

The Global Impact of President Trump's 2025 Tariff Policy - PART 2

Prepared for the IMCI+ Alliance

Author: Modesto N. Peña y Gorriñ, Founder, CEO and Chairman, IMCI+ Group Intl. GmbH

Date: 5th . April 2025

Page | 1

Premise

This second article follows the first one dated 03.04.2025 and aims to provide further insight, especially as the effects of recent policies have become increasingly visible—both in terms of internal reactions within the USA and within the global community.

As previously stated, this paper has no political agenda, nor is it intended to be interpreted as an expression of party or political preference. It is based solely on economic, social, and business reasoning.

Readers and members of the IMCI+ Alliance may hold different views or interpretations. That is entirely valid and, in fact, reflects one of our core values: the respect and encouragement of free speech and diverse opinions. Unlike others, we welcome and embrace diversity of thought and perspective.

1. Executive Summary

In early April 2025, U.S. President Donald J. Trump, in his second term, unveiled a sweeping expansion of his original tariff policies, framing trade deficits as a direct threat to national economic security. The new measures include a proposed 10% universal tariff on all imports and sharply escalated duties on Chinese goods — up to 60% in some sectors. Trump's strategy marks a full return to economic nationalism, challenging global trade norms and reigniting trade tensions. This policy reset is already drawing swift international responses and has immediate implications for supply chains, investment flows, and regional stability.

2. Strategic Philosophy: Why Trade Deficits = Tariffs

President Trump's administration argues that trade deficits are not benign, but instead represent a structural outflow of American capital, jobs, and sovereignty. His view contrasts with traditional macroeconomic interpretations. According to Trump's team, large trade deficits — particularly in manufactured goods — reflect unfair trade practices, currency manipulation, and overreliance on foreign supply chains.

Tariffs are presented as a corrective tool to:

- + Disincentivize imports from surplus nations
- + Encourage reshoring of manufacturing
- + Strengthen the dollar through industrial independence
- + Generate government revenue without raising domestic taxes

3. Current Tariff Measures and Policy Architecture

The 2025 tariff program represents more than an economic policy — it is a cornerstone of President Trump's political identity and reelection strategy. It sends a message to his electoral base, particularly in the industrial Midwest and South, that his administration prioritizes American jobs, domestic factories, and economic independence.

Key elements of the tariff framework include:

1. **Universal 10% Tariff**: Applied uniformly across all imported goods. This measure is designed to blunt criticism of targeted trade warfare and simplify customs enforcement. It plays well politically, symbolizing fairness and American strength.

2. **Escalating Tariffs on China**: Tariffs between 30–60% apply to sectors deemed critical to U.S. competitiveness and security, including steel, green technology, semiconductors, and rare earths. These measures reinforce the geopolitical containment of China.

3. **Trade Surplus Trigger Mechanism**: Countries with sustained trade surpluses against the U.S. may be penalized under a new scoring system developed by the Department of Commerce. This formulaic approach intends to reduce bureaucratic discretion and present the policy as rules-based, although in practice it remains unilateral.

4. **Revenue Repatriation and Industrial Incentives**: Tariff revenues will be funneled into a new "American Sovereignty Fund," supporting federal subsidies for domestic production, tax relief for manufacturers, and incentives for industrial regions affected by globalization.

5. **Legal Praxis and WTO Context**:

These measures test the boundaries of the World Trade Organization's (WTO) rulebook. Under WTO law, tariffs must follow the Most Favoured Nation (MFN) principle, and new duties should be negotiated multilaterally. However, the Trump administration invokes **Article XXI (National Security Exception)** of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), a clause historically used sparingly.

Critics argue that overuse of Article XXI undermines the WTO's legal integrity and invites reciprocal violations. The previous U.S. use of this clause (e.g., in 2018) triggered formal disputes, which remain unresolved. Legal scholars warn of a creeping normalization of trade exceptionalism. In effect, Trump's strategy may deepen the WTO's legitimacy crisis, pushing more countries to sideline it in favor of bilateral and regional agreements.

6. **Domestic Political Angle**:

Trump's tariff narrative reinforces his image as a disruptive, anti-globalist force. It mobilizes support among voters in key swing states and aligns with broader themes of economic nationalism and protection of American sovereignty. The strategy is not just economic—it is cultural and ideological, aiming to reframe globalization as a betrayal of national interests.

4. Global Reactions and Strategic Responses

China: The Chinese government has labeled the tariff expansion a form of economic coercion and responded with symmetrical duties on U.S. agricultural exports, including soybeans, beef, and corn. China is also accelerating its dual circulation strategy — promoting internal consumption while pivoting exports toward BRICS+, Africa, and Southeast Asia. Industrial subsidies and trade deals with Russia, Iran, and Brazil are being scaled up.

European Union: EU leaders convened an emergency trade council and are drafting countermeasures including tariffs on American industrial equipment, tech services, and aircraft. Germany, heavily exposed via its automotive sector, is lobbying for a carve-out, while France pushes for WTO arbitration. Political divisions within the bloc could affect coordination.

****Mexico****: While diplomatically restrained, Mexico is under pressure to protect key exports such as automotive parts, electronics, and agriculture. U.S.-Mexico bilateral channels have intensified, with business groups urging the White House to respect USMCA provisions. Mexico may offer preferential regulatory conditions to U.S. companies seeking nearshoring.

****India and ASEAN****: India is positioning itself as an alternative to China for U.S. investors and supply chains. ASEAN countries like Vietnam, Thailand, and Indonesia are balancing between maintaining U.S. trade ties and avoiding retaliation from China. Several ASEAN members have initiated regional free trade talks to mitigate systemic disruption.

****Latin America and Africa****: These regions face indirect volatility, especially in commodity prices and investment flows. Argentina and Brazil are recalibrating agricultural trade routes. African nations may deepen trade and infrastructure cooperation with China, the UAE, and Turkey to counterbalance Western instability.

In all cases, countries are reassessing their exposure to U.S.-centric trade systems, with many accelerating diversification strategies or aligning with alternative blocs.

Regional Reactions: A Comparative Strategic Analysis

****European Union (EU)****: The EU perceives the U.S. tariffs as a direct challenge to the multilateral trade system. Brussels is preparing retaliatory tariffs on select U.S. goods and has filed a formal complaint at the WTO. Germany, reliant on auto exports, is pushing for exemptions, while France advocates for stronger countermeasures. Political fragmentation within the EU could hamper a unified response but increases the likelihood of regional trade acceleration (e.g., EU-Mercosur, EU-India).

****Africa****: Most African economies are not direct targets of the tariffs, but they are exposed to second-order effects, especially in commodity markets and donor financing. Many African states are intensifying trade cooperation with China, the UAE, and Turkey while prioritizing intra-African trade under the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA). Tariff-induced volatility may reduce foreign investment from Western firms.

****China****: Beijing sees the 2025 tariffs as a continuation of strategic containment and has responded by doubling down on domestic consumption, investing in BRICS+ partnerships, and diversifying trade away from the U.S. It is subsidizing key industrial sectors and expanding influence in Africa, Central Asia, and Latin America. Retaliatory tariffs are in place on U.S. agriculture and aviation components.

****Japan****: As a long-time U.S. ally, Japan is maintaining diplomatic restraint but lobbying intensively for sectoral exemptions, especially in autos and electronics. Tokyo is expanding ties with the EU and ASEAN and reinforcing its supply chain resilience strategy through its “China+1” framework.

****South Korea****: Seoul is negotiating with Washington behind the scenes to protect its high-tech and automotive exports. It is wary of collateral damage and could pivot toward increased regional self-sufficiency. Korean conglomerates are actively reassessing exposure to U.S. tariffs in global expansion plans.

****Vietnam****: As a top beneficiary of U.S.-China decoupling, Vietnam is cautious. It is expanding exports to the U.S. but remains vulnerable to being labeled a trade circumvention hub. Authorities are tightening customs enforcement to avoid sanctions and seeking deeper trade deals with the EU and India.

****Canada****: As a USMCA partner, Canada is directly affected by tariff spillovers. Ottawa has expressed concern over violations of the trade agreement and is working through dispute mechanisms. Canadian manufacturers are diversifying both imports and exports and evaluating closer alignment with EU and Indo-Pacific economies.

****Mexico****: Mexico is in a delicate position. It benefits from nearshoring and rising U.S. demand for regional sourcing but faces rising costs and pressure to enforce border inspections. Mexico is enhancing local production capacity and incentivizing U.S. firms to expand operations within its territory.

****Brazil****: Brazil is adapting its trade routes, especially for agriculture and metals. It is strengthening ties with China and expanding its role within BRICS. Domestic agribusiness groups support a pivot toward Asia, while industrial exporters are calling for greater protection from U.S. measures.

****India****: India sees an opportunity to attract investment away from China. New incentive schemes for electronics and defense manufacturing are underway. India is expanding ties with the U.S. but remains wary of protectionist overreach. It is also boosting trade links with Russia, the Gulf, and Southeast Asia.

****Russia****: The tariffs play into Moscow's geopolitical narrative of Western decline. Russia is further embedding into China's economic orbit and promoting an alternative trade architecture via the Eurasian Economic Union. Energy and weapons exports are being redirected to Asia and Africa.

****Switzerland****: As a neutral financial and trading hub, Switzerland is carefully monitoring the situation. Swiss firms are concerned about disruptions in pharma, machinery, and precision equipment exports. Bern is advocating for de-escalation through diplomatic channels and WTO reforms, while emphasizing bilateral stability with both the U.S. and EU.

5. IMCI+ Strategic Analysis

1. ****Financing and Project Structuring****:

With increased costs on imported goods and regulatory unpredictability, financial models must be stress-tested for tariff exposure. Projects dependent on capital equipment, construction materials, or components from Asia or Europe are particularly vulnerable.

2. ****Investment Migration****:

Investors may seek out lower-risk jurisdictions or favor projects with high local content. Countries like Mexico, Poland, and India may experience increased capital inflows. IMCI+ can position itself to syndicate finance into local manufacturing and infrastructure.

3. ****Tariff Risk in Due Diligence****:

It is critical to embed tariff impact modeling into all feasibility assessments. IMCI+ should develop a proprietary tariff-risk scoring mechanism for use in investment evaluation.

4. ****Syndication Shifts****:

IMCI+ must guide clients in shifting from globalized sourcing to regional models. This includes advisory services on localization, re-export strategies, and regulatory navigation.

5. ****Advisory Leadership****:

As political-economic volatility grows, clients will demand clarity and foresight. IMCI+ should invest in intelligence tools and expand its geopolitical advisory services to support board-level decisions.

6. Conclusion

Trump's 2025 tariff doctrine institutionalizes protectionism as a pillar of U.S. economic policy. It reflects a belief that trade deficits weaken national sovereignty and that the U.S. must reindustrialize through punitive external measures and internal incentives. While the policy is domestically popular among certain voter blocs, its global impact will be deeply disruptive.

Page | 5


IMCI+ must treat this not as a temporary trade disturbance, but as a structural shift. Global business models, financing architecture, and advisory approaches must now adapt to a world where economic blocs harden, supply chains regionalize, and capital is increasingly politicized.

Prepared by:

Modesto N. Peña y Gorrin
Founder, Chairman & CEO
IMCI+ Group Intl. GmbH




Zurich, April 2025




Reciprocal Tariffs

Country	Tariffs Charged to the U.S.A. Including Currency Manipulation and Trade Barriers	U.S.A. Discounted Reciprocal Tariffs
Papua New Guinea	15%	10%
Malawi	34%	17%
Liberia	10%	10%
British Virgin Islands	10%	10%
Afghanistan	49%	10%
Zimbabwe	35%	18%
Benin	10%	10%
Barbados	10%	10%
Monaco	10%	10%
Syria	81%	41%
Uzbekistan	10%	10%
Republic of the Congo	10%	10%
Djibouti	10%	10%
French Polynesia	10%	10%
Cayman Islands	10%	10%
Kosovo	10%	10%
Curaçao	10%	10%
Vanuatu	44%	22%
Rwanda	10%	10%
Sierra Leone	10%	10%
Mongolia	10%	10%
San Marino	10%	10%
Antigua and Barbuda	10%	10%
Bermuda	10%	10%
Eswatini (Swaziland)	10%	10%




Reciprocal Tariffs

Country	Tariffs Charged to the U.S.A. Including Currency Manipulation and Trade Barriers	U.S.A. Discounted Reciprocal Tariffs
Marshall Islands	10%	10%
Saint Pierre and Miquelon	99%	50%
Saint Kitts and Nevis	10%	10%
Turkmenistan	10%	10%
Grenada	10%	10%
Sudan	10%	10%
Turks and Caicos Islands	10%	10%
Aruba	10%	10%
Montenegro	10%	10%
Saint Helena	15%	10%
Kyrgyzstan	10%	10%
Yemen	10%	10%
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	10%	10%
Niger	10%	10%
Saint Lucia	10%	10%
Nauru	59%	30%
Equatorial Guinea	25%	13%
Iran	10%	10%
Libya	61%	31%
Samoa	10%	10%
Guinea	10%	10%
Timor-Leste	10%	10%
Montserrat	10%	10%
Chad	26%	13%
Mali	10%	10%




Reciprocal Tariffs

Country	Tariffs Charged to the U.S.A. Including Currency Manipulation and Trade Barriers	U.S.A. Discounted Reciprocal Tariffs
Peru	10%	10%
Nicaragua	36%	18%
Norway	30%	15%
Costa Rica	17%	10%
Jordan	40%	20%
Dominican Republic	10%	10%
United Arab Emirates	10%	10%
New Zealand	20%	10%
Argentina	10%	10%
Ecuador	12%	10%
Guatemala	10%	10%
Honduras	10%	10%
Madagascar	93%	47%
Myanmar (Burma)	88%	44%
Tunisia	55%	28%
Kazakhstan	54%	27%
Serbia	74%	37%
Egypt	10%	10%
Saudi Arabia	10%	10%
El Salvador	10%	10%
Côte d'Ivoire	41%	21%
Laos	95%	48%
Botswana	74%	37%
Trinidad and Tobago	12%	10%
Morocco	10%	10%




Reciprocal Tariffs

Country	Tariffs Charged to the U.S.A. Including Currency Manipulation and Trade Barriers	U.S.A. Discounted Reciprocal Tariffs
Algeria	59%	30%
Oman	10%	10%
Uruguay	10%	10%
Bahamas	10%	10%
Lesotho	99%	50%
Ukraine	10%	10%
Bahrain	10%	10%
Qatar	10%	10%
Mauritius	80%	40%
Fiji	63%	32%
Iceland	10%	10%
Kenya	10%	10%
Liechtenstein	73%	37%
Guyana	76%	38%
Haiti	10%	10%
Bosnia and Herzegovina	70%	35%
Nigeria	27%	14%
Namibia	42%	21%
Brunei	47%	24%
Bolivia	20%	10%
Panama	10%	10%
Venezuela	29%	15%
North Macedonia	65%	33%
Ethiopia	10%	10%
Ghana	17%	10%



Reciprocal Tariffs

Country	Tariffs Charged to the U.S.A. <small>Including Currency Manipulation and Trade Barriers</small>	U.S.A. Discounted Reciprocal Tariffs
Moldova	61%	31%
Angola	63%	32%
Democratic Republic of the Congo	22%	11%
Jamaica	10%	10%
Mozambique	31%	16%
Paraguay	10%	10%
Zambia	33%	17%
Lebanon	10%	10%
Tanzania	10%	10%
Iraq	78%	39%
Georgia	10%	10%
Senegal	10%	10%
Azerbaijan	10%	10%
Cameroon	22%	11%
Uganda	20%	10%
Albania	10%	10%
Armenia	10%	10%
Nepal	10%	10%
Sint Maarten	10%	10%
Falkland Islands	82%	41%
Gabon	10%	10%
Kuwait	10%	10%
Togo	10%	10%
Suriname	10%	10%
Belize	10%	10%



Reciprocal Tariffs

Country	Tariffs Charged to the U.S.A. Including Currency Manipulation and Trade Barriers	U.S.A. Discounted Reciprocal Tariffs
China	67%	34%
European Union	39%	20%
Vietnam	90%	46%
Taiwan	64%	32%
Japan	46%	24%
India	52%	26%
South Korea	50%	25%
Thailand	72%	36%
Switzerland	61%	31%
Indonesia	64%	32%
Malaysia	47%	24%
Cambodia	97%	49%
United Kingdom	10%	10%
South Africa	60%	30%
Brazil	10%	10%
Bangladesh	74%	37%
Singapore	10%	10%
Israel	33%	17%
Philippines	34%	17%
Chile	10%	10%
Australia	10%	10%
Pakistan	58%	29%
Turkey	10%	10%
Sri Lanka	88%	44%
Colombia	10%	10%