

## **BETWEEN INVINCIBILITY AND VULNERABILITY OF A LEADERSHIP MODEL**

**Zorina GHILEȚCHI, PhD Student**

Academy of Economic Studies of Moldova

E-mail: [ghiletschi.zorina@ase.md](mailto:ghiletschi.zorina@ase.md)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1013-7524>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.59642/JRTMED.2.2025.03>

Universal Decimal Classification: 005:321.01

JEL Classification: F51, F52

---

### **Abstract**

*The reality in which we live increasingly tests axioms that once appeared to be dogmas rather than a field of principles with a right to exist until proven otherwise. Today, a leader's power of persuasion faces the reverse situation in which the ability to influence does not necessarily require a feeling of approval that transitions into adhesion. Behind these changes lies a certain mode of manifesting and exercising power—one that knows how to negotiate its own position.*

*In our view, the leadership practiced by Donald Trump, President of the United States of America, encompasses not only reactive characteristics suited to a global order in full transformation, but also fixative traits of a future-oriented leadership capable of strategic transaction. As we move toward a new structure of global power, the leader becomes a player who maximizes outcomes through coercive capacity and the anticipation of undesirable results. In other words, reality imposes a new propedeutics of modern leadership within a world of constant recalibration, where crises and uncertainty increasingly become permanent, thereby requiring a more combative style of leadership.*

*Consequently, those who validate the profile of a leader must support, with agility, the agenda of the interests they represent. Thus, for clarity, we emphasize that the way a leader chooses to pivot the interests of their supporters will determine the distinction of a leadership capable of ensuring the transition between present and future.*

---

**Keywords:** leadership, power, adhesion, decision, negotiation

---

### **1. Introduction**

The analytical model of a decision-making and action-oriented construct specific to leadership offers both descriptors that essentialize its activity and foundations for certain hypotheses regarding emerging global trends. To what extent these data help us create a model of modern leadership that still preserves its visionary allure is a question whose answer invites us to examine contemporary leadership models considered fixative of future tendencies.

At the same time, we recognize that the disparity between leadership models situated at the border of past, present, and future can be analyzed through the theoretical framework of the leadership phenomenon.

The multitude of leadership theories reconfirms the persistent interest in this field. Leadership theories have evolved over the past 60 years, since the topic began to be studied as a scientific phenomenon. Each theory explains forms of leadership manifestation as well as indicators for

measuring them. The overall scope of research in this area covers four categories of leadership theories: trait theory, behavioral leadership theory, situational leadership theory, and integrative leadership theory [23].

Returning to trait theory, we recall that a trait is a distinct quality of a person, a “provider” of individuality in character and personality. Behavioral leadership theory emerged as a research concern in the 1940s–1950s, emphasizing the leader’s patterns of action and communication. Even if behavior and traits are interdependent, behavior is more predisposed to change compared to traits. This observation laid a broad foundation for research, particularly into leadership styles and behaviors. Trait theory and behavioral leadership theory sought to identify the best leadership style. Despite their significant scientific contribution, neither succeeded in identifying a perfect, universally applicable leadership style.

Situational leadership theory complements the conceptual approach to this phenomenon by identifying circumstances as factors conditioning the choice of one style over another. In the current context of reconfiguring a new global order, we consider the situational leadership perspective to be particularly relevant for explaining the phenomenon itself. In the specialized literature, this category includes several “contingency theories,” which expand the study of leadership by emphasizing situational factors. In what follows, we present these theories by highlighting both their scientific value and their practical utility in a condensed overview. These theories outline approaches to the concept as well as methodologies for building tools to evaluate it.

Thus, the situational leadership theory developed by Fred Fiedler (1951) analyzes whether the choice of a particular leadership style in a given situation can maximize performance. From this, we understand that a leader may find themselves in two types of situations: one that offers situational advantages for exercising influence over followers, and another that places them at a disadvantage. The mechanism for choosing between a task-oriented or relationship-oriented style results from situational variables: relationship structure, task structure, and positional power. The process involves three guiding questions: (1) Are relationships good or poor? (2) Are tasks repetitive or non-repetitive? (3) Does the style fit the situation (in total, eight combinations are possible). Some researchers criticized this theory for lacking a sufficiently persuasive argument regarding group performance.

Another situational leadership theory Path–Goal Theory, promoted by Robert House—includes four leadership styles (directive, supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented). The most complex and widely accepted situational theory in the academic world, due to its detailed research basis, is the normative leadership theory developed by Vroom, Yetton and Jago (1973). It identifies five leadership styles which, depending on the situation, maximize decision effectiveness: two autocratic, two consultative, and one group-oriented. Thus, the history of the leadership phenomenon includes variables that test behavioral abilities and character subtleties projected into diverse situations. The case study of Donald Trump, the current head of state of the United States, requires substantial investigation, as it explains the triangulation of personality traits, behavior, and situational factors simultaneously.

The increased interest in his case is reflected in the considerable number of articles in specialized journals. For example, Kapoutsis and Volkema, in *Negotiation Journal*, reveal that

competitiveness and consistency are central behavioral characteristics of Donald Trump's public persona, and the former may even lean toward "hyper-competitiveness" at times [13]. They further note that "one of the risks of an extremely competitive attitude is the disregard for norms or ethics that might inhibit the chances of winning," suggesting that extreme competitiveness also signals an excessive desire to produce results. Socially speaking, an individual focused solely on winning will eliminate any obstacle that does not generate results.

This hypothesis is further supported by a statement by Donald Trump in his book *Trump: The Art of the Deal*: "My whole life is about winning. I always win." The title of the book in itself presupposes a mode of self-definition and draws attention to the style and strategy through which Trump seeks to win. As the author highlights, in his strategy for reaching the White House, Trump negotiated with other candidates, with the press, and with the American electorate. In doing so, he strengthened the perception of being a skilled negotiator capable of achieving desired outcomes, supported by confidence in his own efficiency.

From this perspective, experts have observed that Trump typically employs a distributive (win-lose) negotiation approach rather than an integrative (win-win) approach. According to the distributive view, negotiation is a zero-sum game, and negotiators aim to maximize individual gains. The integrative approach, by contrast, emphasizes maximizing joint outcomes.

Regarding Trump's negotiation style, researchers have highlighted several individual markers, including the evaluation of vulnerabilities and strengths of the opposing party to discern their goals, needs, declared and undeclared interests, stakes, and resources [14]. He also prefers to create dependency anchors for the other party, feigning disinterest to test their limits and impose his options—often reduced to two: one with an incentive and the other with a warning. As a result, leverage becomes the instrument Trump frequently employs to weaken the other party's position. Often, he creates the perception that the options he offers are too generous to refuse.

President Trump prefers bilateral negotiations to multilateral ones, as they stimulate the perception of privileged treatment of the counterpart, later invoking loyalty in exchange for such generosity. The perceived uniqueness of Donald Trump's leadership model derives from the convergence of his roles as head of state and negotiator for those he represents. While the normalization of unpredictability may follow a certain logic in negotiation, in international cooperation strategies, ambiguity also creates risks.

To broaden the interpretive framework, we recall that a leader vested with a legitimate mandate to represent state power embodies state authority, whose positional completeness is determined, as Hans Morgenthau notes, by "the geographical location of the state, its natural resources, industrial potential, the number and quality of its armed forces, human resources (demographic factor), national character, national spirit, the quality of diplomacy, and the level of public administration" (Burian, A., 2008). The listing of these positioning resources shifts our discussion toward the theory of representational power and the concept of representational culture [22].

Starting from Măgureanu's (2003) assertion that any leader possesses a certain behavioral consistency which helps cultivate a stable image, we reinforce the relevance of analyzing the

nature of leadership power and the means through which it is exercised and maintained. At the same time, this observation subtly enters the domain of discussions about personality manifestation and the expansion of its contributive role beyond its attributive one. Thus, the ubiquity of power derives from the legitimate authority a leader holds and from the manner in which power is expressed—what we previously referred to as representational culture.

Since the beginning of his second term as U.S. President, Donald Trump has demonstrated notable vigor, and the sequence of events reinforcing this impression consists of decisions that, for some, suggest destabilizing leadership, for others a strategic trap, and for others still an approach rooted in positional power [4]. Regardless of interpretations, his presidency is already seen as a phenomenon destined to enter history under the label of “Trumpism,” the study of which, we assume, will begin with the traditional inaugural address before Congress.

Alongside the grandeur inherent to such an event, the newly elected president presented a forward-looking project in which a desire to capitalize on power is evident—interpreted through the demonstration of the United States’ capacity to mobilize its strategic reserves and through Trump’s commitment to confronting the future head-on.

Thus, the president’s speech may be interpreted through the lens of the “Third Wave,” as described by Alvin and Heidi Toffler (1995) in *Creating a New Civilization: Politics in the Third Wave*, a transformation humanity is already experiencing. Nevertheless, this case invites a remark on the symbolic instruments of power to which aspirations of alignment are tied in the new presidential mandate—specifically the dictum “Make America Great Again,” which, in our view, introduces a slight confusion between the leader’s task of envisioning the future and the desire to return to a symbolic past presumed to have therapeutic effects. Returning to our earlier point, even if the slogan suggests a distributive approach to global geopolitics, it was accepted by the American electorate as an expression of authority and positional power.

In this situation, interpreting power through the prism of a historical totem amplifies the desire to capitalize on power while also confronting the risk of capitulation before an extremely uncertain and shifting reality. From this, we hypothesize that a model of leadership still shaped by expectations of a thaumaturgic leader is gradually being replaced by a style combining attributes of negotiator, mediator, reconciler, arbiter, and guarantor of transition into a new evolutionary cycle.

Therefore, the importance of this article lies in highlighting emerging tendencies in contemporary leadership processes by identifying specific markers of a leader’s profile, which we interpret as clear indications of the need for synchronization with changes unfolding in the global order.

## **2. The current state of research and the aim of the study**

The purpose of the present research is to examine leadership through the lens of power theory—power understood both as an instrument for advancing one’s agenda and as a resource aligned with one’s strategic course of action. The convergence of these two components strengthens the recognition of the leader, thereby confirming the decisional utility interpreted, in turn, through decision theory. The conceptual basis of this study consists of the

works of scholars such as Aghemoglu (2015) and Robinson (2015), Dowding (1998) and Măgureanu (2003) [[2], [5], [15]]. From the works of these authors, in which power is extensively debated, several aspects emerge that are necessary to highlight in order to establish congruence with the present research material:

1. power is, by definition, a relational phenomenon;
2. individuals grant power to those who uphold the common good, the “good” being understood in a utilitarian sense;
3. the numerical value of followers is an indicator of the value of the power granted to the one representing them.

For example, in their work *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity, and Poverty*, Aghemoglu and Robinson observe the synergy between power and prosperity, emphasizing that economic markers create the hierarchy of states. This perspective clarifies the causal context of the economic policies undertaken by the U.S. President, Donald Trump.

Dowding’s power theory, as presented in his work *Power*, is interpreted alongside game theory. As a result, the administration of a position of power entails the promotion of models for formulating one’s intentions and interests. In other words, power generates a relationship among actors characterized by interdependent structures, which presupposes that each party arranges its interests. At the same time, the process of ordering preferences is strongly influenced by the existence of constraints, which shape subsequent choices. Whoever masters the art of constraint shapes and orders preferences.

Keith Dowding also clarifies the distinction between preferences and interests by noting the manner in which they manifest: preferences are shaped, while interests are gained. This remark supports the motivational component underlying decisions.

Researcher Virgil Măgureanu, in his book *Decline or Apotheosis of Power*, discusses the relationship between power and personality, arguing that power is essentially the image of difference from the other, and that the leader’s personality—with its qualities and competencies—constructs this image. Măgureanu’s conclusions confirm the interdependence between power theory and leadership theory, especially in his view that “to govern means to display, that is, to occupy the stage”—a capability which, in everyday life, translates into a combination of authority and consistency [15, p. 35]. Therefore, this research aims to analyze the congruence of these theories as projected within a paradigm of unfolding reality.

### **3. Materials and methods**

The article begins from an exploratory perspective, identifying within factual developments certain trends regarding the manifestation of leadership in a reality distorted by uncertainty, accelerated technological innovation, and changing global order. To build a qualitative analytical trajectory, monographs from specialized literature were examined as theoretical grounding, alongside media articles, in order to determine and define markers that could help identify factors of congruence or non-congruence within a leader’s message.

The case study focusing on the leadership exercised by President Donald Trump—a symbolic figure for analyzing the elasticity of the general public to changes induced by the way he constructs his message—was deliberately chosen, as it represents a model of state

representation associated with global power. Data collected from his ongoing presidential mandate through triangulation of scientific sources, media reports, and statistical information provides analytical and synthetic material for assessing the complexity of leadership acting directly within immediate reality.

The exploratory and descriptive elements enabled the formation of a hypothetical framework concerning the factors that condition a leadership model within a new global order by identifying the conditions that generate adherence and, conversely, reveal vulnerabilities. Accordingly, the specific variables of the research topic allowed us to infer causal relationships between the factors driving changes in how leaders construct their vision of the future and those that generate adherence or distancing. Ultimately, the collected and analyzed data offers an empirical basis for deducing and observing a leadership model.

#### **4. Results and discussion**

In his book *Semiology of Power*, Michael Metzeltin [17] asserts that the manifestation of power inherently involves a discursive aspect. In other words, power discursivizes—it has a narrative—and this narrative becomes one of the sources that sustains it. The communicational style of the President of the United States, Donald Trump, tends to be emphatic, rhetorical, and occasionally loud. Observational evidence suggests that this style promotes a strategy of assertiveness and dominance, initially interpreted largely through the lens of quantitative impact. As an argumentative basis, we refer to the number of executive orders issued on the first day of his term [10, FT reporters].

It is worth noting the distributive character of the executive orders issued on January 20, 2025, totaling 26. The first and only order addressed the field of Economics, specifically the Reevaluation and Realignment of U.S. Foreign Aid (Executive Order 14169). The remainder were distributed as follows: five executive orders in the Justice sector, four in Energy and Environment, one in Health, nine in Security, and six in the “Other” category. Although “Trade and Tariffs” did not appear in an executive order on the first day, interest in this heavily discussed topic later competed with the most prominent news stories shaping both global perceptions and public opinions [8].

Many publications note that during the first 100 days of his second term, the newly elected leader’s activity was characterized by the dynamic issuance of executive orders, many of which explicitly revoked or annulled orders signed by his predecessors, Obama and Joe Biden [8]. Furthermore, the intentionality of leadership in the recurring term likely reinforced the need to fortify decision-making authority, particularly with the signing of Executive Order 14236 regarding additional withdrawals of orders and harmful executive actions.

Returning to the distributive aspect of the president’s orders, a thematic analysis is necessary—another indicator of strategic interests shaping the locus of power in anticipating the future. It appears that the normalization of “normality” as a goal to strengthen presidential decision-making began with an internal audit intended to eliminate threats to economic security resulting from detrimental policies, coupled with the creation of the “Department of Government Efficiency,” specified in Executive Order 14210. The announced changes in his program implied continuous decision-making symmetry, emphasizing the promotion and

protection of domestic production in strategic economic sectors, the security of northern and southern borders against illicit flows (particularly drugs), and the reduction of bureaucracy. The term “efficiency” became the motto underpinning policies to strengthen state power and economic security (Executive Order 14236), prevent waste (Executive Order 14243), protect and modernize U.S. bank transactions (Executive Order 14247), safeguard election integrity (Executive Order 14248), revitalize industries such as coal (Executive Order 14261), restore American maritime dominance (Executive Order 14269), and implement executive orders guided by “common sense,” including protecting children from chemical and surgical mutilation (Executive Order 14187), expanding educational freedom for families (Executive Order 14191), improving educational outcomes by empowering parents, states, and communities (Executive Order 14242), ending discrimination and restoring merit-based opportunity (Executive Order 14173), and protecting parity between women’s and men’s sports (Executive Order 14201).

In the “Energy and Environment” sector, executive orders included: Emergency Measures for Water Supply in California and Improved Disaster Response in Certain Areas (Executive Order 14181), Establishment of the National Council for Energy Dominance (Executive Order 14213), Immediate Measures to Increase U.S. Mineral Production (Executive Order 14241), and Strengthening the Reliability and Security of the U.S. Power Grid (Executive Order 14262), among others.

The “Security” sector issued orders ranging from: Restoring America’s Combat Force (Executive Order 14185), Creating the Iron Dome Defense System for America (Executive Order 14186), Prioritizing Military Excellence and Readiness (Executive Order 14183), Modernizing Defense Procurement and Encouraging Innovation in the Defense Industrial Base (Executive Order 14265), to Reforming Foreign Defense Sales for Speed and Accountability (Executive Order 14268) and Extending the Delay on Tik Tok Implementation (Executive Order 14258).

The decision-making vector in the “Economy” and “Trade and Tariffs” sectors was guided by policies addressing specific threats: Eliminating waste and saving taxpayer dollars through enhanced purchasing power (Executive Order 14240), addressing national security risks from imports of wood, lumber, and derivative products (Executive Order 14223), addressing national security threats from copper imports (Executive Order 14220), U.S. withdrawal and funding review from certain U.N. organizations and other international bodies (Executive Order 14199), establishment of the U.S. Sovereign Wealth Fund (Executive Order 14196), creation of the U.S. Investment Accelerator (Executive Order 14255), reciprocal tariff adjustments to reflect retaliation and partner alignment (Executive Order 14266), reduction of anticompetitive regulatory barriers (Executive Order 14267), regulation of imports with reciprocal tariffs to rectify trade practices contributing to persistent U.S. trade deficits (Executive Order 14257), strengthening American leadership in digital financial technology (Executive Order 14178), and removal of barriers to U.S. leadership in artificial intelligence (Executive Order 14179). In addition to their comprehensive effect, these executive orders clearly target priority activity areas, either to remove vulnerabilities or to proactively seize the future.

A qualitative assessment of the president’s initial actions suggests the creation of a basis for negotiating transactions in favor of the power he represents. From this perspective, the

transactional style promoted by the president reveals the causes of the obstacles he encounters, which some perceive as oscillating between offer, delay, and abandonment, while simultaneously creating the need to renew negotiated commitments among stakeholders. Consequently, many countries have been “tempted” to renegotiate their positions, playing the card of the affected party. We hypothesize that a leader’s unpredictability may signal deliberate strategy rather than unconscious deviation—a distinct trait of Trumpian leadership that draws others into an aggressive whirlwind, forcing defensive responses. Defense, as a reactive measure, assumes that one operating within pre-established rules chooses non-confrontation as the preferred course, given the costs of direct confrontation. Hence, the role of a contemporary leader is to be a player who controls the situation, sets targets, and insists on results serving the majority’s interests. The leader’s willingness to assume responsibility for outcomes reflects high devotion to the excellence of power.

Observing the president’s behavioral pattern, interpreted as that of an entrepreneur-leader, Pfeffer’s citation in Hill Andrew (2025) notes that Trump’s most remarkable “performance is his capacity to push to his extremes.” Assembling former rivals into a team validates his leadership power, although some critics contest his desire to “be” at the center of events, positioning him as a populist leader.

Regardless of others’ perceptions, the historical record of Donald Trump and his team introduces new aspects and tasks to the global agenda, shifting emphases, rules, interrogative patterns, communication, and directions of action. Researchers of U.S. presidential leadership highlight that his sometimes convoluted narrative—referencing cases like the Panama Canal, Canada, and Greenland—reinstates discussion on deconstructing a “borderless” world, as geographical expansion becomes a resource for state extension and strengthening [12]. The Greenland case exemplifies U.S. interests in the Tanbreez rare-earth deposit, one of the world’s largest.

Trump’s policies, though sometimes appearing unconventional, reflect a geopolitical vision. As Friedrich Ratzel noted, a state’s spatial concept underpins its vitality, which depends on maintenance and expansion [3, p. 34]. Kjellen emphasized three factors for global power: expansion, territorial unity, and freedom of movement [3, p. 37]. Strategic decisions in Washington, such as reviving the shipbuilding industry and maritime destiny, reinforce U.S. global positioning [3, p. 43].

The need to revitalize strategic resources does not always align with public adherence, given the intersection of multiple factors—military objectives, trade security policies, anti-dumping actions, labor market impacts, and the constant variable of presidential unpredictability [7]. Trump’s tactical maneuvers can be interpreted both as a source of invincibility and as a mark of noncompliance on strategic interests.

Continued segmentation into supporters and opponents is shaped by economic deconstruction policies, tariff turbulence, stock market volatility, and massive layoffs (121,000 employees), reflecting transactional leadership with a strategy to maximize outcomes. Even opponents, including investment fund leaders, acknowledge that market turbulence highlights systemic weaknesses. The lesson is that exposing vulnerabilities necessitates their continuous correction, and those who capitalize on such opportunities gain the most [18].

Adaptive leadership emerges as a response to uncertain futures, evidenced by market capitalization changes. Profitable companies often include aerospace, defense, AI, cybersecurity, mining, renewable energy, and pharmaceuticals [9]. Leaders must align policies to address uncertainty and convey persuasive messages externally.

An example is the creation of a Government Efficiency Department led by Elon Musk, criticized for mass layoffs. Nonetheless, this decision reflects Trump's alignment with a future vision, providing Musk a symbolic decision-making niche. Musk's eventual withdrawal raises questions on the interplay between Trump-style and Musk-style efficiency, highlighting a new leadership paradigm.

However, correcting vulnerabilities does not always favor the presidency. According to a CNN survey, Trump's approval rate during the first 100 days of his second term was lower than predecessors, with a minimum of 41%, particularly concerning economic management. Immigration policy approval fell from 60% in December to 53% in April, while gender identity policies held at 51%. Diversity, inclusion, and merit (DEI) form a triad implicitly shaping public perception, with meritocracy emphasized by Trump as the key driver of authentic performance [8].

Previously advantageous domains, such as trade, immigration, and the economy, now signal potential risks for presidential image. Migration policies, while reducing illegal crossings, highlighted errors in deportations and reduced international tourism. Studies such as *The 10 Charts That Define Donald Trump's Tumultuous First 100 Days* confirm these trends [8].

Traditionally, foreign visits test presidential leadership. Trump's first overseas tour of his second term (May 2025) to Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and the UAE exemplified visionary leadership, generating \$600 billion from agreements and \$142 billion in arms sales. Geography reinforced power axioms, demonstrating negotiation as a strategy to secure commitments from strong economic allies [6].

Relations with China, however, remain cautious. The tariff war escalated tensions, leading Trump to announce "major progress" on social media after Geneva negotiations (May 10–11, 2025), signaling tariff reductions from 145% (China) and 125% (U.S.). Analysts note that Trump's conciliatory style reflected a weak U.S. negotiating position amid a declining dollar and investor uncertainty [20]. China's counterstrategy focused on industrial self-sufficiency and supply chain optimization, highlighting global economic interdependence [16]. The negotiated tariff delay maintained the status quo, underscoring the relational nature of leadership and the role of diplomacy.

## 5. Conclusions

Undeniably, the positional completeness of a leader depends on the confluence of multiple factors; among these, the economic component—based on the analysis presented above—constitutes the articulation point of a leader's decision-making construct. The semiotics of terms such as "tariff war" and "liberation day," now employed as descriptors of this reality, test not only personality traits but also leadership models. Consequently, we observe that leadership action prioritizes the maximization of results.

The case study of U.S. President Donald Trump reinforces the robustness of the hypothesis concerning a transformation in the manifestation of leadership within a new global order, where power frequently resorts to coercive or disjunctive discourse. In other words, the struggle for control within a leader's culture of representation becomes a behavioral constant, often generating risks to cooperation among equals. Many international practitioners recognize that relationship-building and problem-solving strategies are essential components of a leader's skill set, while distributive tactics undermine processes that reveal opportunities for mutual gain.

In the case of President Donald Trump, his frequently utilitarian and unilateral discourse implies an enhancement of negotiating power aimed at compelling counterparties to recognize their own interests. As a result, Trump's leadership imposes rules of global change within a fragile world already moving toward fragmentation. We assume that underlying this leadership lies an intention to reposition and recalibrate interests, primarily economic in nature. The central interrogative reduces to: "What costs will these changes impose on other players compelled to engage in future transformations?"

The leader of tomorrow, as the author of strategic decisions, tends toward the simultaneous consideration of contexts, pursuing the most advantageous outcome to diminish vulnerabilities and reduce risks. Consequently, negotiation serves as a platform for achieving durable agreements among actors with divergent interests. Thus, a negotiator's dexterity is vital to leadership, as it ensures the ability to identify shared interests while avoiding deep disparities.

## REFERENCES

1. AGIESTA, J., EDWARDS-LEVY, A. CNN Poll: Trump's approval at 100 days lower than any president in at least seven decades. 27.04.2025.  
Available (online) <https://edition.cnn.com/2025/04/27/politics/approval-rating-trump-100-days/index.html>
2. AGENOGLU, D., ROBINSON, J. De ce eşuează națiunile. Originile puterii, ale prosperității și ale sărăciei. - București: Editura Litera, 2015, 576 p. ISBN 978-606-33-0025-7.
3. BURUIAN, A. Geopolitica lumii contemporane. Inst. de Ist., Stat și Drept al Acad. de Științe a Moldovei; Asoc. de Drept Internațional din Rep. Moldova. - Ed. a 2-a, revizuită și adăugată.- Chișinău., CEP USM, 2008, 416 p. ISBN 978-9975-70-733. Available [Ediția online] [https://rmdiri.md/publ/3.%20A.Burian,%20Geopolitica,%20Curs%20de%20lectii,%202008%20\(Text%20machetat%20A-5\).pdf](https://rmdiri.md/publ/3.%20A.Burian,%20Geopolitica,%20Curs%20de%20lectii,%202008%20(Text%20machetat%20A-5).pdf)
4. BURN-MURDOCH, J. Why the Maga mindset is different. In: Financial Times. 07.03.2025. Available (online) <https://www.ft.com/content/3046013f-da85-4987-92a5-4a9e3008a9e1>
5. DOWDING, K. Puterea. - București: Editura DU Style, 1998, 151 p. ISBN 973-9246-40-0.
6. ENGLAD, A., AL OMRAN, A., CORNISH, C. Article Trump's Gulf tour: Jumbo jets, megadeals and flattery. In: Financial Times. 17.05.2025. Available (online) <https://www.ft.com/content/b27013eb-b076-450b-9dfd-e77822f31d3b>
7. FOROGBAR, R. Will Trump make ships great again? In: Financial Times. 24.03.2025. Available (online) <https://www.ft.com/content/da357db5-77a0-4194-8bfd-05c4a60620ea>
8. FT REPORTERS. The 10 charts that define Donald Trump's tumultuous first 100 days. In: Financial Times. 29.04.2025. Available (online) <https://www.ft.com/content/9d3ebaed-50b6-477a-bf62-3a35a22fc222>
9. FT REPORTERS. Triumphant under Trump: the corporate winners and losers. In: Financial Times. 06.06.2025. Available (online) <https://www.ft.com/content/368586a4-80e6-4715-b56e-dd63f8c7df59>
10. FT REPORTERS. Trump tracker: US tariffs. In: Financial Times. 06.02.2025. Available (online) <https://www.ft.com/content/2c473393-35fb-479d-8bba-236a1a98087c>
11. HILL, A. What management theory tells us about Trump's 'team of rivals'. In: Financial Times. 17.05.2025. Available (online) <https://www.ft.com/content/5476e880-6b90-466f-a89e-fe86a1aba5da>
12. <https://gogreenresources.ro/metale-rare-critice-strategice-si-pamanturi-rare>

13. KAPOUTSIS, I., VOLKEMA, R. Core Toughie: Donald Trump's Negotiations for the United States Presidency. In: Negotiation Journal, Volume 35, Issue 1, January 29, 2019, pp. 47–63. Available (online) <https://direct.mit.edu/ngtn/article/35/1/47/121408/Hard-Core-Toughie-Donald-Trump-s-Negotiations-for>
14. KOGAN, E. Art of the Power Deal: The Four Negotiation Roles of Donald J. Trump. In: Negotiation Journal, Volume 35, Issue 1, January 29, 2019. pp. 65-83. Available (online) <https://direct.mit.edu/ngtn/article/35/1/65/121440/Art-of-the-Power-Deal-The-Four-Negotiation-Roles>
15. MĂGUREANU, V. Declinul sau apoteoza puterii. - București: RAO International Publishing Company, 2003, 154.p. ISBN 973-576-566-7.
16. MC MORROW, R., LEABY, J. Chinese companies purge supply chain of foreign parts amid US trade war. In: Financial Times. 11.05.2025. Available (online) <https://www.ft.com/content/8e018bd6-17ae-4ac9-b43b-c625a65c2651>.
17. METZELTIN, M. Semiologia puterii. - București: Editura Universității din București, 2016, 213 p. ISBN 978-606-16-0789-1.
18. MOURSELAS, C. Trump's trade war risks US capital flight, warns hedge fund Elliott. In: Financial Times. 15.05.2025. Available (online) <https://www.ft.com/content/0e12be6a-c1fd-438b-9cd8-49affa33d310>
19. O'BRIEN, R. Trump is right to want to revive US maritime power. In: Financial Times. 24.04.2025. Available (online) <https://www.ft.com/content/d766d733-a1a7-4bfd-836a-7dce32409fe9>
20. SEVASTOPULO, D., LEABY, J. US claims 'substantial progress' after trade talks with China. In: Financial Times. 11.05.2025. Available (online) <https://www.ft.com/content/f5e7d514-24e6-4214-ac3b-30f614a31f34>
21. SMITH, G. Q&A: Donald Trump's first 100 days. In: Financial Times. 26.04.2025. Available (online) <https://www.ft.com/content/33eedc54-bcb5-4905-a970-b999e3244cc9>
22. TOFFLER, A., TOFFLER, H. A crea o nouă civilizație. Politica în al treilea val. - Oradea: Editura ANTET, 1995, 119 p. ISBN 973-96967-6-7.
23. ȚUȚUREA, M., MIRICESCU, D., MORARU, G., GRECU, V. Leadership în organizații. - Sibiu: Editura Universității „Lucian Blaga”, 2010, 425 p. ISBN 978-973-739-953-3.

---

#### Rezumat

*Realitatea în care trăim testează tot mai multe axiome care, altădată, păreau a fi mai degrabă dogme decât un teren de legitiții cu dreptul de existență până la proba contrarie. Astăzi, forța convingerii unui lider cunoaște reversul situației când puterea de a influența nu solicită în mod necesar un sentiment de aprobare trecut în faza de adeziune. În spatele acestor schimbări se ascunde un anume mod de manifestare și de exercitare a puterii care știe să-și negocieze poziția. Leadership-ul realizat de Donald Trump, președintele Statelor Unite ale Americii, în părerea noastră, însumează nu doar caracteristici reactive pentru un cadru al ordinii globale în deplină schimbare, ci și caracteristici fixativi ai unui leadership de viitor care știe să tranzacționeze. Înaintând spre o nouă structură a puterii globale, liderul devine un jucător care își maximizează rezultatele prin puterea de constrângere și modul de anticipare a rezultatelor nedorite. Altfel spus, realitatea incumbă o nouă propedeutică a leadership-ului modern într-o lume a retușării, în care factorii de criză și de incertitudine tot mai mult permanentizează, ca rezultat invocând o solicitare pentru un leadership combativ. Prin urmare, cei care validează profilul unui lider urmează să susțină cu agilitate agenda intereselor celor pe care-i reprezintă. Așadar, pentru conformitate subliniem că modul cum alege liderul să pivoteze interesele susținătorilor săi, va marca diferența unui leadership care va asigura tranziția dintre prezent și viitor.*

---

**Cuvinte-cheie:** leadership, putere, adeziune, decizie, negociere

---

#### Аннотация

*Реальность, в которой мы живём, всё чаще подвергает проверке аксиомы, которые когда-то воспринимались скорее как догмы, чем как поле закономерностей, обладающих правом на существование вплоть до опровержения. Сегодня сила убеждения лидера демонстрирует обратную сторону ситуации, когда способность влиять не предполагает непременно наличие чувства одобрения, переходящего в фазу поддержки. За этими изменениями скрывается определённый способ проявления и осуществления власти, умеющей гибко выстраивать и переосмысливать собственную позицию. Лидерство Дональда Трампа, президента Соединённых Штатов Америки, по нашему мнению, объединяет в себе не только реактивные характеристики, обусловленные трансформацией глобального порядка, но и фиксирующие элементы лидерства будущего, способного к стратегическому обмену и переговорам. В условиях формирования новой структуры глобальной власти лидер превращается в игрока, который максимизирует результаты посредством принуждения и способности предвидеть нежелательные исходы. Иными словами, современная реальность предполагает новую пропедевтику лидерства в мире*

*постоянных корректировок, где кризисные и неопределённые факторы всё более закрепляются, вызывая тем самым потребность в наступательном, боевом типе лидерства. Следовательно, те, кто легитимирует профиль лидера, должны с особой гибкостью отстаивать повестку интересов тех, кого они представляют. Таким образом, подчеркнём, что то, каким образом лидер выбирает стратегию перераспределения и защиты интересов своих сторонников, будет определять отличие лидерства, способного обеспечить переходность между настоящим и будущим.*

---

**Ключевые слова:** лидерство, власть, присоединение, решение, переговоры

---

Received 20.07.2025

Accepted 29.10.2025

Published 31.12.2025