



## RESEARCH ARTICLE

# The Dilemma of Globalization: The Decline of the American Global Model

Asst. Prof. Mohanad Hameed Mhaidi PhD.<sup>1\*</sup>, Muhammed Nawar Hussein<sup>2</sup>, Marwan Mohammed Abbood<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,3</sup> College of Law and Political Science, University Of Anbar

<sup>2</sup> College of Applied Sciences, University Of Anbar

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
Received: May 10, 2024 Accepted: Jul 10, 2024	Over the past decades, globalization has transformed the world into a small village-like society. Thanks to technological advances and the development of transportation and communication, cross-border trade and cultural exchange and interaction became possible more easily. Despite this, excessive freedom and the spread of globalization also led to frightening results in some cases, as it exacerbated economic disparities between countries. Besides, it led to a loss of confidence in governments and traditional institutions, as it increased the influence and power of international companies and international financial institutions. This shift raised concerns about a loss of national sovereignty and democratic control. The economic and political decisions became more contested even for countries that were considered the home of globalization, such as the United States of America, which took practical steps to confront the regressive impact of globalization through a package of decisions during the era of former US President (Donald Trump). This was reinforced by the outbreak of the Corona pandemic, which also restricted the globalization movement. This study comes as an attempt to show the increasingly growing wave of opposition to globalization, and to indicate its future.
<b>Keywords</b> Globalization Donald Trump Deglobalization Protectionism Economic Freedom	
<b>*Corresponding Author:</b> <a href="mailto:muhannadhamd84@uoanbar.edu.iq">muhannadhamd84@uoanbar.edu.iq</a>	

## INTRODUCTION

If we want to study globalization as a phenomenon, we must view capitalism as a system rather than destiny. At a time when the majority of countries began to embrace globalization, under the direct supervision of America and its international financial institutions, the United States began to turn to those principles based on its narrow interests in light of America First's proposals. This left a significant decline in the role of the United States in its reputation and international standing. It is no longer a partner that can be trusted and relied upon, and it has entered into the process of transformation towards socialism rather than capitalism.

The role of the United States of America declined as a major driver of globalization in the world, especially during the period of US President Donald Trump in 2017. Its globalization declined then, coinciding with the growing wave of populism within America, which was an important factor in the United States' model turning to itself. That led to a clear shift in the foreign policy of the United States, as its foreign policy focused on protecting its internal interests of the United States and its commitment to international cooperation decreased.

This study tries to explain the mechanisms that have begun to exert their influence in creating a reality that different from what has been the case since the nineties of the last century. The signs of this reality were clearly visible following the rise of right-wing populism, specifically in the United States of America.

## **2. GLOBALIZATION AND THE PROBLEMATIC RELATIONSHIP WITH THE STATE**

Globalization did not suddenly come out of nowhere in the early 1970s. We are not exaggerating when we say that globalization reached its peak in 1995, coinciding with the establishment of the World Trade Organization, and the increase in foreign investments and global trade. We cannot ignore the problems of an international nature that emerged at the end of the last century. Such problems, like pollution and wars, contributed to the emergence of globalization, and increased rates of unemployment and crime. They are all considered the reasons that reinforced the existence of a global obsession with the necessity of cooperation.

The relationship between the state and globalization has always been problematic. Following the economic crises, it can be said that such problematic relationships have increased significantly. Since the Great Depression that ravaged global economies in the twentieth century, state intervention in economic activity has increased (Abdulsalam, 2007:39). Then, such interventions began to decline after that in light of the excessive tendency towards economic freedom encouraged by globalization in addition to the nature of the international economic system in aspects of globalization, internationalization, open market, and specialization (Friedman, 2005:10-12). The weak role of the state intervening in the economy in capitalist systems was often confronted and explained by the efficiency of the capitalist system in dealing with economic crises, which the experience proved to be a failure. So, the flexibility of the capitalist system led the world to believe that overcoming its own weak economic performance is no longer subject to belief (Mhidi, 2023:230). The role of the capitalist state, as Al-Jabiri (2009:145) argues, became limited to perpetuating individualism and inhuman isolation. It is a trend that made the monopolistic system supported by the state, which became biased towards the few who possess the capital. It is a direct encouragement of monopoly and exclusion.

In answering the question about the role of the state under the capitalist system, some thinkers gave a vision of what states in general could follow, not just capitalist states. Laski, as translated by Saed (2021:11), explains that states are the result of history and the experiences they go through, and the behavior of states is determined in light of the goals they wish to achieve, regardless of their differences. This can be understood through the multiple types of intervention of capitalist states between classical, commercial, and Keynesian thought. Keynesian thought was able to some extent to find a real treatment for the relationship between the interventionist role of the state and economic freedom which continued until the financial crisis in 2008. This thought believes that the role of the state is necessary for monitoring the economy, but not to the extent of controlling the economy. Instead, it should be more related to curbing the increasing tendency to fall into financial crises by the capitalist system and the global model. This is a proposal that is very consistent with the trends of Western capitalism (Suleiman, 2009:164). Schäfer (2010:50) claims that, as translated by Ali (2010:50), the state spending during periods of recession increases to revive the economy, knowing that this is the only weapon to confront recession. As a result, a revolution occurred against Keynesian thought where markets excluded the role of the state in economic life and strengthened the position of capitalism freed from any restrictions. This had a negative impact on the state's ability to control.


The beginning of the twentieth century witnessed a significant increase in the role of the state in the economy to the extent that it monitored its operations, including broad control over production facilities. This necessarily refers to the state's initiative to invest in establishing these facilities or nationalizing some of them in which the private sector had invested (Kannan, 2016:339). A huge

economic wave also occurred during that period, which prompted the United States of America to adopt globalization as a successful model and form of the economy. But, these attempts were not truly successful, especially during the period when the world was based on bipolarity. With the collapse of the socialist system at the end of the Cold War, the United States rushed to market globalization as a single, globally successful model. This promotion helped create a “monetary economy” based on maximizing the role of financial centers such as (the stock exchange, credit companies, etc.). They are all activities that contribute to the movement of capital across national borders (Kamil, 2019:861). This means, as believed by Fukuyama and translated by Shahin (1993:23), adopting globalization as a logical form of managing economic operations in the global system. The process of promoting globalization by the United States of America and the rest of the capitalist countries was based on the fact that globalization, capitalism, and democracy, as organizations existing in the liberal model, are the furthest that humanity’s ideological development can reach. Therefore, if countries want to succeed and continue in the international system, they must adopt this model. The attempts to combine the concepts of globalization and democracy performed an important function in promoting the idea of globalization. It has been promoted that adopting democracy and market liberalization, and the existence of an international system are not based on blocs. Globalization is considered one of the means to achieve democracy because it coexists in parallel with globalization (Muller, 2010:25-30). When talking about the problematic relationship between the state and globalization, the issues of national sovereignty and excessive intervention in markets are among the problems that define the relationship between capitalism and the state. The state's intervention in the smallest economic details has failed, and this failure resulted in an increasing trend towards a purely liberal approach Schäfer (2010:50).

## **2.1 Globalization and the dilemma of national sovereignty**

Gul (2003:50-51) argues that pushing capitalist countries towards adopting globalization for the rest of the world is mainly due to the interests of capitalist countries. Globalization makes national governments weak and unable to confront global trends, especially economic ones. Moreover, western capitalist countries rely mainly on globalization to promote the idea of free trade. It allows capital goods to enter the local markets of developing countries without protection for local products and goods, which puts the sovereignty and economy of these countries at stake. Investing in globalization for political and economic purposes has led to the continuation of Western hegemony over developing countries and their local capabilities. It worked to reduce national sovereignty to its simplest meaning in defending the local economic interest by protecting the national economy from foreign capitalist competition. The economic development of developing and poor countries has become hostage to changes in global markets as well as the interventionist influence of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. Thus, international financial institutions are what have come to control the development of most countries in the world (Shopina, Oliinyk, and Finaheiev, 2017:459). This constitutes a violation of national sovereignty, which has been weakened and excluded from economic arrangements as a result of capitalist economic interests imposed by the “age of globalization” in the areas of economics, culture, and politics. In addition to the above, as Abo Amoud (2005:200) declares, globalization works to push countries towards removing governmental obstacles to movements between countries to create an open global economy without borders, and this is undoubtedly a clear violation of the idea of sovereignty and borders.

Due to globalization, Abo Amoud (2005:202) believes that the state also loses its ability to control cash flows. This is due to integration into the global financial system where countries in the era of globalization no longer have a separate and independent economy. One of the most prominent tools of globalization here is multinational companies that control cash flow and foreign trade on behalf of the countries in which they operate.



**Figure 1: The relationship between globalization and the state in the capitalist system**

Globalization is a manifestation of capitalism, and it is also a form of colonialism and colonial control. It developed and became more disciplined through economic structures and institutions such as Bretton Woods and other economic agreements. These actions enhanced the growth of trade and the expansion of investment in Western industrialized countries in a sequential manner and increased brutally after the collapse of the socialist system in the 1990s (Al-Ameer, 2019:143). All of this has contributed to making globalization serve the industrialized countries and the Western system in particular, which has achieved the desired sufficiency and development for itself. Globalization, in its contemporary form, specifically allows industrialized countries to control countries less capable than them culturally and economically without invading them militarily (Murad, 2015:17). This constituted, as many described, a qualitative shift in capitalism in particular and globalization in general as an opportunity to prey on small and developing countries. The Industrial Revolution that began in Europe was the engine behind this globalization trend that shaped the current relations between the industrial West and its transnational companies and the developing “formerly colonized” countries (Nasir, 2011:101).

Capitalism in the era of globalization, as Bina (2023:134) adds, focuses on an important idea, which is mutualism. This means that it is generated through exchange in production and exchange in distribution until there is real economic value. This mutualism, in one way or another, requires working to search for new areas of production and new areas of consumption. Therefore, the function of globalization is to work to remove borders and end national sovereignty within the framework of the search for new products and markets.

## **2.2 Globalization and excessive intervention in markets**

The activity of Western industrialized countries in economic and cultural hegemony over developing countries and interference in the internal affairs of countries, as a clear manifestation of globalization, leads in general to another result, which is an excessive tendency to search for new markets. This was one of the hypotheses formulated by the pioneers of the colonial era in searching for goods, trade, new markets, and new sea and land routes. The matter has not changed much after the Cold War. The rich industrialized countries are still doing the same work, but under the cover of market needs and the provision of rare goods, through cross-border companies that play a major role in finding new markets for the industrialized countries.

Traditional theories of international relations recognize the major role of transnational companies, considering them an important actor in international relations and the international economy. What increases the desire to search for new markets for these companies is their ability to control prices, determine quantities, and also determine production based on the company's need and desire, not the national state and its local market (Toews, 2004:474-477). Transnational companies see themselves in light of globalization as being able to transcend national borders through the process of supply and demand. This exists in the goods and services that they promote globally. So, it becomes an obstacle for national states to control local markets.

Bouderbala (2013:84) believes that the increase in the search for new foreign markets has led many cross-border companies not only to compete with local products but also to convince local countries to introduce these companies into local markets as local partners. In fact, they work to overcome the protectionist policies that countries may impose through the influence, reach, and spread that these companies enjoy.

The unlimited competitiveness entailed by globalization has made transnational companies, in their search for markets, work to give priority to the economy at the expense of politics. The blind orientation towards globalized economic behavior, the search for markets, and making the needs of global markets determine the priorities of society will lead to chaos and the destruction of social structures. (Martin and Schumann, 1998:254). The concern over these companies and their aggressive nature in searching for new markets has made some capitalist countries set several protectionism conditions to confront their spread within their countries. The protectionism policies pursued by the United States of America, the stronghold of capitalism, to confront the threat of Chinese companies and products, has raised many questions about the significant decline in the general liberal trend in countries that were considered an example for countries to emulate.

In general, what happened is that the dictatorship of the public sector has been replaced by a dictatorship of a new type, which is the dictatorship of markets, replacing the government's commitment to social protection with crumbs of aid and subsidies, and working to diminish the state's role in economic decision-making (Al-Mamouri, 2020:233). It is an approach that can be described as an action to create a state of weakness and disintegration of the state's basic values in carrying out its inherent duties.

### **3. NATIONALISM: AN ALTERNATIVE TO GLOBALIZATION**

In recent years, we have witnessed a renewed emergence of a wave of nationalism in many countries around the world. This emergence has been characterized by efforts to strengthen the powers of central governments and defend the sovereignty of states. These developments have greatly affected the reality of globalization, creating a transformation in international relations as well as reducing international cooperation on some issues. Besides, it affected the movement of goods and services across borders and the movement of people and migrant labour.

#### **3.1 Nationalism as an alternative to globalization**

In a very expressive yet clearly visible gesture, economist Martin Wolf explained that while some believe that the importance of states has declined, the truth is that the borders of states have become more important these days. The resurgence of the nation-state is almost the dominant form of the new era, as it has begun to grow and flourish in different places of the world. This is embodied in the rise of China, India, and Brazil on the international stage as projects of nation-states, but they are distinguished by having their own logic because they do not follow the logic of Westphalia (Saul, 2015:286). The coming of Donald Trump to power reinforced this trend when he said in one of his speeches, "We will follow two simple rules: Buy American and hire American."

Excessive globalization, especially in the practice of economic liberalization, has led to the transformation of capitalist countries into competitors rather than partners. The opportunities for less developed countries to benefit from global opportunities have decreased, while levels of economic and social disparities have increased in many countries. Globalization also transferred jobs from rich countries to less economically developed countries, which led to the loss of many jobs in rich countries and exacerbated the problem of unemployment.

However, many studies indicate that globalization has led to a widening of the gap between the rich and the poor in various countries, especially in developing countries, where capitalist countries have adopted trade policies that guarantee them victory in global competition at the expense of the most vulnerable groups in their societies. Here, we will discuss the most important aspects that affected globalization:

### **3.1.1 The dilemma of industrial cities: the shift from globalization to localism**

Globalization has been like a tide whose waves are constantly rising, and which would carry on all ships, but the rising tide itself is a dangerous matter. Kissinger (1975:760) warned that the decline of people's confidence in the future of their society would lead to a loss of faith in democratic means, governmental institutions, and their leaders. This loss of confidence, as Mudde and Kaltwasser (2020:104) argue, is what opened a wide way for the rise of populism.

The United States of America has remained faithful to the idea that what serves its companies serves the American state, and from this standpoint, the United States of America has worked to mobilize all its forces to make its companies and capital roam the world, focusing on its political and military power. Under this principle, the United States of America is working to create an empire based on building exploitative relationships, especially between the First and Third Worlds. These American ideas are based on a globalized military system that plays the game of globalization with extreme force, exploiting international violence and chaos (Derber, 2003:104).

Many researchers and experts have spoken about the beginnings of the decline of globalization and the turn of industrialized countries against this phenomenon in recent years. Some of them attribute this decline to political and social factors that the world has witnessed, such as the increase in ethnic and religious discrimination, political unrest, and the controversial presidential elections. However, the reality of the situation indicates that the decline of globalization and the beginning of its turn dates back to 2008, following the global financial crisis, which demonstrated many of the weaknesses in globalization.

The most important challenge posed by globalization throughout its extended history is that it has turned against the very countries that were promoting it in their excessive harm to the working class as a result of economic openness. It is not a coincidence that Trump's victory began in the states of Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Wisconsin, and the Rust Belt, in addition to the Midwest and Northwest, which include the heart of steel, iron, and coal mines that were affected by globalization (Saeed, 2016).

The problem of unemployment and the decline in social protection for workers is exacerbated, as a result of workers in industrialized countries being exposed to increasing pressure to reduce wages, increase working hours, and reduce social protection. This is due to the move of companies and factories to countries with lower labor costs, such as China, India, or Southeast Asian countries, which contributed to lower product prices, lower production costs, and increased profitability for companies. It also led to lower wages and job losses in industrialized countries. In reality, globalization is a phenomenon that works to privatize profit and generalize loss and crisis, and even the countries sponsoring it have not been spared from this equation (Abdullah, 2009:139). As a whole, this led to the emergence of a growing trend opposing globalization, forming a rebound shock due to its role in crushing the production of the countries of the South and their local product, in

addition to deepening the state of structural imbalance. This conflict was not limited to the countries of the South only but extended to include the industrialized countries themselves.

### **3.1.2 Corona pandemic**

Specialists often tend to liken the Corona pandemic to the Great Depression, specifically concerning expected changes in the structure of the global economic system. While the Great Depression crisis led to a reconsideration of the state's economic role and worked to disrupt the work of rules based on the idea of the "invisible hand" and "laissez-faire" (Salah, 2020:5), the Corona pandemic also contributed to bringing about fundamental changes. It reformulated international economic relations with an emphasis on a more effective role for the state. That was confirmed by the International Monetary Fund in directing countries to the necessity of state intervention towards taking measures to ensure the work of necessary sectors such as health care, food production and distribution, and wage support. However, this represents a clear transition in the Fund's adoptions, which is one of the most important aspects of economic globalization (Alhashimi, 2021:96).

The Corona pandemic had a significant impact on the decline in globalization, and globalization played the most important role in spreading the disease through trade and travel. Government policies of isolation, general bans, and widespread lockdown have strengthened restrictions on what has been called the "three freedoms." They refer to the freedom of movement of goods, the freedom of labor and its movement, and the freedom of movement of capital. These freedoms constitute the globalized economic system (Salih, 2018:39). Moreover, since its beginning, the pandemic has determined the economic winners and losers in light of the closure, quarantine, and travel restrictions policies followed by countries. It made many globalized sectors, such as aviation and tourism, receive major economic blows.

### **3.1.3 Global economic crises**

When we trace the economic crises, at the forefront of which are the Great Depression of 1929 and the global financial crisis of 2008, we realize that what slows down globalization is the financial crisis. As global trade declines during economic crises, demand for global goods and services decreases, leading to a decrease in the volume of global trade. Countries follow protectionism, i.e. imposing customs duties and import restrictions, to protect their local economies, which reduces opportunities for growth and global economic cooperation.

### **3.1.4 Climate change**

Climate change leads to an increase in social and political tensions in some countries, and this affects political and social stability and reduces globalization. The increasing frequency of extreme weather events due to climate change has led to the disruption of global supply chains. For example, floods, hurricanes, and wildfires can damage or destroy transportation infrastructure, making it difficult to move goods across borders. This can also lead to increase prices and lower availability of goods, affecting the global economy (Awadh and Shahata, 2017:19). Climate change has also brought about changes in global trade patterns as countries adapt to changing weather patterns. For example, agricultural production in some regions may become more difficult due to drought or floods, leading to a shift in trade patterns as countries seek to import food from other regions. Furthermore, the globalization of the free market has deprived societies of control over their environment, leading them to face the power of international capital. Transnational companies, as an aspect of this power, have begun to leave harmful waste of the production process in poor countries where production processes and labor are used. This leaves negative consequences for their environmental surroundings (Raftowicz, 2021:3).

Overall, the impacts of climate change on globalization are complex and multifaceted. As the world continues to grapple with the impacts of climate change, we are likely to see further changes in global

trade patterns, migration patterns, and economic policies.

These points and many others have begun to work at an accelerating pace in disavowing the principles of globalized capitalism and making them work in reverse. In addition, countries have been pushed to work on linking their foreign trade and investments to the idea of the environment and climate change. Among these countries is China, the economic competitor of the United States. It has begun to provide opportunities for developing countries that suffer from climate change problems (Hammad and Mohammad, 2022:320).

### **3.2 America first**

As soon as Donald Trump assumed the reins of power in the United States, he explicitly announced that all agreements concluded before were subject to reconsideration, thus beginning a new phase in the history of the United States of America, centered on America first. By applying this behavior, it was announced in 2017 that the United States of America would withdraw from the Paris Climate Agreement, which actually happened (Chestony and Gershinkova, 2017:216). Trump also announced in his speech before the United Nations General Assembly that he rejected the ideology of globalization and embraced the doctrine of patriotism, and in light of that, his policy was determined (Kamal, 2019:90). During his presidency, he adopted several measures that primarily targeted globalization. His policies aimed to reduce the trade deficit, enhance local manufacturing, and protect American industries from foreign competition. Some of Trump's major actions included tariffs, renegotiating trade agreements, and immigration policies. In addition, Trump implemented various policies to address globalization and trade, which he believed were hurting American workers and businesses. Here are some of the actions taken by his administration:

#### **a) Tariffs**

Trump imposed tariffs on a range of imported goods, including steel and aluminum worth \$60 billion annually, as well as products from China. As he believed, these measures were necessary to protect American industries and jobs from unfair competition from foreign companies, specifically Chinese. However, critics argued that these tariffs would increase the prices of goods for American consumers and affect American companies that depend on imports. These American measures push China to resort to imposing retaliatory customs tariffs on American goods imported to it. It appears to many that Trump's tariff policies were motivated by the nationalist motivation of his electoral base, which demanded job opportunities and trade protection because of their position and economic interests (Bimantara, 2019:200).

#### **b) Renegotiating Business Deals**

The United States lived its golden age, calling for freedom of trade and open borders to goods, and trying to take advantage of this advantage with the blessing of the World Trade Organization. But things soon began to change, as Trump renegotiated many trade deals, including the North American Free Trade Agreement which was replaced by the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA). The administration claimed that these new agreements would benefit American workers and businesses by creating more favorable trading conditions (Al-Sadiq, 2018).

#### **c) Withdrawal from International Organizations**

Trump's administration has withdrawn from several international organizations, including the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the Paris Climate Agreement. The administration argued that these agreements were unfair to American workers and businesses and did not serve the national interest. Besides, Trump and his administration worked to obstruct the work of the World Trade Organization (WTO) by not allowing the organization's appellate body to work. By disrupting it, the organization became powerless, so the Trump administration prevented



the renewal of two of its seven judges, forcing the organization to form an appellate body. Trump stated on this issue that the organization benefits everyone except the United States of America (Dijkstra et al, 2022:15).

#### **d) Tax Deductions**

Trump's administration implemented tax cuts that it claimed would stimulate economic growth and create more jobs. The administration argued that this policy would help counter the effects of globalization by boosting domestic investment and consumption.

#### **e) Immigration Policies**

Trump's Immigration Policies also aim to combat globalization by reducing the number of foreign workers in the United States. These policies included a travel ban to several Muslim-majority countries, restrictions on H-1B visas, and a crackdown on illegal immigration. According to a study by Chassamboulli and Peri (2020:4), Trump's immigration policies harmed the US economy. The study found that Trump's policies reduced the number of skilled workers in the United States, leading to lower productivity and reduced innovation. The study also found that Trump's policies did not significantly impact wages or employment of native-born workers. Trump, with his hardline stance on immigration, has called on many occasions to change internal policies, grant citizenship to immigrants, and call for tightening border controls, especially with Mexico, which he asked to bear the costs of building a wall separating the two countries (Boubouche, 2017:15). That was a new situation that had not been familiar to American presidents in previous years.

These trends, as a whole, aim to reduce the trade deficit, enhance domestic manufacturing, and protect American industries from foreign competition. However, academic research suggests that Trump's policies have had a mixed effect on the US economy, with some policies leading to gains while others leading to losses.

## **4. THE FUTURE OF GLOBALIZATION**

Talking about the end of globalization is premature, and it may not happen at all, because globalization did not exist out of nothing, but rather came as a result of a series of phases of development - as we mentioned previously. Globalization was an inevitable result of capitalism in all its manifestations. The decline in globalization is used to describe trends that lead to a decline in economic, political, and social integration between countries. It is usually the result of countries adopting policies of nationalism and trade protectionism. During the administration of US President Donald Trump, the United States adopted a policy of promoting nationalism and imposing tariffs on some imported products, raising concerns about the future of globalization.

In light of the growing wave of nationalism and the high currents of the populist right, the future of globalization is witnessing some challenges and changes. In the past, globalization was an economic and political trend aimed at integrating economies and societies around the world through the liberalization of trade and the exchange of cultures and ideas. Despite this, globalization today faces some challenges that threaten its continuation in its traditional, recognized form. The call for nationalism and the increasing popularity of right-wing populist movements will affect globalization in several ways. For example, the policies of economic protectionism, the imposition of customs duties, and other trade measures followed by some countries may reduce the volume of global trade and undermine global economic integration. The threat of populism to the future of globalization increases when it links the restoration of the state's identity with getting rid of globalization, which

has become a threat to the state (Bashara, 2019:16).

On the other hand, China's adoption of an open market economy could greatly affect the future of globalization. China has become a major economic power and enjoys significant trade and investment around the world. However, many countries are concerned about China's potential control over critical sectors and infrastructure in their countries, leading to increased geopolitical tensions and their impact on globalization. This coincides with the Chinese Go Out policy of encouraging its companies to invest abroad, which uses its companies for external influence. Chinese governmental and non-governmental companies are closer to the policies and directions of the Chinese regime than in liberal countries, as they act according to instructions from the state (Peters, 2019:126). This constitutes a different situation in the globalized system of dealing with China and its companies.

Any decline in globalization would be represented by several aspects, the first of which would be the economic field. Trade protectionism may increase trade costs and reduce access to global markets. This could harm global companies and supply chains and restrict economic growth globally. The second is embodied in the political field, as globalization is one of the factors that enhance cooperation and political interaction between countries. With the decline of globalization, tensions and conflicts between countries may increase as a result of the lack of understanding and harmony between them. The social and cultural field is the third aspect, where the decline in globalization leads to a reduction in communication and cultural exchange between different peoples and cultures. This can exacerbate cultural and ethnic biases and tensions.

It is worth noting that the impact of the decline in globalization is not limited to the duration of the Trump administration alone, as there may be other factors contributing to this decline, such as global economic transformations and regional political tensions. Therefore, it is advisable to analyze the situation comprehensively and employ multiple academic and research sources to understand the effects of deglobalization and evaluate them in a correct and balanced form.

Finally, globalization must change to suit the broader national interest. Economic realities will be part of the national interest, as will the need to cooperate on global threats, but this must be balanced with the need to reduce ties with countries that are less reliable as they move away from the model of market democracy. Due to internal political pressures from different directions, we need better, evidence-based, and reliable public decision-making mechanisms to balance short-term and long-term economic impacts and security benefits against economic costs.

## **5. CONCLUSION**

At the end of this study, it is found that there is a clear decline in the American global model, which reflects the globalization predicament that many countries in the world suffer from. Many factors have had an effective impact on perpetuating the momentum of this decline, such as trade protectionism. The United States of America considers itself threatened by the loss of job opportunities and competitiveness due to excessive globalization. Therefore, it implements economic policies that promote trade protectionism to protect its economy and domestic industry.

The "America First" approach adopted by Trump also led to the reinforcement of this decline. In light of the growing nationalist sentiment in the United States, its foreign and economic policy was focused on achieving its interests before anything else. This nationalistic approach undermined some international cooperation and confidence in international partners, causing the influence of the American global model to decline.

In the end, we must realize that the current changes in the world are not temporary and that the American global model faces real challenges. World leaders must work to enhance international cooperation and overcome the divisions and challenges facing globalization. This requires finding a balance between national interests and international cooperation and finding sustainable solutions

to the problems of globalization faced by different countries. Through this, we can achieve a more balanced and prosperous future for all.

## REFERENCES

### Journal:

- Abu Amoud, Muhammad Saad (2005). Globalization and the State. *Journal of International Politics*, Volume 40, Issue 161.
- Bashara, Azmi (2019). Populism and the Permanent Crisis of Democracy. *Arab Politics Journal*, Issue 40.
- Bimantara, Azza (2019). Donald Trump's Protectionist Trade Policy from the Perspective of Economic Nationalism. *Jurnal Hubungan Internasional*, vol(7), no(2). <http://dx.doi.org/10.18196/hi.72132>
- Bouderbala, Salah El-Din (2013). Sovereignty of States and Transnational Corporations. *Heritage Magazine*, Volume 1, Issue 5.
- Chestony, Sergey. Dinara Gershinkova (2017). USA Withdrawal from Paris Agreement - What Next?. *International Organisations Research Journal*, vol(12), no(4). <http://dx.doi.org/10.17323/1996-7845-2017-04-215>
- Gul, Nabiha (2003). Globalization and Developing Countries. *Pakistan Horizon*, Vol(56), No (4).
- Hammad, Haneen Hatem and Ahmed Ali Mohammad (2022). The Emergence of Green Diplomacy in International Relations: A Qualitative Study. *Croatian International Relations Review*, vol(28), no(90). <https://doi.org/10.2478/>
- Kamal, Muhammad (2019). Trump and the Future of the International Order. *Journal of International Politics*, Volume 54, Issue 215.
- Kamil, Alaa Fahim (2019). Globalization: An International Political Map for World Domination (Intellectual and Cultural Awareness and Scientific Progress as a Model for the Challenge). *Political and International Journal*, issue, issue 41-42.
- Kissinger, Henry (1975). *The Industrial Democracies and the Future*. Department of State Bulletin, vol(73), no(1901).
- Raftowicz, Magdalena (2021). The Climate Crisis as a Product of Globalization. *SHS Web of Conferences*, vol(92), EDP Sciences. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20219206029>
- Salah, Ali (2020). New Features of the Global Economy in the Post-Corona Phase: Special Studies. *Future Journal for Advanced Research and Studies*, Issue 4.
- Shopina, Iryna, Olena Oliinyk, and Valerii Finaheiev (2017). Globalization and its Negative Impact on the Global Economy. *Baltic Journal of Economic Studies*, Vol(3), No(5). <http://dx.doi.org/10.30525/2256-0742/2017-3-5-457-461>
- Suleiman, Samer (2009). The Role of the State in the Economy Reconsidered. *Journal of International Politics*, Volume 44, Issue 175.
- ### Book:
- Abdel Salam, Reda (2007). *The Collapse of Globalization: Will History Really Repeat Itself and Contemporary Globalization Collapse as it Collapsed in its First Wave with the Great Depression?* Beirut: Modern Library for Publishing and Distribution.
- Al-Ameer, Fouad Qassem (2019). *New Liberal Capitalism: Neoliberalism*. Baghdad: Dar Al-Ghad.
- Alhashimi, Hana (2021). Future of Digital Cooperation. In: *The Future of Diplomacy After COVID-19 Multilateralism and the Global Pandemic*, London/New York, Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003166801>
- Al-Jabiri, Muhammad Abed (2009). *Globalization and the Crisis of Neoliberalism*. Cairo: Arab Network for Research and Publishing: Thought and Criticism Series.

- Al-Mamouri, Abdul Ali Kazem (2020). *The Chinese Century: Hegemony Without Occupation*. 1st edition, Beirut: Rawafed Publishing and Distribution House.
- Al-Sadiq, Muhammad (2018). *The US-China Trade War: A Theoretical Study*. 1st edition, Riyadh: Center for Research and Knowledge Communication.
- Awadh, Muhammad Hassan and Hassan Ahmed Shahata (2017). *The Climate Issue and the Challenges of Environmental Globalization*. Cairo: Modern Academy for University Books, 2017.
- Bina, Cyrus (2023). *Globalization and the Decline of American Power The Political Economy of the American Fall*. New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351136785>
- Boubouche, Muhammad (2017). Arab and Middle Eastern Issues in Light of American Foreign Policy. *Arab Future Magazine*, Issue 462.
- Derber, Charles (2003). *People before Profit: The New Globalization in an Age of Terror, Big Money, and Economic Crisis*. New York: Martin's Press.
- Dijkstra, Hylke et al. (2022). *Donald Trump and the Survival Strategies of International Organisations: When Can Institutional Actors Counter Existential Challenges?* Cambridge Review of International Affairs. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09557571.2022.2136566>
- Friedman, Thomas L. (2005). *The World is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Straus and Giroux.
- Fukuyama, Francis (1993). *The End of History and the Last Man*. Fouad Shaheen (trans.) Jamil Qassem, Reda Al-Shaybi, Beirut: National Development Center.
- Kanaan, Taher Hamdi, and Hazem Tayseer Rahahleh (2016). *The State and the Market Economy: Readings on Privatization Policies and their Global and Arab Experiences*. 1st edition, Doha/Beirut, Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies.
- Lasky, Harold J. (2021). *Introduction to Political Science*. Ezz El-Din Saeed (trans.) Giza: Arab Press Agency Publishers, 2021.
- Martin, Hans-Peter and Harald Schumann (1998). *The Globalization Trap: The Assault on Democracy and Welfare*. Adnan Abbas Ali (trans.). *World of Knowledge Series*, Kuwait, National Council for Culture, Arts and Letters.
- Mhidi, Muhannad Hamid (2023). *The Rise of the American Populist Right and its Impact on the System of International Economic Relations*. 1st edition, Doha/Beirut: Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies.
- Mudde, Cas and *Cristóbal Rovira Kaltawasser* (2020). *Populism: A Very Brief Introduction*. Saeed Bakkar and Muhammad Bakkar (trans.), Doha/Beirut: Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies.
- Müller, Klaus (2010). *Globalization*. Muhammad Abu Hatab Khaled (trans.), 1st edition, Cairo: Arab Center for Translation.
- Murad, Ali Abbas (2015). *Democracy in the Age of Globalization*. Beirut: Arab House of Science Publishers.
- Nasir, Jaafar Najm (2011). *Introduction to the Anthropology of Globalization, the West From the Economics of the Self to the Geography of the Other: An Analytical Vision*. Damascus: Pages for Publishing and Distribution, 2011.
- Peters, Michael (2019). *Regulating the Rise of China Australia's Foray into Middle Power Economics*, Cham: Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-05466-3>
- Saul, John Alston (2015). *The Collapse of Globalization and the Reinvention of the World*. Muhammad Al-Khouly (Trans.) Cairo: Family Library.
- Schäfer, Ulrich (2010). *The Collapse of Capitalism: Reasons for the Failure of the Deregulated Market Economy*. Adnan Abbas Ali (Trans.), *World of Knowledge Series*, Kuwait: National Council for Culture, Arts and Letters.

Toews, Roger (2004). International Political Economy in the Age of Globalization, in: John Bellis and Steve Smith, *The Globalization of World Politics*, 1st edition, Dubai: Gulf Research Centre.