World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews
eISSN: 2581-9615 CODEN (USA): WJARAI
Cross Ref DOI: 10.30574/wjarr
Journal homepage: https://wjarr.com/

(Review Article)

Check for updates

The New Era of Protectionism: An analysis of the economic, political, and supply chain impacts of U.S. Tariffs on Export-Dependent Economies

Dayalal Sankhla *

Economic Administration and Financial Management, M.B.C. Govt. Girl's College, Barmer.

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2025, 28(02), 1300–1306

Publication history: Received on 26 September 2025; revised on 08 November 2025; accepted on 10 November 2025

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2025.28.2.3803

Abstract

The recent and ongoing shift in U.S. trade policy toward unilateral protectionism represents a radical departure from the decades-long post-World War II consensus on global free trade. This paper provides a detailed analysis of this new paradigm, examining its multifaceted impacts on both the U.S. domestic economy and its international trading partners. By first establishing the historical and legal context of these policies, the report reveals that modern tariff impositions, particularly through the use of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), are a return to a 19th-century playbook, albeit with a new, legally tenuous mechanism. The analysis demonstrates that, domestically, these tariffs function as a regressive tax, exacerbating inflationary pressures and leading to a net loss of jobs by harming downstream industries. For export-dependent economies, the impact is severe and disproportionately concentrated in labor-intensive sectors, as exemplified by a detailed case study of India. The report further identifies a critical shift in the function of tariffs, which have evolved from a tool of economic correction into an instrument of geopolitical coercion. This re-framing of trade policy has fostered a chaotic and unpredictable global environment, eroding the authority of multilateral institutions and compelling a strategic reorientation of international supply chains. The findings suggest that the path toward restoring predictable and sustainable global commerce will require a combination of market diversification by affected nations and a renewed commitment to a rules-based multilateral trading system.

Keywords: Tariffs; International Trade; Protectionism; Export Dependency; US Economy; India; Geopolitics; Supply Chains; IEEPA; Section 232

1. Introduction

The global economic landscape is undergoing a fundamental transformation, marked by a significant and deliberate shift in U.S. trade policy away from the principles of free trade and toward a more protectionist stance. This movement is not merely a cyclical adjustment but a profound reorientation of international relations, economic governance, and the very architecture of global supply chains. The policies, often implemented with unprecedented speed and severity, have initiated a new era of trade friction, characterized by strategic tariffs and retaliatory measures that have disrupted established commercial relationships and created widespread policy uncertainty. This paper undertakes a detailed analysis of this new paradigm by investigating how recent U.S. tariff actions, characterized by their scale and strategic application under specific legal authorities, impact both the U.S. economy and a range of export-dependent nations. The analysis will also explore the broader geopolitical and supply chain implications of this policy shift.

To address this complex issue, the report is structured in a layered approach. It begins by establishing the historical and legal context of U.S. tariff policy, providing a long-term perspective on the current protectionist turn. Next, it presents a quantitative and qualitative analysis of the economic and welfare impacts on the United States itself. The paper then provides detailed, sector-specific case studies on the effects on key export-dependent economies, with a particular focus

* Corresponding author: Dayalal Sankhla

on India and the European automotive industry. The analysis will culminate in a discussion of the overarching geopolitical and strategic dimensions of these policies, before concluding with a synthesis of findings and forward-looking recommendations for both policymakers and industry leaders.

2. A Historical and Legal Framework of U.S. Tariff Policy

2.1. Historical Context: The Cycles of U.S. Protectionism

The recent resurgence of protectionism marks a notable reversal of a nearly 90-year trend toward trade liberalization. The history of U.S. tariffs can be divided into three distinct periods: a revenue period from 1790 to 1860, a restriction period from 1861 to 1933, and a reciprocity period from 1934 onwards.[1] During the restriction period, average tariffs on dutiable imports rose to approximately 50% and remained at that level for several decades. In stark contrast, the reciprocity period saw average tariffs decline substantially, eventually stabilizing at a modern low of about 5%.[1] The current environment, with effective tariff rates estimated to be an order of magnitude higher than they were a decade ago, appears to be a return to the protectionist playbook of the late 19th and early 20th centuries.[3]

A crucial historical precedent for the current climate is the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930. Enacted to shield American industries during the onset of the Great Depression, the act significantly raised import duties on over 20,000 goods.[4] The policy, while intended to bolster domestic employment, had the opposite effect. It provoked widespread global retaliation from the U.S.'s trading partners, leading to a catastrophic collapse in international trade and a deepening of the economic crisis.[4] The act's failure served as a powerful cautionary example for generations of economists and policymakers and directly influenced the post-World War II global effort to establish a cooperative, rules-based trading system through institutions like the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).[2] The present path of unilateral, high-tariff action suggests a repetition of this historical misstep, with similar dynamics of retaliation and supply chain disruption now observable in the modern era.[6]

2.2. The Legal Architecture of Modern Tariffs

Modern U.S. tariffs have been imposed under a new legal architecture that allows for a level of speed and severity not seen in decades. While traditional authorities such as Section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and Section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974 have been used, a new and particularly powerful tool has emerged: the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA) of 1977.[8]

Sections 232 and 301, while providing the president with broad authority, typically require a formal, time-consuming investigation before action can be taken. Section 232, for example, allows for tariffs on imports that are deemed a threat to national security, but this process requires a 270-day investigation by the Commerce Department.[10] Similarly, Section 301 requires the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR) to conduct an investigation—which can take 12 to 18 months—into "unfair trade practices" before imposing retaliatory measures.[12]

In contrast, the use of IEEPA represents a fundamental shift in the application of tariff policy. This law, previously unused for tariffs, allows the president to regulate imports after declaring a "national emergency".[8] This mechanism enables the administration to impose wide-ranging, across-the-board "reciprocal tariffs" with minimal delay.[9] The legal basis for this unprecedented use of emergency power is currently facing challenges in the courts, with some judges questioning whether it represents an unconstitutional delegation of legislative authority.[14] This legal vulnerability carries significant fiscal risk; the Justice Department has warned that if these tariffs are struck down, the U.S. Treasury could face a wave of refund requests for the billions of dollars in duties already collected, potentially leading to "financial ruin".[14] The shift to IEEPA signifies a move away from traditional, investigated tariff processes to a more unilateral and legally tenuous mechanism, layering chaotic policy uncertainty on top of the serious economic disruption caused by the tariffs themselves.[3]

Table 1 Chronology of Key U.S. Tariff Actions (2018-2025)

Date	Tariff Target (Country/Sector)	Legal Authority	Tariff Rate	Description
Mar 2018	Steel and Aluminum (Global)	Sec. 232	25% (Steel), 10% (Al)	Tariffs imposed on grounds of national security, expanded to more products in 2025.
Mar 2018	Chinese Imports	Sec. 301	25%	First round of tariffs targeting intellectual property theft and unfair trade practices.
Feb 2025	China, Mexico, Canada	IEEPA	10% to 25%	Tariffs invoked under declared national emergencies, later modified.
Apr 2025	Global Imports	IEEPA	Minimum 10%	Universal "reciprocal tariffs" announced under a national emergency declaration.
Aug 2025	Indian Goods	IEEPA	Up to 50%	New, additional tariffs targeting Indian exports on top of existing duties.
Aug 2025	De Minimis Exemption (Global)	IEEPA	Full Duties	Elimination of the $800 duty-free exemption for all imported packages.

3. Economic and Welfare Impacts within the United States

3.1. Macroeconomic Effects: Inflationary Pressures and GDP Contraction

Contrary to the political narrative that tariffs are a source of "massive amounts of CASH" for the federal treasury without negative repercussions, economic analyses confirm that they impose a significant cost on the U.S. economy.[15] The State Bank of India (SBI) estimates that recent duties could reduce U.S. GDP growth by 40-50 basis points, while inflationary pressures are likely to rise due to higher input costs.[15] A Goldman Sachs report projects that U.S. inflation will remain above the Federal Reserve's 2% target through 2026, driven by tariff pass-through and exchange rate movements.

A critical component of this inflationary dynamic is the delayed pass-through of costs to consumers. Initially, American businesses have absorbed a significant portion of the tariff burden, with one report noting that companies have taken on approximately 64% of the hit so far.[15] However, this is not a sustainable model. The report projects that this share will fall to less than 10% as businesses are compelled to pass the costs onto customers.[15] This creates a causal chain where the initial tariffs are a burden on businesses, but the eventual pass-through of those costs will lead to a more severe inflationary shock for American consumers than has been seen to date. This delayed effect underscores why the long-term economic impact of these policies will likely be more detrimental than initial observations might suggest.

3.2. Consumer and Household Welfare: A Regressive Tax Burden

Tariffs are essentially a tax on imported goods and services, and the cost is overwhelmingly borne by American households and businesses, not foreign governments.[16] This has a direct and negative effect on consumer welfare. Analyses indicate that the cost of tariffs could amount to thousands of dollars annually for a typical household.[3]

Furthermore, this tax burden is highly regressive, disproportionately affecting low-income households.[3] Since poor households spend a larger portion of their income on tradable goods, they bear a heavier burden from the resulting price increases.[18] One analysis found that for the lowest income quintile, tariffs cost more than 5% of their after-tax income, while this group receives minimal benefit from tax cuts.[3] This stark finding refutes the populist rhetoric surrounding the policies and reveals a clear, negative welfare effect on a large portion of the U.S. population. The research notes that only the wealthiest households may experience a net welfare gain when the tariff revenue is used to reduce capital income taxes, which primarily benefits the rich.[18] This demonstrates that the policies, far from benefiting the average American, function as a hidden, regressive tax that exacerbates income inequality within the United States.

3.3. Industry and Employment Dynamics: The Net Negative Effect

The policy's primary stated goal of protecting domestic manufacturing and creating jobs is undermined by a net negative employment and competitiveness effect across the broader economy. Tariffs on intermediate goods, which constitute a majority of U.S. imports, raise costs for domestic producers, making them less competitive relative to foreign peer firms.[3]

A classic illustration of this is the case of steel tariffs. While these tariffs may have preserved some jobs within the steel industry, studies have found that these gains were at the expense of a "far larger loss of jobs" in downstream industries that use steel as an input, such as the automotive, machinery, and construction sectors.[3] This downstream economic shock outweighs the upstream benefits. Additionally, the largest exporting firms are frequently also the largest importing firms, meaning that tariffs also hurt U.S. exporters by raising their input costs.[3] This interconnectedness reveals that the policies are not merely a zero-sum game but can result in a significant erosion of overall economic efficiency, reducing innovation and growth by steering the economy away from its areas of comparative advantage.[3]

Table 2 Economic Impacts of Tariffs on the United States

Economic Indicator	Pre-Tariff Status	Post-Tariff Impact
US GDP Growth	Healthy	Reduced by 40-50 basis points
Inflation (PCE)	Fluctuating	Expected to stay above 2% Fed target
Tariff Revenue	$159 billion (2025)	More than double the prior year
Household Cost	Minimal	$2,600 to $4,900 annually per household
Welfare Effect	Neutral	Regressive; disproportionately harms low-income households

4. The Multifaceted Impact on Export-Dependent Economies: A Case Study Approach

4.1. Case Study: India - A Politically Motivated Tariff

The tariffs imposed on Indian goods are among the highest levied by the U.S. on any major trading partner, reaching a staggering 50% or more on key products.[15] This action has a particularly severe impact on labor-intensive sectors such as textiles, gems and jewellery, and seafood, which collectively account for a significant portion of India's exports to the U.S. and are dominated by micro, small, and medium enterprises (MSMEs).[20]

The competitive disadvantage for Indian exporters is pronounced. Indian ready-made garments now face a total tariff of 61%, a rate significantly higher than the 31% faced by competitors in Bangladesh and Vietnam.[20] Similarly, Indian shrimp exports face a 60% duty, which pales in comparison to the 15% tariff on exports from Ecuador.[20] The implementation of these tariffs places key Indian export clusters—including Tirupur for textiles, Visakhapatnam for seafood, and Surat and Mumbai for gems and jewellery—at substantial risk, threatening thousands of jobs.[20] In response, the Indian government is exploring strategies such as extending export support schemes and pursuing Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) with other nations to diversify its market and build resilience against future shocks.[21]

Crucially, the tariffs imposed on India are not solely an economic matter but also serve as a geopolitical tool. The research explicitly notes that the tariffs "serve not to address traditional trade imbalances, but to punish New Delhi for its growing ties with Russia" and for what is perceived as insufficient alignment with U.S. geopolitical priorities.[22] The fact that India's direct competitors face significantly lower tariffs directly supports the argument that the targeting is politically motivated. This use of an economic tool to achieve political ends jeopardizes not only Indian industries and jobs but also the broader U.S.-India strategic partnership, which is ostensibly aimed at countering China's influence.[22]

Table 3 Sector-Specific Impacts on India's Exports to the U.S.

Sector	U.S. Export Value (Approx.)	New Total Tariff Rate	Key At-Risk Clusters	Competitive Disadvantage
Gems & Jewellery	$10 billion	52.1%	Surat, Mumbai	Threatened jobs and market share
Textiles & RMG	$10.8 billion	63.9%	Tirupur, NCR, Bengaluru	Tariffs are nearly double those on Bangladesh and Vietnam
Seafood (Shrimp)	$2.4 billion	60%	Visakhapatnam	Ecuador faces a significantly lower 15% tariff

4.2. Case Study: The European Automotive Sector

The U.S. has targeted the European automotive industry with tariffs that could significantly disrupt its manufacturing and export models. A worst-case scenario with a 50% tariff could reduce EU car exports to the U.S. by an estimated EUR 26.4 billion.[23] Furthermore, tariffs on imported vehicle parts could raise production costs for EU manufacturers operating in the U.S. by up to an additional $4,000 per vehicle, making their domestic production less competitive.[23] Specific manufacturers like Porsche and Audi, which lack manufacturing facilities in the U.S., are particularly vulnerable to these measures.[23]

This policy is not simply a border tax but a deliberate forcing function designed to compel foreign direct investment and relocate manufacturing to the United States. The research notes that some auto parts firms are now considering "rethink[ing] our manufacturing footprint" and setting up "a greenfield plant" in the U.S. to mitigate the tariff risks.[24] This indicates that the tariff is a strategic tool for reshoring manufacturing and compelling foreign companies to invest in American production capacity. While this could be viewed as a successful policy for U.S. job creation, it comes at the expense of global supply chain efficiency, forcing companies to make costly long-term decisions and potentially reducing consumer choice in the American market.

4.3. Case Study: The China-U.S. Retaliatory Spiral

The economic conflict between the U.S. and China serves as a live-action model for the destructive nature of modern protectionism. The dispute has escalated into a "tit-for-tat retaliatory spiral" with tariffs reaching sky-high levels—145% on U.S. goods and 125% on Chinese goods—threatening a virtual embargo of trade between the world's two largest economies.[3]

This conflict perfectly illustrates the central lesson of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act: that tariffs beget retaliation, which in turn leads to a destructive cycle of trade warfare.[4] The U.S.-China trade war provides modern, empirical evidence of this dynamic. The U.S. has also applied a "familiar playbook" of first targeting a specific country and then expanding tariffs to a wider array of nations.[7] A prime example is the elimination of the long-standing "de minimis" exemption, which had allowed packages under $800 to enter the U.S. duty-free. While China accounted for nearly three-quarters of these shipments, the policy now applies universally, disrupting global e-commerce and affecting consumers and businesses in allied nations like the UK, Canada, and India.[7] This demonstrates how a policy ostensibly aimed at a single "foe" can have massive, indiscriminate ripple effects that harm a wide range of global economic actors and supply chains.

5. Geopolitical and Strategic Dimensions

5.1. Tariffs as an Instrument of Coercion

Recent analysis reveals a fundamental shift in the purpose of tariffs, which have been transformed from a tool of economic correction into a "strategic tool...for political and geopolitical coercion".[22] This new paradigm uses tariffs to pressure allies, secure one-sided trade deals, and compel countries to align with U.S. interests on issues often unrelated to trade itself.[14] The transactional nature of this policy is a critical hallmark. For instance, tariffs have been used to pressure India to reduce its ties with Russia, to extract concessions from Mexico on immigration control, and to punish Brazil for legal actions against a U.S.-aligned political figure.[22] This re-framing is essential for a nuanced understanding of the policy, as it demonstrates that tariffs are not merely a border tax but a multipurpose geopolitical hammer aimed at reshaping global power dynamics.

The use of tariffs in this manner jeopardizes strategic alliances and partnerships. By alienating key partners like India, a country with shared security concerns about China, the U.S. risks undermining its own regional influence and resilience.[15] This inconsistent targeting and application of tariffs—penalizing India while sparing other nations—underscores a politically motivated double standard that can be as damaging to U.S. interests as it is to its trading partners.[22]

5.2. The Breakdown of Global Trade Governance

The U.S.'s unilateral tariff actions are actively eroding the authority and function of multilateral trade institutions, most notably the World Trade Organization (WTO). For decades, the WTO has provided a framework for a rules-based system of global trade, offering a forum for resolving disputes and reducing barriers to commerce.[25] However, the new U.S. tariff regime often bypasses or ignores this system, relying instead on domestic laws like IEEPA to act with speed and without the need for international consultation.[8]

The research indicates that the U.S. has declined consultation requests from countries like India regarding tariffs, signaling a preference for unilateral action over multilateral dispute resolution.[26] The declared aim of this policy is to "undermine international organisations that challenge US primacy (such as the World Trade Organisation)".[22] This is a move that threatens the predictability and stability of global commerce, potentially leading to a fragmentation of the world economy into competing trade blocs or a return to the destructive bilateral trade wars of the past.

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

The comprehensive analysis of recent U.S. tariff actions reveals a profound and multi-faceted impact on the global economic order. The policy represents a radical historical reversal, abandoning the post-war consensus on free trade in favor of a 19th-century playbook. Domestically, these tariffs are not the unmitigated success they are often portrayed to be. They have imposed a significant economic cost on the U.S., exacerbating inflation, functioning as a regressive tax on households, and causing a net loss of jobs by raising costs for downstream industries.

For export-dependent economies, the impact has been severe and immediate. The case study of India demonstrates how high tariffs can devastate labor-intensive sectors and put key export clusters at substantial risk. The analysis also shows how tariffs on the European automotive industry are not just a border tax but a forcing function designed to compel foreign direct investment and reshore manufacturing. The U.S.-China trade war serves as a live-action model for the destructive retaliatory spiral that can ensue, proving that a policy aimed at a single adversary can have massive, indiscriminate ripple effects across global supply chains.

The most significant shift identified is the weaponization of tariffs, which have been transformed from a tool of economic correction into a multipurpose geopolitical instrument of coercion. This new paradigm has led to a chaotic and unpredictable global environment, eroding the authority of multilateral institutions like the WTO and threatening to dismantle the rules-based system that has governed international trade for nearly a century.

Moving forward, the challenges of restoring trade predictability and stability are immense. The ongoing legal challenges to IEEPA and the potential for a new wave of retaliatory measures will continue to cast a shadow over global commerce. To build resilience against future protectionist shocks, policymakers and industry leaders must consider a multi-pronged approach. Governments of export-dependent nations should prioritize market diversification through new trade agreements and export support schemes. For example, India is already pursuing FTAs with key markets like the UAE and the UK to offset its vulnerability to the U.S. market.[21] Global policymakers must re-engage with and strengthen multilateral institutions like the WTO to restore a rules-based system of trade governance. Finally, businesses should actively re-evaluate and optimize their global supply chains and manufacturing footprints to mitigate against tariff risks.

References

[1] History of tariffs in the United States - Wikipedia, Paper https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_tariffs_in_the_United_States

[2] How Tariffs Shaped U.S. Trade | College of DuPage, Paper https://www.cod.edu/news/2025/april/tariffs.html

[3] The aftermath of tariffs - CEPR, Paper https://cepr.org/voxeu/columns/aftermath-tariffs

[4] Smoot–Hawley Tariff Act - Wikipedia, Paper https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Smoot%E2%80%93Hawley_Tariff_Act

[5] The Smoot-Hawley Trade War | Cato Institute, Paper https://www.cato.org/research-briefs-economic-policy/smoot-hawley-trade-war

[6] China–United States trade war - Wikipedia, Paper https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/China%E2%80%93United_States_trade_war

[7] Trade war: Trump starts with China and then hits many in the world, Paper https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/international/global-trends/trade-war-trump-starts-with-china-and-then-hits-many-in-the-world/articleshow/123597132.cms

[8] Legal Authority for the President to Impose Tariffs Under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA) | Congress.gov, Paper https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/LSB11281

[9] International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA) Frequently, Paper https://www.cbp.gov/trade/programs-administration/trade-remedies/IEEPA-FAQ

[10] Section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 | Congress.gov, Paper https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/IF13006

[11] Policy Backgrounder: Section 232 Tariff Investigations and Public Comments, Paper https://www.conference-board.org/research/ced-policy-backgrounders/section-232-tariff-investigations-and-public-comments

[12] Section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974 | Congress.gov, Paper https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/IF11346

[13] Section 301 Tariffs and Proceedings: Recent and Potential Developments, Paper https://www.cov.com/en/news-and-insights/insights/2024/12/section-301-tariffs-and-proceedings-recent-and-potential-developments

[14] Court finds Trump's tariffs an illegal use of emergency power, but leaves them in place for now, Paper https://apnews.com/article/trump-tariffs-appeals-court-b714cfc8dff51289b1d5291f46d71f3f

[15] US consumers to pay the price of Trump's tariffs on India, Paper https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/economy/foreign-trade/us-consumers-to-pay-the-price-of-trumps-tariffs-on-india-others/articleshow/123523707.cms

[16] Tariffs in the second Trump administration - Wikipedia, Paper https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tariffs_in_the_second_Trump_administration

[17] 50% tariffs on India to blowback on Trump? US GDP growth could shrink 40–50 bps, inflation to flare: SBI report, Paper https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/business/india-business/50-tariffs-on-india-to-blow-back-on-trump-us-gdp-could-shrink-4050-bps-inflation-to-flare-sbi-report/articleshow/123538556.cms

[18] On the Distributional Effects of International Tariffs – Globalization Institute Working Paper No. 413 – Dallas Fed, Paper https://www.dallasfed.org/~/media/documents/research/international/wpapers/2022/0413.pdf

[19] US Tariffs on Steel and Aluminum: Analyzing Impacts | BCG, Paper https://www.bcg.com/publications/2025/us-tariffs-steel-aluminum-analyzing-impacts

[20] Explained: How will Donald Trump's tariffs impact India's exports to ..., Paper https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/business/india-business/explained-how-will-donald-trumps-tariffs-impact-indias-exports-to-us-these-sectors-will-be-the-hardest-hit/articleshow/123520096.cms

[21] Donald Trump's tariffs put India at disadvantage to peers; 70% of ..., Paper https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/business/india-business/donald-trumps-tariffs-put-india-at-disadvantage-to-peers-70-of-indian-exports-to-us-under-serious-threat-barclays/articleshow/123546114.cms

[22] How a slighted Trump scuttled India-US deal, Paper https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/economy/foreign-trade/how-a-slighted-trump-scuttled-india-us-deal/articleshow/123566632.cms

[23] Assessing the impact of US tariffs on the European automotive ..., Paper https://www.rabobank.com/knowledge/d011480100-assessing-the-impact-of-us-tariffs-on-the-european-automotive-sector

[24] Tariffs: Theory and Practice - UK Parliament, Paper https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/LLN-2019-0039/LLN-2019-0039.pdf

[25] US copper tariffs: India may seek WTO talks amid export risks; similar action in steel, auto cases earlier, Paper https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/business/india-business/us-copper-tariffs-india-may-seek-wto-talks-amid-export-risks-similar-action-in-steel-auto-cases-earlier/articleshow/123582144.cms