-Cold War globalist consensus. It is also consistent in its methods: the use of bilateral pressure, the weaponization of

tariffs for both trade and non-trade objectives, and a reliance on personal brinkmanship. The ultimate success or failure of this doctrine depends less on its internal logic—which is radical but consistent—and more on the reaction of a global system unaccustomed to such a direct and sustained assault on its foundational principles. It is a high-risk, high-reward strategy that wagers the long-term stability of the international order against the prospect of short-term, tangible gains for the United States.

5.2 Recommendations for a New Global Landscape

The emergence of the Trump Doctrine necessitates a fundamental reassessment of strategy for all major international actors. The old assumptions of American leadership and the predictability of the international system no longer hold.

For U.S. Allies: The primary imperative is to build resilience through "strategic autonomy".⁶⁸ This should not be conceived as an anti-American project but as a pragmatic adaptation to a new reality. European and Asian allies should accelerate efforts to increase defense spending, enhance military interoperability, and develop the capacity to act collectively with a potentially reduced or less reliable U.S. presence. By creating a stronger, more self-sufficient pillar within alliances like NATO, they can make the alliance more valuable in the transactional calculus of the Trump administration, framing their contributions not as fulfilling an obligation but as providing a valuable service.⁷² In the economic sphere, allies should prioritize forming unified negotiating blocs, as the European Union has done, to dilute the coercive power of U.S. bilateralism.

For U.S. Adversaries: The key is to recognize that the "madman" strategy has inherent limits and vulnerabilities, most notably the risk of domestic political and economic backlash within the United States.⁷⁵ A strategy of patient, unified resistance, coupled with targeted and proportional retaliation—as demonstrated by China—may prove more effective than immediate capitulation. Adversaries should seek to exploit the frequent disconnects between the president's personal rhetoric and the more institutionalized actions of the U.S. government bureaucracy.

For U.S. Policymakers: The enduring political potency of the "America First" doctrine signals a deep and legitimate domestic discontent with the outcomes of post-Cold War foreign policy.¹⁷ A simple return to the pre-Trump consensus is likely to be

politically unsustainable. Future U.S. foreign policy, regardless of the administration, must build a new and durable domestic consensus. This will require a more explicit and convincing effort to link America's global engagement—its alliances, trade agreements, and foreign aid—to tangible economic and security benefits for American workers, families, and communities. Addressing the core domestic grievances that gave rise to the Trump Doctrine is the essential prerequisite for crafting a foreign policy that is both effective abroad and sustainable at home.

Works cited

1. Trump's "America First" is America the Small - Brookings Institution, accessed August 2, 2025, <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/trumps-america-first-is-america-the-small/>
2. Foreign policy of the second Donald Trump administration - Wikipedia, accessed August 2, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Foreign_policy_of_the_second_Donald_Trump_administration
3. America's New Grand Strategy - First Things, accessed August 2, 2025, <https://firstthings.com/americas-new-grand-strategy/>
4. Tariffs in the second Trump administration - Wikipedia, accessed August 2, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tariffs_in_the_second_Trump_administration
5. America First - Wikipedia, accessed August 2, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/America_First
6. en.wikipedia.org, accessed August 2, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Death_by_China#:~:text=Death%20by%20China%3A%20Confronting%20the.and%20abusive%20trade%20policies%2C%20to
7. Death by China - Wikipedia, accessed August 2, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Death_by_China
8. Book Review : Death By China - Literary Sojourn, accessed August 2, 2025, <https://literarysojourn.blogspot.com/2011/09/book-review-death-by-china.html>
9. Death by China: Confronting the Dragon - A Global Call to Action by Peter Navarro, Greg Autry, Paperback | Barnes & Noble®, accessed August 2, 2025, <https://www.barnesandnoble.com/w/death-by-china-peter-navarro/1101141393>
10. Trump's former trade chief says China is a threat, tariffs are necessary - CBS News, accessed August 2, 2025, <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/trump-former-trade-chief-robert-lighthizer-say-s-china-is-a-threat-tariffs-are-necessary-60-minutes-transcript/>
11. The Honorable Robert Lighthizer | Team - America First Policy Institute, accessed August 2, 2025, <https://americafirstpolicy.com/team/robertlighthizer>
12. 100 Days of an America First State Department, accessed August 2, 2025, <https://www.state.gov/releases/2025/04/100-days-of-an-america-first-state-department/>
13. America First Trade Policy - The White House, accessed August 2, 2025, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/01/america-first-trade-pol>

- [icy/](#)
14. Foreign policy of the first Donald Trump administration - Wikipedia, accessed August 2, 2025,
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Foreign_policy_of_the_first_Donald_Trump_administration
 15. Trump signs order imposing new tariffs on a number of trading partners that go into effect in 7 days, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://apnews.com/article/trump-tariffs-mexico-3b03b98296424e59c7dc19a865d21969>
 16. Trump's tariff hit: India among dozens to be impacted after new deadline - 10 key takeaways for the world from the fresh White House order, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/business/india-business/trumps-tariff-hit-india-among-dozens-to-be-impacted-after-new-deadline-10-key-takeaways-for-the-world-from-the-fresh-white-house-order/articleshow/123049596.cms>
 17. Donald Trump: Foreign Affairs | Miller Center, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://millercenter.org/president/trump/foreign-affairs>
 18. Fact Sheet: President Donald J. Trump Amends Duties to Address the Flow of Illicit Drugs Across our Northern Border - The White House, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://www.whitehouse.gov/fact-sheets/2025/07/fact-sheet-president-donald-j-trump-amends-duties-to-address-the-flow-of-illicit-drugs-across-our-northern-border/>
 19. Trump Tariffs: Tracking the Economic Impact of the Trump Trade War - Tax Foundation, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://taxfoundation.org/research/all/federal/trump-tariffs-trade-war/>
 20. What consumers can expect from import taxes as the US sets new tariff rates, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://apnews.com/article/trump-tariffs-consumers-prices-ebf959d8f8ad24bd0757d8e3693924c1>
 21. Trump 2.0 tariff tracker - Trade Compliance Resource Hub, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://www.tradecomplianceresourcehub.com/2025/07/31/trump-2-0-tariff-tracker/>
 22. Further Modifying the Reciprocal Tariff Rates - The White House, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/07/further-modifying-the-reciprocal-tariff-rates/>
 23. US-China Trade War Tariffs: An Up-to-Date Chart | PIIE, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://www.piie.com/research/piie-charts/2019/us-china-trade-war-tariffs-date-chart>
 24. A timeline of Trump's tariff actions so far | PBS News, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://www.pbs.org/newshour/economy/a-timeline-of-trumps-tariff-actions-so-far>
 25. Tariffs in the first Trump administration - Wikipedia, accessed August 2, 2025,

- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tariffs_in_the_first_Trump_administration
26. US-China phase one tracker: China's purchases of US goods | PIIE, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://www.piiie.com/research/piie-charts/us-china-phase-one-tracker-chinas-purchases-us-goods>
 27. A Timeline of the U.S.-China Trade War During Trump's Second Term - Time Magazine, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://time.com/7292207/us-china-trade-war-trump-tariffs-timeline/>
 28. 2025 United States trade war with Canada and Mexico - Wikipedia, accessed August 2, 2025,
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2025_United_States_trade_war_with_Canada_and_Mexico
 29. The future of the USMCA - Peterson Institute for International Economics, accessed August 2, 2025, <https://www.piiie.com/microsites/2025/future-usmca>
 30. UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE FACT SHEET ... - USTR, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://ustr.gov/trade-agreements/free-trade-agreements/united-states-mexico-canada-agreement/fact-sheets/modernizing>
 31. Trump orders a 35% tariff for goods from Canada, citing a lack of cooperation on illicit drugs, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://apnews.com/article/canada-tariffs-drugs-trade-7d331082f313df53c9ad66271ae8a628>
 32. Trump escalates Canada tariffs to 35% while setting new tariff rates for dozens of other countries - Fox Business, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://www.foxbusiness.com/politics/trump-escalates-canada-tariffs-35-while-setting-new-tariff-rates-dozens-other-countries>
 33. Trump unleashes new tariffs on 69 countries, set to take effect in 7 days: Full list and details, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/international/global-trends/trump-unleashes-new-tariffs-on-69-countries-set-to-take-effect-in-7-days-full-list-and-details/articleshow/123032466.cms>
 34. Trump didn't chicken out. So what's Canada's next move? | CBC News, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://www.cbc.ca/news/world/trump-tariffs-canada-carney-next-1.7599602>
 35. India in the crosshairs: Trump's trade war culminates in 25% tariff - 10 points, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/business/india-business/india-in-the-crosshairs-trumps-trade-war-culminates-in-25-tariff-10-points/articleshow/123001470.cms>
 36. EU-US trade talks on an agreement on industrial goods and conformity assessment | Legislative Train Schedule - European Parliament, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://www.europarl.europa.eu/legislative-train/theme-international-trade-inta/file-eu-us-trade-talks>
 37. Foreign Retaliations Timeline - International Trade Administration, accessed

- August 2, 2025,
<https://www.trade.gov/feature-article/foreign-retaliations-timeline>
38. L_2018158EN.01000501.xml - EUR-Lex - European Union, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32018R0886>
 39. US–EU Tariff Agreement Sets 15% Import Rate Amid Steel Dispute - ASI, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://members.asicentral.com/news/industry-news/july-2025/us-eu-agree-to-15-tariff-rate-but-steel-aluminum-50-rate-remains/>
 40. How the US-EU trade deal wards off more escalation but will raise prices and slow growth, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://apnews.com/article/eu-tariffs-united-states-15-prices-growth-31e52a6dda17f3b5d70475e1cd0002ca>
 41. Trump sets 15% tariff on EU: Here are the key aspects of the trade deal, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/international/global-trends/trump-sets-a-tariff-of-15-pc-on-eu-here-are-the-key-aspects-of-the-trade-deal/articleshow/122938807.cms>
 42. Fact Sheet: The United States and European Union Reach Massive Trade Deal, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://www.whitehouse.gov/fact-sheets/2025/07/fact-sheet-the-united-states-and-european-union-reach-massive-trade-deal/>
 43. 25% on India, 19% on Pakistan, 35% on Iraq: Full list of US tariff rates announced by Donald Trump; who's worst-hit?, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/business/international-business/trade-war-donald-trump-signs-executive-order-imposing-tariffs-up-to-41-what-to-know/articleshow/123031936.cms>
 44. Trump announces 25% tariff on India and unspecified penalties for buying Russian oil, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://apnews.com/article/trump-tariffs-russia-india-9e388a55583e7007149819c52f0fd71b>
 45. Congressional Budget Office Confirms Massive Cost of Trump Tariffs, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://www.ntu.org/publications/detail/congressional-budget-office-confirms-massive-cost-of-trump-tariffs>
 46. Trump Tariffs Will Hurt Economic Growth, Boost Inflation, Raise Costs to Families, CBO Finds - Senator Jeff Merkley, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://www.merkley.senate.gov/trump-tariffs-will-hurt-economic-growth-boost-inflation-raise-costs-to-families-cbo-finds/>
 47. Budgetary and Economic Effects of Increases in Tariffs Implemented ..., accessed August 2, 2025, <https://www.cbo.gov/publication/61389>
 48. Trump's tariffs would cut US deficits and shrink the economy, CBO says | AP News, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://apnews.com/article/cbo-trump-tariffs-cut-deficits-shrink-economy-18a07a73b72a31a164b15835dd34fd61>

49. State of U.S. Tariffs: July 14, 2025 | The Budget Lab at Yale, accessed August 2, 2025, <https://budgetlab.yale.edu/research/state-us-tariffs-july-14-2025>
50. Trump tariffs could increase factory costs by up to 4.5%: analysis ..., accessed August 2, 2025, <https://apnews.com/article/trump-tariffs-factory-costs-manufacturing-4c928842b57c7f36db9d5ca26a84108b>
51. From 'savvy' Putin to secondary sanctions: How Trump's relations with Russia have changed, accessed August 2, 2025, <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/international/global-trends/from-savvy-putin-to-secondary-sanctions-how-trumps-relations-with-russia-have-changed/articleshow/123000301.cms>
52. Trump says he's shortening the 50-day deadline for Russia to end the war in Ukraine, accessed August 2, 2025, <https://apnews.com/article/russia-ukraine-trump-putin-deadline-ultimatum-0e4cfb5969be5d02217be90f7521ce48>
53. Trump says US deploying nuclear submarines in response to 'provocative' Russian comments, accessed August 2, 2025, <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/international/global-trends/trump-says-us-deploying-nuclear-submarines-in-response-to-provocative-russian-comments/articleshow/123048264.cms>
54. Why is Trump moving nuclear submarines after spat with Medvedev? - Al Jazeera, accessed August 2, 2025, <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2025/8/2/why-is-trump-moving-nuclear-submarines-after-spat-with-medvedev>
55. On the record: The U.S. administration's actions on Russia | Brookings, accessed August 2, 2025, <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/on-the-record-the-u-s-administrations-actions-on-russia/>
56. Russia's actions in Ukraine 'disgusting', says Trump | Russia ..., accessed August 2, 2025, <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2025/8/1/russias-actions-in-ukraine-disgusting-says-trump>
57. Former Aide Reveals How Vladimir Putin Played Donald Trump Like A Fiddle On Phone Call | Russia Matters, accessed August 2, 2025, <https://www.russiamatters.org/analysis/former-aide-reveals-how-vladimir-putin-played-donald-trump-fiddle-phone-call>
58. Fiona Hill: What Does Trump See in Putin? | Foreign Affairs Interview - YouTube, accessed August 2, 2025, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GxfrJ5smAU8>
59. President Trump Impeached and Acquitted of Charges Relating to His Conduct of Foreign Affairs | American Journal of International Law, accessed August 2, 2025, <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/american-journal-of-international-law/article/president-trump-impeached-and-acquitted-of-charges-relating-to-his-conduct-of-foreign-affairs/48AE0B8B4A3EEDB7FB4BCF9A7CCB72B4>
60. 2019 Trump–Ukraine scandal - Wikipedia, accessed August 2, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2019_Trump%E2%80%93Ukraine_scandal

61. The Smithsonian removes a Trump impeachment reference from an exhibit but says it's temporary, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://apnews.com/article/smithsonian-trump-impeachment-label-removed-d15860f008d6645d196b4c542f870475>
62. Timeline: How Trump withheld Ukraine aid - Center for Public Integrity, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://publicintegrity.org/national-security/timeline-how-trump-withheld-ukraine-aid/>
63. Trump casts doubt on willingness to defend Nato allies 'if they don't ...', accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2025/mar/07/donald-trump-nato-alliance-us-security-support>
64. Trump hails 'big win' as Nato states agree to raise defence spending to 5% of GDP, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2025/jun/25/trump-praises-nato-states-as-summit-prepares-to-lift-defence-spending-target>
65. NATO's 5% percent spending goal: realistic or just sweet-talking Trump? | DW News, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=S7H0gT5Tey4>
66. Trump's 5 percent defense spending target seemed far-fetched. Now not so much., accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://www.politico.eu/article/donald-trump-5-percent-defense-spending-target-far-fetched-nato/>
67. Trump's uphill battle to make NATO allies hit his mega defense spending target - Politico.eu, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://www.politico.eu/article/donald-trump-nato-allies-defense-spending/>
68. How Europe is preparing for Trump II - Stiftung Wissenschaft und ..., accessed August 2, 2025,
https://www.swp-berlin.org/publications/products/arbeitspapiere/European_Perspectives_on_Trump_II_WP_von_Daniels_Major_von_Ondarza.pdf
69. Network reflections: What will Trump's election mean for European security?, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://europeanleadershipnetwork.org/commentary/network-reflections-what-will-trumps-election-mean-for-european-security/>
70. The Transatlantic Alliance in the Age of Trump: The Coming Collisions - CSIS, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://www.csis.org/analysis/transatlantic-alliance-age-trump-coming-collisions>
71. Eastern Europe must earn its security in a post-American NATO | Donald Trump | Al Jazeera, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2025/7/30/eastern-europe-must-earn-its-security-in-a-post-american-nato>
72. The Irresistible Plan Europeans Can Offer Trump to Save NATO, accessed August 2, 2025,
<https://carnegieendowment.org/europe/strategic-europe/2025/05/the-irresistible-plan-europeans-can-offer-trump-to-save-nato?lang=en>

73. Madman theory - Wikipedia, accessed August 2, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Madman_theory
74. Madman or Mad Genius? The International Benefits and Domestic Costs of the Madman Strategy - Belfer Center, accessed August 2, 2025, <https://www.belfercenter.org/publication/madman-or-mad-genius-international-benefits-and-domestic-costs-madman-strategy>
75. The hidden costs of Trump's 'madman' approach to tariffs | Responsible Statecraft, accessed August 2, 2025, <https://responsiblestatecraft.org/trump-tariffs/>
76. On foreign policy, has Donald Trump become predictable? - Good Authority, accessed August 2, 2025, <https://goodauthority.org/news/foreign-policy-donald-trump-unpredictable-madman-tariffs-nato/>
77. Trump's Second-Term Foreign Policy: Highly Centralized, and Highly Personal, accessed August 2, 2025, <https://arabcenterdc.org/resource/trumps-second-term-foreign-policy-highly-centralized-and-highly-personal/>
78. Trump's Foreign Policy Upending US-Led Global Order, Says Former Russia Adviser Fiona Hill, accessed August 2, 2025, <https://www.rferl.org/a/trump-100-days-interview-series-fiona-hill/33407609.html>
79. At War with Ourselves – HarperCollins, accessed August 2, 2025, <https://www.harpercollins.com/products/at-war-with-ourselves-h-r-mcmaster>
80. At War with Ourselves: My Tour of Duty in the Trump White House - Barnes & Noble, accessed August 2, 2025, <https://www.barnesandnoble.com/w/at-war-with-ourselves-h-r-mcmaster/1145239508>
81. At War with Ourselves: My Tour of Duty in the Trump White House - Premiere Collectibles, accessed August 2, 2025, <https://premierecollectibles.com/atwar>
82. How the departure of John Bolton might change Trump's foreign policy | PBS News, accessed August 2, 2025, <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/show/how-the-departure-of-john-bolton-might-change-trumps-foreign-policy>
83. Bolton's departure signals Trump's foreign-policy pivot - Brookings Institution, accessed August 2, 2025, <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/boltons-departure-signals-trumps-foreign-policy-pivot/>
84. In conversation with Fiona Hill on Donald Trump's nuclear ..., accessed August 2, 2025, <https://engelsbergideas.com/essays/in-conversation-with-fiona-hill-on-donald-trumps-nuclear-nightmares/>

* This paper is licensed under the [CC BY 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).