



By: *Emre Alkin*

Monroe Doctrine 2.0 and Possible Economic Effects



The U.S. National Security Documents not only determine the country's strategic orientations but also play a significant role in international relations and global economic dynamics.

These documents, which began to be shared with the public during President Carter's time, are prepared by thinkers and experts working on national security strategies.

In this week's analysis, we will evaluate the effects of the [2025 National Security Document](#) on global trade and the economy in more detail, drawing on various research and expert commentary. What transpired up until the writing phase of the document is also significant, of course.

Global Economy and National Security Concepts

Dr [Richard Haass](#), President of the Council on Foreign Relations, emphasises the connection between the rise of global trade and national security: "The global integrated economy is reshaping our national security strategies. Economic relationships can create more types and intensities of uncertainty than political relationships."

From this perspective, the 2025 National Security Document appears to review trade relations with other countries while attempting to maintain America's international relations while preserving its economic strategies.

The "America First" doctrine has been a leading component of this strategy. Many experts even refer to it as "Monroe Doctrine 2.0."

"America First" Doctrine and Protectionism

In this context, many [columnists summarise](#) the effects of the Trump administration's trade policies as follows: "This policy is necessary

not only for economic growth but also for the U.S. to be a more effective player on the international stage."

Despite strong support, we can see that this approach has led to tensions with allied countries.

For example, local policies such as "border security," mentioned in the 2025 document, stand out as an effort to ensure national security.

Such protectionist measures can lead to decreased trade with other countries and, consequently, to global economic imbalances

However, such protectionist measures can lead to decreased trade with other countries and, consequently, to global economic imbalances.

For instance, Professor Susan Sadler from the University of Toronto underscores that "Protectionist policies only allow you to gain short-term profits, which may lead to a decrease in trade and the contraction of local markets in the long run."

I have been continuously reminding about the disproportionate protectionism implemented in Turkey since 2014 and the inflationary environment it has created.

Thus, it is possible to state that the strategic orientations of the Trump administration could destabilise international trade.

Transactional Alliances and Global Power Dynamics

The 2025 National Security Document expects allies to take on more responsibility, which could lead to a reshaping of transactional alliances.

Dr John Mearsheimer, a professor at the

University of Chicago and an expert on international relations, warns, "The theory of balance of power suggests that countries act by considering only their own interests. Questioning the U.S.'s commitment to its allies in this direction could change power dynamics worldwide."

The process of "building alliances in exchange for money or commercial transactions" is seen as diplomatically problematic

Moreover, the demand in the 2025 document that NATO countries spend 5% of their GDP on defence will create pressure on allies. This means that allies will shape their strategies in line with U.S. national interests.

Dr Fiona Hill, an international relations expert who worked in the White House during Trump's first presidential term, interprets this situation as "a form of economic blackmail against U.S. allies" and emphasises that this could complicate international relations.

Therefore, the process of "building alliances in exchange for money or commercial transactions" is seen as diplomatically problematic. They are not wrong.

Hard Power and Unconventional Diplomacy

The U.S. strategies based on hard power represent another important aspect of the changes in foreign policy.

The **National Security Document** promotes the principle of "Peace Through Strength," attempting to offer a combined approach of diplomacy and economic solutions.

The late Professor **Joseph Nye** from Harvard University noted, "The use of hard power can yield results in international relations, but this strategy can weaken diplomatic skills," listing the potential risks of this approach.

Specifically, the proposed "strong diplomacy" approach for Iran and conflicts in the Middle East is creating uncertainty regarding strategic solutions.

Strategy has the potential to weaken America's role in the international trade arena

Professor Nye pointed out that "Using economic leverage can be a risky strategy for achieving long-term peace and stability."

Such a hard power-based approach to foreign policy in global trade can impact relationships with other countries.

Business commentator Barry Eichengreen emphasises, "If economic relations are used solely as a tool for national security, this situation can undermine global economic stability."

It is evident that such a strategy has the potential to weaken America's role in the international trade arena.

Redefining Regional Approaches

Another significant aspect of the document is the redefinition of policies in specific regions.

For example, the "Trump Addition to the Monroe Doctrine" highlights the U.S.'s efforts to re-establish its **dominance in Latin America**.

Experts point out that the U.S. intends to reshape its domestic policies while also creating an investment and trade hub to increase its influence in the region.

Policy changes in the Middle East are summarised by Eric Edelman, who served as the U.S. Ambassador to Turkey, as "avoiding endless wars."

Measures taken against China in Asia could lead to pronounced economic and military competition

Edelman analyses that "this situation could enable the U.S. to play a role that goes beyond being an energy supplier in the region, but it also carries risks."

Similarly, measures taken against China in Asia could lead to pronounced economic and military competition.

Experts emphasise that this situation could increase tensions in the region and heighten the risk of potential conflict.

Critical Minerals and Supply Chain Control

The 2025 National Security Document reflects the necessity of developing a strategy for **access to critical minerals** and the security of supply chains.

Experts state that "the importance of critical minerals for global economic security plays a crucial role in the economies of many countries."

The U.S.'s efforts to control these minerals could affect its trade relations with other countries, increasing competition.

Considering the competition with China, this strategy could potentially put the U.S. in a precarious situation regarding its economic interests

In this context, considering the competition with China, this strategy could potentially put the U.S. in a precarious situation regarding its economic interests.

Access to supply chains in global trade is

critical not only for economic interests but also for national security.

Therefore, the importance of controlling these supply chains needs to be emphasised.

Climate Change and Energy Policies

Lastly, the approach to climate change and energy policies presented in the document shows a significant transformation.

The climate policies of previous administrations are described as a "catastrophic" formation in the document. This indicates a tendency to adopt a more fossil fuel-focused energy policy.

Environmental experts caution that "this transformation in the U.S. approach to climate change and energy policies will have serious consequences economically as well as environmentally," drawing attention to the complexity of this issue.

The 2025 National Security Document has emerged as a document that reshapes the U.S.'s role in international relations and its effects on the global economy.

Evaluations by experts indicate that this document has the potential to significantly affect not only U.S. national security strategy but also trade relations with allies and the international order as a whole.

The "America First" doctrine, along with protectionist approaches and the use of hard power, could pave the way for lower trade volumes and potential conflicts

The "America First" doctrine, along with protectionist approaches and the use of hard power, could pave the way for lower trade volumes and potential conflicts.

In this context, the impacts of U.S. foreign policy and economic strategies become particularly significant.

The strategies outlined in national security documents are steering both domestic and foreign policy dynamics, creating uncertainty in global economic relations.

The 2025 National Security Document aims to strengthen the U.S.'s influence in a world where the American economy operates in instability by adopting a more protectionist approach.

However, several factors could challenge this goal and question the U.S.'s global leadership position.

Global Interaction and Economic Risks

The increasing shaping of global trade along political and economic interests necessitates a careful balance in relationships with other countries.

International relations analyst and New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman assesses the current situation by stating, "The world is now managed more in a Hobbesian mindset than with a Keynesian understanding."

In this context, it should not be forgotten that the philosophical foundations guiding trade and economic interactions have evolved into a process dominated by conflict and competitive norms.

This situation threatens not only economic growth but also brings political tensions and military conflict risks in its wake.

The Beijing administration might adopt an escalating approach in response to Washington's hard diplomacy and economic sanctions

For instance, the **Beijing administration** might adopt an escalating approach in response to Washington's hard diplomacy and economic sanctions.

The tensions in the Asia-Pacific region provoke trade wars and economic bloc formations, complicating relationships with other strategically significant countries.

Expert Opinions and Future Predictions

Another perspective on economic strategies is provided by Dr Fiona Hill: "Global trade agreements will not only ensure economic growth but may also contribute to deepening geopolitical relationships. However, whenever the U.S. adopts a protectionist stance, it may lead other countries to shift in a similar direction, potentially creating a global economic downturn and instability."

Dr Ian Bremmer, who enjoys a high follower count on social media, states, "The world may enter a period where a power-centred order emerges instead of a multipolar world led by the U.S."

A New Paradigm

The 2025 National Security Document emerges as a significant document with the potential to bring about important changes in the global economy, transcending the mere provision of U.S. national security.

The protectionist and transactional approaches it contains pose serious risks to world trade and question the existing global order, exposing it to transformation.



The protectionist and transactional approaches pose serious risks to world trade and question the existing global order, exposing it to transformation - Emre Alkin

Expert evaluations indicate that international relations may become more uncertain and complex.

The transformation of trade into a strategic weapon in alignment with U.S. international policies, along with heightened competition among allies, has become clearly recognisable as an element threatening global stability.

This gradually emerging new paradigm will prove decisive in how both the U.S. and other countries manage this situation.

Ultimately, the 2025 National Security Document deeply questions the U.S.'s reshaped role on the world stage and its global economic effects.

However, for the strategy to succeed, it will require a critical balance in international relations through mutual understanding and cooperation, not just consensus in domestic policy.

The approaches produced by Trump's "merchant mentality" may find it challenging to capture this sensitivity.

We must remember that a protectionist and hard power-focused approach can provide advantages in the short term; however, in the long run, actions taken without understanding the complex nature of international trade carry the potential to threaten economic stability.

In today's world, achieving lasting peace and prosperity requires multilateral cooperation and mutual dependencies rather than unilateral commitments.

In my view, this document poses a risk to the global order. It appears that navigating through 2026 will be challenging, confronting the complexities and instabilities of an increasingly transactional world.

As these dynamics unfold, the U.S. must find a way to balance its national interests with the need for international collaboration, understanding that fostering positive relationships with allies and competitors alike will be essential in an interconnected global landscape.

Only through a nuanced and strategic approach can the U.S. hope to maintain its status as a global leader while addressing the multifaceted challenges that lie ahead.