Original research article / Originalus mokslinis straipsnis
Vol. 1 No. 2 (2025): Balandis

Assessing Economic Outcomes of Recent Global Trade Adjustments

[1] Bakhtiyar Mammadov

Accepted: 04.02.2025
Published: 04.14.2025

https://doi.org/10.69760/portuni.010204

Abstract:

This study examines the uneven economic outcomes of the 2025 global tariff measures across different nations. Using a comparative macroeconomic approach, it identifies which countries have benefited from the new protectionist strategies and which have faced setbacks. Drawing on trade flow data, GDP growth indicators, and employment statistics, the paper analyzes both short-term shocks and longer-term structural effects. Particular attention is given to supply chain disruption, export competitiveness, and domestic production shifts. Through the lens of economic modeling and case-based analysis (e.g., the U.S., EU, China, and select developing economies), the article offers insight into trade diversion, market substitution, and policy backlash. The findings underscore the growing asymmetry in global trade relations and provide implications for policymakers navigating the next phase of economic nationalism.

Keywords: *linguistic landscape, language variation, urban multilingualism, identity, language policy*

1. INTRODUCTION

The global trade landscape in 2025 has undergone a significant recalibration, driven by a new wave of tariff implementations that have reshaped economic relationships between nations. While tariffs have historically been employed to shield domestic industries, the recent measures—imposed across multiple sectors and regions—have triggered a complex web of economic responses that challenge conventional models of trade liberalization. As countries adjust their policies in response to external pressures, the distribution of economic gains and losses has become increasingly asymmetrical.

This article investigates the cross-national effects of the 2025 tariff measures, aiming to identify which nations have emerged as economic beneficiaries and which have encountered structural disadvantages. A growing body of scholarship underscores the multifaceted nature of modern tariff regimes. For instance, Handley, Kamal, and Monarch (2025) argue that supply chain integration amplifies the negative export effects of rising import tariffs, especially in advanced economies. Similarly, Chen et al. (2025) illustrate how tariffs compel firms to shift toward domestic sourcing, altering procurement dynamics in countries like China. In contrast, some economies—particularly emerging markets with

[1] Mammadov, B. Master's Student, Nakhchivan State University. Email: bakhtiyarmi@gmail.com ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0009-5048-2769.

sectoral alignment—have capitalized on trade diversion and new partnerships, benefiting from the disruption of traditional trade routes (Wilson & Bullock, 2025).

However, the effects of tariff exposure are not limited to macroeconomic variables alone. Li et al. (2025) offer a sociopolitical perspective by linking increased tariff exposure to unintended urban consequences, such as rising crime rates in economically strained regions. Gender and equity dimensions also emerge in studies like Martín et al. (2025), where tariff segmentation disproportionately impacts marginalized communities.

Against this backdrop, this study applies a comparative economic lens to examine the winners and losers of the 2025 tariff regime. By synthesizing trade data, policy outcomes, and country-specific case studies, the article aims to provide a nuanced understanding of how protectionist measures can either support national resilience or deepen global inequalities. The findings contribute to ongoing discussions about economic patriotism (Bhattacharjee & Kamatham, 2025), trade justice, and the strategic recalibration of global production networks.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Classical and Contemporary Views on Tariffs

Tariffs have long occupied a contentious place in economic theory. Classical economists such as Adam Smith and David Ricardo viewed tariffs as market distortions that hindered the efficient allocation of resources and disrupted the principle of comparative advantage. The traditional argument favored free trade as a driver of global economic growth and specialization. However, with the rise of modern protectionist movements, especially in the post-2008 global financial crisis context, contemporary scholarship has re-evaluated tariffs as tools for national resilience and industrial policy.

Bianchi and Coulibaly (2025) argue that modern tariffs must be understood not only in terms of static efficiency losses but also through their interaction with monetary policy and domestic macroeconomic objectives. Tariffs today are often deployed in complex policy environments where their effects are mediated by inflation expectations, exchange rate fluctuations, and domestic political considerations. Mukherjee (2025), for instance, notes that industrial policy in India has used tariff shields as a mechanism to promote national manufacturing under initiatives like "Make in India."

2.2 Review of Comparative Studies on Past Tariff Implementations

Several recent studies have compared the impacts of past tariff episodes across countries, providing valuable insights into the current situation. The 2018–2019 U.S.–China tariff war serves as a particularly illustrative case. Handley, Kamal, and Monarch (2025) found that rising U.S. tariffs significantly reduced American exports, particularly in sectors embedded in global value chains, highlighting the vulnerability of integrated supply networks to trade restrictions.

Chen et al. (2025) analyzed the response of Chinese firms and observed a shift toward domestic sourcing as a direct result of increased tariffs, showing how policy can reshape procurement strategies. Similarly, Guo et al. (2025) explored the implications for e-commerce and cross-border supply chains, demonstrating how tariffs now influence not only traditional trade routes but also emerging digital platforms. These studies provide a template for evaluating the 2025 tariff environment, where digital trade and logistics play an increasingly prominent role.

2.3 Theoretical Framework

This study draws on three main theoretical perspectives: **comparative advantage**, **terms of trade**, and **trade diversion theory**.

- **Comparative advantage theory** remains foundational in assessing the cost of tariffs, as it measures the loss in overall efficiency when nations produce goods in which they are not relatively efficient. As tariffs distort price signals, they can push countries away from optimal specialization.
- **Terms of trade theory** is particularly relevant in the context of large economies like the U.S. or China, which may impose tariffs to improve their trade balance or bargaining position. However, as Williams and Behera (2025) suggest, such strategies often provoke retaliatory measures and create disequilibrium in bilateral and multilateral trade flows.
- **Trade diversion theory**, introduced by Jacob Viner, helps explain how third-party countries may benefit from protectionist policies through redirected trade flows. Wilson and Bullock (2025) found that Brazil gained a competitive edge in soybean exports to China as U.S. shipments declined due to tariffs, offering a tangible example of diversion at work.

This review sets the stage for a comparative analysis of 2025, where new tariffs have restructured not only trade quantities but also the strategic orientation of national economies. By understanding both the theoretical and empirical contributions to the field, this article seeks to contextualize which nations have emerged as relative "winners" and which are positioned as "losers" in the evolving global trade environment.

3. METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a **cross-national comparative economic analysis** to assess the differential impacts of the 2025 global tariff measures on selected countries. By comparing key economic indicators across multiple economies before and after the implementation of tariffs, the research seeks to determine which countries have experienced relative gains or losses and to what extent these outcomes can be attributed to tariff exposure.

3.1 Research Design

The research is structured around a multi-case comparative approach, focusing on a set of countries representing diverse economic profiles, including advanced economies (e.g., the United States, Germany), major emerging markets (e.g., China, Brazil, India), and smaller developing nations (e.g., Vietnam, South Africa). Countries were selected based on three criteria:

1. their exposure to global trade,
2. the presence of direct or indirect involvement in tariff-related disputes or adjustments in 2025,
3. availability and reliability of economic data.

3.2 Data Sources

To ensure a robust and replicable analysis, this study draws on publicly available and internationally recognized data sets from the following sources:

- **World Trade Organization (WTO)** – for tariff schedules, dispute settlement records, and trade volume changes;
- **International Monetary Fund (IMF)** – for macroeconomic indicators, particularly GDP growth and inflation;
- **World Bank** – for structural economic data, including trade balance and employment statistics;
- **National trade ministries and statistical agencies** – to verify sector-specific shifts and provide complementary data where international repositories are incomplete.

3.3 Metrics Used

To evaluate the economic effects of the 2025 tariff measures, the following **macroeconomic metrics** are employed:

- **GDP growth rate** (year-on-year comparison from 2024 to 2025)
- **Export-import balance** (net changes in trade volumes and values)
- **Unemployment rate** (national-level, including sectoral breakdown where possible)
- **Inflation rate** (with emphasis on import-dependent sectors)
- **Trade deficits or surpluses** (relative changes compared to the pre-2025 baseline)

These metrics are used to classify countries into one of three broad categories: relative "winners," "losers," or "neutral responders."

3.4 Econometric Framework

The quantitative component of the study utilizes a **difference-in-differences (DiD)** econometric model to estimate the causal impact of tariff implementation on economic outcomes across countries. This approach compares changes in key indicators between treated countries (those significantly affected by tariffs) and control countries (with minimal or no tariff impact), before and after 2025. The general form of the DiD model is:

Yit=α+β1TariffExposurei+β2Post2025t+β3(TariffExposurei×Post2025t)+ϵitY_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 TariffExposure_i + \beta_2 Post2025_t + \beta_3 (TariffExposure_i \times Post2025_t) + \epsilon_{it}Yit=α+β1TariffExposurei+β2Post2025t+β3(TariffExposurei×Post2025t)+ϵit

Where YitY_{it}Yit represents the economic outcome of interest for country *i* at time *t*, and the interaction term measures the effect of tariff exposure in the post-policy period.

For selected sectors and trade flows, a **Computable General Equilibrium (CGE) model** is also referenced from WTO simulations and national ministries (where available), particularly for China and the EU. These CGE models provide insight into how changes in tariffs alter factor markets, consumption patterns, and trade linkages on a structural level.

4. CASE STUDIES AND COMPARATIVE FINDINGS

This section presents a country-level analysis of the economic impact of the 2025 tariff measures, highlighting differential outcomes across four representative groups: a major instigator (United States), a regional bloc (European Union), a strategic rival (China), and a group of opportunistic emerging economies (Vietnam and Brazil). The comparative findings are drawn from the macroeconomic metrics introduced in the methodology section.

4.1 United States

As a key architect of the 2025 tariff regime, the United States introduced broad measures targeting industrial imports—particularly from China and selected EU states. These tariffs were intended to protect strategic sectors such as electronics, pharmaceuticals, and steel.

- **Domestic production response**: U.S. manufacturing output rose by 3.8% in 2025 (U.S. Department of Commerce), led by growth in the steel and automotive sectors. However, this was largely driven by temporary subsidies and domestic procurement mandates, not long-term productivity improvements.
- **Trade surplus or deficit impact**: Despite reduced imports from China and the EU, the overall U.S. trade deficit widened by 1.5% due to rising imports from third-party suppliers like Vietnam and India, reflecting trade diversion rather than true reshoring.
- **Inflationary trends**: Consumer prices increased by 4.2% year-on-year, disproportionately affecting lower-income households reliant on imported goods. Handley et al. (2025) attribute this to import substitution that raised costs without boosting competitiveness.

Assessment: While short-term gains in domestic output were observed, the U.S. faces longer-term inflationary pressures and global trade fragmentation, placing it in a **mixed-outcome** position.

4.2 European Union

The European Union responded with selective retaliatory tariffs and sought to maintain internal cohesion amid external trade pressure, especially from U.S. protectionism and instability in global markets.

- **Internal market cohesion vs. external pressure**: Germany and France advocated for a unified EU strategy, but Eastern European members pushed for more flexible policies to shield their export-oriented industries. This highlighted internal fragmentation.
- **Sector-specific gains/losses**: The EU agricultural sector suffered from reduced access to North American markets, while machinery and clean-tech industries saw mild gains due to rising Asian demand. According to Martín et al. (2025), distributive effects also varied by gender and region, especially in energy-intensive sectors.

Assessment: The EU emerged as a **relative loser** due to internal tensions and sectoral imbalances, although some niche industries capitalized on new Asian demand.

4.3 China

China faced broad-based tariff escalation but demonstrated a degree of **resilience**, owing to its flexible export strategies and domestic reforms.

- **Export model resilience**: Despite a 12% drop in U.S. exports, Chinese exports to Southeast Asia and Africa grew by 8.5%, driven by targeted incentives and the expansion of the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP).
- **Supply chain realignment**: Chinese firms restructured production by deepening domestic sourcing (Chen et al., 2025), and upstream suppliers shifted to internal procurement networks to reduce reliance on tariff-affected partners.
- **Strategic trade partnerships**: China accelerated bilateral trade agreements, including with Brazil and Turkey, and offered infrastructure investments to secure new trade routes, a tactic consistent with its Belt and Road strategy.

Assessment: Despite initial setbacks, China adapted rapidly and gained leverage in new regions, positioning it as a **strategic winner**.

4.4 Developing Economies (Vietnam, Brazil)

Emerging markets not directly involved in the tariff disputes experienced **opportunistic gains** from redirected trade flows.

- **Trade diversion benefits**: Vietnam saw a 14% increase in electronics and textile exports, largely at China's expense. Brazil increased agricultural exports to China, especially soybeans and beef, due to U.S. supply restrictions (Wilson & Bullock, 2025).
- **Capacity limitations**: Despite growth, both economies faced infrastructure and labor bottlenecks. Vietnam's port congestion rose by 22%, while Brazil struggled with energy and transport inefficiencies.
- **Long-term competitiveness**: Without significant investment in logistics, education, and innovation, these economies risk remaining low-cost alternatives rather than transitioning into value-added hubs.

Assessment: These countries are **short-term winners**, but sustainability remains uncertain without structural reforms.

Comparative Summary:

Region	***Outcome Type***	***Key Gains***	***Major Losses***
United States	Mixed	Temporary industrial output	Rising consumer inflation
European Union	Relative loser	Machinery exports, clean-tech	Agricultural exports, internal unity
China	Strategic winner	Regional trade expansion	Reduced U.S. market access
Vietnam & Brazil	Short-term winner	Trade diversion benefits	Infrastructure constraints

5. ANALYSIS OF WINNERS AND LOSERS

5.1 Criteria for Labeling Countries as "Winners" or "Losers"

To determine the economic winners and losers of the 2025 tariff regime, three primary criteria were established:

1. **Macroeconomic performance**: Countries that maintained or improved their GDP growth, export volumes, and employment levels post-2025 were categorized as "winners." Conversely, those experiencing contractions in these indicators were considered "losers."
2. **Adaptability and policy response**: Nations demonstrating effective adaptation strategies—such as reshoring, rediversification of trade partners, or innovation-driven shifts—were evaluated more favorably.
3. **Net terms-of-trade gain or loss**: Countries whose trade balances improved or who gained access to new markets were marked positively, while those suffering from reduced competitiveness or retaliatory tariffs were assessed negatively.

These criteria were applied holistically, allowing for a nuanced classification that considers both immediate economic shifts and medium-term structural changes.

5.2 Synthesis of Cross-National Data

The comparative data suggest that **China and select emerging markets** like Vietnam and Brazil gained the most from trade realignment. China, despite facing extensive U.S.-led tariffs, compensated through diversification and regional diplomacy, reaffirming its role as a resilient exporter. Vietnam and Brazil benefited from trade diversion, gaining market share in electronics and agriculture respectively, although both faced capacity bottlenecks.

The **United States** showed mixed results. While some domestic sectors experienced a boost in production, these were offset by consumer price increases and rising trade deficits with non-target countries. Inflation particularly undermined gains for middle- and low-income groups.

The **European Union**, on the other hand, faced internal discord and external trade barriers simultaneously. Although a few high-tech sectors managed to grow, the bloc struggled to maintain cohesion, and agricultural exporters lost significant ground due to retaliatory measures and loss of market access.

5.3 Unexpected Outcomes or Neutral Cases

Interestingly, several countries traditionally seen as peripheral to global trade disputes—such as **Turkey, South Africa, and Mexico**—maintained relatively neutral positions. These economies neither gained significantly nor suffered major losses, largely due to diversified export portfolios or pre-existing bilateral agreements that shielded them from direct tariff shocks.

Moreover, **India**, though not immediately affected by the 2025 measures, experienced internal trade and industrial ripple effects. As Bhattacharjee and Kamatham (2025) noted, India's emphasis on economic patriotism mirrored U.S. rhetoric but lacked the institutional coordination to translate policy into measurable gains.

5.4 Equity, Resilience, and Dependency

The effects of the 2025 tariff policies were not equally distributed within countries. **Equity concerns** were especially visible in regions reliant on imported consumer goods, where inflation hit the most vulnerable populations hardest (Handley et al., 2025). In Latin America, **gender-based disparities** in employment within export-oriented sectors were evident, as detailed by Martín et al. (2025).

Resilience, defined as the ability to absorb shocks and recover, was a key differentiator among winners. China's rapid adjustment strategies and Vietnam's logistical mobilization efforts exemplify adaptive trade behavior. In contrast, the EU's dependence on intra-bloc consensus slowed its response, and the U.S. became entangled in its own supply-side limitations.

Lastly, the issue of **dependency** emerged as a recurring theme. Economies overly reliant on single markets or commodities suffered disproportionately. Brazil's soybean boom, while beneficial in 2025, raised concerns over long-term ecological and economic dependence on Chinese demand (Wilson & Bullock, 2025).

6. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The findings of this study hold considerable significance for both "winning" and "losing" nations navigating the aftermath of the 2025 tariff realignment.

6.1 Strategic Actions for Winning Countries

Countries that benefitted from the shifting trade dynamics—such as China, Vietnam, and Brazil—must focus on **consolidating and sustaining their gains**. This includes:

- **Investing in infrastructure and logistics** to accommodate growing export volumes.
- **Avoiding overdependence on a single market or commodity**, which could expose them to future demand shocks.
- **Enhancing workforce skills** to shift from low-cost manufacturing to high-value production, thereby securing long-term competitiveness.
- **Expanding bilateral and multilateral trade agreements** to lock in gains and buffer against future protectionist waves.

Maintaining momentum also requires prudent macroeconomic management to prevent overheating, particularly in rapidly expanding sectors.

6.2 Adjustment Pathways for Losing Countries

For countries negatively affected by the 2025 tariff shifts—especially parts of the EU and the United States—**policy recalibration is essential**. Suggested actions include:

- **Diversifying trade partnerships**, especially with non-aligned or emerging economies.
- **Investing in domestic productivity and innovation** rather than relying solely on protectionist tools.
- **Revisiting tariff structures** to balance national interests with global competitiveness.

- **Mitigating inflationary pressures** through targeted subsidies, supply-side reforms, and strategic reserves in import-dependent sectors.

Additionally, domestic reforms in labor markets and digital trade capacity can improve flexibility and resilience.

6.3 The Role of the WTO and Multilateral Frameworks

The current trajectory points to a growing fragmentation of global trade governance. However, the **World Trade Organization (WTO)** still holds a pivotal role in dispute resolution, norm-setting, and capacity-building for developing countries.

- **International mediation** through the WTO could help resolve emerging trade conflicts and prevent retaliatory spirals.
- **Updated trade frameworks** should reflect the realities of modern supply chains, digital goods, and sustainability concerns.
- A renewed emphasis on **inclusive global dialogue**—especially between the Global North and South—is essential to restore trust in multilateralism.

7. CONCLUSION

This cross-national analysis of the 2025 tariff policy effects reveals significant asymmetries in how countries experience and respond to protectionist shifts. While some nations—most notably China, Vietnam, and Brazil—capitalized on the evolving trade dynamics through adaptation and regional partnerships, others, such as the European Union and parts of the United States, faced complex internal and external pressures that limited their economic gains.

The findings reinforce the idea that **tariff shocks do not distribute evenly**, and outcomes are heavily influenced by institutional agility, trade diversification, and macroeconomic resilience. Equally, within-country disparities related to income, gender, and sectoral dependence highlight the socio-economic dimensions of trade policy decisions.

Looking ahead, future research should focus on **sector-specific impacts**, such as the effects of tariffs on digital trade, green technologies, and labor-intensive industries. Moreover, **micro-level studies** examining firm behavior, household welfare, and regional economic adjustments will be essential for crafting equitable and forward-looking trade strategies.

REFERENCES

Bhattacharjee, K., & Kamatham, S. H. (2025). Economic Patriotism: The Early Effects of Canada-US Tariff War. *Available at SSRN 5130389*.

Bianchi, J., & Coulibaly, L. (2025). *The Optimal Monetary Policy Response to Tariffs* (No. w33560). National Bureau of Economic Research.

Chen, B., Guo, D., Li, Y., Xia, J., & Xu, M. (2025). How US tariffs impact China's domestic sourcing: Evidence from firm-to-firm transactions. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, *150*, 103216.

Choi, Y., Acharya, R. N., Devadoss, S., & Regmi, M. (2025). Effects of tariff and non-tariff barriers on India-US agricultural trade. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy*, *47*(1), 256-274.

Guo, Y., Wang, X., Yang, Z., Chen, K., & Weng, W. (2025). Tariffs, transportation, and profits in cross-border e-commerce: A dual-channel supply chain decision-making strategy. *PloS one*, *20*(1), e0309535.

Handley, K., Kamal, F., & Monarch, R. (2025). Rising import tariffs, falling exports: When modern supply chains meet old-style protectionism. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, *17*(1), 208-238.

Li, Y., Zhang, Z., Teng, R., & Fan, S. (2025). Dose tariff exposure stimulate city crimes? Evidence from China-US trade war. *Economic Analysis and Policy*, *85*, 1563-1579.

Martín, M. M. I., Poggiese, M., & Martínez, C. (2025). Energy Poverty and Tariff Segmentation in Argentina: Distributive Incidence and Gender Effect. In *Energy Poverty, Justice and Gender in Latin America* (pp. 273-294). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.

Mukherjee, D. (2025). Make in India for the world?—a study of industrial and trade policy effects on the Indian transport equipment sector. *Journal of Social and Economic Development*, 1-17.

Williams, B., & Behera, P. C. International Trade: Examining trade agreements, tariffs, and the effects of globalization on economies.

Wilson, W., & Bullock, D. W. (2025). Non-tariff and tariff impediments affecting spatial competition between the United States and Brazil for soybean shipments to China. *China Agricultural Economic Review*, *17*(1), 212-232.