

# TRUMP

## Analysis by Piero Bassetti

An age has ended: the inter-national age.

The glocal one has burst forth.

The most advanced “Local”, the United States of America, has written the first page of the fatal conflict between the internationalist politics of yesterday and the glocalist ones of today and tomorrow.

And it has written its dramatic desire to go further into History, finding both spaces of a return to the past and those of a different future there.

A different future that it has wanted to entrust to someone different, in the conviction that the proposal by those of yesterday and today was unacceptably wrong.

And it was.

For too long, in fact, in a world that science and innovation have now rendered “glocal”, Power and “Expertise” insisted and still insist on offering a world that is unacceptable for any “local” dimension different from those of the people who are already immersed in globalist privilege.

Of course, for research, finance, the multinationals, the diasporas, globalisation appeared to be an ideal environment and Hillary the best answer.

But just as certainly this was not the case for those who saw the suffering of a looming disappearance or a beleaguered transformation as the sole prospect.

But above all for those - as we have seen, a majority - who considered that the world of power had no concern for their worries or, if they did, the wrong kind.

But what is the right response, if there is one? Trump? It is justifiable to doubt that.

And it is justifiable to do so precisely because he too seems far away from understanding the problem.

Which is certainly not going back to protectionisms or to nationalisms.

But it is a problem that is much more difficult to set out if it is true that it involves a cultural update and a series of cohesive proposals that are anything but easy to invent and to propose.

Meanwhile there is the problem of the political dimension of reference to adopt. If we must reject the illusion of a return to the myths of the local such as the nation and frontiers (walls!) or to those of 19th-century internationalism, is it possible to imagine a different “order”? What, if there is one, is the alternative proposal to the “national” dimension as a superstructural reference within which to plan a “glocal” political reordering?

Well, I believe that on 7th November 2016 one has been shown to us, even if it is still in its early stages and, in any case, difficult to adopt.

It is the one that you obtain by observing the map of the results of the electoral colleges in the various States of the Union: it is very clear that if you assume that the states on the two coasts more or less correspond to a neo-urban or metropolitan localism, while those of the centre correspond to a traditional localism, then you can already glimpse what type of institutional reorganisation the U.S.A. must inevitably launch if it wishes to achieve the dual objective of preserving its political unity and preserving an organic connection with the glocalistic component that irreversibly already traverses it in the two city-worlds that have come about on the east and west coasts.

Will the meeting of an unprecedented political character such as Trump with the almost imperial one of the federalism of Washington be able to produce the essential palingenesis for a recovery of the U.S.'s role (and with it of the European one) in a global world irreversibly dominated by a glocal functionalism but at the same time challenged from today by almost irresistible localist nostalgias?

Or will this be the historical task that History intends to entrust to China?

It seems to me that, for us glocalists, this is the true issue for reflection on what happened in the U.S.A. on 7th November 2016.

By Piero Bassetti