

СОЦІАЛЬНО-ПОЛІТИЧНІ ПРОБЛЕМИ МІЖНАРОДНИХ ВІДНОСИН ТА СВІТОВОЇ ПОЛІТИКИ

DOI 10.31558/2617-0248.2018.3.5

УДК 327:336:502:321.01

WHY DID TRUMP ANNOUNCE HIS INTENT TO WITHDRAW FROM THE PARIS CLIMATE AGREEMENT?

Sven Krüger, PhD candidate at Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences (FSES), Comenius University in Bratislava (Slovakia)



“In order to fulfil my solemn duty to protect America and its citizens, the United States will withdraw from the Paris climate accord,”
President Donald Trump

Using qualitative methods, this research which examines the driving forces behind U.S. President Donald Trump's decision to withdraw from the Paris Climate Agreement. Empirically the thesis seeks to observe and explain Donald Trump's behaviour, whilst also testing falsifiable hypotheses derived from observations of empirical facts. Trump's self-assured, although widely criticized decision by the International community, to withdraw from the Paris can be explained in the context of International Relations from the perspective of hegemony, Hegemonic Stability Theory and sovereignty which considers the evolution of US foreign policy since the cold war and the impact of President Trump's 'America First' campaign on the international community.

On 1 June, 2017, the U.S. President Donald Trump announced, that the U.S. would withdraw from the Paris Climate Agreement and with immediate effect stop applying the agreement, including the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) and financial contributions. The president's decision to withdraw was criticized in the US and overseas, with disappointment and protest voiced by world leaders, international organizations, civil society, and media.

The U.S. State Department, on 4 August, 2017, sent to the United Nations a formal communication confirming that the U.S. would be leaving the agreement, and raised the question about the withdrawal decision: Why did President Trump decide to withdraw, knowing that his withdrawal decision would be subject to extensive criticism domestically and internationally?

The Paris Climate Agreement was a common response by the global community to work together, recognizing that climate change was man-made. This decision was based on scientific advice, with 97 percent of climate researchers agreeing that human activity was the cause for the current period of global warming.

Key words: Paris Climate Agreement, D. Trump politics, US foreign policy, climate change.

Крюгер Свен, Чому Д.Трампа анонсував свій намір про вихід із Паризької кліматичної угоди?

У статті досліджуються рушійні сили, які стоять за рішенням президента США Дональда Трампа вийти з Паризької кліматичної угоди. Паризька кліматична угода була спільною реакцією світової спільноти на глобальну спільну проблему зміни клімату. Вона укладалася виходячи із визнання того, що ця проблему було викликано діяльністю людини. Це рішення ґрунтувалося на наукових рекомендаціях, де 97% дослідників клімату погоджувалися з тим, що діяльність людини була причиною поточного періоду глобального потепління. 1 червня 2017 року президент США Дональд Трамп оголосив, що США вийдуть з Паризької кліматичної угоди і негайно припинять дотримуватись угоди, включаючи національно визначені внески (НДЦ) та фінансові внески. Рішення президента про вихід країни з паризької угоди було піддано критиці в США і за кордоном, з розчаруванням і протестом, висловленими світовими лідерами, міжнародними організаціями, громадянським суспільством і засобами масової інформації. Державний

департамент США 4 серпня 2017 року надіслав до Організації Об'єднаних Націй офіційне повідомлення, що підтверджує, що США залишать Угоду. Ці дії порушують питання про витoki цього кроку: чому президент Трамп вирішив вийти з Угоди, знаючи, що його рішення буде предметом широкої критики всередині країни і на міжнародному рівні? Емпірично дана стаття спрямована на спостереження та пояснення за допомогою якісних методів поведінки Дональда Трампа, а також на тестування гіпотез, що впливають із спостережень емпіричних фактів. На думку автора, самовпевнене рішення Трампа про вихід із паризької угоди, яке піддається критиці з боку міжнародної спільноти, можна пояснити в контексті міжнародних відносин з точки зору гегемонії, гегемонічної теорії стабільності та суверенітету, що бере до уваги еволюцію зовнішньої політики США з моменту холодної війни та вплив кампанії президента Трампа «Америка Перша» на міжнародну спільноту.

Ключові слова: Паризька кліматична угода, політика Д. Трампа, зовнішня політика США, зміна клімату

Introduction

Doubts emerged in 2009 when errors appeared in a report [31] from the globally-recognised scientific body for climate research, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change[45] (IPCC). The IPCC argued that in a document of nearly 3,000 pages with over 1,000 authors a small number of errors are unavoidable [9]. Critics of the IPCC immediately seized upon the opportunity to spread doubt in the politically charged arena of climate science.

The Paris Climate Agreement was adopted in 2015 and the USA pledged to reduce emissions by 26-28% by 2025 mostly by the Clean Power Plan Executive 2016 which aimed to curb carbon dioxide emissions from coal fuelled power stations. A switch from coal to natural gas as a result of fracking meant that emissions were 12% below the 2005 levels [17].

American President Donald Trump, is the most prominent climate skeptic in the world. Using the social media platform, Twitter, which at the time of writing had 52.3million followers (<https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump>), to broadcast his feelings, he tweeted that climate change was invented by the Chinese to damage the American economy [20]. Using the social media platform Twitter once he again, he tweeted the renowned “It’s really cold outside, they are calling it a major freeze, weeks ahead of normal. Man, we could use a big fat dose of global warming!” [21] argument.

Ohio State University International Relations professor and scholar, Randall Schweller, is a Trump supporter. He believes that unlike his predecessors Trump, understands the limits of American power. He believes that Trump is a realist who knows what matters for America. Schweller summed up his perspective on Trump by saying “He’s not interested in globalism for globalism’s sake. He’s not interested in multilateralism for multilateralism’s sake. He’s very much about the national interest. Now, we can discuss country by country. But I think he has the pulse of the American people. They don’t care about globalism; they don’t care, necessarily, about the liberal international order. They don’t want to spend blood and treasure on that. They want the national interest to be advanced” [4]. Schweller argues that pulling out of the Paris Climate Agreement sent a signal to the global community demonstrated that the USA wouldn’t be manipulated by the rest of the world and that it didn’t matter. Schweller argues “It doesn’t commit us to do anything, so there’s nothing to worry about.”

Trump cast the Paris Climate Agreement as fundamentally unfair to the United States, “at what point does America get demeaned, at what point do they start laughing at us” — it actually is part of a web of interconnected agreements that sustain America’s dominant global position in the world. Isolating the US in this fashion sends an extraordinarily strong signal to other major powers that the US cannot be trusted to act on its international commitments, or even to work within international organizations at all” [49].

It is suggested that the withdrawal decision was considered success for Stephen Bannon, Mr. Trump's former chief strategist, and Scott Pruitt, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) administrator, yet the decision has no benefits to global climate governance or the U.S. [43].

According to Peter Haas [17], Paris doesn’t impact employment in coal as renewable energy is now the major energy sector job creator and coal jobs won’t return. Paris didn’t disadvantage the US economy against India and China as they were already making moves away from coal [1].

What did the Paris Agreement mean for the global community?

The Paris Climate Agreement is termed by Karin Bäckstrand as “hybrid multilateralism” (Bäckstrand and Kuyper 2017) and is an unusual International exercise [3]. Its success depends on an intricate system of dynamic elements comprising of voluntary national commitments, private sector promises, reporting adherence and money transferred to poorer nations from the private sector and richer countries to pay for energy transitions [13; 16].

Transparency over reporting and publishing their efforts the ambition was that nations could glean knowledge from each other and shame other counties into a firmer commitment. It was not legally binding. The reductions were voluntary and the hope that the commitments would become more political and ambitious over time. The voluntary element meant that the US was not being exploited by any nation.

There was provision within the Paris Agreement for richer nations to transfer funds voluntarily to invest in energy transitions they would not be able to afford. It was deemed that these were not gifts but altruistic investment in accelerating the energy transitions to reduce greenhouse gases.

Legally, and in accordance with the terms of the Paris Agreement, withdrawal by the US cannot occur until 2020. The US is still committed to releasing annual reports on US greenhouse emission as part of its obligation to the 1992 United Nations Climate Change Convention but the budget for the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Agency (NOAA) needs to be retained and the responsible NOAA scientists need to keep their jobs for this obligation to be honoured [17].

Why did Trump decide to withdraw from the Paris Agreement?

During his 2016 presidential campaign Donald Trump vowed to withdraw from the Paris Agreement once he was elected. His views were skeptical, and in some instances, he even denied climate change. Once he had won the election, his position softened and he declared an “an open mind” [39] toward climate change. He delayed his decision to withdraw aware that an exit would encounter criticism domestically and globally. He eventually decided to withdraw and there are various factors pointing to why he chose to do so.

One such reason is that interest groups are a defining feature of American politics and the Trump Administration is closely tied to the fossil fuel industry. The Trump Administration and the Republican Party are politically influenced by the fossil fuel industries. An article in the New York Times linked Trump himself, Vice President Pence and EPA Administrator Pruitt with the petrochemical mogul Koch Industries [32]. Following the withdrawal, it is likely that the Trump Administration will look to repeal climate regulations for the benefit of energy companies, such as, Koch Industries. EPA Administrator Pruitt insisted the US withdraw from the Paris Agreement, has repeatedly denied anthropogenic causes of global warming, and led the legal charge against Clean Power Plan initiated by former President Obama. On May 25, 2017, twenty-two Republican senators, who reportedly have collected Republican party donations worth more than US\$ 10 million in oil, gas, and coal since 2012, also wrote a letter to President Trump urging him to leave the agreement [33].

Another reason is the current political and social polarization gave Trump the courage of his convictions and the confidence to make the withdrawal decision; the partisanship, social tension, and ideological antagonism underpins the current U.S. have no space for bipartisan cooperation [19], and the ‘Unite the Right’ white supremacist Charlottesville riot on 21 August, 2017, was an incident that testified to the current polarization. Confident that his constituency would not respond negatively to his withdrawal decision, Trump had the political courage to announce the exit, bolstered by aspirations of gaining ground for the next election.

Many times, in recent years, Trump has denied the science of climate change, calling it a “con job” and a “myth,” [5] and suggested it was “created by and for the Chinese in order to make U.S. manufacturing non-competitive.” On the campaign trail in 2015, Trump said “I consider climate change to be not one of our big problems.”. Elaborating further to say he did not believe climate change is a significant threat, and that he doubted humans contributed to it.

Trump, a skeptic of climate change, refused to acknowledge the fundamental principle of common, yet differentiated responsibility in global climate cooperation and so he has never publicly acknowledged that climate change is occurring and due to human beings, at odds with the position of the majority of U.S. scientists. Trump stated, in withdrawal speech that “the Paris Accord is very unfair at the highest level to the U.S. and compared China and India's mitigation obligations with U.S.” ignoring the common but differentiated responsibility principle.

Detailing his energy reform plan in a May 2016 speech, Trump pledged to lead the country toward total energy independence but considering “rational environmental concerns” such as clean air and water. The proposal sought to void Obama administration's Clean Power Plan [25], to walk away from the Paris climate accord and expand domestic production of oil and gas, permitting the construction of the Keystone XL oil pipeline. Following his victory, Trump said that on his first day in office he will redirect the billions of dollars the Obama administration, committed to UN climate change programs [25] toward fixing U.S. infrastructure. He stated that the United States should pursue all forms of energy, including renewables, and not favour one source over another [11].

The Sierra Club is an environmental organization in the United States and one of the first large-scale environmental preservation organizations in the world, which currently engages in lobbying politicians to promote environmentalist policies. In a press release the Sierra Club compiled public statements from the leaders of the 195 nations recognized by the State Department prior to Trump's victory and in response to his claims that climate change is a “con job” and a “myth.”. The statement re-iterated the action to reduce climate-warming carbon emissions by US allies; including Great Britain, Germany, France, Japan and Canada.

AP news reported the following highlighting the international commitment to reduction of carbon emissions:

“Chinese President Xi Jinping, head of the Earth’s most populous country and the No. 1 global emitter of carbon, has called for eventually phasing out dirty coal-fired power plants and is leading an ambitious national effort to build massive arrays of solar panels and wind turbines.

The regime of reclusive North Korean dictator Kim Jong Un signed on to the Paris accord last year and is implementing a 10-year push to plant new forests as part of a “national effort to mitigate climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions.”

Even the leaders of nations economically dependent on oil production also accept the reality that the world’s climate is warming, including Russian President Vladimir Putin and Saudi King Salman.

“Being highly vulnerable to climate change and actions and plans to address it, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia will be engaged in several actions to address climate change and make its development more sustainable,” the Saudi state said in a statement issued last year.

Trump, meanwhile, has pledged to “renegotiate” U.S. commitments under the Paris accord and has suggested that the science of climate change is part of a plot to weaken the American economy.

“The concept of global warming was created by and for the Chinese in order to make U.S. manufacturing non-competitive,” Trump tweeted in 2012.

He has also cited cold winter weather as evidence the world is not really warming.

“The entire country is FREEZING — we desperately need a heavy dose of global warming, and fast! Ice caps size reaches all-time high,” Trump tweeted during a 2014 blizzard.

While Trump’s climate-change denial has become orthodoxy within the Republican Party, it is at odds with the overwhelming consensus of the world’s scientific community and rejects reams of data about how the Earth’s climate is changing” [5].

According to NASA, there is consensus amongst 97 percent of the climate scientists that world is getting hotter and due to man-made carbon emissions. Historically, there has been ten of the warmest years in the past twelve. The mass decrease in Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets have been shown in studies, and on average the has been an average of a seven-inch rise in the world's oceans in the last century.

Regardless of his political stance, there is evidence that Trump may not concur with his own public stance, as the Trump International Golf Links and Hotel in Ireland cited the threat of sea level rise as a reason to build a nearly two-mile-long stone wall between it and the Atlantic Ocean in a permit application.

John Coequyt, the Sierra Club's director for global climate policy, feels that Trump's failure to acknowledge basic climate science isolates him globally as president, but added, "Trump's climate science denial would make him a global laughing stock if it wasn't so dangerous" [5].

In addition, Trump's undue emphasis on America First moves away from Obama's foreign policy philosophy. Fiscally, Obama believes that the Paris Agreement promotes America's climate security, enhances America's low-carbon economy and renewable energy industry, and is key to secure employment and maintain the U.S. competitive edge [37]. In contrast, Trump believes that the Paris Agreement undermines U.S. competitive edge and hinders both employment and traditional energy industries [48]. Trump believes that the agreement weakens the U.S. sovereignty and by contrast, Obama believes that the Paris Agreement strengthens the U.S. leadership in international affairs.

On the 22nd January 2018, in accordance with his America First principles, Donald Trump dealt a blow to clean energy in the US when he approved higher tariffs on solar cells and modules made abroad [12], putting duties as high as 30% in the first year and gradually reducing them to 15% [51]. The idea is to protect US manufacturers of solar equipment from overseas made cheaper offerings, especially by Chinese manufacturers. Critics responded that other parts of the solar energy sector, such as installers would be hurt by the move as they rely on cheap imports. The majority of the industry's employment consists of installers [50]. The non-profit Solar Energy Industries Association predictions suggest that the tariffs would lead to around 23,000 job losses [22].

Tony Clifford, chief development officer for Standard Solar in Maryland, which finances projects and installs equipment, said to the Washington Post, "It boggles my mind that this president—any president, really—would voluntarily choose to damage one of the fastest-growing segments of our economy. This decision is misguided and denies the reality that bankrupt foreign companies will be the beneficiaries of an American taxpayer bailout" [29].

This move caused concern amongst economists that Trump, with his "America First" policy, with more tariffs to come, could trigger trade wars and price hikes for American consumers which will cause damage the US solar industry [23]. A climate skeptic, Trump puts overwhelming weight on mitigation's economic costs and belittles its ecological and economic benefits, which is consistent with his nationalistic and isolationist America First world view.

Trump, America First, Hegemony and Sovereignty

Donald Trump is reshaping the way other states interact with America and with one another. The president's rhetoric and to some extent his policies demonstrate marked shift with the post-World War II tradition in American foreign policy. Trump's America First global perspective rejects the notion that the United States can best protect its own interests by underwriting a broader global order where like-minded states can flourish, and instead has a more zero-sum approach to international affairs.

The post war liberal international order (LIO) was mainly created by the US. Washington's consensus, geopolitically fused to the western 'core' during the Cold War, became global following the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the advent of systemic unipolarity. For the first 15 years after the Cold War, the world had to cope with unrivalled and rising American power — the "unipolar moment." During the post-Vietnam years, widespread perceptions of American retrenchment impacted the behavior of allies, adversaries, and non-aligned countries alike. Following 9/11, perceptions of American "unilateralism" and unchecked "hegemony" elicited an array of global responses [6].

According to Stivatchis, hegemony describes the leadership of one state over others in a global system. As a certain type of international order, hegemony is different from a non-hegemonic order with manifestly rival powers and no single power is able to establish the legitimacy of its dominance. The U.S. as a hegemonic power has substantial material power resources, therefore its hegemony is a reflection, or form of social hierarchy, centred on its status and recognition.

Hegemony is an institutional type of international order, where overall procedural and substantive norms fix social hierarchy, reducing the need for coercion and exploitation on the part of the U.S. which would damage or remove its authoritative power. It is hinged on the negotiation of identities and interests. For lesser states to find the international order akin with their own interests U.S. leadership, and the procedural and substantive norms that frame it must reflect those interests. The U.S. dominance needs to be impressed by displays of force used sparingly and judiciously in case it undermines the social status and institutional basis of its own hegemony. Illegitimate use of force as considered by the community of states creates a gap between the current international norms and the dominant power. This gap can corrode the hegemony.

In 2006, Stivatchis wrote; "To sustain the consent of other states, and as an extension, international order and stability, the U.S. must resist the pull of domestic politics and do two things. First, it must maintain the basic procedural norms of the system, which means recognizing the legal equality of all states, observing the rules like others, permitting their responsibilities to delimit their freedom and accommodating secondary powers. Second, the U.S. must recognize that new procedural and substantive norms must be negotiated, not dictated. This is partly because norms are not commands; they are socially sanctioned standards of behavior. But, it is also because other states require recognition as social agents with identities and interests worthy of respect" [44].

Referring to International Relations theory, and in particular hegemonic stability theory (HST), serves to support the understanding of the structural logic underpinning hegemonic leadership.

Generally, HST argues that the international system is increasingly likely to be stable when the dominant power within that system is a single state. The hegemon's existence serves to eliminate problems that have long bedevilled international politics such as; collective action associated with the creation of often costly global public goods essential to world commerce, to the underwriting of the political and strategic contexts of global economic interdependence.

Kindleberger argued that a hegemon offers leadership as a form of benevolent service to the international community [27]. Therefore, promoting the collective interests of the states that it leads as well as its own interests: a form of noblesse oblige. Thereby, hegemonic leadership is 'thought of as the provision of the public good of responsibility, rather than exploitation of followers or the private good of prestige, it remains a positive idea'. Hegemonic leadership can calm occurrences of economic rivalry within the global economy.

The hegemon benignly transfers its net resource transfers, at great expense, to the rest of the international community through the costs of the supply of public goods, including security public goods in the form of alliance networks such as NATO. The implication is that United States does seek its own immediate advantage or unbalanced advantage vis-à-vis other economic centres. The exercise of benign hegemony promotes change in the collective interests of global prosperity. Advocates of this school of thought would regard US deviations from multilateralism generated by domestic protectionist and mercantilist lobbies using their domestic political power to undercut a multilateral mainstream on occasion.

Another school of thought is Gilpin's coercive hegemon, which provides public goods but less tolerance of states which don't contribute [15; see also 26]. Sustaining international order is done out of self-interest and the hegemon is willing to coerce non-contributors into paying to fund its hegemony. Instead of a Kindleberger-style transfer of resources from the hegemon to the international community as a whole, the provision of public goods is resource-neutral for the hegemon as long as other states can be coerced into contributing or willing do so. Whilst potentially good for hegemonic longevity, using coercion to cover the costs of supplying public goods can raise issues of legitimacy. Liberal internationalist and constructivist theorists assert that consensual regimes serve to prolong the longevity of the order itself, as other states have 'voice opportunities' to help shape the order [10].

Coercion and legitimacy require a trade-off. Coercive hegemony illustrated by the US-led 'war on terror' after 2001, even in the context of military unipolarity can only achieve so much, as allied states need to reconcile the demands of the hegemon and those of their own domestic publics. Too much coercions, and the outcome is that both soft and hard balancing dynamics arise and one's democratic allies are punished by their own hostile publics.

The structurally advantaged hegemon, could be argued accurately captures the nature of US hegemony. Leadership provides the capacity to shape world order to create advantages enabling the recovery of the costs of supplying public goods, but also to gain other positional advantages. The benefits of co-operation can be gained without resorting to coercion, the hegemon's position is re-enforced with the extraction of resources from the rest of the global community and re-investment in area that prolong its hegemony. The other states enable this to occur by accepting the international order as legitimate as long as the opportunity cost outweighs the cost retaining the status quo. The benefit to the hegemon is the flow of resources from the international community. The United States is a 'system maker' and a 'privilege taker', and gains advantages by structuring world order beneficially to its own interests meanwhile delivering enough benefits to other states to discourage a revision of the US-led order [31].

However, Trump's administration has retreated from global leadership on issues from trade to climate change, shedding doubt on the U.S. commitment to NATO and other alliances, and have managed—mainly by Trump's own behavior—to disrupt relationships with countries from Mexico to Canada and beyond. It has resulted in a negative effect on international public opinion of the United States. It is also prompted governments around the world to react to a new era in American statecraft.

It is not unusual as America's immense global power means that other states must adapt to shifts in U.S. behavior. Whilst Trump shakes up American policy, he is also shaking up the policies of countries around the globe. The disruption is prominent because it is happening at a time when American global leadership and hegemony is already in question.

Since the mid-2000s, America's relative power is considered to have declined, because of the rise, or resurgence of rival nations, such as China and Russia, the effects and aftermath of the Great Recession, and other factors. Under the leadership of President Barack Obama, perceptions of American decline and geopolitical disinterest were impacting relationships with nations that traditionally welcomed U.S. leadership, as well as those who traditionally resented as well. In 2018, under the Trump leadership these perceptions are being combined with an overriding sense that Washington is shifting to a more parochial, narrowly nationalistic posture [6]. This could be considered a sovereign approach [6].

President Donald Trump addressed the UN General Assembly [47] for the first time on September 18, 2017. The intention of his speech to promote a new departure in American foreign policy, a "principled realism" putting "America First," the foundation of what was sovereignty. Within this speech Trump used the term twenty-one times. He identified sovereignty with the right of nations to put their own interests first and decide upon their own affairs. This new emphasis challenged less "muscular" foreign policy of his predecessor, President Barack Obama. In summary, according to Donald Trump, the US should be able to do what it wants, when it wants, and the way it wants.

Stephen Bronner stated, "the shift privileges unilateral over multilateral action, coercion over diplomacy, arbitrary determination of the American national interest over international cooperation, and a crude and traditional "power politics" over human rights" [7].

According to Bronner to understand Trump's speech and the danger it presents it is important to examine the history of sovereignty:

"Sovereignty and *raison d'état* emerged after the Hundred Years War (1337–1453), the Thirty Years War (1618–1648), and a host of other wars in between. Sick of the bloodshed, wary of religious absolutism, the secular sovereign was seen as, above all, seeking stability. This meant countering the hegemonic aspirations of any state by decentralizing

international power, forging favorable alliances (even with rivals), and remaining watchful of new states entering (and possibly changing) the existing constellation of political forces. The concept developed in concert with a new appreciation of the “balance of power,” the principles underpinning international law, and the extension of formal reciprocity to other sovereign states in choosing their government and religion.

In this system, policies that call for unqualified isolationism — which could result in an erosion of leverage — are as dangerous as those justifying impulsive intervention in the affairs of other states. There is a sense in which the two play off one another. Feelings that the state is alone, disrespected, and under siege heightens the appeal of paranoia and xenophobia, unpredictable policy choices, and the likelihood of war. Distinctions between “friend” and “enemy” blur and change so rapidly that purely instrumental considerations come into play. Any state can appear as an “enemy” or “friend” at any time not merely in principle but in fact. Strategy dissolves into tactics; the consequence is an inability to formulate any coherent or consistent policy. This is precisely the situation in which the United States now finds itself: sovereignty has been stripped of its connection with the balance of power, reciprocal recognition of other states, respect for international law, and — perhaps above all — stability” [7].

The implicit and explicit notations of President Trump reiterate that the United States stands isolated and without any possibility of exercising its power. According to Bronner, the outcome has delivered “a self-fulfilling prophecy”. An outward American distrust of the global community has created a growing distrust of the United States which has fuelled paranoia and xenophobia coupled with arbitrary decisions regarding foreign policy.

Relationships with traditional allies are weakened while subverted collaboration with authoritarian and reactionary regimes such as Russia and Saudi Arabia are normalised; threats military/nuclear attack exist between two nations, Iran and North Korea; and persuasive influence has decreased following US withdrawal from the Paris Agreement, the International Labor Organization, and UNESCO.

There has been a call from Republican congressman Mike Rogers (R-AL) demanding that the president withdraw from the United Nations and take the next logical step by sponsoring the American Sovereignty Restoration Act of 2017.

The pretext of American “sovereignty” has been deployed to threaten Venezuela, increase military intervention in Afghanistan [42] and Iraq, create a nuclear arms race in Southeast Asia, and decertify (due to alleged non-compliance) the nuclear treaty with Iran.

These random and narcissistic interpretations of sovereignty have magnified the image of the United States as a bully. Imperialist ambitions remain embedded in the Monroe Doctrine; beginning in 1823, it was a United States policy of against European colonialism in the Americas. It stated that continued efforts by European nations to assume control of any independent state in North or South America would be considered as “the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States” [46].

However, another intervention in Latin America [30] is likely to create a nationalist backlash. For the last fifteen years Afghanistan [2] has endured a persistently unsuccessful American intervention and the insertion of additional forces is lacking in a sovereign domestic ally or strategy for exit. The litany is endless, South and North Korea, will bear the cost in the event of an American attack on Kim Jong-un’s regime; it appears immaterial the South Korean government has tended to support a more measured strategy and a diplomatic solution to the crisis.

In his speech to the UN Trump, demonstrated a double standard, and when synthesised down the meaning is clear, American can do what it wants, when it wants, and by the means it wants while randomly selected rivals cannot and all executed under a new meaning of sovereignty. Bronner asserts, “the media and the academy has been remiss in debating how the sovereign exercises power, the character of popular sovereignty versus its authoritarian variant, and what defines the sovereign in the first place” [7].

The president refers to this new doctrine “principled realism,” however with the advent of a growing global society which has struggled to respond successfully to new extremist reactions, and which contains almost 650 million stateless refugees as a result of climate change [40], according to Bronner [7] is not “principled” or “realistic”. Bronner states that “Trump’s speech bypassed the real challenges to sovereignty, especially for more vulnerable nations than the United States” [7].

For Bronner, “the question today is whether meaningful understandings of sovereignty can co-exist with cosmopolitan attitudes, liberal ideals, and new forms of institutional accountability. That is what any future critical inquiry into sovereignty and the sovereign should bring to light” [7].

From a foreign economic relations perspective, Trump has explicitly campaigned on a platform of hostility to the central tenets of the post war LIO, including globalization and free trade.

Since taking office, the US has abandoned the Asian TPP, a ‘disaster done and pushed by special interests’ [41], began to renegotiate NAFTA, the ‘worst trade deal in the history of the world’ [24], and pulled the United States out of the Paris Agreement, which placed the US totally at odds with the G7 on an agreement signed by 195 nations and formally ratified by 147 nations.

Shifting away from the post war economic consensus on free trade, he has to erected tariff barriers against other states undertaking what he claims are unfair trade and imposes penalties on American companies which move jobs overseas.

By rejecting globalized multilateralism, Trump could be described as delivering cost-benefit bilateralism. This bilateralism rejects a trans-formational foreign policy driven by principles like human rights or democracy and favours transactional relationships with a deep sceptical about states or organisations considered to be creating a restriction to American freedom of action.

The preference being to deal with other states individually calculating the cost-benefit of each relationship and whether it works in America’s perceived economic or political interests.

H. R. McMaster, the White House National Security Advisor, and Gary Cohn, Trump's senior economic adviser, believe the 'world is not a "global community" but a stage where nations, nongovernmental actors and businesses seek competitive advantage through engagement. And, they assert: 'Rather than deny this elemental nature of international affairs, we embrace it' [34].

According to Thomas Wright (2016) the heart of Trump's 'America First' world-view, is overriding skepticism towards existing global regimes supporting others at US taxpayers' expense, or that have perceived negative associations for US economic interests. Wright asserts that 'Trump believes that America gets a raw deal from the liberal international order it helped to create and has led since World War II,' and accordingly seeks to recalibrate American ambition [52].

In addition, Trump has ill feeling towards Obama [28] and enjoys destroying Obama's political legacy; during the 2016 Presidential campaign, they openly attacked each other. Trump follows an anything-but-Obama stance and relished rolling back most of Obama's policies after he took office, especially the Paris Agreement, one of Obama's strongest political legacies [38].

Trump's Paris Agreement withdrawal decision was mainly driven by the U.S. domestic politics and his personal preferences rather than any hindrances on the U.S. imposed by the Paris Agreement. According America's tripartite system, the President, the Congress, and the Supreme Court can make climate policies, with clean energy becoming increasingly profitable and growing popular pressure [36] urges politicians to take actions on climate change, the Trump Administration will have a lot to contend with in rolling back Obama-era climate regulations.

Overall the U.S. withdrawal will considerably diminish the likelihood of achieving the Paris Climate Agreement's target and may even render the target unachievable. The withdrawal undercuts the foundation of global climate governance and upsets the process of global climate cooperation. The Paris Climate Agreement helped galvanize international action on climate change, even if it wasn't binding, it set the standard and countries around the world began to take action on a serious situation. It was also a sign that the US was taking a global problem seriously, the withdrawal could make the US appear untrustworthy and damage the faith of allies that America would keep its promises.

However, IR scholar Randall Schweller disagrees he asserts, "I think those are fallacious, because the US is going to do plenty about climate control. This agreement — it was a facade. China and India aren't going to do anything, but we are. I wish the press had explained what the agreement actually committed the US to, but they never do that. That's the problem: The media just gets so riled up. Everything Trump does, they're upset about. It's just a knee-jerk reaction; everything he does is bad. So people think we actually pulled out of a binding agreement where nation states had signed up to do something. But it wasn't that kind of an agreement" [4].

The U.S. however remains a party to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and will continue attending negotiations under the framework. In its 4 August, 2017, statement the U.S. State Department was clear that "the U.S. will continue to participate in international climate change negotiations and meetings, including the 23rd Conference of the Parties of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, to protect U.S. interests and ensure all future policy options remain open to the administration. Such participation will include ongoing negotiations related to guidance for implementing the Paris Agreement."

Conclusion:

The U.S. State Department, on 4 August, 2017, sent to the United Nations a formal communication confirming that the U.S. would be leaving the Paris Climate Agreement. American President Donald Trump, is the most prominent climate skeptic in the world. Trump cast the Paris Climate Agreement as fundamentally unfair to the United States. Trump Administration is closely tied to the fossil fuel industry and the Trump Administration and the Republican Party are politically influenced by the fossil fuel industries. Confident that his constituency would not respond negatively to his withdrawal decision, Trump had the political courage to announce the exit, confident of gaining ground for the next election. Many times, in recent years, Trump has denied the science of climate change, calling it a "con job" and a "myth and he did not believe climate change is a significant threat, and that he doubted humans contributed to it. Trump refused to acknowledge the fundamental principle of common, yet differentiated responsibility in global climate cooperation and so he has never publicly acknowledged that climate change is occurring and due to human beings, at odds with the position of the majority of U.S. scientists. Even the leaders of nations economically dependent on oil production also accept the reality that the world's climate is warming, including Russian President Vladimir Putin and Saudi King Salman.

Trump's undue emphasis on America First moves away from Obama's foreign policy philosophy. Trump has ill feeling towards Obama and enjoys destroying Obama's political legacy; Trump believes that the Paris Agreement undermines U.S. competitive edge and hinders both employment and traditional energy industries. Trump believes that the agreement weakens the U.S. sovereignty and by contrast, Obama believes that the Paris Agreement strengthens the U.S. leadership in international affairs.

Donald Trump is reshaping the way other states interact with America and with one another. The president's rhetoric and to some extent his policies demonstrate marked shift with the post-World War II tradition in American foreign policy. Trump's America First global perspective rejects the notion that the United States can best protect its own interests by underwriting a broader global order where like-minded states can flourish, and instead has a more zero-sum approach to international affairs.

Since the mid-2000s, there has been a decline of America's relative power due to the rise, or resurgence of rival nations, such as China and Russia, the effects and aftermath of the Great Recession, and other factors. Under the leadership of President Barack Obama, perceptions of American decline and geopolitical disinterest were impacting relationships with nations that traditionally welcomed U.S. leadership, as well as those who traditionally resented as well. In 2018, under the Trump leadership these perceptions are being combined with an overriding sense that Washington is shifting to a sovereign approach; a more parochial, narrowly nationalistic posture.

Trump has explicitly campaigned on a platform of hostility to the central tenets of the post war LIO, including globalization and free trade from a foreign economic relations perspective. Trump's America First agenda is making it difficult for the US to maintain its role and the country appears to be slipping into the lower rung of being an 'ordinary' hegemon that will seek to use its raw power to maintain its primacy. Historically, the US has cast itself as a humane authority and accept some constraints on its behaviour but, backed with the power of the American military and economic system, the strategy has been a winning one for the US until now. Trump is now threatening to upend this approach.

Since the end of the Second World War, the dominant trend of American exceptionalism in the rhetoric and outlook of US presidents has been the belief that the hegemonic status of the United States is to redeem the world by extending liberty and democracy to all peoples. However, President Donald Trump is an exception. He thinks that in the post-Cold War era successive US administrations have pursued reckless visions of regional or global hegemony leaving the US domestic policy to languish and the nation open to ridicule. For Trump, the government must first protect its citizens and promote their prosperity. Despite eschewing this stream of American altruism, Trump shifted away from U.S hegemony to a sovereignty and wants to "make America great again" by rebuilding its economy and projecting military strength.

Following Trump's first 18 months in office the administration's policy decisions have exhibited either isolationism or a willingness to countenance American retreat from the world. Trump is not an internationalist and has never expressed support for the institutions of global governance that emerged after 1945.

Trump's America First impulses are hardening as he gains greater confidence on the world stage. Since taking office, the US has abandoned the Asian TPP, began to renegotiate NAFTA, and pulled the United States out of the Paris Agreement, at odds with the G7 on an agreement signed by 195 nations and formally ratified by 147 nations. Simply put Trump's decision to withdraw from the Paris Climate Agreement is one more step towards the beginning of the end of US hegemony and a shift towards US sovereignty.

References:

1. Anand, Geeta. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/06/02/world/asia/india-coal-green-energy-climate.html>
2. Astore, William. <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2017/03/afghanistan-war-troop-surge-mick-nicholson-vietnam-graveyard-empire>
3. Backstrand, K. and J. W. Kuyper. "The Democratic Legitimacy of Orchestration." *Environmental Politics*. 2017.
4. Beauchamp, Zack. <https://www.vox.com/world/2018/1/11/16875344/trump-foreign-policy-randall-schweller>
5. Biesecker, Michael. <https://apnews.com/9f61f5a9f8b242bc8eb12a9b36449b54/trumps-denial-climate-science-odds-world-leaders>
6. Brands, Hal., Feaver, Peter. <https://warontherocks.com/2018/03/living-in-trumps-world-the-global-reaction-to-america-first/>
7. Bronner, Stephen Eric. <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2017/11/trump-foreign-policy-un-sovereignty-america-first>
8. Buzan, Barry. 1991. *People, states & fear: an agenda for international security studies in the post-cold war era*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
9. Clark, Duncan. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2012/jun/06/ipcc-errors-climate-science>
10. Clark, Ian. *Legitimacy in International Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
11. Council of Foreign Relations. <https://www.cfr.org/interactives/campaign2016/donald-trump/on-energy-and-climate>
12. Eckhouse, Brian. Natter, Ari. Martin, Chris. <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2018-01-22/trump-taxes-solar-imports-in-biggest-blow-to-clean-energy-yet>
13. Falkner, R. *The Paris Agreement and the new logic of International Climate Politics*. *International Affairs*. 2016. 92(5)
14. Fox, Justin. <https://www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2017-06-15/97-percent-consensus-on-climate-change-it-s-complicated>
15. Gilpin, Robert. *War and change in world politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
16. Haas, P. M. *Post Paris Climate Change Governance*. *Chinese Journal of Urban and Environmental Studies* 2016. 4(1).
17. Haas, Peter.M. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10042857.2017.1343906?journalCode=tpre20>
18. Hafner-Burton, Emilie. Mansfield, Edward. and Pevehouse, Jon. *Human Rights Institutions, Sovereignty Costs and Democratization*. *British Journal of Political Science* 2015. 45, pp. 1-27.
19. Haidt, Jonathan. Abrams Sam. <https://www.better-angels.org/features/the-top-10-reasons-american-politics-are-so-broken>
20. <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/265895292191248385>
21. <https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/656100109386674176?lang=en>
22. https://twitter.com/SEIA/status/955571492481314818?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw&ref_url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.vox.com%2Fenergy-and-environment%2F2018%2F1%2F22%2F16921244%2Fsolar-tariff-white-house-itc-trump
23. Huang, Echo. <https://qz.com/1186305/trump-is-bringing-america-first-to-the-climate-change-economy/>
24. Jagannathan M. Here are all the terrible things President Trump has said about NAFTA — before deciding to stick with it. *New York Daily News*. Apr 27, 2017. <http://www.nydailynews.com/news/politics/terrible-president-trump-nafta-article-1.3107104>
25. Kelly, Amita. Sprunt, Barbara. <https://www.npr.org/2016/11/09/501451368/here-is-what-donald-trump-wants-to-do-in-his-first-100-days?t=1531315123883>
26. Keohane, Robert. O. *After hegemony: cooperation and discord in the world political economy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.

27. Kindleberger, Charles P. The world in depression: 1929–1939. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013.
28. Liptak, Kevin. Jones, Athena. <https://edition.cnn.com/2017/06/28/politics/trump-obama-relationship/index.html>
29. Lynch, David.J. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2018/01/22/trump-imposes-tariffs-on-solar-panels-and-washing-machines-in-first-major-trade-action/?utm_term=.d2134ae20fb1
30. Main, Alexander. <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2017/01/trump-latin-america-foreign-policy-obama-intervention-pink-tide/>
31. Mastanduno, Micheal. 'System maker and privilege taker', World Politics 61: 1, 2008
32. Mayer, Jane. <https://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/in-the-withdrawal-from-the-paris-climate-Agreement-the-koch-brothers-campaign-becomes-overt>
33. McCarthy, Tom., Gambino, Lauren. <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/jun/01/republican-senators-paris-climate-deal-energy-donations>
34. McMaster H.R., Gary D. Cohn America First Doesn't Mean America Alone. The Wall Street Journal. May 30, 2017. <https://www.wsj.com/articles/america-first-doesnt-mean-america-alone-1496187426>
35. Morello, Lauren. <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/ipcc-error-correction-moves-at-glacial-speed/>
36. Newport, Frank. https://www.gallup.com/opinion/polling-matters/211682/public-opinion-trump-decision-paris-Agreement.aspx?g_source=CATEGORY_CLIMATE_CHANGE&g_medium=topic&g_campaign=tiles
37. Obama, Barack. <http://science.sciencemag.org/content/355/6321/126>
38. Obama, Barack. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/10/us/politics/obama-farewell-address-speech.html>
39. Oliver, Milman. <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2016/nov/22/donald-trump-paris-climate-deal-change-open-mind>
40. Parenti, Christian. <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2016/01/refugees-europe-merkel-germany-migrants-france-emergency>
41. Popken B. Why Trump Killed TPP — And Why It Matters To You. <http://www.nbcnews.com/business/economy/why-trump-killed-tpp-why-it-matters-you-n710781>
42. Robin, Corey. <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2017/08/trump-afghanistan-imperialism-war-republican-party>
43. Stavins, Robert. N. <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2017-06-05/why-trump-pulled-us-out-paris-accord>
44. Stivachtis, Dr. Yannis A. American Hegemony and International Order, 2006 (Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University). <https://www.zgodovina.eu/slovenski/dokumenti/USA%20hegemony.pdf>
45. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. <http://www.ipcc.ch>
46. "The Monroe Doctrine (1823)". Basic Readings in U.S. Democracy. United States Department of State. Archived from the original on January 8, 2012.
47. Trump, Donald. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-72nd-session-united-nations-general-assembly/>
48. Trump, Donald. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/statement-president-trump-paris-climate-accord/>
49. Trump's withdrawal from Paris is a major blow to the American-led global order. Vox. Jun 1, 2017. <https://www.vox.com/world/2017/6/1/15719968/trump-paris-climate-agreement-world>
50. Umair, Irfan. <https://www.vox.com/energy-and-environment/2018/1/22/16921244/solar-tariff-white-house-itc-trump>
51. US Government Fact Sheet, 2018. <https://ustr.gov/sites/default/files/files/Press/fs/201%20Cases%20Fact%20Sheet.pdf>
52. Wright, Thomas. <http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2016/01/donald-trump-foreign-policy-213546>.

DOI 10.31558/2617-0248.2018.3.6

УДК 327 (321.01)

СТРАТЕГІЯ В ЗОВНІШНІЙ ПОЛІТИЦІ ТА РЕАЛІЗАЦІЇ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИХ ІНТЕРЕСІВ ДЕРЖАВИ: СУТНІСТЬ ТА ЗНАЧЕННЯ

Літвін Л. А., к. політ. н., доцент кафедри політології та міжнародних відносин Східноукраїнського національного університету імені Володимира Даля (Україна)

Метою роботи є визначити сутність та значення стратегії й тактики в зовнішній політиці й реалізації національних інтересів держави. Зазначено, що розвиток та ефективне функціонування сучасної держави неможливі без визначеної стратегії. Реалізація національних інтересів та національної безпеки також повинні підпорядковуватися конкретним стратегіям дій. Вироблена послідовна політична стратегія є одним із основних факторів ефективної внутрішньої та зовнішньої політики. Акцентовано увагу на тому, що проблемою також постає інтегральність тактичних ходів і стратегічного концепту дій, невідповідність яких може призводити до структурних криз, у тому числі, воєнно-політичного характеру. Надані визначення понять «стратегія», «політична стратегія», «політична тактика», «стратегічне планування». Поняття стратегії досліджено з різних точок зору. Розглянута категорія «мистецтво допустимого».