Jurnal DIALEKTIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial
Vol 23 No. 3 2025

ARTICLE

TRUMP'S "AMERICA FIRST" LEADERSHIP AND RESOURCE NATIONALISM: IMPLICATIONS FOR INDONESIA'S LOGISTIC INDEPENDENCE AND DEFENSE DOCTRINE

Djoko Purnomo*, Emanuel, Joko Prasetyo, Andy Mustafa Akad, Tarsisius Susilo
Sekolah Staf dan Komando TNI, Indonesia
*Email: polaris67@gmail.com**

Article History
Received: 26 August 2025
Accepted: 9 September 2025
Published: 6 December 2025

Abstract

This study examines the relationship between Donald J. Trump's leadership style, which promotes the America First policy, and its manifestation in defense and energy industry policies. It then examines the implications of this policy for efforts to achieve logistical independence and the formulation of Indonesia's defense doctrine. The background of this study is the phenomenon of resource nationalism and protectionism that influence the structure of the global supply chain and national security priorities. The objectives of this study are: (1) to identify the characteristics of Trump's leadership style that impact defense and energy industry policies; (2) to explain the mechanisms by which these policies change logistical independence and the sustainability of strategic supply chains; and (3) to formulate policy implications that can be adapted to strengthen Indonesia's defense doctrine. The method used is a descriptive qualitative approach in the form of literature review, policy analysis, content analysis of official documents and policy publications, and thematic analysis to examine thematic patterns. Key findings indicate that the Trump administration emphasized a nationalistic narrative, the use of executive and protectionist instruments, and an emphasis on strengthening the domestic industrial base as a security strategy. These policy mechanisms operate through strengthening domestic demand, encouraging supplier diversification, and increasing attention to supply chain visibility, but simultaneously create trade-offs in the form of increased costs, market fragmentation, and the risk of hidden dependencies. For Indonesia, the study indicates that literal imitation of protectionist policies is inappropriate; more relevant are selective adaptations in the form of operational capability-based industrial policies, strategic supply maps, structured public-private partnerships, human resource and R&D investments, strategic stockpiling, and technology diplomacy that maintains interoperability. In conclusion, effective logistics independence must be designed as a holistic strategy that considers economic efficiency, resource sustainability, and Pancasila values to ensure Indonesia's defense doctrine remains adaptive and equitable. This research recommends further empirical studies to test the effectiveness of operational policies at the sectoral and provincial levels.

Keywords: America First, Defense Doctrine, Logistics Independence, Trump Leadership, Resource Nationalism

A. INTRODUCTION

Global geopolitical developments over the past decade have demonstrated a marked shift, with the emergence of leadership and policy patterns that prioritize resource nationalism and economic protectionism as instruments of national strategy. One of the most obvious manifestations of this trend is the "America First" doctrine promoted by the Donald

J. Trump administration, which links industrial, energy, and security policies within a single framework of national priorities. At the strategic policy level, this is reflected in core security policy documents and administration speeches, which place the revitalization of the domestic industrial base and the protection of supply chains as key elements of national resilience (The White House, 2017).

Specifically, the "America First" agenda places energy production and industrial capacity as geopolitical components. The shale revolution that spurred a surge in oil and gas production in the US provides the technical foundation for this ambition, while executive policies and regulatory incentives are aimed at accelerating energy exports (including LNG) to Asian and European markets, a move positioned as an effort to reduce the influence of energy suppliers perceived as geopolitically problematic (Guliyev, 2020). The Buy American policy and a number of executive orders that emphasize the use of local content in government procurement emphasize efforts to return industrial value added to the country, especially in strategic sectors such as defense (The White House, 2020)(U.S. Department of Energy, 2017).

This phenomenon is part of a broader discourse: resource nationalism, the practice of states seeking to assert greater control over strategic resources for political, economic, and security purposes. Recent studies emphasize that resource nationalism is no longer solely the domain of "resource-rich" states; non-traditional actors (industrialized nations with strategic interests in critical minerals) are also implementing policies that prioritize control and security of supply as foreign and industrial policy priorities (Xu et al., 2024). In the modern US context, the combination of the energy technology revolution and nationalist policy pressures has resulted in a new geopolitical transaction: energy is not simply an economic commodity but also a political and security instrument capable of altering regional balances of influence (Bass, 1985).

The impact of such policies on the structure of national and international supply chains is twofold. On the one hand, strengthening the domestic industrial base and diversifying supply sources increases logistical resilience, a direct benefit for military readiness and operational continuity. On the other hand, protectionist measures and competition for resources can exacerbate global market fragmentation and increase the risk of disruption to critical supplies, particularly if international alternatives are politicized (Burns, 1978). This risk is particularly relevant for countries that still rely on imports of strategic raw materials or high-tech components for defense purposes.

For Indonesia, the lessons of the America First policy have a dual meaning. Indonesia, as an archipelagic nation with a geostrategic position and rich natural resources, has an interest in safeguarding its sovereignty and the continuity of national defense operations. However, Indonesia's ideological and constitutional foundations differ: defense policy must align with the values of Pancasila and the national defense doctrine, which emphasizes a total defense system, namely, the implementation of defense that integrates military and non-military forces (Heifetz, 1994) (Ministry of Defense of the Republic of Indonesia, 2019). Therefore, adopting lessons from foreign resource nationalism cannot be a copy-and-paste process but must be selectively adapted to maintain Indonesian values, social justice, and resource sustainability.

The emerging issues are both practical and strategic: how can Indonesia increase logistical independence and defense industrial capacity without neglecting the principle of openness necessary for technology transfer and investment? How can national strategic leadership be formulated that can mobilize human resources, technology, and industry (science, technology, industry, and talent) to support the total defense doctrine? These issues are pressing given the multi-dimensionality of contemporary threats including conventional,

cyber, information competition, and critical supply chain disruptions that demand continuous logistics readiness.

This research aims to fill this analytical gap by conducting a focused study of Trump's leadership style and policies (America First) in the defense and energy industries, then examining their implications for the concept of logistical independence and the formulation of Indonesia's defense doctrine. The analytical framework used combines strategic leadership theory, particularly transformational theory (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978) and adaptive leadership (Heifetz, 1994), with policy analysis and a review of strategic documents, thus enabling a mapping of leadership style, policy choices, and operational consequences for defense posture.

Therefore, the objectives of this research are formulated as follows: (1) to analyze the characteristics of Donald J. Trump's leadership style that contribute to the America First policy regarding the defense and energy industries; (2) to identify the mechanisms by which this policy affects logistical independence and the sustainability of strategic supply chains; and (3) to formulate relevant and adaptable policy implications for strengthening Indonesia's defense doctrine, while upholding the values of Pancasila and the principle of total defense.

B. LITERATURE REVIEW

Theory and Concept of Resource Nationalism

Control over extractive resources “lies at the heart of modern economic and social development” (Bebbington, 2014: 86), yet it also functions as something “imagined” rather than simply a material reality. One mode of governance that highlights this dualism is the resurgent discourse and policy of “resource nationalism.” This term is loosely used to describe the tendency of nation-states to assert economic and political control over natural resources found within their sovereign territories (Bridge, 2014a; Evans et al., 1985). Conventional understandings are largely rooted in territorial conceptualizations of how political power is exercised in controlling the economic distribution of resource rents, although they often fail to capture the changing political geography of the resources themselves (Childs, 2016).

Resource nationalism is often assumed to be the antithesis of economic liberalization, or as Halina Ward (2009) calls it, “resource privatism.” It is seen as antagonistic to foreign capital (Emel et al., 2011: 71) by restricting the operations of international corporations and asserting greater national control over resource development (Stevens, 2008: 5). However, the literature shows that resource nationalism is not static; it swings according to the logic of the “privatization/nationalization pendulum” (Butler, 2013; Chang et al., 2010; Hindery, 2013). Thus, rather than a simple dichotomy between the state and the market, this policy is better understood as a hybrid form of governance that is always in a state of flux (McCarthy, 2005; McCarthy & Prudham, 2004).

Discursively, resource nationalism is often perceived differently between developed and developing countries. In Global North countries such as Norway or Australia, it is seen as part of a legitimate political debate (Bremmer & Johnston, 2009; Wilson, 2011), while in the Global South, especially Africa, it is seen as a risk and obstacle to investment and growth (Vivoda, 2009; Click & Weiner, 2010; Maniruzzaman, 2009). Another emerging dichotomy is “soft” versus “hard” resource nationalism. “Soft” includes regulatory strategies, taxes, or local content obligations (Domgas, 2012; White & Rowley, 2012), while “hard” includes nationalization, contract cancellation, or tight control over ownership (Ward, 2009; Andreasson, 2015; Pickel, 2003).

In Koch and Perreault's (2018) view, resource nationalism is not simply a state-centric phenomenon, but rather a political discourse mobilized by various actors. It serves as an

idiom for the expression of collective identity, sovereignty, and citizenship rights (Anderson, 1991; Billig, 1995; Perreault & Green, 2013). Resource nationalism can emerge in the form of "hot nationalism" (political speeches, nationalization) or "banal nationalism" (symbols, murals, or public mobilization) (Billig, 1995; Jones & Merriman, 2009; Sutherland, 2012). This emphasizes that in addition to the state, non-state and sub-national actors play a role in producing this discourse.

As social constructs, resources cannot be understood as "things in themselves," but rather as the product of social, economic, and political relations (Harvey, 1974; Bridge, 2009). Thus, states and resources are mutually constitutive, with processes of state formation often coexisting with "resource-making" (Coronil, 1997; Bridge, 2010; Emel et al., 2011). For resource-exporting states, resource nationalism manifests itself in discourses of rent control and the threat of foreign domination; while for importing states, it manifests in concerns about scarcity and potential supply cuts (Bridge & Le Billon, 2013; Himley, 2013, 2014).

From a critical geography perspective, resource nationalism cannot be understood solely as a threat to the neoliberal order, but rather as a hybrid form of governance that combines state intervention and market logic (Nem Singh, 2010; Kaup, 2010). It is also a discourse that shapes national imagination, political legitimacy, and the structure of rights to resources (Williams & Smith, 1983; Kuus & Agnew, 2008). Thus, the study of resource nationalism opens up analytical space for how claims to sovereignty, the distribution of rents, and national identity are negotiated in an interconnected global context.

“America First” Policy

The "America First" policy under Donald J. Trump stems from a strategic orientation that places trade deficits, exchange rate policy, and the renegotiation of trade agreements at the forefront of the United States' political and economic agenda (White House, 2025). Through this approach, the Trump administration closely links foreign economic policy with national security policy, making trade not merely an economic matter but also a geopolitical strategy (Ciuriak, 2025). The primary instrument used is a tariff war, particularly through the implementation of Sections 232 and 301, supported by rhetoric of economic sovereignty and protection of domestic industries. This emphasizes that the "America First" agenda is inseparable from efforts to reposition the United States within the global supply chain and its international alliance system.

The known consequences of this policy are demonstrated through a number of empirical findings. The imposition of tariffs on steel and aluminum, for example, failed to produce the desired effect and even had broader negative impacts (Autor et al., 2024; Durante, 2024). Rather than reducing the trade deficit, official data shows that the United States' trade balance actually widened in the period following the tariff policy's implementation (US Bureau of Economic Analysis, 2024). Furthermore, the administrative costs arising from administering this tariff-based trade policy have proven to be very high, both in terms of bureaucratic burden and regulatory uncertainty for businesses (GAO, 2023; Chorzempa et al., 2024). A comparison with the Brexit experience reveals a similar pattern, where protectionist policies resulted in a significant decline in trade and investment, and implications for national productivity (Springford, 2024; TBI, 2023; Crowley et al., 2019).

Meanwhile, unpredictable consequences are more difficult to anticipate due to the complex and adaptive nature of the global economic system. The Nixon Measures of 1971 provide a relevant example: the decision to unpeg the dollar to gold and impose global tariffs was initially seen as a short-term response, but over time it triggered global inflation, an oil crisis, and a fundamental restructuring of the international financial system (Nixon, 1971; Hammes & Willis, 2005; Corbett, 2013). This policy gave rise to financial derivatives markets and unforeseen long-term global economic instability (Ciuriak, 2013a, 2013b). Thus,

the "America First" policy has the potential to generate similar dynamics, with long-term implications that could far exceed policymakers' initial calculations.

Geopolitically, "America First 2.0" has significant implications for the United States' relations with its traditional allies such as NATO, the European Union, Japan, and South Korea. Trump's demands for burden-sharing in defense funding, along with his push for allies to develop greater strategic autonomy, have the potential to alter the balance of long-established alliances (America First 2.0, 2024). This has also resulted in the fragmentation of trade and security blocs, which in practice has encouraged the emergence of alternative patterns of cooperation outside the United States' orbit of influence. Furthermore, this policy has accelerated the process of strategic decoupling from China, particularly in the high-tech and energy sectors, thus reinforcing the bipolar dynamics in the contemporary global order. The implications for global supply chains are immediate, particularly in the context of strategic industries related to defense, energy, and technology, where "America First" positions the United States to reduce external dependence while increasing geopolitical bargaining power through economic instruments.

Defense Logistics Independence

Defense logistics independence is defined as a country's ability to ensure the availability, continuity, and continuity of supplies of materials, components, and services necessary for military operations in both peacetime and crisis, without critical reliance on foreign suppliers that are vulnerable to politicization or disruption. This concept encompasses industrial dimensions (manufacturing capacity and spare parts), supply chain management (visibility, mapping, substitution), strategic reserves (stockpiles), and surge production mechanisms that enable rapid production increases during crises. This type of independence is not simply a protectionist policy; it is a capacity strategy that combines operational preparedness and economic resilience to prevent operational effectiveness from being eroded by supply disruptions (Elvemo, 2025; Loska et al., 2025).

The experience of major powers shows that the biggest problem is not simply the absence of domestic manufacturers, but rather the lack of visibility into lower-tier suppliers (raw materials, small component makers), which makes countries vulnerable to hidden dependencies. Official audits and studies have found that supply chain mapping efforts are often fragmented, covering only large subsystems, while lower-tier suppliers are often missing from procurement databases, even though they are critical to final assembly. Therefore, digital approaches (digital Bill of Materials (SBOM) and mandatory supplier reporting are important tools for increasing visibility (United States Government Accountability Office, 2025).

Efforts to increase logistical independence absolutely involve trade-offs: import substitution and local content preferences can increase production costs, reduce short-term efficiency, and have consequences for national productivity if not accompanied by increased productivity and economies of scale. Therefore, policies must be designed as capability-driven industrial policies that prioritize strategic components/added value for domestic development, while other non-critical components can still be imported with risk mitigation mechanisms. Targeted fiscal and R&D interventions help narrow the cost gap and increase the competitiveness of domestic production (Hellberg et al., 2025).

Mapping the supply chain down to the raw material level is a mandatory initial step. Best practices suggest using a combination of contractual data, digital BOM/SBOM, and regular vendor audits to identify vulnerable points. In practice, defense institutions should require contractual clauses mandating supplier transparency and the use of digital formats for BOMs, so that policymakers can prioritize mitigation at the highest-risk nodes. Supply maps enable

the government to design substitution programs, R&D incentives, and more prescriptive stock policies.

The establishment of strategic stockpiles for critical raw materials (e.g., minerals, explosives, certain chemicals, or semiconductors) needs to be balanced with surge production mechanisms: contractual agreements with industry (capacity reservation), co-investment schemes, and rapid activation procedures tested through training. International experience shows that stockpiles that are not strategically managed (e.g., expired, high maintenance costs) can become a burden; therefore, stockpiling policies must be oriented towards concrete operational needs and combined with stock rotation through civil-military use whenever possible (Rule, 2021).

Sustainable logistics independence is generally achieved through a hybrid model: fiscal incentives for R&D and production scale, credit for strategic MSME suppliers, co-investment facilities for defense manufacturing projects, and offset and joint-venture provisions in technology transfer contracts. The government's role is not always to directly finance all capacity, but rather to create a medium-term demand signal that encourages private investment. Such a model also requires an outcome measurement mechanism (e.g., readiness, time-to-surge, local share) so that policies can be evaluated and adjusted (Hellberg et al., 2025). Strengthening the manufacturing base requires long-term investment in technical human resources and R&D. Recommended best practices include integrated industry-university vocational programs, R&D scholarships for dual-use topics, support for defense technology incubators, and testing and certification facilities that shorten the time to commercialization of innovations. Synergy between national research institutions, universities, and small and medium-sized supplier industries is key to building a sustainable local value chain (Loska et al., 2025).

In the context of Indonesia's defense doctrine, which emphasizes a Universal Defense System, logistics independence must be defined as a balance between supply sovereignty and the principles of productive international cooperation. Adopting measures such as supply chain mapping, strengthening domestic strategic suppliers, establishing stockpiles and surge mechanisms, and hybrid industrial policies can improve readiness without closing the door to investment and technology transfer. Clear legal and governance arrangements, along with transparency principles, will ensure that independence does not degenerate into protectionism that is detrimental to social welfare. The national policy document (the Defense White Paper) should include a framework for prioritizing logistics capabilities to guide medium- and long-term investment (Kemhan_RI, 2015).

Indonesian Defense Doctrine

Indonesia's defense doctrine grew out of the historical experience of the struggle for independence and evolved along with political dynamics, the constitution, and contemporary security demands. Conceptually, the doctrine is rooted in the idea that national defense must be comprehensive, involving all components of the nation, territory, and national resources, and prepared early and implemented in a total, integrated, directed, continuous, and sustainable manner to uphold state sovereignty and protect the nation's safety (Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 3 of 2002). This view was later crystallized in modern terminology as the Total People's Defense and Security System (Sishankamrata), which places civilians not merely as policy objects but as key actors and resources in national defense efforts (Kemhan_RI, 2015).

The intellectual roots of Sishankamrata can be traced to the thoughts of military figures during the independence period, particularly the ideas of guerrilla warfare and the empowerment of the people as a reserve force, formulated and developed by A. H. Nasution in his works on the principles of guerrilla warfare. This thinking emphasizes that the

legitimacy and effectiveness of defense in Indonesia must stem from popular support and the readiness of territory and resources, so that the organization and operational doctrine must be able to integrate military and non-military capabilities within a broad national framework (Nasution, 1984). In modern state practice, these principles are realized through state policies and strategic documents that emphasize the role of the TNI as a primary component of the state's defense apparatus within a framework that continues to respect civilian supremacy and constitutional rules.

Indonesia's doctrinal formula not only emphasizes people-to-people involvement, but also emphasizes the territorial and multimodal dimensions of defense: border area readiness, strategic resource management, and the integration of military and non-military elements (local government, community, industry) in crisis scenarios. This holistic approach has unique implications for logistics planning: planning must be embedded in the regional scale, take into account the geographical diversity of the archipelago, and ensure that distribution capacity, reserves, and civil-military support are operational under normal and emergency conditions. The Indonesian Defense White Paper emphasizes that logistics capabilities and material support must be configured to align with the principle of whole-of-nation involvement, so that defense industry development, stockpile preparation, and surge production mechanisms are not sectoral initiatives but rather part of an integrated national strategy (Kemhan_RI, 2015).

The development of contemporary threats, including asymmetric, hybrid, and non-traditional threats such as cyberattacks or supply chain disruptions, forces Indonesian doctrine to continuously adapt without abandoning its universal foundation. Academic studies show that Sishankamrata remains relevant, but requires conceptual modernization: integration of information technology, strengthening civilian capacity for critical functions, and harmonization of regulations between defense policy and regional development policy are urgently needed to ensure the universal system can absorb and respond effectively to new threats (Muksinin, 2020). Consequently, doctrine must combine efforts to increase military capabilities with policies to strengthen national resilience in the economic, technological, and social sectors—an intersectoral approach that demands high institutional coordination.

Legally and policy-wise, Indonesia's doctrine is supported by a regulatory umbrella that mandates citizen participation and an integrated defense governance structure. Law Number 3 of 2002 concerning National Defense provides the legal basis for the implementation of a universal defense system and requires the government to undertake early preparedness for threats. The concrete implementation of this doctrine is realized through more operational national policy documents, including the Defense White Paper and implementing regulations governing the role of ministries/agencies and civil-military relations in the implementation of defense (Defense, 2015). Updating and strengthening these regulations are prerequisites for the universal doctrine to be not merely normative but also operational at the regional and implementing unit levels.

In relation to logistical independence, Indonesia's defense doctrine places the principles of supply sovereignty and empowerment of national resources as strategic objectives, but they must be realized in a balanced manner. This means that efforts to build the capacity of the domestic defense industry and strategic reserves must be designed to align with the principle of openness that encourages technology transfer and conducive international cooperation. A sustainable, capability-based approach that carefully assesses which capabilities must be developed in-house, which can be acquired through partners, and how to manage the division of roles between the central and regional governments will strengthen the effectiveness of the Sishankamrata doctrine in the context of modern threats. This is where governance, accountability, and long-term planning are key to ensuring that the

doctrine is not merely a symbol but an operational instrument that enhances the nation's deterrent power (Kemhan_RI, 2015; Muksinin, 2020).

Ultimately, Indonesia's defense doctrine should be viewed as a living document requiring regular evaluation in response to changes in the strategic environment, national capacity, and international practices. Contextual reformulation that emphasizes the role of civil society, strengthens technological integration, and aligns economic resilience policies with operational defense needs will maintain the relevance of Sishankamrata. This policy should be outlined in clear implementation guidelines, a mechanism for dividing tasks between the central and regional governments, and performance indicators that can measure logistical preparedness and surge capability. Thus, the defense doctrine serves not only as a normative foundation but also as a pragmatic roadmap for developing logistical independence and an adaptive and sustainable defense posture.

C. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research uses a descriptive qualitative approach, relying on literature review and policy analysis. As Creswell & Creswell (2018) emphasize, qualitative research begins with assumptions and the use of an interpretive/theoretical framework that informs the study of a research problem that addresses the meanings individuals or groups attach to social or human issues. Data in qualitative research is collected in a natural setting sensitive to the people and places studied, and data analysis is inductive and establishes patterns or themes (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

The policy analysis in this research follows the approach described by Bardach & Patashnik (2020), who defines policy analysis as a social and political activity. This activity is socially and politically embedded; conducted by people for people. Analysts respond to the needs of their clients, but they also engage in a process of mutual education. Therefore, this research emphasizes the relationship between empirical data in the form of official policy documents and an interpretative process oriented toward Indonesia's strategic defense needs.

This research uses a descriptive qualitative approach, relying on literature review and policy analysis. As Creswell & Creswell (2018) emphasize, qualitative research begins with assumptions and the use of an interpretive/theoretical framework that informs the study of a research problem that addresses the meanings individuals or groups attach to social or human issues. Data in qualitative research is collected in a natural setting sensitive to the people and places studied, and data analysis is inductive and establishes patterns or themes (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

The policy analysis in this research follows the approach described by Bardach & Patashnik (2020), who defines policy analysis as a social and political activity. This activity is socially and politically embedded; conducted by people for people. Analysts respond to the needs of their clients, but they also engage in a process of mutual education. Therefore, this research emphasizes the relationship between empirical data in the form of official policy documents and an interpretative process oriented toward Indonesia's strategic defense needs.

D. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Characteristics of Donald J. Trump's leadership style and his contribution to the America First policy (defense and energy industry)

A thematic analysis of policy statements, executive orders, and institutional documents issued during the Trump administration reveals a populist-nationalistic, pragmatic, and short-term results-oriented leadership style that influences strategic policy choices in the defense and energy sectors. This leadership style can be explained by combining three

leadership theoretical lenses: transformational (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978), adaptive (Heifetz, 1994), and military-strategic leadership.

First, rhetorically, Trump displayed transformational elements, offering a grand narrative (vision) of "restoring America's industrial glory" and inspiring his base through concrete economic promises such as "Buy American" and "Made in America" (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978). However, when examined against formal transformational indicators such as long-term institutional capacity building, instilling collective values, and forming cross-sector coalitions, his transformational pattern appears fragmented. policies are more instructional and administrative (executive orders, tariffs) than fundamental institutional reforms (United States Department of Defense, 2018).

Second, from an adaptive leadership perspective, the Trump administration's actions represent a response to structural challenges (changing trade patterns, competitors' technological advances, and concerns over supply dependency) that favors disrupting the status quo, such as tariff wars, energy deregulation, and an emphasis on onshoring strategic production. This approach demonstrates adaptive capacity by establishing a new framework, but often neglects transition management; the economic impacts and cross-sectoral consequences are not always adequately anticipated and mitigated (The White House, 2017).

Third, when viewed through the lens of military strategic leadership, Trump's policies align economic and security priorities: strengthening the defense industrial base is a priority because it directly relates to troop readiness and sustainment. This effort is realized through policy initiatives, supply chain audits, and a push to increase domestic production capacity, the strategic significance of which is emphasized in government documents (United States Department of Defense, 2018) (The White House, 2017).

Trump's leadership style contributed to the formation of America First policies through the following mechanisms: (a) emphasizing a strong national narrative to build political support; (b) using executive and protectionist policy instruments to create rapid change; and (c) prioritizing defense that subordinated global market logic to the needs of strategic supply readiness and sovereignty. However, the limitations of long-term transformative action and managing cross-sector consequences leave significant implementation gaps—an important lesson for policymakers seeking to emulate some aspects of America First without incurring unnecessary social and economic costs.

The mechanisms by which America First policies impact logistics independence and the sustainability of strategic supply chains

Analysis of policy documents, institutional audits, and independent studies reveals several key mechanisms through which America First policies transform strategic logistics and supply chain independence.

Strengthening the domestic industrial base through policy instruments

Instruments such as Buy American clauses, local content preferences, fiscal incentives, and direct investment in critical sectors redirect government demand toward domestic suppliers, thus revitalizing local manufacturing and defense subcontractor chains. A DoD report (EO 13806) and policy analysis confirm that this strategy has successfully increased attention to supply chain visibility and foreign dependence on key components (United States Department of Defense, 2018). However, this strengthening is selective: the capacity to increase production of complex components remains limited, necessitating additional interventions.

Supplier diversification versus market fragmentation

Energy export policies (LNG) and the promotion of strategic mineral production expand US geopolitical options, such as suppressing the influence of certain energy suppliers. This increases political leverage but also encourages consumer countries to restructure their supply

relationships, which in the long run leads to market fragmentation and "geopolitical supply chains" (Guliyev, 2020). On the one hand, diversification makes supply chains more resilient to supply outages from a single source; on the other hand, the politicization of supply increases transaction costs and logistical complexity, particularly for countries with limited industrial capacity.

Economic costs and trade-offs between resilience and efficiency

Domestic preference policies tend to raise production costs (when domestic inputs are more expensive than imports) and complicate global market integration. Empirical studies of the impact of tariffs and protectionism show that the effects on the trade balance, investment, and productivity often fall short of policymakers' expectations (United States Government Accountability Office, 2025). In other words, efforts to increase logistics resilience can create economic trade-offs that must be managed, especially for developing countries whose industrial capacity is not yet as extensive as the US.

Limited visibility and hidden dependencies

Despite Trump's increased attention to supply chains, recent evidence (United States Government Accountability Office, 2025) suggests that the US government remains limited in identifying all levels of suppliers, particularly those providing lower-level components and raw materials vital to weapons system production. This lack of visibility places the country at risk of hidden dependencies that are difficult to mitigate through domestic preference instruments alone.

Medium-term impact on alliances and interoperability

Reducing external dependence and pressure on allies to increase burden-sharing can encourage allies to develop local capacity. However, when accompanied by excessive protectionist rhetoric, this has the potential to undermine the technical and logistical interoperability mechanisms that underpin coalition operations. This impact is evident in discussions about NATO burden-sharing reform and in allies' efforts to build their own strategic autonomy (Xu et al., 2024).

Methodologically, the mechanisms above demonstrate that the America First policy operates not only through direct policy instruments (tariffs, EOs, subsidies), but also through shifting geopolitical and market preferences, resulting in new, more politicized and fragmented supply chain structures that simultaneously require coordinated policy interventions to maintain the efficiency and continuity of logistics operations. This emphasizes that logistics independence is not simply a matter of local production but also of supply ecosystem management (visibility, substitution, strategic stocks, and multilateral cooperation), which requires a country's capability to integrate industrial capacity, trade policy, and security strategy (O'Hanlon & Rocha, 2024).

Policy implications for strengthening Indonesia's defense doctrine

Based on the above findings, practical implications can be formulated that are relevant for Indonesia, an archipelagic country that upholds the doctrine of total defense and upholds the values of Pancasila in an effort to strengthen logistical independence and the resilience of its defense posture.

Establishing defense industry priorities based on operational needs

Emphasis should be placed on a concrete capability gap analysis: which parts of the logistics chain are most vulnerable (military communications systems, critical spare parts, military energy, semiconductors for control systems) and suitable for domestic development. Defense industry development should be capability-driven, not simply protectionist. Procurement policies should require local content (TKDN) but be accompanied by a technology transfer roadmap and realistic production readiness targets (Heritage & Brookings recommendations on revitalizing the industrial base) (American Security Project, 2025).

Building supply chain visibility and risk mitigation mechanisms

Indonesia needs to develop a strategic supplier registry and supply chain mapping system for critical components. This approach is similar to the supply chain visibility efforts emphasized by the DoD and GAO, but tailored to national scale and capacity. Implementation includes mandatory reporting for key suppliers, an import dependency audit program, and funding for strategic substitution (incentives for critical raw materials and component manufacturing) (Karkare, 2024).

Hybrid industrial policy: public-private incentives and selective international partnerships

The US experience shows that public support alone is not enough; synergy between government investment, private capital, and market policies is needed to build sustainable manufacturing capacity. Indonesia needs to design incentive mechanisms that balance protection and transparency, such as R&D tax credits, credit programs for strategic small and medium enterprises, co-investment facilities for defense projects, and industrial policies that encourage supplier ecosystems (cluster development). At the same time, international cooperation for technology transfer must continue, but be regulated through contracts that protect sovereign interests (local offsets, joint ventures, capacity building).

Human resource development and integrated research

Logistics independence is impossible without long-term investment in technical human resources and research capabilities. Recommended approaches include integrated vocational education programs, R&D fellowships for dual-use military-civilian topics, and defense technology incubators linking universities, R&D institutions, and industry. This public-private synergy model aligns with recommendations to strengthen the defense manufacturing and innovation base in other countries (Wired, 2023).

Formulating strategic stock policies and surge production mechanisms

To address sudden supply disruptions, Indonesia needs a strategic stockpiles policy for critical components and a surge production mechanism (production capacity that can be increased in times of crisis). This requires a legal framework, financing, agreements with the private sector, and integrated logistics exercises to test readiness. Learning from the US and Ukraine's experiences, the combination of managed stockpiles and a flexible network of small suppliers provides operational resilience (Armental, 2024).

Maintaining ideological balance: adaptation according to Pancasila and the principle of universal defense

Every step in defense industrialization must consider the values of Pancasila: social welfare, justice, and unity. Therefore, policies should not solely encourage profit accumulation or ignore environmental aspects; the exploitation of strategic resources must be accompanied by principles of sustainability and transparency. An aggressive model of resource nationalism is not entirely in line with Pancasila values; a more appropriate approach is resource stewardship, which combines resource sovereignty with shared benefits for the people (Greenway et al., 2025).

Defense diplomacy to reduce the risk of politicization of supplies

Indonesia must actively engage in technology and energy diplomacy to develop alternative supply chains without sacrificing independence. The ASEAN framework, bilateral (co-production) agreements, and participation in multilateral initiatives on critical minerals can mitigate the risk of being caught between major powers. This type of diplomacy also helps maintain interoperability and exercise cooperation, which are essential to the universal defense doctrine (Widjajanto, 2010).

The discussion above confirms that America First, as a result of a specific leadership style, produces a mix of positive effects (increased attention to industrial resilience, risk

visibility) and risks (market fragmentation, economic costs, and hidden dependencies). For Indonesia, the most realistic strategy is not to emulate wholesale protectionism, but rather to adopt a selective and adaptive approach: capability-driven industrial policy, increased supply chain visibility, structured public-private partnerships, investment in human resources and research and development, strategic reserves, and pragmatic diplomacy. All these steps must be tied to the principles of Pancasila and the universal defense doctrine, resulting in ethical, sustainable, and effective logistical independence for long-term national security.

E. CONCLUSION

This study finds that Donald J. Trump's leadership style, which emphasizes nationalistic narratives, swift policy action, and an emphasis on industrial independence, played a significant role in the birth of the America First policy, which combines energy, industry, and security issues. The tangible impact of this policy is seen in efforts to strengthen the domestic industrial base and increased attention to strategic supply chain visibility, but the policy also creates trade-offs in the form of increased costs, market fragmentation, and the risk of hidden dependence on layers of suppliers that are difficult to identify. In the Indonesian context, the main findings suggest that the relevant lesson is not a literal imitation of protectionism, but rather the selective adoption of its principles such as capability-driven industrial policy, strengthening supply chain visibility, and human resource investment aligned with the values of Pancasila and the doctrine of total defense so that logistical independence can be achieved sustainably and equitably.

Further research should explore empirical field studies that test the effectiveness of operational capability-based defense industry policies at the provincial or sector-specific level, as well as measure the medium-term economic impact of import substitution policies on productivity and resilience. Quantitative studies combining input-output analysis with supply chain risk models would help map specific points of vulnerability and evaluate surge production scenarios. Furthermore, interdisciplinary studies involving industry, academic, and military actors through participatory methods (in-depth interviews and selected case studies) would provide richer empirical data for designing effective technology transfer policies and public-private incentive schemes.

This study has several limitations that should be considered when interpreting the results. First, the descriptive qualitative approach used relies on document analysis and secondary literature, thus limiting the ability to quantitatively assess the policy's impact. Second, the study's focus on America First policies and their implications for Indonesia limits the generalizability of the findings to other countries with different economic structures and industrial capacities. Third, rapidly changing policy dynamics and geopolitical conditions mean some findings are sensitive to new developments; therefore, these results are best viewed as a preliminary policy roadmap that requires further empirical verification.

REFERENCES

American Security Project. (2025). *Strategic Implications of U.S. LNG Exports Energy Security*. *January*.

Armental, M. (2024). U.S. Applies Private-Equity Fund Model to National Security Supply Chain. *The Wall Street Journal*. https://www.wsj.com/articles/u-s-applies-private-equity-fund-model-to-national-security-supply-chain-8c6b9eb8

Bardach, E. S., & Patashnik, E. M. (2020). *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path* (6th ed.). SAGE.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations* (1st ed.). The Free

Press.
Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. In *Leadership.* (pp. ix, 530–ix, 530). Harper & Row.
Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches Fifth Edition. In *Writing Center Talk over Time* (Fifth edit). SAGE. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429469237-3
Elvemo, L. (2025). Supply Chain Resilience in Military Operations: A Case Study Exploring Command and Control. *Scandinavian Journal of Military Studies*, *8*(1), 178–199. https://doi.org/10.31374/sjms.356
Greenway, R., Fein, J., Stern, R., Beaver, W., Doan, M., Greszler, R., Embree, J., & Peters, R. (2025). *A Strategy to Revitalize the Defense Industrial Base for the 21st Century*. *314*. https://report.heritage.org/sr314
Guliyev, F. (2020). Trump's "America first" energy policy, contingency and the reconfiguration of the global energy order. *Energy Policy*, *140*, 111435. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2020.111435
Heifetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership Without Easy Answers*. Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1pncrt0
Hellberg, R., Sprängare, D., Candell, O., Carpenfelt, C., Lundberg, K., Samuelsson, P., Antai, I., Andersson, P., & Backlund, L. (2025). Performance constraints in defence industry supply chains: evidence from case studies. *Defence and Peace Economics*, 1–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/10242694.2025.2500362
Karkare, P. (2024). *Resource nationalism in the age of green industrialisation*. *365*, 1–33.
Kementrian Pertahanan RI. (2019). Summary Doktrin Pertahanan Negara. In *Kemenhan RI*.
Kemhan_RI. (2015). *Buku Putih Pertahanan Indonesia*.
Krippendorff, K. (2013). Content Analysis An Introduction to Its Methodology. In *SAGE* (Vol. 28).
Loska, D., Hazen, B., Rich, N., Genchev, S., & Malik, T. (2025). Military Supply Chain Logistics and Dynamic Capabilities: A Literature Review and Synthesis. *Transportation Journal*, *64*(2), e70002. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/tjo3.70002
Muksinin, L. (2020). Sishankamrata in the Indonesian State Defense and Security System from the Beginning of Independence to the Reform Period. *Walisongo Law Review (Walrev)*, *2*(2), 115. https://doi.org/10.21580/walrev.2020.2.2.6587
Nasution, A. H. (1984). *Pokok-pokok gerilya dan pertahanan Republik Indonesia di masa lalu dan yang akan datang*. Angkasa.
O'Hanlon, M. E., & Rocha, A. (2024). *Strengthening America's defense industrial base*. Brookings. https://www.brookings.edu/articles/strengthening-americas-defense-industrial-base/
Pertahanan, K. (2015). Peraturan Menteri Pertahanan RNI No 23 Tahun 2015. *Buku Putih Pertahanan Indonesia*, *879*, 2004–2006.
Rule, T. (2021). Toward a More Strategic National Stockpile. *Texas A&M Law Review*, *9*(1).
The White House. (2017). *National Security Strategy of The United States of America*. https://doi.org/10.1201/9781315586373-29
The White House. (2020). *Donald J. Trump The Buy American, Hire American President*. https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Donald-J-Trump-Buy-American-Hire-American-President.pdf
U.S. Departement of Energy. (2017). *Remarks by President Trump at the Unleashing American Energy Event*. Energy & Environment. https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-unle

ashing-american-energy-event/

United States Department of Defense. (2018). *Assessing and Strengthening the Manufacturing and Defense Industrial Base and Supply Chain Resiliency of the United States*. *September*. https://media.defense.gov/2018/Oct/05/2002048904/-1/-1/1/Assessing-And-Strengthening-The-Manufacturing-And Defense-Industrial-Base-And-Supply-Chain-Resiliency.Pdf

United States Government Accountability Office. (2025). *Defense Industrial Base Actions Needed to Address Risks Posed by Dependence on Foreign Suppliers* (Issue July).

Widjajanto, A. (2010). Evolusi Doktrin Pertahanan Indonesia. *Prisma, 29*(1), 3–20. https://lib.atmajaya.ac.id/default.aspx?tabID=61&src=a&id=206329

Wired. (2023). *The Ukraine War Shows the US Military-Industrial Complex Isn't Battle Ready*. Wired.Com. https://www.wired.com/story/ukraine-future-of-war-mom-and-pop-military-industrial-complex/

Xu, D., Dou, S., Zhu, Y., & Cheng, J. (2024). Resource nationalism: the intersection of politics and economics. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03949-8