

Andrzej Bryk

prof., Jagiellonian University

DONALD TRUMP AS A RESPONSE TO A GLOBAL POST-COLD WAR LIBERAL WORLD

Dynamic departure from liberal consensus

President Donald Trump has been in office for over three years and his record has turned out to be rather successful despite incessant attacks of the liberal-left establishment and an effort to impeach him from office on the part of the Democratic Party for alleged improprieties, which so far compromise more the Democrats than him. But this is a typical political American game tried repeatedly in the past by one or the other side, a means of limiting presidential influence and cripple him before the next election.

During his presidency Trump placated the most rabid opposition inside of the Republican Party, forcing the opposition from the Democratic Party and the liberal-left camp in general to claim that although he has turned out to be more competent than his inexperience and personal immorality from the past suggested he is even more dangerous because he has turned out to be more competent than expected, even if his nominations to different administrative posts have been erratic and his firings of the same officials spectacular, a merry go around which makes sometimes an impression of a total chaos in the White House. But Trump

has realized, in a substantial part, much what the inefficient and corrupted by power Republican Party once promised but never delivered. In domestic policies he not only introduced a new tax reform and deregulation measures. That caused a substantial increase in wages which together with tax credit for the lower and middle classes ended a sterile, ideological discussions about state-mandated minimum wage laws. Trump successfully ended the most excessive climate change regulations limiting American business opportunities for expansion, with internal oil extraction rising. This has so far limited the cost of energy and boosted the economy.

At the same time Trump limited federal subsidies to the most experimental environmental programs, supporting instead initiatives to extract shale gas and oil offshore and on the federal lands, and ended the limits on oil and coal exportation. In other words the United States has begun to recognize its position as the major oil and gas producing country making itself immune to oil boycotts and trying to find the new market for them, while using it as a weapon in international relations.¹ He was also able to end the more or less conscious politicization during the Obama years of the major federal agencies such as FBI or IRS. In foreign affairs many dire predictions about his intention to leave NATO, lift sanctions on Russia, begin an all-out tariff war with China or the EU or generally to withdraw the United States from playing an active role in international relations and conduct an isolationist policy turned out to be false, although some selective tariffs have been announced, “rationalization” of American military involvement in the Middle East executed, and berating some NATO countries for not paying enough expressed. Trump essentially wanted the allies to stick to the accepted obligations to invest 2% of the budget for defence. He wanted Europe to be more determined to defend Western interest and values, although he realized an absolutely indispensable role of the United States as the leader of the West. He galvanized NATO shifting its power more towards East-Central Europe, and has increased the military budget, trying to make East-Central Europe a stumbling block preventing both a strategic alliance between Germany and Russia and a creation of the European Armed Forces as an alternative to NATO, thus preventing such forces to hollow up NATO’s usefulness for Europeans and thus to push the United States

¹ For instance the so called “Intermarium”, the economic and strategic initiative of the countries of East-Central Europe, members of the European Union is conceived as a defence measure to counterbalance the growing pressure of Russia and Germany, the leader of the EU, to subordinate that region politically and economically. The project aims at creating a strong political but mainly economic region within the EU achieve equal status inside it. Trump showed an interest in the initiative, indicating this during his Warsaw visit in July 2017. This was done for political reasons – to create a counterbalance and a blockade in East-Central Europe against Russia and Germany, as well as against China, as independent players with possible anti-American implications, and for economic reasons as a huge export market for the American energy resources. See: M.J. Chodakiewicz, *Intermarium: The Land Between the Black and Baltic Seas*, New Brunswick 2012.

out of Europe making the European Union an independent, equal player next to America.

But the military, political and economic competition of the United States and China is additionally exacerbated by civilisational incompatibility which makes any stable rapprochement more difficult, especially in such areas relations between the state and its relation to economy, and individuals, a.k.a. human rights issues, but also the nature of time, understanding of what conflict is and a vision in international relations, in case of China additionally complicated by its intense sense of revenge for the 19's century humiliation by the West and a different understanding of the state and its relation to economy and citizens.² In addition China is in fact the only lever the U.S. can use to control the North Korean nuclear weapons program, which might get out of control. Trump also successfully ended the war against ISIS, moving the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem recognizing it as Israel's capital, thus finally executing the old, "frozen" decision of Congress and pressuring Palestinians and Israeli to recognize reality at a situation where there are more pressing dangers in the Middle East. In this he coordinated the most important agencies of the federal government like the CIA, FBI, the State Department restored somehow tarnished efficiency of them. Trump also renounced the Iran deal supporting there the mass demonstrations against theocracy. His initiatives which looked sometimes confrontationist can be defined like that in relation to a "sleeping" administration of Barak Obama who seemed to go along with a globalized international approach to American interests. Called "'principled realism' or a new 'Jacksonianism' the Trump doctrine has now replaced the 'strategic patience' and 'lead from behind' recessional of prior administration and not emulated the neo-conservative nation building of the George W. Bush administration".³

Votes of the "deplorable"

Trump's victory in the presidential election of 2016 seemed improbable, but it was not accidental. This turned out to be an event with global consequences, with helpless liberal establishment watching populist democratic rebellions in the Western world. This establishment accused Trump and his supporters with arguments short on substance long on senseless emotions, delegitimizing opponents, not realizing that Trump's victory constituted just one instance of a rebellious movement in the West against politics as usual, as a meaningless ritual. Trump's victory galvanized the world, especially the liberal-democratic West signaling

² See in general on that G. Allison, *Destined for War: Can America and China Escape Thucydides's Trap?*, Boston–New York 2017.

³ V.D. Hanson, "The Many Wars of Donald Trump", *National Review* 2018, Vol. 70, No. 2, p. 28.

something profoundly new for which there was yet no language to describe it, except ideologically charged and very imprecise term of populism. It also polarized America as never before extending from the halls of politics to the very personal levels. According to surveys Trump's victory caused disagreements which ended 1 out of 10 marriages with divorce, among these 22% of them among millennials, a phenomenon called "the Trump divorce".⁴ Although Trump lost in sheer votes to Hillary Clinton, he won, due to the federal system of voting based on the electoral college on the 85% territory of the U.S., dividing it geographically between the liberal bastions in the West and the East Coast and the interior of the country. As one observer remarked, after jumping over the East or the West Coast one could march from one to the other end of America essentially through the Trump country.

Trump's victory was also worth noticing for another reason. Although American politics has been connected in many ways with show business, not only because of the strong political engagement of celebrities but also by their active entrance to politics, Trump's example is nevertheless spectacular. Until his victory in 2016 there had never been a celebrity, who without any political experience led the most powerful world state. Ronald Reagan, although an actor, had a long experience in politics including his two terms as governor of California.

One has to separate Trump as a person from Trump as a phenomenon organizing a populist revolt in the U.S., a "grass roots" movement, propelled by deep and bitter resentments against Washington, the federal bureaucracy, the establishments of both the Democratic and Republican parties, the Wall Street, and the dominant liberal corporate media. In other words it constituted, one might say, a veritable rebellion against oligarchization of American politics.

Trump addressed his incoherent, nevertheless angry message to America as a nation, while his opponent Hillary Clinton, contrary to her rhetoric, to client, identity groups. This was an election against entrenched ideology of identity liberalism killing the promise of America as a nation of equal opportunity. Trump took over the Republican party, probably saving it from disintegration as once Ronald Reagan did. This corroborated an old truth in American politics that if one wanted to run on the anti-establishment program one has to take over one of the big parties, instead of forming the third one. Not even one among such parties has been successful after the II World War.

⁴ E.E. Smith, "How to Protect Relationships in the Trump Era", *National Review*, 25.07.2019, <https://www.nationalreview.com/magazine/2019/08/12/how-to-protect-relationships-in-the-trump-era> [accessed: 16.08.2019]; J. Safer, *I Love You, but I Hate Your Politics: How to Protect Your Intimate Relationships in a Poisonous Partisan World*, New York 2019.

New morning for Great America

Some compare Trump's⁵ victory to Ronald Reagan's triumph in 1980, when he mobilized the conservative movement and took over the Republican Party dominated by the opportunistic, establishment elites. Reagan ran on a slogan "Its morning again in America". Trump's slogan "Make America great again" may seem to be appealing to the same sense of the lost potential of America in need of recovery. But there are profound differences. Although both were definitely true American patriots, Reagan was an avowed conservative acting on his principles for decades before the election and his program of reform was based unequivocally on such principles. Trump's ideas are unclear and his openings to conservatives seems to be tactical and more opportunistic. This difference is profound, but it may stem from the fact that Reagan's America and Trump's America are different entities. Both Reagan and Trump knew fantastically how to connect with the American electorate, a gift which cannot be learned, and both sensed that America needed a deep transformation. But both were connecting, one in 1980, the other in 2016 to a profoundly different nation. Reagan's America was a classical middle class America, with strong social structure, and a deep sense of solidarity despite shattering crisis in the 70's. Trump's America is different, with millions of families

[...] ill equipped to seize economic opportunity and unsure whether by this opportunity they mean the same thing. If Reagan's 'Morning in America' could be speeded up by political means and thus elections counted enormously how to achieve better America, today Trump's 'great America' is much more resistant to direct political measures which could galvanize it. That is why 'the kind of renewal and unity [America] experienced in [1980's] ib [its] political reach. [...] Now is the time for mourning in America. The fact that our educated upper class can achieve at the highest level is cold comfort when the daily lives of the working and (increasingly) the middle classes are burdened not so much by bad politics as by bad choices – choices no political 'outsider' can overcome. Reagan helped unleash the enormous human capital of the American nation. But [American] nation has spent much of the last 30 years squandering that human capital, in the grip of cultural forces that create problems politics can't solve. In 1981, America not only had a new leader, it possessed a people who were ready, willing, and able to shed the burden of bad leadership and unite behind a common vision. In 2016, [America's] leaders are different, [America's] people are different, and [her] loss of national character has become the greatest burden of all.⁶

Trump's nomination probably saved the Republican Party from a deep, structural crisis, or even disintegration as was the case in the 70's and with Trump's election the Republicans regained, also because they had right after the election control over both chambers of Congress, a chance to reorient the political system. In addition Trump nominated already two judges to the Supreme Court as

⁵ See: D.A. Epstein, *Left, Right, Out: The History of Third Parties in America*, New York 2012.

⁶ *National Review* 2016, Vol. 68, No. 16, p. 17.

well as many federal judges thought to be, one way or another conservative. The nominations to the Supreme Court – the U.S. Constitutional Court as well, have been during the last decades highly politicized, the expectation is that it might change some crucial precedents of the previous courts such as “Roe vs. Wade” concerning abortion as an unrestricted in fact, constitutional right.

The election showed total political inefficiency of the most brutal attacks against Trump. As a shrewd media fox of the mass narcissistic culture, today truly subconscious language of the majority of Americans, Trump possessed during the election an amazing political intuition destroying a rhetoric of political correctness which allegedly was to kill him. Political correctness, the liberal-left newspeak dictating public morality, enabled the liberal elite to “criminalize” in fact critics delegitimizing them morally a, for instance racists or misogynists. This enabled them to create whenever there was a need for it a coalition of people “being in fear”, making it impossible to define reality property. But this time it did not work, because Trump was smart enough to sense where was a new defining battle front in contemporary America. This battle front, being also a global one, represented on the one hand a grass root revolt of the American lower and some middle classes, which its liberal left enemies called a populist reaction, and on the other hand the liberal establishment, which did not have anything to offer a group of “dispossessed” victims of a globalized, atomized economy and the liberal-left culture.

Elites, 10–20% of “protected” within liberal society understood that a ritual of the liberal democracy did not solve social problems, but this did not matter for them. Trump’s brutal language made irrelevant and politically delegitimized the old conflict of the cultural liberal left allied with the managerial liberal elites of global governance, with the Right today constituting an alliance of the libertarian culture rejecting global governance in the name of the global free markets. For Trump’s voters these two camps in fact were forming one. Their common interests had been for some time detrimental to the lower and Middle America.

Politics and construction site

Trump, in stark contrast to Obama is a doer with business like mentality combined with an optimism and do it yourself mentality. It is not a coincidence that one of Trump’s favourite pastors, who conducted Trump’s first marriage to Ivana, was Norman Vincent Peale, who wrote the most popular self-help books of his time in America “The Power of Positive Thinking” published in 1952. Containing a mixture of cheap psychotherapy and common sense advice it formed a melange of sounding wise banalities, one of the many instances of the American massive psychotherapeutic responses to a dislocation of American protestant capitalism. And this is a particular type of business mentality which, as Charles Kessler

noticed was described by Michael Barone as coming from “hard America” as distinguished from “soft America”.⁷ “Hard America” is shaped by the forces of competition and accountability in the market. “Soft America” is being created in public schools and universities through which over half of the American population passes. The “soft America” began to be created at the beginning of the 20th century during progressive drive to humanize the market forces, aided by the New Deal policies and radicalized in the aftermath of the 1968 cultural resolution. It took a form not only of various government social programs and psychotherapeutic approach to life with “self-esteem” and “no offence” attitude towards reality, but was additionally combined with a new liberal-left ideology of political correctness and social engineering attitude to every aspect of life.

This social engineering was applied, also towards “hard America” defined increasingly as the recalcitrant remnant of the reactionary past in comparison with the new progressive America and increasingly identity liberalism at its center. Although these “two America’s” coexist and merge they have been increasingly in constant tension, the “soft America” accusing the “hard” one of insensitivity and cruelty including all kinds of prejudices like racism, xenophobia or homophobia. Hilary Clinton, Trump’s Democratic Party opponent, represented the “soft America” branding the “hard” one as bunch of “deplorables”. The “hard America” accuse the “soft” one of making young people unprepared for life defined increasingly in psychotherapeutic terms of the liberal political correctness. Donald Trump represents here, of course, “hard America”, defending it against the “soft”. His career and nearly all features of character have been shaped by “hard America” which he considers to be the creative essence of American greatness, calling it “a nation of builders” and himself “a builder”. Thus as one observer noticed at the time of the election of 2016, he knows his ways around simple workers, being his entire life in the construction business, despite the fact that he played the game in a rough way. For this reason such a situation created a particular personality type and

[...] his virtues and vices skew to that hard, brazen, masculine world of getting things built quickly, durably, beautifully if possible, and in any case profitably. He wants to revive hard America’s mines, factories, and building sites, in the face of what he knows is the growing power of its despisers in soft America. [Of course] [...] there are different districts in hard America. For example, Mitt Romney is a very successful businessman, too. But [...] they divide along recognizable lines that until 2016 did not seem that interesting, because most commentators simply assumed that Romney’s neighborhood had forever displaced Trump’s. They pose sharp contrasts within the world of hard America: construction versus consulting, blue-collar versus white-collar, ‘deals’ versus mergers and acquisitions. For most of his life, Trump ran a prosperous and famous family business. Though he’s had clients, partners, and customers, he’s never had to report regularly to a board of directors or to public shareholders or to regular capital markets, and it shows. He’s used to being the

⁷ M. Barone, *Hard America, Soft America: Competition vs. Coddling and the Battle for the Nation’s Future*, New York 2004.

boss, to following his intuition, to trying one thing and then another, to hiring and firing at will (and to hiring family members at will), to promoting himself and his companies shamelessly. [...] Trump also knows his way around a television studio. The hard reality of being a builder and landlord is combined, in his case, with being a longstanding reality-TV star. If the preceding president cast himself in the role of 'no-drama' Obama, the current one plays all-drama-all-the-time Trump. From the beginning his kind of real estate verged on show business. Branding and selling his name, [...] represented for him another step in the direction of show business. Show business is a business, however, and Trump likes to interpret what might be considered the softer side of his career in the hardest possible terms. He emphasizes numbers – the ratings, the advertising dollars, the size of his crowds. He has survived in several cutthroat industries, and intends to add politics to the list.⁸

Trump entered a contest in 2016 in a situation when a big segment of the American society had become a victim both of the global economy rules in large part dictated by the American political and economic bipartisan establishment, and a dysfunctional culture with educational degradation and mass pathologies as a result of family disintegration. Trump's opponent in the election Hillary Clinton, defining half of his electorate as "deplorables", the racist and xenophobic scum showed, convinced Trump that any discussion with the liberal left did not make sense and that it was necessary to abandon the politically correct language conventions to reach cross to "forgotten" people whom the liberal left denied a status of equal citizenship, defined with derision as irrational useless citizens, enemies embodying moral evil. Such a blackmail ceased to be successful and the Trump's electorate responded: Ok., if forcing you to discuss important issues is moral evil, then it is your problem. For people who were losing jobs, pensions or houses on a massive scale since the financial crisis of 2008 Trump was an American and a businessman to a core. He did not say "we will rob the rich", but "we will rebuilt American chances for all". He ceased playing politics as usual entering "kicking a table". One of the features of his character is his disdain of "experts", whether in business or politics. In both he prefers intuition, instinct and his experience as the surest paths to victory. His constant accusations are aimed, directly or indirectly, at "experts" who have been always wrong and making America weaker. Trump run as an outsider, a real one by this fact of positioning himself as not using experts. But he did not have much choice since he was a total novice in politics. Because he had not much experience and in addition not much knowledge of history he was

[...] forced to improvise. Sometimes that scrambling has the character of the best kind of entrepreneurial innovation, sometimes it seems like the worst kind of reality-TV blather [...]. His campaign was a case in point. It wasn't an accident that his children filled so many key positions in the early going. That wasn't nepotism, it was desperation. Trump didn't know the experienced strategists, fundraisers, pollsters, and politicians that a normal presidential campaign requires to operate. Most of the outsiders who were attracted to him

⁸ Ch.R. Kesler, "Thinking About Trump", *Claremont Review of Books* 2018, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 12–13.

early were either complete unknowns or has-beens. [...] It was a mess, but competent people eventually were found, and amid the confusion Trump's indictment of the torpid party leaders continued to be heard, and welcomed.⁹

One of his strong virtues was his peculiar, folkish sense of humor which made liberals furious. That was his ability to speak directly to the people over any intermediaries, not even the official media, also through twitter. And he had a peculiar sense of humor which his Republican opponents as well as Hilary Clinton lacked. His rallies were long and his speeches off the cuff, but he nevertheless kept the audience both interested in what he was saying even if he constantly repeated himself, while at the very same time kept them laughing. His humor was not refined and ironic, definitely not self-deprecating, a trademark of Ronald Reagan's humor. It was crude, bold, sometimes outrageous, and often insensitive to many. The opponent's and the liberal media hated him for that, but Trump was able to make an astonishing connection with his audience, since his language seemed to be straightforward, lacking a typical political Jargon. This was a message of one fellow citizen to another not within the rules of the politics as usual process. He did not have this attitude of condescension which policy experts show towards their interlocutors. He treated the media as serving essentially oligarchic reasons, and the experts as detached from the subjects of their experiments without any responsibility for the wrong action while entire fields of American economy were in crisis. He consciously as a businessman

[...] identified with working men and women, and promised (at least) to *add* jobs, to boost economic growth, to 'win' for pipe-fitters and waitresses, too. [...] Trump memorably declared, 'I love the poorly educated.' You'd never hear [...] any [...] mainstream Republican, say that! [...] These days the Left is always campaigning; as is the Right. Under those conditions, moral criticisms shade quickly into aesthetic-political ones, and vice versa.¹⁰

Against fiction of the "world peace"

Trump's election constituted a symbolic ending of the American or Western in general post-1945 consensus. Three dogmas upon which such a consensus had been successfully built for nearly three generations began to fall apart.

The first one is a dogma that an increase of wealth by means of technocratic economic neo-Keynesian management would be continuous, guaranteeing a rise of a larger and larger group of people entering the middle class. With that a successful assimilation of immigrants and their slow joining of this class was to proceed as usual. The liberal elites' response to a growing crisis of this dogma had been a growing transfer of the economic management to a global sphere, building institutions of the transnational global governance. The Right's answer,

⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 16.

¹⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 13.

whether libertarian or neoconservative, but not necessarily conservative, traditional or religious, focused on a repetition of the American national strategy at the global level through free trade, opening of borders and export of democracy. An important underlying and taken for granted assumption of such a view was a conviction that the United States, as before, would be able to dictate the rules of this global game. Both strategies were defined by Trump as utterly unsuccessful, if by success one means economic security of the U.S. lower and middle classes, which became increasingly hostages to a dysfunctional leviathan-state distributing alms. He decided to use a machinery of the nation state as the best tool of solving problems of a growing dysfunctionalities of the global market. Trump rejected both the economic and cultural cosmopolitanism of the liberal-left and the cultural libertarian and economic opening of borders of the Right. But he was against an isolationist policy of closing borders instead proposing immigrants national egalitarianism, that is assimilation and entrance to the middle class. This in turn required strong American sense of common culture preventing global and countercultural forces of disintegration.

The second disintegrating post-1945 dogma was a loss of faith in American exceptionalism after Afghanistan, Iraq, the Middle East debacle, and the North Africa disaster of the “Arab Spring”, all of these events tied to an illusion that exporting western style liberal democracy to the non-western countries, many of them ruled by dictators, was just a technical problem of implementation. In that perspective military interventions to topple dictators in many of these countries looked sensible. But Trump unequivocally renounced costly, endless and non-conclusive wars depleting American resources and decided to return to the Westphalian system of nation states’ rivalry, the game which Russia and China, the main rivals of the U.S., had been playing all the time, trying to use global economic rules to their advantage.

The third dogma which broke down was a conviction that the post-1968 cultural management creating social cohesion and solidarity would successfully replace the dominant protestant WASP’s cultural code (White Anglo-Saxon Protestant), which began to wear out in the 60’s and 70’s and which finally lost its legitimacy and power in the 80’s and the 90’s.¹¹ This new post-WASP cultural management devised by the post-1960 new class consisting of liberal elites in the universities, media, corporations, judges and accepted by the bipartisan alliance of the American political class was to be created out of a new vision of equality and justice on the basis of such ideas as multiculturalism, diversity or identity liberalism of group choices, new tolerance understood as total acceptance of any claim to full social and political recognition with non-judgmentalism as a public ethic, all of them guarded by ubiquitous rules of political correctness as their keystone with a corresponding powerful legal and institutional structure supporting

¹¹ R. Brookhiser, *Way of the Wasp: How It Made America, and How It Can Save It, So to Speak*, New York 1991.

it. But this plan to build such a new consensus has turned out to be superficial and has built neither social consensus or solidarity.

Trump proposed, at least rhetorically, a return to social solidarity based on traditional American patriotism of equal chances, the essence of American traditional liberalism of the Declaration of Independence subverted by identity liberalism and the corresponding ideas of the post-1968 variety aiding it, sensing that such a longing within an American society is a dream which refuses to die. This is a longing to restore a republican spirit and loyalty which transcend identity groups for the sake of a less narcissistic ideal. And he understood that without the strong nation state such a task was impossible and that the enemy in the late neo-liberal world was not so much the state as such, but the abused state. But without it was impossible to reign in international corporations which formed part and parcel of this globalized, international beyond any control network. They constituted as well a new totalitarian threat to individual freedom, being totalitarianism not of the state but of international corporations without control.¹²

Trump stands right at the very center of a process which can be defined as a conflict between non-democratic, global liberalism and democratic principle of people longing for an alternative, or to put it in another way a conflict between the so called “the open society” and the nation state. He rolled over the bipartisan consensus thinking that the global rules of the game are good for America and its society, totally disregarding the bitter plight of the lower classes, treated as, in fact, not part of goodness of the United States. Trump questioned all dogmas of that bipartisan consensus, that is why his victory was a shock not only for the liberal establishment, in the Democratic Party, the media, the universities and the corporations, but also for a large part of the Republican establishment. Thus an incessant hysteria of the “resistance movement” against Trump, not capable of realizing what happened and why. Since they listened only to their own people.

Trump's election took place amidst a great crisis of the liberal society, sharpened and brought to attention of the world by a fateful, extra-legal decision taken in 2015 by Angela Merkel, the chancellor of Germany, about unrestricted immigration to the European Union.¹³ The European immigration crisis subverted something which the ancient Greeks named a virtue of prudence-*phronesis*, in the name of an ideal of global justice mixed among the Western elites, predominantly in the European Western states, with a sense of profound guilt for the legacy of Western culture which allegedly led inexorably not only to a colonial exploitation of the non-Western countries but as well as to the Holocaust.¹⁴ A new

¹² See: R. Dreher, “The Controlling Power of Big Data”, *The American Conservative*, 14.08.2019, <https://www.theamericanconservative.com/dreher/controlling-power-of-big-data/> [accessed: 16.08.2019].

¹³ See in general: D. Murray, *The Strange Death of Europe: Immigration, Identity, Islam*, London 2017.

¹⁴ See: P. Bruckner, *The Tyranny of Guilt: An Essay on Western Masochism*, Princeton 2010.

self-identifying point of reference was to be multiculturalism and identity liberalism. In Europe this attitude to guilt has made Europe's approach to its past as absolutely a-historical, as if Europe has never overcome its sinful past, or as if it left it totally behind in a march towards a new Paradise, the European Union, the idea strikingly visible in the Museum of European History in Brussels.¹⁵ The target of such a critique is a desire to apologise for the crimes of the past with the sins of colonialism, racism and genocide during the II WW, which means essentially for the entire European past which makes any Western state as a sinner and penitent. Any attack on Western civilisation and its people, including the most vicious terrorists attacks cannot be wholly condemned because of this burning sense of guilt which makes such attacks as being deserved from hands of people oppressed in the past.¹⁶

In this perspective the "European values" are identical, as Pierre Manent noticed "[...] with a permanent critique of the European life and history [...] in the name of the new man".¹⁷ This amounts to an attempt to erase the European tradition in the name of identity created ex nihilo. Since the 1968 revolution this "negative" stance has become the ideology not only of the European new order but as well of the American liberal elites, especially in the universities and the media. An element of this approach is a support of open borders and mass immigration.¹⁸ One of the most inflaming Trump's speeches during the presidential campaign concerned immigration, both legal and illegal, with an idea of building a solid wall on the U.S.–Mexican border. Although the wall has not been built because of the shortage of funds and an adamant resistance of the Democrats and some of the Republicans and the issue is still a bone of bitter contention between the United States and Mexico, the illegal immigration has diminished by about 60% due also to an effective ending of chain immigration and additional border security initiatives.¹⁹

After Vilfredo Pareto we can name this as a conflict between two models of the common interest: utility of the community, that is a value of survival, and utility for the community that is the common good implying some kind of a sacrifice. Strong civilizations plan not in the perspective of utility understood as Comfort. They think about utility for the good of society. The present immigration policy in the European Union as well as in the United States has been treated by the globalized elites mainly as a way to increase profits in the global economy with its burdens thrown on their particular societies. Immigration understood as utility

¹⁵ Zob. A. Bryk, "Polska narracja historyczna w czas hegemonii liberalnej", [in:] *Od Niepodległości do Niepodległości. Polska myśl polityczna i prawna 1918–2018*, eds. M. Maciejewski, M. Marszał, M. Sadowski, Wrocław 2019, pp. 428–429.

¹⁶ See on it in general: P. Bruckner, *op. cit.*

¹⁷ P. Manent, "Nieczytelny krajobraz", *Res Publica Nowa* 2014, No. 1, p. 73.

¹⁸ It is interesting to notice that nearly all Democratic candidates fighting for a nomination to be a president of the U.S. in 2020 are supporting "open borders", short of embracing the label.

¹⁹ V.D. Hanson, *op. cit.*

for the community means strengthening readiness to bear sacrifices in the name of ethical purpose. This ethical purpose should be demanded also from the immigrants. They should not be defined essentially as labor force, as aliens kept in isolation by welfare states, and with a multicultural ideology giving them an artificial feeling of cultural equality without a chance for a real social advancement. Such an approach of paternalistic neglect can of course be defined as a pragmatic answer to cultural weakening characterized by a gnawing self-doubt, which is the case in the European Union. In case of the United States it is more a globalist neglect in case of the American elites. In both cases a response was a paternalistic management of people on the way to the “open society”. Immigration was a useful tool for a destruction of the nation state solidarity, since the whole discussion has been conducted to create global society consisting of individuals within a vision of the universalist global empire.²⁰

This is an equivalent of the modern class war where we have “[...] on the one side people rooted in their country, culture, mores and identity, thus representing a continuity Multi-centuries vision of man, on the other side a new global elite, for which any form of a ‘border’ – whether a national one, cultural, social, religious or sexual – constitutes an obstacle. As Zygmunt Bauman correctly observed: ‘In the fluid stage of modernity, the settled majority is ruled by the nomadic and extraterritorial elite’”.²¹ But only within the nation state and its democratic procedures elites can be subjected to democratic accountability. There is no universal people which can call into account the global elites. But the nation state fulfills also a need for a community of common communications which cannot be realized in the “open society”. People are not atoms in the economic, legal or moral free market. They are part of particular communities. They are born into concrete relations, institutions, ties. They have their duties, loyalties and loves of families, countries, cultures, faiths. Such dimensions of their life give them deeper existential meanings. People are in need of communities and the nation state constitutes a quintessential community of communities bound together by loyalties rooted in culture, religion, laws, gratitude towards these before and duties towards these after us, and with a memory of good and bad. People love their countries exactly for such reasons. That is a proper meaning of patriotism.

The global elite thinks that it is possible to create universal patriotism with human rights as the only language of Communications between people, without any other mediations constituting unnecessary burdens on the way towards a glorious future. The post-political utopia of universal humanity built on human rights, the alleged basis of global patriotism constitutes a situation of a constant vigil, necessary to guard us against a situation in which someone may commit

²⁰ See: P. Hitchens, “In Praise of Borders”, *First Things* October 2017, pp. 27–30.

²¹ Z. Krasnodębski, “Postęp, inżynieria społeczna a pytanie o tożsamość Europy – przegląd sytuacji”, [in:] *Renovatio Europae: O hesperialistyczną reformę Europy*, ed. D. Engels, Poznań 2019, p. 35.

a sin of love which allegedly means always “excluding” somebody. Such an attitude of exclusivity, where one has to enter the world first through particular mediations does not mean that people are indifferent or hostile towards others. Authentic openness to accept others gives all a chance to enter the world not of abstractions but mutual responsibility. Human rights cannot create citizens out of the masses of immigrants treated first of all as tools of a larger ideological vision of destroying nation states, and also as cheap labor, the “fodder of history”. There is no way any type of attachment, let alone deeper responsibility for such a community can develop. Only taking responsibility for something, also a country make citizens. This is a destiny which is propelled by duty and love and consciously taken up. This destiny cannot be a right or worse, a privilege as a precondition of a duty.

Such a relationship does not develop, it is the other way round that it can work. Taking up such a role requires responsibility which comes from being inculcated. Political correctness does not make such people, who trained in it suddenly feel homeless, a phenomenon visible both in the EU and the U.S. This homelessness is being additionally aggravated by a sense of metaphysical boredom in case of the EU, and increasingly in the U.S. The immigration crisis, an ideological as well as economic and only partially humanitarian response to a resistance of all communities ready to regain subjectivity and restoring the nation state to its previous crucial status Cannot be treated as simply a policy wrongly implemented. The plurality of nations prevents tyranny, defending against conceit of dreaming about the global empire managed by “enlightened” technocrats. Decisions concerning immigration are among the most important in human communities. They shape the world in which people want to live. That is why a policy of multiculturalism on the way to a total “open society” creates a utopia of global cooperation. A destruction of the nation state leads to a situation in which more and more spheres of life are taken out of democratic control, transferring them to international bodies, markets, corporation or judges, where mentally disarmed citizens become atomized consumer of rights, commodities or identities.

The fall of structural narcissism

The Tower of Babel biblical story tells us something important about this ideology of one, united global humanity as a threat closing just dissidents any chance of escape. Thus a world of the final integration in the name of progress will not create one global nation. It may understand such a nation solely as an administrative, legal, economic and even military technocratic machinery, devised within a limited world of ideas of the economic, legal, university and media elites of a particular time and place. It is their world not the people’s world.

But there is another dangerous consequence of this total uprooting from common ties created in nation states in the name of the global, post-patriotic reality. It must constitute also a declaration of war on all communal ties and loyalties. The self-governing republic seems to constitute a *sine qua non* condition of a free society. Post-national “open society” empire is a utopia uprooting people from their world of loves and substituting for it a utopian dream. An apparent uneasiness, even hysterical reaction of the liberal, global elites when they face the present rebellion of nations is quite understandable. But it is the nations which are right. Such a globalized world constitutes a naive fairy tale about brotherhood outside any mediations of states, nations, cultures, religions, or families, a sweet dream of John Lennon’s world out of a song “Imagine”. But in end the steel teeth of naked power beyond rosy words are clearly visible, with a corresponding desire of expert management applied to every aspect of human life by means of human rights, biased psychotherapy and consumption, to transcend all conflicts and evil as such in a world that nobody, to use T.S. Eliot words, there will be no need for love and good people. This is a dream of the ultimate end of history “emancipated” from all evils of history and forming human paradise.²² Only people, who feel common bonds of communal ties of all types, but mainly love, are able to challenge the global liberal elites, technological corporations and dictatorial regimes threatening eventually human freedom. Radical individualism, a trend both spontaneously and consciously enhanced by globalization creates a dangerous situation, that against such corporation and regimes only individuals, not communities can stand up. But atomized individuals are helpless additionally weakened by the gender ideological resolution which teaches and trains them to behave in every moment as gods of their own destiny without any solid basis where to place one’s feet.

Trump sensed instinctively this rootless sense of gnawing homelessness of a growing number of Americans and many saw in him an advocate of their long forgotten hopes. He also realized that to win the nomination he has to risk head on conflict with the establishment of his own Republican Party since his potential winning electorate has been for quite a long time in conflict with this establishment.

Such conflicts in the United States’ history have of course been common, a form of a populist revolt punishing the oligarchy inside the parties as in the nation in general for forgetting whom they should serve. If in the European tradition populism has nearly always used a battle cry “suck the rich”, the American populist revolts have had on their banners another demand: “let us sit at the same table”.

For the electorate of Donald Trump he was perceived as a politician-businessman capable of successful decisions and action. Superficially this sounded

²² On this lack of any theory of evil as well as death within liberal theory see J. Kekes, *The Illusion of Egalitarianism*, Ithaca 2003, pp. 3–4, 15–26, 135–137.

similar to a technocratic approach, but in fact his election was a choice of a man who was capable of defining problems hidden from public by liberal political correctness, even if that could mean a head on conflict with reigning economic, cultural and political orthodoxy.

Trump has been constantly accused as being quintessential, irresponsible populist appealing to the lowest instincts of the most frustrated. This constituted a technique of criminalization of the political opponents by association and had little cognitive value, since the question which was hidden by such attacks was very simple: in the name of what and against what and whom Trump's electorate was rebelling. Trump, financially independent could not be stopped neither by vicious attacks of the liberals accusing him of sexism, racism, isolationism or the most fashionable liberal-left thought crime-homophobia, nor attacks of the Republican establishment. Accusations only increased support for him.²³

The West experiences today a tectonic, multidimensional change since the II World War. The cultural change encompasses a growing disintegration of solidarity and atomization of communities with a post-modernist ethics of autonomous choices constituting the only legitimate basis of rights. This disintegration has been strengthened by political correctness ideology forbidding moral judgments, substituted by "correct" issues of "a particular day" defended by cultural and economic elites. A technocratic language of experts creating a market of global consumers becomes a "religion". In this game the strong are the winners, and the weak pay the highest price for a destruction of family and a chaos of the sexual revolution, getting instead a tabloid consumption and psychotherapy as a palliative. Not so much differences in wealth but this cultural abyss divides the rich from the weak. The white middle class, trained by political correctness as a form of mental reeducation camp on the university campuses, in the public administration, corporations and the media has become the major victim of such a policy.

What large sections of the lower classes and the middle class have for a long time experienced and which turned into a populist rage which Trump mobilized for his victorious campaign was a peculiar alliance of the social and cultural liberal "emancipation" program of transforming America (sexual resolution, destruction of marriage, LGBT+, identity groups as a basis of social solidarity etc.) with the libertarian economic Right which treated people solely as individual consumer in the open market of the globalized economy.

In that process, which began in the late 60's, the Democratic Party lost to the Republican Party traditional voters from the original, blue collar immigrant ethnic communities as well as the workers, forming an alliance with identity groups, gradually creating an administrative clienteles state and becoming the party of oligarchic professional elites. It also sided unequivocally with the

²³ See: C.R. Lewandowski, D.N. Bosse, *Let Trump be Trump: The Inside Story of His Rise to the Presidency*, New York 2017.

countercultural resolution and its standard postulates, like writing, since 1972, abortion and eventually homosexual marriage into its program.²⁴ Ronald Reagan's conservative victory in 1980's was partially a result of this shift. But after two generations also the Republican Party has radically evolved, unable to stop that countercultural revolution, with its establishment allaying itself with the libertarian global economic forces, abandoning its working and middle class electorate, Reagan's success, and becoming a party of oligarchic professional elites as well.²⁵ A financial crisis of 2008 and a revolt of the "Tea Party" in 2009 as its result was to change the Republican Party's course, but it turned out to be unsuccessful, provoking only a slow and chaotic, heterogeneous coalition which Trump organized, sensing that it was big enough to carry him to victory due to a logic of the electoral system of counting votes, which elevated the states of interior America into significant political prominence. This populist in the best sense of the American word revolt against the establishment which betrayed a basis of its own party gave rise to the antiestablishment coalition.²⁶ This ancient American mood of "throwing the rascals out" was sensed perfectly by Trump and he addressed his rallies with cheering crowds by first of all a new brutal, thoroughly radical language bordering on hateful rage, declaring from the beginning "to hell with political correctness".

Open society and it's hidden drawbacks

Trump realized that his chance of winning was to build bridges to this part of the American electorate which was outraged by turning elections into a ritual without meaning. One could argue, that he represented during the election campaign a conservatism of the counterrevolution, or, as his critics pointed out populism of a mindless emotion, a political "mistake" to be tamed and then kicked out as quickly as possible. But Trump's noticed that a huge part of the American people were despised both by the liberal-left as well as the republican establishments as stupid "deplorables" who did not share the liberal oligarchy's values and life

²⁴ On the beginning of this shift to identity politics see E.J. Dionne, *Why American Hate Politics?*, New York 1992; recent criticism of the identity politics as a betrayal of traditional American liberalism and as the main reason of the Democratic defeats see M. Lilla, *The Once and Future Liberal: After Identity Politics*, New York 2017.

²⁵ On this process of oligarchization and abandoning culture war logic see an analysis from a religious conservative point of view R.A. Viguier, *Conservatives Betrayed*, Los Angeles 2006; from a general point of view a good survey of this decline see *Crisis of Conservatism?: The Republican Party, the Conservative Movement and the American Politics after Bush*, eds. J.D. Aberbach, G. Peele, Oxford 2011; also A. Bryk, "Konserwatyzm amerykański od Ronalda Reagana do rewolucji Obamy", [in:] *Ronald Reagan: Nowa odsłona w 100-lecie urodzin*, ed. P. Musiewicz, Kraków 2011, pp. 191–319.

²⁶ See: W.R. Mead, "The Jacksonian Revolt: American Populism and the Liberal Order", *Foreign Affairs* 2017, Vol. 96, No. 2, pp. 2–7.

style, that no one represented them and they were big enough to give him victory. Trump had an instinctual insight that a road to victory was to show that the oligarchic self-serving, self-righteous governing elite, the new class of America, was hollowing not only its economy but its culture as well, killing the American Dream.²⁷ In this sense, despite his outrageous comments, his sometimes vulgar style, his vanity and egocentric mania his call to make America great again was a sincere call for renewal and recognized by many, even these who had many reservations towards him, as the last chance to redirect American dangerous course and to shatter its growing oligarchic nature, not from the first principles of socialism as another candidate Bernie Sanders tried to do, but from the first principles of the American constitutionalism.²⁸

He sent his message to such “deplorables”, kicking the table of traditional political game, realizing that what was taking place in the United States was a revolt of the growing group of “unprotected” lower and middle class people pushed away from “the American table of opportunity”, against establishments of both major parties which were increasingly playing, even if for different reasons and with different aims in mind, the global game. It was this establishment which was dictating its rules without bearing the negative consequences of globalization. These were paid solely by disregarded “unprotected” who did not have neither economic, legal or cultural means to understand, let alone withstand “collateral damage” of them. This globalization process was a double one, economic and cultural, aimed at creating both at the economic as well as cultural level perfect individual consumer of goods and values.²⁹

Trump strongly criticized, a risky thing in the United States, an uncontrolled, illegal immigration, which destroyed an idea of equal citizenship and democratic control over national destiny. He stressed that in this process not managers were losing their jobs or professional classes their positions while living in isolated suburb communities with children attending better schools and cut off from all pathologies of the new “ghetto” communities. These higher classes use

²⁷ This process was analyzed well by one of the first and more objective accounts of the Trump phenomenon by C. Black, *Donald J. Trump: A President Like no Other*, Washington D.C. 2018.

²⁸ The most famous call to support Trump was made by a quintessential liberal Mark Anton writing under a pseudonym “Publius Decius Mus” in his article “The Flight 93 Election”, *Claremont Review of Books*, 5.09.2016, <https://www.claremont.org/crb/basicpage/the-flight-93-election/> [accessed: 16.08.2019]. Mus, a Roman military leader is credited with saving the Roman army in 343 B.C. when it got into a trap during a war with Samnites. The title referred to a courageous storming by terrorized passengers of a hijacked jet heading towards the White House in 2001 during a terrorist attack. Anton appealed to American public to realize the grave danger of where America was heading and support Trump in a courageous attempt to revert its suicidal course. Anton developed his theses in a book *After Flight 93 Election: The Vote that Saved America and What We Still Have to Lose*, New York 2019.

²⁹ See on this process for instance R.R. Reno, *Return of the Strong Gods: Nationalism, Populism, and the Future of the West*, Washington D.C. 2019.

cheap immigrant labor, with its women cleaning apartments of the upper class women while at the same time supporting liberal cultural programs with luxurious, marginal issues of gender feminism, transgender rights or homosexual marriage, with cast aside people stigmatized as bigots, racists or homophobes.

The “excluded” demanded a meritocratic acceptance “at the table” and a renewal of all-American solidarity, which was subverted in a process of continuous erosion by the liberal cultural establishment. This all-American sense of national solidarity rooted, using Abraham Lincoln words, in the “mystical chords of memory”, was falling apart. Its substitution, a culture of pragmatic, technocratic solutions with multiculturalism as their base was not working. Moreover such solutions were increasingly treated as a useful means to destroy strong national and religious or other attachments not decided by a subjectivist autonomous choice, destroying liberty, especially religious liberty and freedom of speech.³⁰ Such attachments were considered to be impedimenta on the road to a peacefully functioning global market of consumers. Trump, an authentic American patriot understanding American heroic code, knew that its civilisational greatness was built not by a formal “religion” of the Constitution, but the United States’ nation with its heroic ethos of liberty, culture and religion. America has always given millions of immigrants chances to prosper, but included them at the very same time into a universe which it wanted to cherish and defend, preparing them for these goals with education and duties, something Europe is no longer capable of.

This process of cultural disintegration has been for a long time subverting the middle class created after the II WW and stabilizing the American, or in general the Western, political system. Every citizen felt to be a part of this more or less egalitarian world, with a possible exception formally until the 60’s of blacks, but this is a separate problem. This middle class has thus been subjected to an enormous pressure, seeing the mass immigration as a brutal tool of increasing market efficiency in the interests of the global elites, with national sovereignty treated as an obstacle to the universal world of consumers. These global elites do not realize due to their enormous resources and flexibility of organizing their existences in ways they think are good for them, that people are not just labor force but human beings seeking belonging and roots. That is, when Trump repeatedly declared “either we have a state or we don’t” a response from the electorate was massive, since identity liberalism based on race, ethnic, sexual basis does create only private attachments, but not human solidarity as such.³¹

Trump channeled this rebellion animated by such underlying causes. He is not a typical conservative, especially in his private life, although his support for

³⁰ See: P. Deneen, *Why Liberalism Failed*, New Haven 2018.

³¹ See a bitter analysis of this liberal decline written already in 2010 M.K. Beran, “The Descent of Liberalism”, *National Review* 2010, Vol. 62, No. 65, pp. 30–34. As Beran wrote “Having repudiated classical liberty, which once counterbalanced their politics of social reform, the Left today confronts the abyss”, *ibidem*, p. 30.

some conservative causes like opposition to abortion or erosion of free speech on American campuses due to liberal-left political correctness has been visible. Nevertheless he represents more a figure of a traditional American businessman appealing to a myth of a self-made man. If he is a populist than not in a sense that he is a rabid demagogue, even if the liberal-left portrays him as such, but in a sense, probably for the first time seen on such a massive scale, that he knew how to manager crowds by social media. He sensed profound, destabilizing changes within America and the liberal global world, changes which began to work against American national and social interests. Changes which the Republican establishment did not notice, let alone understood, and which the liberal establishment disregarded defining its social and cultural consequences in a form of social protests as the last vestiges of leaving a historical stage reactionary America, this America which has to be eradicated as soon as possible, so to finally close the “emancipation” revolution and end history for good. The United States economy has finally recovered from a crisis of 2008, the stock market looks good and small business has regained confidence, even if Trump’s promise to reindustrialize America and convince capital and industry not to leave the country but to invest at home seems not to be entirely successful, although some of the “forgotten” regions devastated economically, socially and culturally have been revitalized.

But Trump’s victory has had profound consequences for the entire world, due to its global superpower status. He decided to change the rules of the liberal global game, both economic and cultural, which had to affect every aspect of the post-Cold War international order, sensing its dangerous destabilizing political and cultural tendency.³² All these policies are not negligible and dire predictions about the egotistic dilettante wreaking havoc to the U.S. have turned out to be unfulfilled. But whether Trump will become a president to be remembered in the pantheon of the American presidents in history is beyond our grasp. It is too early to predict.

References

- Allison G., *Destined for War: Can America and China Escape Thucydides’s Trap?*, Boston–New York 2017.
- Barone M., *Hard America, Soft America: Competition vs. Coddling and the Battle for the Nation’s Future*, New York 2004.
- Beran M.K., “The Descent of Liberalism”, *National Review* 2010, Vol. 62, No. 65, pp. 30–34.
- Black C., *Donald J. Trump: A President Like no Other*, Washington D.C. 2018.
- Brookhiser R., *Way of the Wasp: How It Made America, and How It Can Save It, So to Speak*, New York 1991.

³² See an analysis of this liberal crisis from a cultural perspective M. Cichocki, “Kulturowa schizma Zachodu. Jak dzielą nas nierówności, kultura i polityka”, *Rzeczpospolita*, 17–18.06.2017, pp. 7–8.

- Bruckner P., *The Tyranny of Guilt: An Essay on Western Masochism*, Princeton 2010.
- Bryk A., "Konserwatyzm amerykański od Ronalda Reagana do rewolucji Obamy", [in:] *Ronald Reagan: Nowa odsłona w 100-lecie urodzin*, ed. P. Musiewicz, Kraków 2011, pp. 191–319.
- Bryk A., "Polska narracja historyczna w czas hegemonii liberalnej", [in:] *Od Niepodległości do Niepodległości. Polska myśl polityczna i prawna 1918–2018*, eds. M. Maciejewski, M. Marszał, M. Sadowski, Wrocław 2019, pp. 417–445.
- Chodakiewicz M.J., *Intermarium: The Land Between the Black and Baltic Seas*, New Brunswick 2012.
- Cichocki M., "Kulturowa schizma Zachodu. Jak dzielą nas nierówności, kultura i polityka", *Rzeczpospolita*, 17–18.06.2017, pp. 7–8.
- Crisis of Conservatism?: The Republican Party, the Conservative Movement and the American Politics after Bush*, eds. J.D. Aberbach, G. Peele, Oxford 2011.
- Deneen P., *Why Liberalism Failed*, New Haven 2018.
- Dionne E.J., *Why American Hate Politics?*, New York 1992.
- Dreher R., "The Controlling Power of Big Data", *The American Conservative*, 14.08.2019, <https://www.theamericanconservative.com/dreher/controlling-power-of-big-data/> [accessed: 16.08.2019].
- Epstein D.A., *Left, Right, Out: The History of Third Parties in America*, New York 2012.
- Hanson V.D., "The Many Wars of Donald Trump", *National Review* 2018, Vol. 70, No. 2.
- Hitchens P., "In Praise of Borders", *First Things* October 2017, pp. 27–30.
- Kekes J., *The Illusion of Egalitarianism*, Ithaca 2003.
- Kesler Ch.R., "Thinking About Trump", *Claremont Review of Books* 2018, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 10–24.
- Krasnodębski Z., "Postęp, inżynieria społeczna a pytanie o tożsamość Europy – przegląd sytuacji", [in:] *Renovatio Europae: O hesperalistyczną reformę Europy*, ed. D. Engels, Poznań 2019.
- Lewandowski C.R., Bosse D.N., *Let Trump be Trump: The Inside Story of His Rise to the Presidency*, New York 2017.
- Lilla M., *The Once and Future Liberal: After Identity Politics*, New York 2017.
- Manent P., "Nieczytelny krajobraz", *Res Publica Nowa* 2014, No. 1, pp. 72–73.
- Mead W.R., "The Jacksonian Revolt: American Populism and the Liberal Order", *Foreign Affairs* 2017, Vol. 96, No. 2, pp. 2–7.
- Murray D., *The Strange Death of Europe: Immigration, Identity, Islam*, London 2017.
- National Review* 2016, Vol. 68, No. 16.
- Publius Decius Mus [Mark Anton], "The Flight 93 Election", *Claremont Review of Books*, 5.09.2016, <https://www.claremont.org/crb/basicpage/the-flight-93-election/> [accessed: 16.08.2019].
- Reno R.R., *Return of the Strong Gods: Nationalism, Populism, and the Future of the West*, Washington D.C. 2019.
- Safer J., *I Love You, but I Hate Your Politics: How to Protect Your Intimate Relationships in a Poisonous Partisan World*, New York 2019.
- Smith E.E., "How to Protect Relationships in the Trump Era", *National Review*, 25.07.2019, <https://www.nationalreview.com/magazine/2019/08/12/how-to-protect-relationships-in-the-trump-era> [accessed: 16.08.2019].
- Viguerie R.A., *Conservatives Betrayed*, Los Angeles 2006.

Donald Trump odpowiedzią na świat liberalnego globalizmu po zimnej wojnie

Wygrane przez Donalda Trumpa – dzięki odwołaniu do wartości i narracji konserwatywnej – wybory prezydenckie wywołały wstrząs w społeczeństwie amerykańskim. Nowy prezydent z powodzeniem ograniczył postępującą oligarchizację życia politycznego Stanów Zjednoczonych. Zdołał pokonać Hilary Clinton z jej wizją państwa – oligarchii wspieranej przez klienckie grupy tożsamościowe. Trump skoncentrował swoją retorykę i kierunki polityki na solidarności społecznej w ramach państwa narodowego opartego na wartościach republikańskich. Stał w opozycji zarówno do liberałów, jak i do libertarian związanych w walce przeciwko niemu. Widać tu konflikt dwóch modeli interesu wspólnotowego w ujęciu Vilfredo Pareto. Ponadto dostrzec można podobieństwa do prezydentury Ronalda Regana, jednakże trudno pominąć zasadnicze rozbieżności (Trump – człowiek wielkiego biznesu z ogromnym majątkiem osobistym, niemający doświadczenia politycznego i niepełniący wcześniej funkcji publicznych). Sama wizja „wielkiej Ameryki” jest stworzonym przez Trumpa zjawiskiem społecznym, opartym na retoryce wielkości i władzy wykorzystywanej jednak przy wdrażaniu rzeczywistych zmian polityki państwa (np. nominacje sędziowskie). Oprócz tego nowy prezydent zapewnił Partii Republikańskiej wyjście z kryzysu, dając szansę na gruntowną i zasadniczą reorientację systemu politycznego USA. Intuicja polityczna i doświadczenie przedsiębiorcy pozwalają Trumpowi na obalenie monopolu retoryki politycznej poprawności wraz z moralnym dyktatem nowomowy i rozproszonymi formami cenzury. Brutalna retoryka i specyficzne poczucie humoru towarzyszące autentycznemu optymizmowi *self-made man*, wraz z biznesową mentalnością, pozwoliły Donaldowi Trumpowi na przetrwanie ostracyzmu elit oraz zaciętych ataków mediów liberalnych. Nowy prezydent zajął miejsce trybuna „twardej Ameryki” (Michael Barone) stając w opozycji do liberalnej pogardy dla „godnych pożałowania”. Trump identyfikuje się jako budowniczy, człowiek działania, doświadczony i ostry gracz świata wielkich interesów. Sama Ameryka dlań to naród budowniczych. Nowa prezydentura jest również symbolicznym zakończeniem porządku ustanowionego w USA i Europie Zachodniej po roku 1945. **Słowa kluczowe:** prezydentura Donalda Trumpa, oligarchia liberalna, Partia Republikańska, państwo narodowe, porządek polityczny po 1945 roku

Donald Trump as a Response to a Global Post-Cold War Liberal World

Donald Trump utilizes conservative values and narrative to gain power in elections, causing profound social turmoil (to hell with political correctness) and successfully attempts to limit oligarchization of American political life. He was able to defeat Hilary Clinton with her vision of liberal oligarchy supported by identity clientele groups. Trump focused his rhetoric and policies on social solidarity in a nation state fueled by republican values, thus opposing both liberals and libertarians joined against him in a conflict of two models of common interest in V. Pareto's understanding. Some similarities to Ronald Reagan's presidency are visible, albeit major differences (business background, massive personal wealth, lack of political experience or administrative career) must be noticed. Trump's vision "Great America" is a construed temporal social phenomenon, based on rhetoric of greatness and power, used however to implement real and profound policy changes (e.g. nominations to SCOTUS and federal courts). Moreover, Trump saves Republicans from political stalemate or even crisis, as they regain a chance to reorient the political system in a radical manner. His political intuition and business experience allowed Trump to overthrow the rhetoric of political correctness, liberal dispersed censorship and newspeak dictate of public morality. Brutal rhetoric and peculiar sense of humor combined with sincere optimism of a "self-made man" and entrepreneurial mentality allowed Trump to survive both ostracism of elites and ferocious attack of

liberal media. He established himself as a representative and voice of “Hard America” (M. Barone), opposed to liberal despise for the “deplorable”. Trump identifies himself as a man of action, rough business player and a builder, America to him is a nation of builders. Trump’s victory is a symbolic ending of the American and Western order established after 1945.

Key words: Donald Trump’s presidency, liberal oligarchy, Republican Party, nation state, open society, post-1945 political order

