

Michał Kuź

PhD, Lazarski University
ORCID: 0000-0003-4330-4058

TRUMP AND THE ANTI-GLOBALIZATION REBALANCING WITHIN THE WEST

Introduction

President's Trumps international agenda is often viewed as a part of a wider political shift, which undermines the current liberal global order and places more emphasis on the nation state as an international player.¹ Events such as Brexit, Matteo Renzi's lost referendum, the general strengthening of far-right and populist parties are often cited in this context. The phenomenon itself seems to be quite considerable in scope. The politicians described as populists or nationalists are still not a dominant force in most of the elections in developed countries. However, a new divide that moves beyond the post-war left-right division can be clearly observed and variously described. This study will propose the notions of two ideological camps: globalism and localism (with a special focus on national-localism). It will also examine the first year of president Trump's presidency using the historical analysis tools proposed by Harold James and Stephen Skowronek.

¹ T. Wright, "Trump's Team of Rivals, Riven by Distrust", *Foreign Policy*, 14.12.2016, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2016/12/14/trumps-team-of-rivals-riven-by-distrust> [accessed: 10.11.2017]; M. Doran, P. Rough, "Transatlantic Ties in a Populist Era", *American Interest*, 4.05.2017, <https://www.the-american-interest.com/2017/05/04/transatlantic-ties-in-a-populist-era> [accessed: 14.11.2017].

As every new ideological divide, the new shift has a huge potential for disruption and conflict. This article will further argue that from the point of view of the history of political thought a strong political backlash against the liberal globalization is to be expected. In this context, for all the criticism of president Trump’s foreign policies, his presidency offers a potential for stabilization through anti-globalist rebalancing both in the context of international and domestic policies. This rebalancing in turn, has the potential for dismantling an even more radical anti-globalist and nationalist backlash.

The Globalism-Localism Divide

The phenomenon of party dealignment² was the first sign of the crisis of the notions of left and right. Nevertheless, during the first decade of the twenty-first century those notions were still not openly challenged as an accurate description of politico-ideological division. Ian Bunge, after considerable research on parties and party programs, in 2000 still defined the main dichotomy in the following way:

Table 1. The Left and Right Themes

Left	Right
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – peace; – internationalism; – democracy; – planning and public ownership; – protectionism; – social security; – education; – trade unions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – armed forces; – national way of life; – authority, morality; – free market; – free trade; – social harmony; – freedom and rights

Source: I. Bunge, “Identifying Dimensions and Locating Parties: Methodological and Conceptual Problems”, [in:] *Handbook of Party Politics*, eds. R. Katz, W. Crotty, London 2006, p. 429.

Bunge clearly assumed that the period of party dealignment is not a moment at which new ideologies are created. In line with Fukuyamian intuitions³, he seemed to describe a universal crisis of ideologies as such rather than a transitory period from one ideological divide to the other. According to this theory, the globalized liberal democracy and free trade were to abolish all ideological divisions. And democracy was supposed to turn tacitly into a consensual post-democracy.⁴ The sentiments, however, have changed in the second decade of the twenty-first

² M. Wattenberg, “The Decline of Party Mobilization”, [in:] *Parties without Partisans: Political Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies*, eds. R. Dalton, M. Wattenberg, Oxford 2000, pp. 64–76.

³ F. Fukuyama, *End of History and The Last Man*, New York 1992, pp. 27–31.

⁴ C. Crouch, *Post-Democracy*, Cambridge 2004, p. 68.

century. New ideologies have begun to appear in the political aftermath of the financial crisis. New social phenomena became apparent: the rise of the precariat⁵ (the new underclass) and the global mass migration (a new security challenge). Those ideologies, nonetheless, were still unnamed when political scientists started examining the wave of elections and referendums that swept through the Western states (defined as the USA and EU members) between 2015–2016. It was clear that politicians challenging the Fukuyamian dream, such as Donald Trump, Boris Johnson, Geert Wilders, Marine Le Pen were something new. Some saw in this phenomenon just a new wave of right-wing populist reaction.⁶ At the same time, the social-democratic left has lost almost all of its socialist zeal, and became a family of complacent parties of the aspiring urban middle-class. In line with Anthony Giddens' postulate, the left focused on the quality of life⁷ rather than on redistribution or indeed any form of social justice. In many countries, this made the left surprisingly liberal (in the classical sense) and very close to business. As a result the new populists have taken over some of the left-wing socialism and some of the right-wing identity politics. They are, however, clearly not the old-style right any more, but neither are their opponents the old-style left. The new ideological divide is still not well-researched today, however, the first conceptualizations have already been presented in some rather general terms. The opposing camps receive various names: an early notion was proposed by Stephan Shakespeare, the British head of YouGov, who described the two options as “drawbridge up” and “drawbridge down”.⁸ In his recent book, *The Road to Somewhere*⁹ David Goodhart sees “two rival value blocks”. “Anywheres” value freedom, openness, and shifting identities. True to their name, thanks to education and being employed in trades that deal with cutting-edge technology, they can live and work almost anywhere. By contrast, the “somewheres” are more imbedded in the local; they see family, security and group identity as values of paramount importance. Again, as the name suggests they are “are rooted and usually have ‘ascribed’ identities”.¹⁰

Trying to describe a similar divide in the Polish politics, I propose a different division:

⁵ G. Standing, *Precariat. The New Dangerous Class*, London 2011.

⁶ J.B. Judis, *The Populist Explosion: How the Great Recession Transformed American and European Politics*, New York 2016.

⁷ A. Giddens, *Modernity and Self-Identity. Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*, Cambridge 1991, p. 214.

⁸ “Drawbridges up”, *The Economist*, 30.07.2016, <https://www.economist.com/news/briefing/21702748-new-divide-rich-countries-not-between-left-and-right-between-open-and> [accessed: 5.11.2017].

⁹ D. Goodhart, *The Road to Somewhere: The New Tribes Shaping British Politics*, London 2017, pp. 19–44.

¹⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 3.

Table 2. Globalism and Localism

Globalism	Localism
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – “investors”; – internationalism; – liberal democracy; – trade agreements; – flexibility; – free trade; – compensation equal to competencies; – tolerance; – multiculturalism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – small and medium-sized businesses; – a rooted way of life; – direct democracy; – protectionism; – stability; – social security; – solidarity; – local traditions, national identity, state sovereignty

Source: M. Kuź, “Globalism and Localism in the Perspective of Polish Politics”, *The Warsaw Institute Review* 2017, qr. 2, No. 2, pp. 20–27.

The term “localists” seems to be more pertinent than the “nationalist” or “populists”, and less vague and uncommunicative than “somewheres” or “draw-bridges up”. This is because it encompasses a wide range of anti-globalist approaches that are not necessary a simple return to the nation state as understood in the nineteenth century. The new localism is not tantamount to an all-embracing statism. As a matter of fact, it often seeks to maintain a free or partly-free market economy and personal liberty, although, within the confines of the nation-state. Especially in economy, it views the state as something more than Smith’s night-watchmen but not necessarily the all-powerful controller. The state seems to be more as a shepherd, who shields national businesses from damaging influences with the use of various regulatory means.¹¹ One also needs to note a crucial difference between the European localists like Jaroslaw Kaczyński, Sebastian Kurz or Marine Le Pen and Trump. The old-world localists have no qualms about increasing the welfare programs and expanding the role of the state as a redistributor, while, Trump is still very much a “small state” republican. His tool of choice for social politics is protectionism and other bring-the-jobs-back policies, such as the recent tax reform encouraging the repatriation of foreign capital owned by American companies.¹²

Localists worldwide are also starkly different from the anti-Western authoritarians, who tend to side with Russia or China. What we witness seems to be more of anti-globalist rebalancing within the West. Nevertheless, one of the typical element of this rebalancing is accusing new ideological movements of siding with non-Western forces. As a matter of fact, the current accusations of being pro-Russian, leveled against localists such as Trump or Kaczynski, are reminiscent

¹¹ Cf. J. Kurlantzick, *State Capitalism*, Oxford 2016, pp. 37–49.

¹² J. Ciolli, “Trump’s Tax Plan Could Bring \$250 Billion Into the US – Here Are the Companies Set to Benefit Most”, *Business Insider*, 20.12.2017, <http://www.businessinsider.com/trump-tax-reform-plan-repatriation-14-us-companies-with-most-cash-overseas-2017-9?IR=T> [accessed: 18.11.2017].

of the similar accusation leveled at Western social-democrats for their purported (or in some cases quite real) ties with the Soviets. For all the Soviet influences in Western social-democratic parties, their activities ultimately cannot be interpreted merely as a conspiracy against the West. Historically, those parties had led to a change in the Western mainstream and the construction of the modern welfare state, which in no way amounts to sabotaging the enemies of the Soviet Union. Currently, the trend is different but the logic remains the same. A number of parties and politicians believe that the institution of the nation-state needs to be protected from the neoliberal globalization and offer a new rebalancing that the old political forces, however, very often interpret as hostility and treason. Nevertheless, what Donald Trump seems to be doing, is trying to propose anti-globalization within the West as new ideological dynamic and an alternative development option. This desire can be clearly identified in the UN speech Trump made in September 2017:

In foreign affairs, we are renewing this founding principle of sovereignty. Our government's first duty is to its people, to our citizens – to serve their needs, to ensure their safety, to preserve their rights, and to defend their values.

As President of the United States, I will always put America first, just like you, as the leaders of your countries will always, and should always, put your countries first. [...]

All responsible leaders have an obligation to serve their own citizens, and the nation-state remains the best vehicle for elevating the human condition.

But making a better life for our people also requires us to work together in close harmony and unity to create a more safe and peaceful future for all people.¹³

Global Uniformity or the Art of the Deal

The large trade agreement such as TTIP and TPP are notoriously complicated multi-state deals. The limitations they impose on the state-legislation is considerable¹⁴ to say the least. The protection of rights of large companies that presumes their personhood itself is a very problematic concept.¹⁵ All those factors create an impression that modern trade agreements are moving in the direction of imposing a uniform global trading regime which would circumvent the prerogatives of states and individuals whom those states are said to represent. Moreover, political actors, especially those of aspiring political parties, can easily lay the blame for all economic shortcoming of their countries at the doorstep of the authors of the deal, i.e. a previous government, and win elections with an anti-globalist agenda.

¹³ “Full Text: Trump’s 2017 U.N. Speech Transcript”, *Politico*, 19.09.2017, <https://www.politico.com/story/2017/09/19/trump-un-speech-2017-full-text-transcript-242879> [accessed: 18.11.2017].

¹⁴ H. Sweetland Edwards, *Shadow Courts: The Tribunals that Rule Global Trade*, New York 2017, pp. 17–20.

¹⁵ L. Strate, “The Supreme Identification of Corporations as Persons”, *ETC: A Review of General Semantics* 2010, Vol. 67, No. 3, pp. 280–286.

The phenomenon itself is by no means new. Already in the early 2000's a renowned historian of economic thought, James, predicted that the lack of political control of the global trade can lead to frustrations, similar to those that were witnessed by the already fairly globalized world in the first half of the twentieth century.¹⁶ From that perspective both world wars can be seen as attempts to regulate the mechanism by a brutal power-grab on the part of the states that became ruled by anti-globalist forces. After the Second World War, in the West the tension between the states and the markets was resolved by the creation of welfare state. This prevented social dissatisfaction from reaching critical levels and was coupled with setting up global organizations like WTO to ensure a stable trading environment. For all that, with more global trade some of the old problems have started resurfacing. Specifically, those involving the growing global discrepancies in income¹⁷ such as the rise of the new disadvantaged class that lives without the social safety net, stability and savings that the previous generation enjoyed.

Not dealing with those issues can lead to another unprecedented overdrive of the whole global system, which again is not a new concept. As a matter of fact, it has been explored already by Karl Polanyi¹⁸ and Joseph Schumpeter¹⁹, both of whom saw fascism and communism as violent responses to the antimonies created by liberal politics. Alternatively, the world may face a period of a long "secular stagnation"²⁰ that could over time lead to a period of social instability and economic inefficiency of unprecedented length, indeed something to be compared to the new "dark ages". Given the problems with the current global institutions and their growing unpopularity that is reflected in the localist's political rhetoric, there are few silver-bullet solutions. The key decision-makers can either create a more coherent global regime that would enable global regulation and redistribution, or grant more power to the exiting state institutions; and thus, try to cool down globalization in a controlled way.

The first solution has a clear progressive appeal. However, it faces two problems. Firstly, global and regional regulatory institutions lack legitimacy. In the modern politics it is tacitly assumed that legitimacy is granted through procedures that are recognized as democratic i.e. drawing power directly from a large population rather than from a supernatural being (the mandate of heavens). Still, democratic decision making is practicable only if the voters have a minimal common understanding of key life-style and political concepts and argue only over the more detailed interpretations. This seems to be corroborated by Ronald Inglehart

¹⁶ H. James, *The End of Globalization: Lessons from the Great Depression*, Cambridge, MA 2001, pp. 101–168.

¹⁷ T. Piketty, *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*, Cambridge, MA 2014, pp. 57–70.

¹⁸ K. Polanyi, *The Great Transformation*, Boston 2001, pp. 171–231.

¹⁹ J.A. Schumpeter, *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, New York 2008, pp. 187–217.

²⁰ "Definition of secular stagnation", *Financial Times*, <http://lexicon.ft.com/Term?term=secular-stagnation> [accessed: 18.11.2017].

and Christian Welzel²¹, whose large scale research on global values point to the fact that members of the exiting nation-states tend to share many values and can be subdivided into larger cultural categories. Secondly, even leaving aside the issue of representativeness and legitimacy of global governance, there are no global institutions that would be able to carry out the task of global coordination and redistribution for a prolonged period of time. Even the new technologies seem to be of little help, the involvement of new media in the political processes have so far only led to violent outburst of short-term activism, sometimes aptly called “slacktivism”.²²

Even the global corporations, in spite of their wealth, to a large extent still rely on the stability provided by the exiting nation states. The existing international organizations also fall back on the nation-states as their building blocks. Non-governmental institutions have so far been able to act as providers of social safety and stability only in emergency situations. Regional cooperation blocks vary in their cohesion, with EU being the most tightly-knit union. At this point, such cooperation seems to be the only option for smaller states which seek to improve their bargaining power. At the same time the social problems created by global economy are quite urgent. In short, it is highly unlikely that a radically new global government that takes over some of the prerogative of the nation states will come into existence.

Given the above circumstances, the only solution seems to be to empower the exiting state structures in a controlled way (rather than risk a violent power grab of radical forces). And this is precisely what president Trumps attempts to do. The further rationale behind his actions is a world order that is more state-based and can become a more flexible, auto-regulating system. Let us not forget that the period between 1814–1914 was one of the longest periods of peace in Western history. The liberal-globalist faction can, at the same time, content itself with the notion that international institutions can be simultaneously developed over time. However, given the insufficiency of the existing institutions, the logical short term solution is to fall back on the older nation-state based system.

In short, what president Trump seems to propose is a flexible environment of transactional politics instead of large multilateral deals that tie the hands of all the partners involved. This transactional approach has already yielded certain results. The current economic data falsify the claim that the abandoning TTP and TTIP will have a negative impact on the U.S. economy, which is developing very fast and indeed creates new jobs. Recently this has been admitted by George Soros a major investment guru, notorious for betting against Trump and

²¹ R. Inglehart, Ch. Welzel, “The WVS Cultural Map of the World”, World Value Survey, 2014, <http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/WVSContents.jsp?CMSID=Findings> [accessed: 19.11.2017].

²² D. McCafferty, “Activism vs Slactivism”, *Communications of the ACM* 2011, Vol. 54, No. 12, pp. 17–19.

his economic policies.²³ NATO financing is another example. Of course, the plans to increase the funding were in motion already before Trump assumed office. However, president Trump clearly did add “[...] urgency to a decision that had already been taken”.²⁴

Global Safety in the Trump Era

The global safety also becomes increasingly dominated by state politics rather than a “global community” approach. For better and for worse it is also the state politics, rather the pressure of international organizations, that currently leads to a so-far successful campaign against the ISIS. Naturally, it may be said that states are both the major causes and the solutions to the global safety issues. However, it remains a fact that the UN peacekeeping missions achieved little success and at times ended in spectacular failures.²⁵ UN remains more of a platform for interstate communication than a robust institutions with its own political agenda. Indeed, it is used in such a way by the Trump administration, especially in the wake of the Korean Missile crisis that is unfolding as this article is being prepared for publication.

The EU, in spite of many attempts to create a military muscle, never succeeded in building it and still largely relies on the U.S. for safety. Given the increasing tensions in the Pacific region and clear symptoms of imperial overstretch, the strategy seems questionable. The EU states are, moreover, increasingly at odds with Turkey. The state is repressive towards its own citizens, detains EU citizens and blackmails the Western Europe with threats of facilitating mass migration. Turkey also more and more openly challenges the U.S. leadership, and continues to have unsettled territorial disputes with Greece. This is quite significant, given that Turkey army is the second largest military force in NATO and the largest land-force of the alliance.²⁶ At the same time, U.S. is seeking to make the notorious a pivot to Asia, which seems necessary given China’s military buildup in the South-China Sea and the Korean tensions. As RAND Corporation notes, this situation is something that the Russian Federation can easily take

²³ H. Zschäpitz, „George Soros kapituliert vor der Wall Street“, *Die Welt*, 16.11.2017, <https://www.welt.de/finanzen/article170659763/George-Soros-kapituliert-vor-der-Wall-Street.html> [accessed: 19.11.2017].

²⁴ Ch. Morris, “Reality Check: Is Donald Trump right on Nato’s Funding Boost?”, *BBC*, 6.07.2017, <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-40525116> [accessed: 19.11.2017].

²⁵ W. Shawcross, *Deliver Us from Evil: Peacekeepers, Warlords, and a World of Endless Conflict*, New York 2000; L.M. Howard, *UN Peacekeeping in Civil Wars*, Cambridge 2008.

²⁶ “2017 Turkey Military Strength”, Global Firepower, https://www.globalfirepower.com/country-military-strength-detail.asp?country_id=turkey [accessed: 20.11.2017].

advantage of.²⁷ If the USA forces are suddenly occupied in the Pacific region an opportunistic attack on the Baltic States, Ukraine or even Poland is possible.

Unfortunately, the existing international institutions such as the EU and UN are clearly not able to take fuller responsibility for global safety. NATO is over-reliant on the U.S. contributions, while the second largest army in the pact belongs to a country clearly at odds with the rest of the alliance. In this situation, increasing the military spending as proposed by president Trump seems to be a logical solution. Another great powers concert seems to be the lesser danger at a time when just one power appears to be the main global security provider.

Mass Migration and the Antinomies of Multiculturalism

The weakening of the state without adequate robustness of the existing international institutions can be, at least, partly blamed for the current migrations crisis. The refugees come mainly from failed states that are torn by war; the economic migrants from the states that are not able to leave the poverty trap.

This, at least, in part is a result of the fact that the recent restructuring of the nation-state was, in fact, a global weakening of the role of the state to meet the demands of economic and cultural globalization. In what Immanuel Wallerstein named “the center”²⁸, this weakening led to certain political tensions. The situation was, however, much worse in the peripheries, there it led to a stalling of state development, precisely at the time when such a development was necessary to prevent the citizens from migrating; but at a point when they had enough resources to cover the costs of the trip. Thus, the mechanism of the current crisis of globalization is a systemic crisis embedded in the very logic of globalization and its antinomies.

A typical globalist response to mass migration is, however, not to facilitate state building but to increase the move towards greater openness and deal with humanitarian crises with the help of emergency aid. The proponents of globalism will also see strong national identities that preclude a more multicultural environment as major problems, especially in the states that receive mass migration. Globalist-leaning commentators will also swiftly stigmatize anti-migrant politicians and parties as racists and anti-democratic.²⁹ Leaving aside the veracity of such accusations, there are deeper problems with the globalist response. It

²⁷ D.C. Gompert, A. Stuth Cevallos, C.L. Garafola, *War with China. Thinking Through the Unthinkable*, Santa Monica 2016, pp. 56–60, http://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR1140.html [accessed: 20.11.2017].

²⁸ A. Wallerstein, *World System Analysis: An Introduction*, Durham 2007, pp. 76–91.

²⁹ This *Foreign Policy* article can serve as a representative example of many similar pieces published in this and other globalist magazines dealing with foreign affairs: M. Boot, “The GOP Is America’s Party of White Nationalism”, *Foreign Policy*, 14.03.2017, <http://foreignpolicy.com/2017/03/14/the-gop-is-americas-party-of-white-nationalism/> [accessed: 22.11.2017].

overlooks the real socio-economic problem that results from the weakening of the state. The current migration is a product of a progressive collapse of periphery with few state structures into the center that is still equipped with relatively well-functioning (albeit weakened) states that provide social security and the rule of law. From a localist perspective, this implosion cannot be good for either side. This standpoint is adopted by president Trump when in the aforementioned UN speech he said:

For decades, the United States has dealt with migration challenges here in the Western Hemisphere. We have learned that, over the long term, uncontrolled migration is deeply unfair to both the sending and the receiving countries.

For the sending countries, it reduces domestic pressure to pursue needed political and economic reform, and drains them of the human capital necessary to motivate and implement those reforms.

For the receiving countries, the substantial costs of uncontrolled migration are borne overwhelmingly by low-income citizens whose concerns are often ignored by both media and government.³⁰

Of course, this approach is not completely in tune with severe cuts in foreign aid that the Trump administration has put into effect. Nevertheless, it is consistent with a more flexible approach to free-trade. It is also consistent with president Trump's repeated criticism of the open-border policy adopted in 2015 by Angela Merkel and his attempts at limiting the influx of migrants to the USA. Of course, his initial attempts at enacting those policies met with hostility in the Congress and indeed were rather unsuccessful. Still, at this point, even the Democrats actually support tighter border controls (without a physical wall), and seem to be willing to compromise with the president in exchange for Trump's decision not to repeal the former law which grants a path to citizenship to the migrants that are already present in the USA and came there as children.³¹

Bringing the State Back in, or Why Is the Rebalancing Necessary

According to the afore mentioned James, the current world order is, at least, as susceptible to the shocks coming from within as the previous one, which was based on the gold standard and the power of colonial empires. At the time when James's work was created, no one had any inkling of the current rise of anti-globalization forces. James, however, was quite confident that they will be similar to the anti-globalization forces from the past. One can name eight defining points of the old anti-globalism, as defined by James. They, in turn, can be compared

³⁰ "Full text: Trump's 2017 U.N. Speech Transcript", *op. cit.*

³¹ J.T. Bennet, "Trump: Dems Must 'Guarantee' All Wall Funding in DACA Bill", *Roll Call*, 3.11.2017, <https://www.rollcall.com/news/politics/trump-dems-must-guarantee-all-wall-funding-in-daca-bill> [accessed: 22.11.2017].

and contrasted with a similar set of modern policies as defined and promoted by the anti-globalist parties or fractions that have emerged from the recent elections in the USA (the Alt-Right), France (Front National), Germany (AfD) and Poland (Kukiz 15' and a large faction within PiS).

Table 3. Old and New Anti-Globalism

Anti-globalism 1900–1939 (based on H. James)	Modern anti-globalism (M. Kuź)
1) anti-migration sentiments buttressed by the move to protect the national labor market; 2) slanting critique of bankers and currency speculators; 3) antisemitism; 4) general statist protectionism; 5) faith in the state; 6) nationalism; 7) national socialism, socialism and communist as the main alternative visions of politics; 8) interstate war was a major threat to the global world order and a result of protectionism	1) anti-migration sentiments buttressed by the move to protect the welfare state and national identity; 2) critique of multinational corporations and financial institutions; 3) anti-Americanism (in Germany and France), anti-Islamism (in the West in general), critique of international organizations; 4) selective protectionism of chosen sectors; 5) limited faith in state mixed with some libertarian sentiments, the state is seen as a protector from outside influence that should, nevertheless, give relative freedom to the citizens within; 6) nationalism mixed with communitarian sentiments (importance of substate structures such as city movements and small communities); 7) lack of clearly defined ideological alternatives apart from a general desire to cool down the globalization; 8) war seen as a threat, however, the development of global economy without global cooperation creates new threats such as: environmental pollution, climate change and humanitarian crises

Source: own analysis.³²

The above comparison indicates that, perhaps, for all the fears that the new political divide raises the situation, is still not as dire and divisive as a hundred years ago. Nevertheless, the uncanny similarity between anti-globalist politics now and then strongly suggest a similar mechanism at play. The global economy, which in turn creates a global political dynamic, has only existed since the 19th century. It is too early to suggest this with all confidence, however, what we might be witnessing is a cyclical fluctuation of global politics from more to less globalization.

Previously during such a fluctuation, the system regulated itself using the most violent means possible. Nonetheless, the fluctuations of elites and ideologies

³² My comparison here is based on the analysis of the political programs of the most extremely anti-globalist forces in Poland, Germany and France, however it needs to be noted that all major parties are to be found somewhere on the spectrum. In some political systems the largest, most mainstream parties are decidedly more anti-globalist, e.g. PiS in Poland in others, as in Germany they are clearly more globalist.

does not need to necessarily take on violent forms. It is a well-known fact from the field of comparative politics. State level-politics in the state formation period also typically took on violent forms of civil wars or coups, however, over time in many states it has become more tame and regular. Of course, from time to time, the politics of democratic countries still becomes very intense and anti-establishment. This usually indicates that the previous establishment and previous set of commitments became outdated and is in need of a correction. Skowronek's typology describing how American presidents interact with their political environment seems to be especially pertinent to the conceptualization of the anti-establishment turns and Trump's presidency. In his work Skowronek distinguishes 4 types of presidents, based on their relation to previously established commitments and their political identities.

Table 4. Presidential Politics in the USA

Previously Established Commitments	Presidential Political Identity	
	Opposed	Affiliated
Vulnerable	Politics of reconstruction	Politics of disjunction
Resilient	Politics of preemption	Politics of articulation

Source: S. Skowronek, *The Politics Presidents Make: leadership from John Adams to George Bush*, Cambridge–London 1993, p. 36.

It is crucial for a president to recognize what is the state of the previously established commitments. In short, is the society ready for a change, and is the old establishment weak. Politics of disjunction is generally that of presidents who are reactive, although, they are expected to be proactive and break the previously established commitments. Herbert Hoover, with his notoriously inept approach to the great crisis, is one example of politics of disjunction. Politicians of preemption, on the other hand, seek a beneficial change too early, when the establishment is strong and the society at large opposes it. Woodrow Wilson, with his interesting but underestimated vision of the new global order, is a classic example. Finally, politics of reconstruction is the politics of major change that is welcomed and brings the president strength and popularity. Ronald Reagan can be described as a politician of reconstruction. Politics of articulation, in turn, only capitalized on the successful reconstruction, just like George Bush (senior) capitalized on Reagan's success.

Different elements of presidential politics acquire a following or discontinuation at different periods of time. For instance, one may view president Obama's presidency as the presidency of a late articulation. Articulation pertaining to a yearning for the Clinton years and the "go-go-nineties" atmosphere. Obama, naturally, discontinued some elements of Bush-era interventionism. Over time, however, the neoliberal consensus and the globalist rhetoric became more and more at odds with the social sentiments. This became especially visible during

Obama's second term, when the relation between the president and the republican congress led to a serious crisis.

Nevertheless, Obama's disjunction was not deep enough to create a fully-fledged reconstruction. President Trump was elected as a protest candidate, especially on the part of the blue collar northern working-middle-class voter, who went into the "disjunction" mode during the late Obama years. However, "established commitments" also pertain to maintaining a desirable state of relations with elite interests groups. And Trump clearly faces more criticism from the media and various elite groups than many other leaders.³³ Similar criticism was visible during the typically reconstructive Reagan presidency, although, over time president Reagan managed to gain a wide popularity, even with the media and interests groups that initially were critical of his personality and actions. It is not impossible for Trump to move in that direction, should he win a second term. Even so, it seems much more difficult than may appear. At this point, the American presidential politics seems to be in a state of an uneasy stasis with constant tensions and a media fog of war hanging over the main players. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that so far most of the candidates in the run-off election to congress, who have been supported by Trump, won their seats. The Russian-involvement commission failed to come up with solid evidence of Trumps foul plays. And his approval a year after the election is at a stable 40%.

What president Trumps does clearly show is, however, that over time the globalist commitments will become more and more questioned. Sooner or later a new reconstruction will be needed both in American and in global politics, even if it is not Trump who will perform it. Let us not forget that it was Franklin Delano Roosevelt (a president of a great reconstruction), who eventually instituted the key elements of Wilsonian politics. A politics that was so strongly opposed during Wilson's lifetime.

Conclusions and Loose Ends

Skowronek's simple model shows how, the procedural mechanism of a modern democratic state can absorb social tensions, which in a different institutional context could very well lead to a destructive conflict or, indeed, a civil war. The question we are now facing is whether the same mechanism that helps to avoid regulating the system through large-scale wars can be applied on a global level. Describing the institutional recipe for this achievement is beyond the scope of this work. However, it does seem that the world politics is going through a process similar to Skowronek's cycles.

³³ Cf. R. Singh, "I, the People: A Deflationary Interpretation of Populism, Trump and the United States Constitution", *Economy and Society* 2017, Vol. 46, No. 1, pp. 20–42.

The global order predicated on the liberal theory of international relations is undergoing a severe crisis not because of ill-will of morally evil actors but because of evident structural problems. Global inequality, mass migration, dissatisfaction of the middle and working classes, ineptness of international organizations all add to the mix. In a situation where liberal institutions are failing and new ones (like for instance the coalition of cities described by Benjamin Barber³⁴) never materialize, the only logical solution is to fall back on exiting state structures and global politics based on the balance of powers. In other words, liberal globalization needs to be cooled down to preserve global stability. Perhaps, with better technologies and ideas humanity will be able to return to the concept of liberal globalization, but at this point the stakes seem to be too high to risk another step in the direction of the globalistic dream. This anti-globalistic rebalancing is clearly an element foreshadowed in president Trump's policies and in his political rhetoric. In spite of president Trump obvious lack of experience as a professional politician, this message needs to be taken with all seriousness.

References

- “2017 Turkey Military Strength”, Global Firepower, https://www.globalfirepower.com/country-military-strength-detail.asp?country_id=turkey [accessed: 20.11.2017].
- Barber B., *If Mayors Ruled the World: Dysfunctional Nations, Rising Cities*, New Haven–London 2013.
- Bennet J.T., “Trump: Dems Must ‘Guarantee’ All Wall Funding in DACA Bill”, *Roll Call*, 3.11.2017, <https://www.rollcall.com/news/politics/trump-dems-must-guarantee-all-wall-funding-in-daca-bill> [accessed: 22.11.2017].
- Boot M., “The GOP Is America’s Party of White Nationalism”, *Foreign Policy*, 14.03.2017, <http://foreignpolicy.com/2017/03/14/the-gop-is-americas-party-of-white-nationalism/> [accessed: 22.11.2017].
- Bunge I., “Identifying Dimensions and Locating Parties: Methodological and Conceptual Problems”, [in:] *Handbook of Party Politics*, eds. R. Katz, W. Crotty, London 2006, pp. 422–433.
- Ciulli J., “Trump’s Tax Plan Could Bring \$250 Billion Into the US – Here Are the Companies Set to Benefit Most”, *Business Insider*, 20.12.2017, <http://www.businessinsider.com/trump-tax-reform-plan-repatriation-14-us-companies-with-most-cash-overseas-2017-9?IR=T> [accessed: 18.11.2017].
- Crouch C., *Post-Democracy*, Cambridge 2004.
- “Definition of secular stagnation”, *Financial Times*, <http://lexicon.ft.com/Term?term=secular-stagnation> [accessed: 18.11.2017].
- Doran M., Rough P., “Transatlantic Ties in a Populist Era”, *American Interest*, 4.05.2017, <https://www.the-american-interest.com/2017/05/04/transatlantic-ties-in-a-populist-era/> [accessed: 14.11.2017].

³⁴ B. Barber, *If Mayors Ruled the World: Dysfunctional Nations, Rising Cities*, New Haven–London 2013.

- “Drawbridges up”, *The Economist*, 30.07.2016, <https://www.economist.com/news/briefing/21702748-new-divide-rich-countries-not-between-left-and-right-between-open-and> [accessed: 5.11.2017].
- Fukuyama F., *End of History and The Last Man*, New York 1992.
- “Full Text: Trump’s 2017 U.N. Speech Transcript”, *Politico*, 19.09.2017, <https://www.politico.com/story/2017/09/19/trump-un-speech-2017-full-text-transcript-242879> [accessed: 18.11.2017].
- Giddens A., *Modernity and Self-Identity. Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*, Cambridge 1991.
- Gompert D.C., Stuth Cevallos A., Garafola C.L., *War with China. Thinking Through the Unthinkable*, Santa Monica 2016, http://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR1140.html [accessed: 20.11.2017].
- Goodhart D., *The Road to Somewhere: The New Tribes Shaping British Politics*, London 2017.
- Howard L.M., *UN Peacekeeping in Civil Wars*, Cambridge 2008.
- Inglehart R., Welzel Ch., “The WVS Cultural Map of the World”, World Value Survey, 2014, <http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/WVSContents.jsp?CMSID=Findings> [accessed: 19.11.2017].
- James H., *The End of Globalization: Lessons from the Great Depression*, Cambridge, MA, 2001.
- Judis J.B., *The Populist Explosion: How the Great Recession Transformed American and European Politics*, New York 2016.
- Kurlantzick J., *State Capitalism*, Oxford 2016.
- Kuź M., “Globalism and Localism in the Perspective of Polish Politics”, *The Warsaw Institute Review* 2017, qr. 2, No. 2, pp. 20–27.
- McCafferty D., “Activism vs Slactivism”, *Communications of the ACM* 2011, Vol. 54, No. 12, pp. 17–19.
- Morris Ch., “Reality Check: Is Donald Trump right on Nato’s Funding Boost?”, *BBC*, 6.07.2017, <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-40525116> [accessed: 19.11.2017].
- Piketty T., *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*, Cambridge, MA, 2014.
- Polanyi K., *The Great Transformation*, Boston 2001.
- Schumpeter J.A., *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, New York 2008.
- Shawcross W., *Deliver Us from Evil: Peacekeepers, Warlords, and a World of Endless Conflict*, New York 2000.
- Singh R., “I, the People: A Deflationary Interpretation of Populism, Trump and the United States Constitution”, *Economy and Society* 2017, Vol. 46, No. 1, pp. 20–42.
- Skowronek S., *The Politics Presidents Make: leadership from John Adams to George Bush*, Cambridge–London 1993.
- Standing G., *Precariat. The New Dangerous Class*, London 2011.
- Strate L., “The Supreme Identification of Corporations as Persons”, *ETC: A Review of General Semantics* 2010, Vol. 67, No. 3, pp. 280–286.
- Sweetland Edwards H., *Shadow Courts: The Tribunals that Rule Global Trade*, New York 2017.
- Wallerstein A., *World System Analysis: An Introduction*, Durham 2007.

- Wattenberg M., "The Decline of Party Mobilization", [in:] *Parties without Partisans: Political Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies*, eds. R. Dalton, M. Wattenberg, Oxford 2000, pp. 64–76.
- Wright T., "Trump's Team of Rivals, Riven by Distrust", *Foreign Policy*, 14.12.2016, <http://foreignpolicy.com/2016/12/14/trumps-team-of-rivals-riven-by-distrust/> [accessed: 10.11.2017].
- Zschäpitz H., „George Soros kapituliert vor der Wall Street“, *Die Welt*, 16.11.2017, <https://www.welt.de/finanzen/article170659763/George-Soros-kapituliert-vor-der-Wall-Street.html> [accessed: 19.11.2017].

Trump i antyglobalistyczne równoważnie na Zachodzie

Polityka zagraniczna prezydenta Trumpa bywa postrzegana jako część szerszego politycznego przesunięcia, które poważa obecny liberalny ład globalny i większą nadzieję pokłada w państwie narodowym. Wydarzenia takie jak: Brexit, porażka referendalna Matteo Renziego oraz ogólne wzmocnienie się ugrupowań populistycznych są często przytaczanymi przykładami. Politycy opisywani jako populiści bądź też nacjoniści nadal nie są dominującą siłą w większości krajów rozwiniętych. Jednakże nowy układ polityczny, który wychodzi poza powojenny podział na prawicę i lewicę, jest wyraźnie widoczny. Artykuł proponuje wydzielenie dwóch obozów: globalizmu i lokalizmu (oraz skupienie się zwłaszcza na narodowym lokalizmie). Analizuje również pierwsze lata prezydentury Donalda Trumpa używając do tego narzędzi zaproponowanych przez Harolda Jamesa i Stepheną Skowronka.

Słowa kluczowe: Trump, globalizm, lokalizm, Europa, USA, Polska, równoważenie

Trump and the Anti-Globalization Rebalancing Within the West

President's Trumps international agenda can be viewed as a part of a wider political shift, which undermines the current liberal global order and places more emphasis on the nation state. Events such as Brexit, Matteo Renzi's lost referendum, the general strengthening of far-right and populist parties are often cited in this context. The politicians described as populists or nationalists are still not a dominant force in most of the elections in developed countries. However, a new divide that moves beyond the post-war left-right division can be clearly observed and variously described. This study will propose the notions of two ideological camps: globalism and localism (with a special focus on national-localism). It will also examine the first year of president Trump's presidency using the historical analysis tools proposed by Harold James and Stephen Skowronek.

Key words: Trump, globalism, localism, Europe, USA, Poland, rebalancing