

Ewelina WAŚKO-OWSIEJCZUK

University of Białystok

Is America safer today? The first changes to U.S. foreign and security policy during the presidency of Donald Trump

Abstract: This article describes the first months of Donald Trump's presidency. It presents his most important decisions on U.S. foreign and security policy, the voices of those critical and supportive of him, and possible implications for U.S. security. Even during his election campaign, some of Trump's proposals raised concerns among the international community and many questions about past alliances. He has announced the introduction of laws for the immediate removal of illegal immigrants from the United States, and the reintroduction of torture as a tool for fighting terrorism. He has criticized the current policy of cooperation with allies, and the provision of security to other countries at the expense of the United States. The decisions made during Donald Trump's first 100 days affect the internal situation of the United States, both in the context of national security and the political system, due to the emerging constitutional crisis and the friction between the executive and the judiciary branches. His decisions also affect relations between the United States and its allies, transforming America's role in the world and the impact of the superpower on the collective system of security.

Key words: Donald Trump, United States, Syria, terrorism, U.S. foreign and security policy

Introduction

Even during his election campaign, the republican candidate for president of the United States proposed changes in foreign and security policy that caused anxiety among the international community and raised many questions about existing alliances and the functioning of the collective security system. Donald Trump, among others, announced that he would call for the immediate deportation of illegal immigrants from the U.S., for the restoration of the use of torture against terrorists, for the renegotiation of relations with Russia and closer cooperation in the fight against terrorism in the Middle East, and the construction of a wall on the border with Mexico. He undermined current policies of cooperation with allies, challenged the policy of providing security to other countries at the expense of the United States, and even played with the idea of the U.S. eventually withdrawing their support for South Korea and Japan, which would have far-reaching consequences for the international order.

Although the announcements themselves may have caused some anxiety, it was assumed that the election campaign was governed by rules entirely different from those used for the actual governance of the state and the hope was that the candidate's promises would never be put into action. However, the decisions taken by the president during the first 100 days in office may indicate that Donald Trump intends to carry out his campaign promises. In the first week of his presidency, Trump signed a series of executive orders that put into effect the radical announcements of his election campaign.

The purpose of this article is to present the first series of changes made by president Trump in foreign and security policy, and to analyze possible repercussions, as well as to show the opinions of supporters and critics. The analysis will serve to answer the following questions: what changes in foreign and security policy does Donald Trump wish to introduce? Will the proposed changes strengthen U.S. security? What will Trump's doctrine be? What implications for U.S. relations with other states will the changes in legislation bring about?

The role and position of the president in U.S. foreign and security policy – theoretical aspects

The influence and role of the U.S. president in creating foreign and security policy is superior to that of other organs of public authority. This is mainly due to the specifics of the presidential system and the U.S. Constitution, which assigns him a wide range of power as chief executive. It is worth noting that the U.S. Constitution details the powers of Congress in detail. This is not the case for the function and position of the president, where the wording is very general, leaving a wide field for arbitrary interpretation, which is the starting point for extending the capabilities and power of the president (Dziemi-dok-Olszewska, 2009, p. 154 et seq). Thus, the president of the United States has quite a diverse role as a symbol of the state and the people of the United States, as the head of the armed forces, chief of diplomacy, leader of the party, chief executive, national spokesman, promoter of economic development and world leader (Amos, Jordan, Taylor, Meese, Nielsen, Schlesinger, 2009, p. 77). As some researchers point out, the broad powers conferred on the president make him the most important actor in U.S. foreign and security policy (Ulrich, 2012, p. 63).

While serving as head of state and head of government, the U.S. president is responsible for the preparation and implementation of the budget, nominating powers (e.g. the nomination of the secretary of state) and the administrative activities of overseeing the cabinet, agencies and executive committees (Wordliczek, 2003, pp. 96–118). Such strong power in the presidential system carries the risk of abuse. Thus, a braking mechanism is needed, which in the U.S. is the principle of *checks and balances* between the executive, legislative and judiciary branches of government (Hill, 2001, p. 43). In the context of foreign and security policy, Congress carries out their control function by accepting presidential nominations or receiving reports on the activities of government agencies (Waśko-Owsiejczuk, 2014, p. 87). However, the most important element of control the legislative body has over the executive body is the right to declare war and to allocate a budget for it, which is the responsibility of Congress and not the president (Michałek, 2005, pp. 65–66).

In order to implement foreign and security policy, the president is equipped with important tools, including executive orders and presidential directives. Executive orders, which do not require congressional approval, are usually directed at federal agencies. Often these are important decisions that cause changes in American legislation. Presidential directives are also an important security policy instrument. Although signed or endorsed by the president of the United States, this document is usually handled by the

National Security Council. Presidential directives are often secret and, although they are usually targeted at specific government agencies, their scope includes the executive, legislative and judicial branches of the federal government, as well as state and local governments (Waško-Owsiejczuk, 2014, p. 58).

Apart from the legal position of the president in shaping foreign and security policy, non-constitutional factors also play a role, such as the personality of a given president, his skills and style of governance, and the situational context in which leadership is exercised (Antoszewski, 2014, p. 23). President Harry Truman's assistant, Richard Neustadt, once said: "Americans like to judge their leader not in terms of competence or incompetence, but in terms of strength or weakness" (see: Czulda, 2010, p. 60). The personality characteristics and predispositions that one should have in order to function effectively as the head of a superpower include strength, courage and confidence. Less important is competence, or whether the candidate in question is an economics or foreign policy expert, since he is assisted by a wide circle of trusted associates. This must be a strong leader who cares for citizens' security and the development of the country. The president of a superpower should also have charisma and be a good speaker, thus exciting his listeners (Waldman, 2000, p. 105). What is more important than political correctness are attributes such as decisiveness and firmness in the leader of the most powerful state in the world (Ludwikowski, Ludwikowska, 2009, pp. 122–123). There is even a concept called the *imperial presidency*, referring to the position and function of the U.S. president. Here, it is understood that the president is seen as almost predestined to be the leader of an international empire (Shafritz, 1993, pp. 378–379). Americans are able to forgive their president many things, but not weakness and the inability to exercise power.

The external environment plays an important role in the process of shaping foreign and security policy. The political parties and Congress can be either a partner or opponent to the president. The media, public opinion, interest groups, and the international community (see: Amos, Jordan, Taylor, Meese, Nielsen, Schlesinger, 2009, p. 77) can all exert pressure, thus influencing the decision-making process of the White House. Another important group is the National Security Council, whose main purpose is to advise the U.S. president on state security, taking into account internal, national, foreign and military policies. This group includes the vice president, the secretary of state, the treasury secretary, the defense secretary and the president's national security adviser (Shafritz, 1993, p. 317; Best, 2011, p. 1 et seq).

The unique (privileged) position of the United States in the international system also has influence on the role and position of the president in foreign and security policy. Since the end of the Cold War and the breakup of the Soviet Union, the United States has become a superpower¹ with a dominant role in the international system.² Two factors – military and political – play a crucial role here. U.S. defense expenditure accounts for nearly 50% of global defense spending (Roser, Nagdy, 2017). Its enormous military

¹ Power in foreign policy refers to states that can decide on world war and peace, have global interests, and determine the world order. The strength of the state is understood as the real and potential ability to use all its assets and liabilities to achieve goals and meet their needs in an international environment (see more: Włodkowska, 2004, pp. 163–170; Włodkowska-Bagan, pp. 199–202).

² The international system consists of elements (participants), related to each other (see more: Pawłuszko, 2014, pp. 9–28).

potential and modern military technology provide the United States with a dominant international position. Americans want to maintain their status as the most powerful military in the world not only to deter potential enemies from attacking the U.S., but also to enable military action in almost every region of the world. The military potential of the superpower is so large that it is the only state in the world which has armed forces capable of carrying out military operations on a global scale. According to the doctrine of *two and a half wars*, the superpower can simultaneously carry out two wars and one conflict in any part of the world (Balcerowicz, 2010, pp. 74–77).

Equally important is the political factor. The power of the United States is also manifested through its role and position in international organizations. It is difficult to imagine the functioning and smooth operation of organizations without U.S. involvement, especially those that originated from their own initiative, such as the UN, NATO and NAFTA. The strength of the position of the U.S. on the international stage can be observed not only through records and regulations, or through its permanent membership on the UN Security Council, but also through the actions of the superpower. For example, one of its actions was the unlawful invasion of Iraq in March 2003, despite criticism and opposition from the international community, including most of the members of the UN Security Council. The actions of the United Nations after the U.S. invasion of Iraq were also important in showing the strength of the position of the U.S. in the international system. Not only did the United States face no consequences, but the UN called on other states to support the efforts of the U.S. coalition to rebuild Iraq (Waśko-Owsiejczuk, 2016b, pp. 133–153). As it turned out, the UN was completely helpless against the unlawful actions of its strongest member.

The dominant position of the U.S. in the world, coupled with the strong position of the president in a presidential system of government, not only makes the role of the leader of the superpower superior in creating foreign and security policy, but is of crucial importance for the whole international system. Thus, the decisions and actions of the U.S. president have a significant impact and implications not only on the internal security of the country, but also on the other participants of international relations.

What will Trump's doctrine be?

After Donald Trump's inauguration as the 45th president of the United States, a short note appeared on the White House website, highlighting the main foreign policy goals of the new administration, which included: peace through strength; defeat of radical Islamist terrorist groups, using aggressive coalition operations if necessary; the liquidation of the sources of income for terrorists; the rebuilding and enlargement of the U.S. military; the construction of a modern missile defense system; renegotiation or withdrawal from NAFTA (*America First Foreign Policy*, 2017).

This short message cannot even be called an outline of the White House conception for U.S. foreign policy, it is rather a duplication of the election slogans without the provision of any details. Trump's foreign policy vision was not precisely defined during the election campaign, nor was it clarified in the first few months of his presidency. Unlike the administration of his predecessors – Barack Obama and George W. Bush, who had

clearly defined goals and successively realized them, the Trump administration is having problems in defining a coherent foreign and security policy. The biggest discrepancies are between the president and a group of his closest advisers, with the exception of the dismissed national security adviser, Michael Flynn, whose views can be considered consistent with Trump's. President Trump's position varies with that of defense secretary – James Mattis, who has repeatedly emphasized the threat posed by Russia and the inviolability of U.S. alliances, has called Putin “delusional” for breaking all the rules of international diplomacy, and has claimed that among the world's threats “the most dangerous might be Russia” (Scarborough, 2016). A similar point of view is held by vice president – Mike Pence, secretary of state – Rex Tillerson, and the newly appointed national security advisor to the president – Herbert McMaster. The president's position on U.S.-Russian relations is significantly different from his advisers. Even during his election campaign, he announced his desire to cooperate with Russia in the fight against the terrorist organization called the “Islamic State” (*Donald Trump*), and his wish to improve relations between Washington and Moscow, expressing great respect and sympathy for president Putin (Pengelly, 2017). In turn, Trump's associates criticized Russia for violating international law, for its aggressive and destabilizing actions, and emphasized the inability of the United States to engage in military cooperation with Russia. They expressed their deep skepticism over Russia's ability to comply with its earlier commitments to the United States, and over the actual intentions of Russia in Syria, where more than 80 percent of Russian raids were directed against rebels fighting the Assad regime and not jihadists (Masters, 2017; Shinkman, 2017).

Trump's pro-Russian stance could be considered a solid point in his conception of U.S. foreign policy if not for the recent commentary by the U.S. president, where he criticized Russia's seizure of Crimea, asking whether former U.S. president Barack Obama was too mild towards Russia in the context of these events. This commentary is quite surprising, since during his campaign Trump declared that Ukraine mattered the least to the United States out of all of the NATO countries, and the solution to this problem and the burden of responsibility should not belong to the U.S. (LoBianco, 2015). Of course, it cannot be ruled out that the colder attitude towards Moscow is due to recent events, which were heavily covered by the media, namely the the resignation of national security presidential advisor Michael Flynn, who lied about having contact with Russia before Donald Trump took over the presidency (see: Haberman, Rosenberg, Apuzzo, Thrushf, 2017).

Similar divergences and contradictory signals can be seen in Trump's election statements in the context of NATO and in the statements of his administration, especially comments made by the secretary of defense. During his campaign, Trump claimed that the North Atlantic Alliance was outdated, criticized the excessive involvement of the U.S. in NATO, even though this alliance has been the basis of Western security policy since the Cold War. He announced a reduction on spending on NATO, and a desire to focus on internal affairs (Sanger, Haberman, 2016), which sent a signal to other nations that the United States would not be the “world's policeman” under Trump's rule. He weakened the guarantee of the provision of international security by the U.S., making it dependent on the ability of individual countries to fulfill their financial commitments to the Alliance. It now seemed that a U.S. response to possible aggression towards other

NATO members depended on the country's regulation of financial dues, according to the principle: "If you pay we will defend you, otherwise you are on your own." The secretary of defense for the Trump administration issued a very different declaration, where he confirmed the commitment of the United States to engage in the North Atlantic Alliance as a loyal ally (Brook, 2017). He also expressed the view that Vladimir Putin was trying to destroy the alliance between the U.S. and Europe, with the hope of breaking up NATO (Ackerman, Gambino, 2017).

Donald Trump's speeches and statements on foreign policy raise many doubts and questions, including whether the U.S. will continue to guarantee international order and whether NATO members can count on the help of America when faced with aggression. What will the relationship between Brussels and Washington be like for the next four years? Trump's win was not met with much enthusiasm in the European Union. Out of all EU leaders, only Italian Prime Minister – Matteo Renzi publically supported Hillary Clinton, but privately an overwhelming majority of EU rulers sided with her in the election. Only a minority of EU leaders sided with Trump, which should not be surprising, given the critical remarks made by the republican candidate about the European Union, where he wished its quick disbandment. Trump did not hide his support for Brexit in the UK, saying that the European Union was on the verge of collapse, and urged other member states to follow suit (Stewart, Yuhas, Walker, 2017). Trump's enthusiasm was not shared by other politicians, and not just in the European Union. United States Ambassador to the European Union, Anthony L. Gardner, stated: "To think that by supporting fragmentation of Europe we would be advancing our interests would be sheer folly. It's lunacy" (Dominiczak, 2017).

It is not only Europe that is concerned about the direction of foreign policy of the superpower. The neighbors of the U.S. are also concerned. The more so, in that Trump's statements indicate major changes in the North American Free Trade Agreement, which he termed "the worst trade deal maybe ever signed anywhere" (see: Withnall, 2017). Mexican authorities are rebelling against Trump's announcement of building 1,000 miles of a border wall between the countries, for which Mexico is to pay for. An additional regression in relations between the two countries has been prompted by the introduction of a 20% tax on the import of goods from Mexico (Jacobs, Rushe, Agren, 2017).

Relations between Washington and Beijing are also unclear. During his campaign, Trump threatened to introduce higher customs tariffs if the Chinese government refused to renegotiate the trade deals that existed between the two countries. At the same time, he announced an increase in U.S. military presence in the South Sea, which would prevent China's territorial expansion in the artificial islands there. Much concern was also caused by the announcement that Trump wishes to break the nuclear deal with Iran, or force an eventual renegotiation, to which Trump wants to force onto Iranian authorities by doubling, or even tripling, sanctions. He has threatened to withdraw the U.S. from the World Trade Organization and the International Agreement on Combating Climate Change. Concerns were also raised about his declaration to restore torture as an effective tool in the fight against terrorism (Fisher, 2016). Trump also announced a desire to reduce, or eventually completely abandon U.S. commitments to long-term U.S. allies Japan and South Korea. However, the recent reaction by U.S. authorities to North Korea's missile tests, which was to launch the first elements of an anti-missile system to South

Korea, and president Trump's confirmation of the United States's solidarity with Japan and South Korea, calmed their allies, signaling that in case of aggression they could count on the support of the Americans (Gearan, Morello, 2017).

After taking office, the Trump's rhetoric has also changed in the context of the U.S. intelligence services, which he had severely criticized and disregarded during the election campaign, even comparing their actions to the policies of Nazi Germany. However, after taking office he stated that he felt safe with the U.S. intelligence services "having his back" and that "he supports them 1,000 per cent" (Ackerman, Siddiqui, 2017), which at least for now has silenced the debate over an open conflict between the president and U.S. intelligence.

Donald Trump's first 100 days in office failed to answer many of the most pressing questions in U.S. foreign and security policy. We still do not know what will be the Trump doctrine, whether the United States will in fact focus on internal problems, limiting its international role, and whether its domain will be *hard* or *soft power*.³ It is not surprising that the newly elected president of the United States did not specify the basic assumptions of the superpower's foreign policy within three months of taking office, as he has changed his views during the election campaign and presented ambiguous, sometimes contradictory proposals. Yet lack of consistency and of a shared position between the president and his closest associates cause confusion and anxiety. In such important matters for the state, the president's administration should speak with one voice. The question seems to be whether the newly elected U.S. president can count on Congress to support his policies? Considering that the Republican Party has a majority in both the House of Representatives and the Senate, implementing the president's policies should theoretically go smoothly, as they are all from the same party. However, given that Trump's statements and campaign slogans aimed directly at the Washington establishment, not only the Democratic Party but also the Republican Party, it may turn out that the lack of consensus and cohesion among Trump's closest associates will not be the only obstacle to the implementation of president Trump's U.S. foreign and security policy.

The first months of Donald Trump's government – the most important decisions in U.S. foreign and security policy

Since the inauguration of the 45th president of the United States, Donald Trump has signed dozens of executive actions, including executive orders, presidential memoranda, presidential proclamations and presidential notices of varying importance and scope. Some of them are strictly administrative (such as the relocation of individual units). Some are Trump's election promises, but not all are controversial, such as the creation of task forces at the Justice Department to fight drug cartels, and to reduce crime and attacks on the police. Others cause astonishment, such as the memorandum directing the

³ *Soft power* should be understood as "the ability to get what you want through attractiveness rather than coercion. It is the result of the attractiveness of the culture and political ideals." The opposite of *soft power* is *hard power*, which involves the use of coercive means, especially the military, during implementation of foreign policy of the state (see: Nye, 2007, p. 9).

secretary of defense to draw up a plan within 30 days to defeat “Islamic State”. The surprise comes from the fact that during the election campaign Trump asserted that he had a “secret plan for the fight against the Islamic State” (Schmidt, 2017) and even that he knew more about “Islamic State” than the generals did (Miller, 2017). But here, Trump’s memorandum orders the generals and security advisers of the president to provide him with a plan, within a month, to beat the jihadists. It seems that the “secret plan” was one of Trump’s electoral slogans, with no basis in reality. What’s more, the initial plans presented by the Pentagon point to a continuation of Obama administration tactics, the same tactics that Trump criticized during his election campaign. The plan is mainly based on the continuation of bombing of jihadists’ positions; support for local forces; elimination of the sources of funding for terrorists, and the stabilization of areas taken away from ISIS (McFadden, Arkin, 2017).

One of Trump’s first decisions was to start the procedure for the withdrawal of the United States from the multilateral trade agreement of the Trans-Pacific Partnership, signed in October 2015 by twelve countries.⁴ Acting on the assumption that traditional bilateral trade agreements are more beneficial to America, Trump rejected an agreement that, according to Barack Obama, would create an economic defense wall against China’s growing power. Experts have pointed out that Trump’s decision has begun to transform America’s role in the global economy, “leaving an opening for other countries to flex their muscles,” which could directly affect the United States and its ability to maintain influence and leadership in both economic and political affairs (Mui, 2017).

Another Trump decision concerns one of the flagship slogans of his election campaign, namely the construction of a wall on the border of the United States with Mexico. The U.S. president expects that the financial burden (estimated at over \$20 billion) will be taken up by the Mexican government. The wall is supposed to stop the influx of illegal immigrants and drug smugglers into the U.S. (Apuzzo, 2017). During his election campaign, Trump made a number of controversial claims, i.e. that Mexicans are rapists and only bring drugs and violence into the U.S., thus provoking indignation among Mexicans and Latinos. The statistics of the Federal Bureau of Investigation do not support his claims, showing that as the number of illegal immigrants in the United States increased from 3 to more than 11 million (1990 to 2013), there was a significant decrease in the crime rate by as much as 48%, with fewer recorded robberies, thefts, rapes and murders. A similar decrease of 41% could be seen in the number of car thefts and burglaries. This discrepancy between statistical data and the president’s statements can also be heard in the speeches of former president Truman, who called immigrants from Mexico “out of control,” and who also promised to “take our country back.” The Pew Research Center reported that the number of illegal immigrants from Mexico living in the United States fell by one million to 5.9 million in 2012. In 2010, more Mexicans left the U.S. than entered the country. Trump accused Mexicans not only of criminal activity, but also of harming the American economy through the relocation of U.S. companies to Mexico due to more favorable conditions. Trump used such sharp words as: “they’re killing us economically.” The facts, however, are that the GDP of the U.S. is 13 times greater than that of Mexico, and the income per capita in the United States is four times that

⁴ Australia, Brunei, Canada, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore, the United States and Vietnam.

of Mexico. More importantly, Mexico is the third largest trading partner with the U.S., after Canada and China. And just as Mexico is not able to “kill the U.S. economy,” such sharp statements and Trump’s actions can adversely affect relations between the two countries. Mexican authorities have already announced they are not going to pay for the construction of the wall, calling it a “blatant monument to anti-Mexican hostility” (Estevez, 2015).

President Trump’s next decision concerned the withdrawal of federal funds for so called “sanctuary cities”, asylum cities whose authorities refused to cooperate with the government in prosecuting and deporting illegal immigrants. The list included a few hundred cities and counties, including New York and Los Angeles, which, in light of Trump’s executive order, provided shelter for undocumented migrants, thereby violating U.S. immigration laws. According to statistics, there are more than 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S. at present, and Trump’s order intends to intensify their deportation. Existing regulations required the deportation of persons who “have committed acts that would constitute a chargeable criminal offense” or that an immigration officer has judged that such person constitutes a threat to public security. The changes will lead to the deportation of people who have no legal documentation and have had any sort of interaction with local law enforcement agencies and have been written up. Some say that the inclusion of local police in the deportation process will cause illegal immigrants to avoid contacting the police even if they need help or wish to report a crime. Opponents of the change refer to statistics that indicate that “sanctuary cities” have lower crime rates than the national average. They point out that when the police become the gateway to deportation, it undermines the principle that the legal system protects everyone (Cameron, 2017). While the president can count on support from the republicans in this case, democrats criticize these actions, pointing out that Trump’s tightening of the rules will lead to the separation of many families, thereby “turning his back on both our history and our values as a proud nation of immigrants” (Laughland, Wong, Siddiqui, 2017).

Another decision made by the U.S. president was to increase the number of border guards by an additional 5000. It would seem that this issue would be the least controversial from a security point of view. However, as experts and practitioners point out, this decision may not reduce the level of crime, but may even increase it. The reason is the difficulty in verifying applicants for the position of a border guard. The latest attempt to increase their numbers did not eliminate those sentenced later for corruption, drug trafficking and human trafficking through checkpoints. Statistics show that since 2004, a total of 197 Customs and Border Protection employees have been arrested and sentenced for corruption. Experts point out: “The presence of even one corrupt agent or officer deployed at the border has the potential to completely undermine whatever level of security has been put in place” (Holpuch, 2017).

Another decision by the U.S. president was to end the practice of what in his election campaign Trump called “catch and release.” This refers to the situation where illegal immigrants are released after being caught and must wait to be questioned. The release is due to the fact that there is not enough room to accommodate everyone at detention centers. U.S. immigration authorities can not immediately deport people back to Mexico due to humanitarian concerns. Most of the detainees have fled the country due to poverty and violence. Equipped with an electronic bracelet on the ankle they are released

pending the date of appearing in an immigration court. Cases take a long time due to the fact that many immigrants are asking for asylum. Trump's executive order obliged the secretary of homeland security to check whether immigration laws, which guarantee people conditional release or asylum on the basis of fear of persecution in their home country, are not being used to block deportation. After the change, the rules would apply only to persons with an urgent humanitarian cause or significant social benefits derived from such a conditional exemption (Kopan, Shoichet, 2017). Opponents of the change are alarmed that the forced detention of all illegal immigrants in the centers will make it difficult for them to reach an independent legal counsel and will mean that many of them may face deportation without complying with United States legal obligations under the UN Refugee Convention (Laughland, 2017).

One of the most controversial decisions made by the new U.S. president, which has caused enormous public outrage and protests not only in the United States but around the world, has been the ban on entry into the U.S. for travelers who are the citizens of seven countries: Iraq, Iran, Syria, Libya, Yemen, Somalia and Sudan. Trump explained that this was intended to prevent "radical Islamic terrorists" from entering the U.S. He added that U.S. authorities would agree to accept only those refugees who would "support and deeply love the United States." Priority should be given to Christian refugees and other religious minorities over Muslims. Many experts perceive this as religious discrimination, and therefore a violation of the U.S. Constitution. This order was harshly criticized by human rights activists who accused the U.S. president of sanctioned religious persecution under cover of security, a "euphemism for discriminating against Muslims" (Shear, Cooper, 2017).

The president's order obliges officials to impose additional checks on refugees "to ensure that those approved for refugee admission do not pose a threat to the security and welfare of the United States." Trump caused controversy when he referred to the September 11, 2001 attacks when announcing the change. The problem was that the majority of the 19 aircraft hijackers who destroyed the World Trade Center and Pentagon towers came from Saudi Arabia, the rest from the United Arab Emirates, Egypt and Lebanon. None of these countries were included in the list of citizens forbidden to enter the United States. Some say that the reason for this is that Trump had business contacts in Saudi Arabia, Egypt and the United Arab Emirates. Why did the U.S. presidential administration choose these seven states? In the official statement, it was claimed that the governments of these countries were "unable or unwilling to provide the information we need." As it turns out, it is of little importance that none of the citizens of these banned states contributed to the death of even one American as a result of a terrorist attack in the United States since 2001 (Shear, Cooper, 2017).

Due to the sudden entry into force of the decree, many people were detained at U.S. airports. Because of the lack of clarification, the entry ban was also applied to those who had already received entry visas into the United States, or initially also to holders of Green cards. Despite opposition from the federal appeals court, which blocked the decree, arguing that it violated the right to "do justice to the United States Constitution," Donald Trump questioned and criticized the judge's opinion, calling it "ridiculous", declaring at the same time that he will appeal the decision. Experts claim that the United States is currently facing a constitutional crisis. "This is an epic confrontation between

the presidency and the constitution,” and the disrespectful nature of the president’s approach to legislation is very dangerous, since it can lead to chaos in the state (Walters, 2017).

Eventually, the president issued a new executive order, which banned the entry into the United States from the six countries listed in the previous list, excluding Iraq. The decision was explained as a result of collaboration between the United States and Iraq in combating the “Islamic State,” and an agreement with the Iraqi government, which had pledged to increase cooperation with America in the verification of Iraqi applicants to the United States. Permanent residents and current visa holders were excluded from the ban. Also, a complete ban on refugee entry from Syria was removed and replaced with a 120-day suspended entry period required for verification and renewal. A record from the previous document was kept, which reduced the number of refugees admitted to the U.S. each year from 110,000 to 50,000 (Thrush, 2017). Trump’s second order was also blocked by a district court judge who accused him of discriminating against Muslims, stressing: “We can not fault the president for being politically incorrect, but we do fault him for being constitutionally incorrect” (*Hawaii judge*).

In the context of Trump’s electoral statements regarding the limited (conditional) involvement of the United States in solving international problems, his rapid decision of April 7, 2017 to bomb Syrian Air Force al-Shajrat was quite a surprise. This was in response to the use of chemical weapons against civilians on April 4, 2017, where at least 86 people were killed, for which Trump’s administration unequivocally accused Bashar al-Assad’s regime. The quick reaction of the American president may be surprising given that this decision was not made within the framework of the UN, after an investigation and the explicit exclusion of other options. His predecessor – Barack Obama – was in a similar situation in 2013, when more than 1,400 people were killed as a result of the use of chemical weapons in Ghouta near Damascus. However, Obama decided not to respond with a military attack. Instead, he chose the diplomatic route, which resulted in the Syrian president’s commitment to liquidate the Syrian chemical arsenal. The entire arsenal was to be liquidated by the end of June 2014. Despite assurances from the Pentagon that Russian forces were warned about plans to bomb the base in Syria, the Kremlin’s reaction was unequivocally critical of U.S. activities, calling them “aggression against a sovereign nation,” which could consequently lead to a halt in military cooperation between Russia and the U.S. in Syria and seriously undermine relations between the two countries. All the more so since the Russian government called the chemical attack in Syria a “provocation” by rebels fighting with Assad, thereby denying the Syrian government’s participation in it (see: Sengupta, Macfarquhar, Steinhauer, 2017).

It is worth pointing out that the bombing of the Syrian base was the first direct U.S. attack on the Bashar el-Assad regime since the beginning of the six-year war in Syria. Trump’s decision may seem surprising when compared to his earlier pro-Russian stance, at the same time raising many questions about further U.S. military engagement in Syria: will there be an intensification of attacks or was the bombing a one-off project? Whether strong or weak, Russia’s response to U.S. actions, which can be seen in terms of a trial of strength, will have significant consequences and affect Russia’s position in the international system. All the more so since the American administration informed the Russian authorities that they must choose whose side they wish to be on in the Syrian conflict,

while announcing the approaching end of the Assad regime. Thus Trump's decision raises questions about further relations on the Washington-Moscow line.

The decision-making process at the White House is also brought into question, given the impression that Trump's decision to bombard Syria seemed to have been made impetuously, without much reflection, calculation or analysis of possible repercussions. And as some researchers and journalists point out, "the emotional president is easily manipulated" (Milewski, 2017). In this context one might wonder whether Trump's decision was influenced by his closest associates whose approach to the Kremlin's policies differ significantly from that of the president of the United States. Perhaps Trump wanted to minimize criticism from Congress, including the republicans, who accused him of a passive stance on the Syrian conflict. Perhaps in a symbolic way Trump also wanted to end suspicions of Russian influence on the White House. Perhaps it was a show of strength, independence and determination by the superpower leader. Perhaps he wanted to show that, unlike Barack Obama, who in 2012 drew a "red line" against the use of chemical weapons, after which the U.S. was to react strongly to the Assad regime, yet in reality showed a passive attitude, Trump will react immediately to provocation. No matter the impetus for this decision, the U.S. president once again surprised the international community, raising even more doubts and questions about what the Trump doctrine will be.

The implications of Donald Trump's foreign and security policy for the United States – conclusions

One of the most important questions in the context of recent changes in U.S. foreign and security policy is: is America more secure today? Although Trump's most controversial order banning entry to the United States for the citizens of six Muslim countries has been blocked by law, the president's administration has not given up and is fighting for new legislation. The question seems to be: will the ban on entry into the United States increase the security of the superpower, protecting Americans from further terrorist attacks? According to reports from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security and State Department, the answer is: not necessarily. This is due to the fact that citizenship is an "unlikely indicator" of a terrorist threat to the United States. Statistics show that few people from these states have been involved in terrorist activities in the United States since the civil war started in Syria in 2011. As pointed out in the report of 82 people who, according to the government, were influenced by a foreign terrorist group to conduct or attempt to attack on an area in the U.S., more than half were U.S. citizens, born in the United States. The rest came from Pakistan, Somalia, Bangladesh, Cuba, Ethiopia, Iraq and Uzbekistan. One person from Iran, Sudan and Yemen each was involved in terrorist activities. None were from Syria, whose citizens are now completely banned from entering the U.S. The report emphasized that terrorist organizations in Iran, Libya, Somalia and Sudan are focused on their own regions, while groups in Iraq, Syria and Yemen pose a threat to the United States (Salama, Caldwell, 2017; *Country Reports on Terrorism 2015*).

Another important question in the context of the Trump ban is: can it lead to an increase in attacks on the U.S.? Even in the ranks of the republicans, Trump's decision

alarmed many who believed it was a great propaganda boost for the “Islamic State,” which, in the name of injustice, by announcing anti-American slogans, could recruit new members to the organization and motivate them to attack the United States (Yuhas, 2017). The order concerns six nationalities, and covers all professional and social groups, including academics, students, doctors, and specialists, who came to the United States in search of a “better life” (Dehghan, 2017). Separation of families, and “pigeon-holing” people of certain nationalities or religions as potential terrorists, may prove to be counterproductive, and lead to trauma and hostility towards people of different ethnicities. This may result in the radicalization of various people living in the United States, who otherwise would not have thought about committing acts of terror. Trump’s decisions are plagued by rhetoric which reinforce the propaganda of the “Islamic State,” which falsely claim that the United States is at war with Islam (Loffredo, 2017). Closing doors for refugees to the United States may weaken the nation’s ability to lead the world, for they are turning away from the problems of their allies. This has a destabilization effect on allies’ security. The paradox of the situation is that the U.S. government, and specifically the administration of president George W. Bush, led to the emergence of an “Islamic State” (Waśko-Owsiejczuk, 2017, pp. 7–31), destabilizing the entire region and triggering a wave of refugees, and now the new president has made a decision to turn away from the problem the U.S. created themselves.

The closing of borders or building walls on the border with Mexico will not solve the problem of crime in the United States, but will certainly affect the deterioration of relations between states. Employing an additional 5,000 border guards will not eliminate the problem of corruption which allows drug trafficking and human trafficking to be conducted among the U.S.-Mexican border. An outline of Trump’s doctrine illustrates another face of America, one which renounces international obligations and pursues unilateral politics in the name of Trump’s “America first.” In a narrower perspective, withdrawing from international agreements and commitments may strengthen the position of the United States, which, as a superpower, will be able to dictate their conditions to others; but in a broader perspective, this will only weaken U.S. allies while strengthening their enemies. After World War II, the United States, as the strongest and most influential member of the United Nations and NATO, became the guarantor of international security. The introduction of a business system in the operation of these organizations, where a reaction to aggression will depend on the contributions paid, will only accelerate the erosion of the collective security system. Trump’s view of foreign policy seems to be very short-sighted, in believing that cutting the U.S. off from the rest of the world will bring it security and prosperity. In times of the “global village,” the problems of Europe or the Middle East are also the problems of the U.S. Without international cooperation, no nation can feel safe today.

On the one hand, Trump’s recent decision to bomb the Syrian base may be a signal of reassurance to the international community that the superpower will react to the use of chemical weapons against civilian populations and defend human rights. On the other hand, the decision may be a cause of concern, since it was made outside the international framework, without consultation with the United Nations. Although welcomed by many world leaders as an adequate response to the use of forbidden chemical weapons, the bombing of the Syrian base by the Americans was imperious, and denounced by Rus-

sian authorities as illegal, in violation of UN law. Remembering the aggressive politics of George W. Bush's administration, which was characterized by an illegal invasion of Iraq, the Russians are alarmed that the scenario may be repeated and the Americans may return to unilateral and imperious actions (see: Savage, 2017).

Trump is changing the face of America not only in terms of its international, but also its internal, approach. In less than 100 days after the takeover of power, the United States is heading for a constitutional crisis in which a clash between the executive and the judiciary branches could affect the entire political system of the state. What is troubling are the attacks on judicial independence and disregard for judicial power, which is a peculiar position for the president of a superpower to take. Also unsettling are the president's opinions about the power of the president, the division of power, respect for the Constitution, and the principle of *checks and balances*, which is supposed to be a deterrent mechanism to control executive power. Trump's first decisions seem to confirm the fears cited after his victory that the first U.S. president without any political experience may have problems managing the state. It seems that Donald Trump forgets that superpower management is not the same as the management of a company, where any word of criticism can cause the dismissal of an employee. America has repeatedly experienced that the use of *soft power* is a much more useful tool than the use of *hard power*. But diplomacy does not seem to be a strength of the new U.S. president, who openly declares that he supports torture as an effective tool for combating terrorism, despite the fact that the 2014 Senate Intelligence Commission Report claimed that torture victims provided false testimony and Osama Bin Laden's hideout was discovered through traditional intelligence (eavesdropping) and not through torture (Waśko-Owsiejczuk, 2016a).

Trump undoubtedly wants to rule with a hard hand, changing the face of America to one that closes and isolates itself from its allies, and bases its actions, including its response to aggression, on money and not on values or the law; which as a country built by immigrants closes its doors to them, including such injured and vulnerable groups as refugees; where executive power disregards the powers of the courts and trivializes its decisions. In this way Donald Trump will not strengthen America, but will only weaken it. Ruling a superpower requires deliberation, and Trump's first decisions may be proof that deliberation will not be the main feature of his presidency, but rather governance through unpredictability and short-sightedness.

Bibliography

- Ackerman S., Gambino L. (2017), *Russia is trying to smash Nato, James Mattis says in confirmation hearing*, 12.01.2017, "The Guardian", <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/jan/12/james-mattis-mike-pompeo-confirmation-hearings-russia>, 19.03.2017.
- Ackerman S., Siddiqui S. (2017), *Donald Trump speech at CIA memorial risks fueling intelligence feud*, 22.01.2017, "The Guardian", <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/jan/21/cia-donald-trump-first-meeting>, 15.03.2017.
- America First Foreign Policy*, The White House, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/america-first-foreign-policy>, 14.03.2017.
- Antoszewski A. (2014), *System polityczny jako przedmiot badań politologii i nauki prawa konstytucyjnego*, in: *Rozprawa o metodzie prawa i polityki*, eds. M. Sadowski, A. Szychalska, K. Sadowa, Wydział Prawa, Administracji i Ekonomii Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, Wrocław.

- Apuzzo M. (2017), *Trump Orders a Wall Built, but Congress Holds the Checkbook*, 25.01.2017, "The New York Times", <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/25/us/politics/donald-trump-mexico-border-wall-congress.html>, 23.03.2017.
- Balcerowicz B. (2010), *Sily zbrojne w stanie pokoju, kryzysu, wojny*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, Warszawa.
- Best R. A. (2011), *The National Security Council: An Organizational Assessment*, Congressional Research Service Report for Congress, Washington.
- Brook T. V. (2017), *Defense Secretary Mattis emphasizes NATO commitment on first day*, 23.01.2017, "USA Today", <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2017/01/23/mattis-support-nato/96971878/>, 18.03.2017.
- Cameron D. (2017), *How sanctuary cities work, and how Trump's executive order might affect them*, 25.01.2017, "The Washington Post", <https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/national/sanctuary-cities/>, 23.03.2017.
- Country Reports on Terrorism 2015*, United States Department of State Publication Bureau of Counterterrorism and Countering Violent Extremism.
- Czulda R. (2010), *Polityka bezpieczeństwa militarnego Stanów Zjednoczonych 2001–2009*, Wydawnictwo Akademii Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa.
- Dehghan S. K. (2017), *Trump travel ban will hit Iranian critics of regime hardest, analysts warn*, 9.03.2017, "The Guardian", <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/mar/09/trump-travel-ban-iranian-students-critics>, 1.04.2017.
- Dominiczak P. (2017), *Donald Trump 'wants EU to break up in wake of Brexit vote', outgoing US ambassador in Brussels suggests*, 13.01.2017, "The Telegraph", <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2017/01/13/donald-trump-wants-eu-break-wake-brexit-vote-outgoing-us-ambassador/>, 19.03.2017.
- Donald Trump Would Consider Alliance With Russia's Vladimir Putin Against Isis*, 25.07.2016, "Newsweek", <http://www.newsweek.com/donald-trump-vladimir-putin-isis-syria-iraq-moscow-islamic-state-democratic-483826>, 14.03.2017.
- Dziemidok-Olszewska B. (2009), *System polityczny Stanów Zjednoczonych*, in: *Współczesne systemy polityczne*, eds. M. Żmigrodzki, B. Dziemidok-Olszewska, PWN, Warszawa.
- Estevez D. (2015), *Debunking Donald Trump's Five Extreme Statements About Immigrants And Mexico*, 5.09.2015, "Forbes", <https://www.forbes.com/sites/doliaestevez/2015/09/03/debunking-donald-trumps-five-extreme-statements-about-immigrants-and-mexico/2/#10576e121ce1>, 23.03.2017.
- Fisher M. (2016), *What Is Donald Trump's Foreign Policy?*, 11.11.2016, "The New York Times", <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/12/world/what-is-donald-trumps-foreign-policy.html>, 21.03.2017.
- Gearan A., Morello C. (2017), *Trump administration calls North Korea a 'pariah'*, 7.03.2017, "The Washington Post", https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/trump-administration-calls-north-korea-a-pariah/2017/03/07/47d0aa48-0377-11e7-b9fa-cd727b644a0b_story.html, 22.03.2017.
- Haberman M., Rosenberg M., Apuzzo M., Thrush G. (2017), *Michael Flynn Resigns as National Security Adviser*, 13.02.2017, "The New York Times", <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/13/us/politics/donald-trump-national-security-adviser-michael-flynn.html>, 17.03.2017.
- Hawaii judge refuses to overturn block on Trump travel ban*, 30.03.2017, "The Guardian", <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/mar/30/hawaii-judge-refuses-overturn-block-trump-travel-ban>, 31.03.2017.
- Holpuch A. (2017), *White House plan to hire more border agents raises vetting fear, ex-senior official says*, 26.02.2017, "The Guardian", <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/feb/26/trump-plan-border-agents-vetting-james-tomsheck>, 24.03.2017.
- Jacobs B., Rushe D., Agren D. (2017), *Trump-Mexico relations hit new low after 20% border wall tax mooted*, 27.01.2017, "The Guardian", <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/jan/26/trump-calls-for-20-tax-on-mexican-imports-to-pay-for-border-wall>, 21.03.2017.

- Jordan A. A., Taylor W. J., Meese M. J., Nielsen S. C., Schlesinger J. (2009), *American National Security*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Kopan T., Shoichet C. E. (2017), *Key points in Trump's immigration executive orders*, 25.01.2017, "CNN", <http://edition.cnn.com/2017/01/25/politics/donald-trump-immigration-executive-orders/>, 24.03.2017.
- Laughland O. (2017), *US could face human rights crisis after Trump's xenophobic immigration orders*, 26.01.2017, "The Guardian", <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/jan/26/trump-immigration-border-detention-migrants-catch-release>, 24.03.2017.
- Laughland O., Wong J. C., Siddiqui S. (2017), *'Sanctuary cities' endangered by Trump order threatening to cut federal funds*, 25.01.2017, "The Guardian", <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/jan/25/sanctuary-cities-trump-executive-order-immigration>, 24.03.2017.
- LoBianco T. (2015), *Donald Trump: Crimea is Europe's problem*, 31.07.2015, "CNN", <http://edition.cnn.com/2015/07/31/politics/donald-trump-crimea-europe-problem/>, 17.03.2017.
- Loffredo N. (2017), *Trump Travel Ban Weakens National Security, Foreign Policy Experts Argue*, 11.03.2017, "Newsweek", <http://www.newsweek.com/trump-travel-ban-weakens-national-security-foreign-policy-experts-566722>, 1.04.2017.
- Ludwikowski R., Ludwikowska A. (2009), *Wybory prezydenckie w USA na tle porównawczym*, Wydawnictwo Prawnicze LexisNexis, Warszawa.
- Masters J. (2017), *Trump defense chief Mattis: US not ready for military cooperation with Russia*, 16.02.2017, "CNN", <http://edition.cnn.com/2017/02/16/politics/mattis-russia-military-cooperation/>, 14.03.2017.
- McFadden C., Arkin W. M. (2017), *Trump's Pentagon Presents ISIS Plan That Looks Much Like Obama's*, 17.03.2017, NBCNews, <http://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/trump-s-secret-plan-beat-isis-looks-lot-obama-s-n735171>, 22.03.2017.
- Michałek K. (2005), *Konstytucja Stanów Zjednoczonych Ameryki*, in: *Konstytucja oraz inne podstawowe dokumenty i symbole amerykańskiej kultury patriotycznej*, red. K. Michałek, Wydawnictwo Mada, Warszawa.
- Milewski P. (2017), *Amerykanie zaatakowali Syrię*, 7.04.2017, "Newsweek", <http://www.newsweek.pl/swiat/polityka/atak-usa-na-syrie-amerykanie-zaatakowali-syrie,artykuly,408416,1.html>, 10.04.2017.
- Miller Z. J. (2017), *President Trump Orders 30-Day Review of Strategy to Fight ISIS*, 28.01.2017, "Time", <http://time.com/4652696/president-trump-isis-review/>, 22.03.2017.
- Mui Y. Q. (2017), *Withdrawal from Trans-Pacific Partnership shifts U.S. role in world economy*, 23.01.2017, "The Washington Post", https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/economy/withdrawal-from-trans-pacific-partnership-shifts-us-role-in-world-economy/2017/01/23/05720df6-e1a6-11e6-a453-19ec4b3d09ba_story.html, 23.03.2017.
- Nye J. (2007), *Soft Power: Jak osiągnąć sukces w polityce światowej*, Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne, Warszawa.
- Pawłuszko T. (2014), *Użyteczność analityczna kategorii systemu międzynarodowego*, "Stosunki Międzynarodowe – International Relations", no. 1 (t. 49).
- Pengelly M. (2017), *Donald Trump repeats respect for 'killer' Putin in Fox Super Bowl interview*, 6.02.2017, "The Guardian", <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/feb/05/donald-trump-repeats-his-respect-for-killer-vladimir-putin>, 14.03.2017.
- Revesz R. (2017), *Donald Trump's new 'Muslim ban' still does not include countries that have produced terrorists*, 6.03.2017, "Independent", <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/donald-trump-muslim-travel-ban-countries-terrorists-immigration-order-a7614701.html>, 25.03.2017.
- Roser M., Nagdy M., *Military Spending*, <https://ourworldindata.org/military-spending/>, 12.03.2017.

- Salama V., Caldwell A. A. (2017), *Homeland Security Intelligence Report Disputes Terror Threat for Countries Included in Travel Ban*, 24.02.2017, "Time", <http://time.com/4682723/homeland-security-intelligence-report-travel-ban/>, 1.04.2017.
- Sanger D. E., Haberman M. (2016), *Donald Trump Sets Conditions for Defending NATO Allies Against Attack*, 20.07.2016, "The New York Times", <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/21/us/politics/donald-trump-issues.html>, 18.03.2017.
- Savage C. (2017), *Was Trump's Syria Strike Illegal? Explaining Presidential War Powers*, 7.04.2017, "The New York Times", <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/04/07/us/politics/military-force-presidential-power.html>, 10.04.2017.
- Scarborough R. (2016), *Trump's Pentagon pick says Russia 'dangerous,' Putin possibly 'delusional'*, 6.12.2016, "The Washington Times", <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2016/dec/6/donald-trump-james-mattis-differ-on-vladimir-putin/>, 14.03.2017.
- Schmidt M. S. (2017), *Trump's Plan to Fight ISIS Includes Calling It by That Name*, 29.01.2017, "The New York Times", <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/29/us/politics/trump-isis-isis-name.html>, 22.03.2017.
- Sengupta S., Macfarquhar N., Steinhauer J. (2017), *U.S. Airstrikes in Syria: Fallout Around the World*, 07.04.2017, "The New York Times", <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/04/07/us/politics/trump-syria-airstrikes.html>, 10.04.2017.
- Shafritz J. M. (1993), *The Harper Collins Dictionary: American Government & Politics. A Wealth of Information on National, State and Local Government and Politics*, HarperPerennial, New York.
- Shear M., Cooper H. (2017), *Trump Bars Refugees and Citizens of 7 Muslim Countries*, 27.01.2017, "The New York Times", <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/27/us/politics/trump-syrian-refugees.html>, 25.03.2017.
- Shinkman P. D. (2017), *Cooperation with Russia in Syria Off the Table for Trump Team*, 13.03.2017, "USNews", <https://www.usnews.com/news/politics/articles/2017-03-13/trump-team-isnt-considering-cooperation-with-russia-in-syria-sources-say>, 15.03.2017.
- Stewart H., Yugas A., Walker P. (2017), *Donald Trump's first UK post-election interview: Brexit a 'great thing'*, 16.01.2017, "The Guardian", <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/jan/15/trumps-first-uk-post-election-interview-brexit-a-great-thing>, 19.03.2017.
- Thompson Hill K., Hill G. N. (2001), *The Fact On File Dictionary of American Politics*, Checkmark Books, New York.
- Thrush G. (2017), *Trump's New Travel Ban Blocks Migrants From Six Nations, Sparing Iraq*, 3.03.2017, "The New York Times", <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/06/us/politics/travel-ban-muslim-trump.html>, 27.03.2017.
- Ulrich M. P. (2012), *National Security Powers: Are The Checks In Balance?*, in: *The U.S. Army War College Guide To National Security Issues. Volume II: National Security Policy and Strategy*, ed. J. B. Bartholomees, Strategic Studies Institute, Carlisle.
- Waldman T. (2000), *The Best Guide to American Politics*, Renaissance Books, Los Angeles.
- Walters J. (2017), *'An epic confrontation': has travel ban put White House and courts at odds?*, 4.02.2017, "The Guardian", <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/feb/04/donald-trump-travel-ban-constitutional-crisis>, 25.03.2017.
- Waśko-Owsiejczuk E. (2014), *Polityka bezpieczeństwa narodowego Stanów Zjednoczonych Ameryki w latach 2001–2009*, Avalon, Kraków.
- Waśko-Owsiejczuk E. (2016a), *Globalizacja tortur – o programie tajnych więzień CIA na świecie*, "Politeja. Pismo Wydziału Studiów Międzynarodowych i Politycznych Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego", no. 45.
- Waśko-Owsiejczuk E. (2016b), *Misja Wsparcia Narodów Zjednoczonych dla Iraku – cele, zadania i inicjatywy ONZ po zakończeniu II wojny w Zatoce Perskiej*, "Stosunki Międzynarodowe – International Relations", nr 3 (t. 53).

- Waśko-Owsiejczuk E. (2017), *Wpływ polityki USA na powstanie "państwa" islamskiego. O spuściznie prezydentury George'a W. Busha*, "Athenaeum. Polskie Studia Politologiczne", vol. 53.
- Weaver M., Spencer A. S. (2017), *Trump claims torture works but experts warn of its 'potentially existential' costs*, 26.01.2017, "The Guardian", <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/jan/26/donald-trump-torture-absolutely-works-says-us-president-in-first-television-interview>, 2.04.2017.
- Withnall A. (2017), *Donald Trump to sign executive order signalling intention to rip up Nafta*, 23.01.2017, "Independent", <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/donald-trump-tpp-nafta-president-trade-deals-mexico-canada-china-executive-order-a7541611.html>, 21.03.2017.
- Włodkowska-Bagan A. (2015), *Ambicje imperialne Rosji i innych mocarstw w przestrzeni poradzieckiej*, in: *Rosja. Rozważania imperiologiczne*, eds. S. Bieliń, A. Skrzypek, Oficyna Wydawnicza ASPRA-JR, Warszawa.
- Włodkowska A. (2004), *Mocarstwowość w polityce zagranicznej państw*, in: *Wstęp do teorii polityki zagranicznej państwa*, ed. R. Zięba, Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, Toruń.
- Wordliczek Ł. (2003), *Kształtowanie się uprawnień prezydenta USA w polityce zagranicznej*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Kraków.
- Yuhas A. (2017), *Trump defends travel ban and lashes out at GOP critics McCain and Graham*, 29.01.2017, "The Guardian", <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/jan/29/trump-muslim-country-travel-ban-john-mccain>, 1.04.2017.

Czy Ameryka jest teraz bezpieczniejsza? O pierwszych zmianach w polityce zagranicznej i bezpieczeństwa USA za prezydentury Donalda Trumpa

Streszczenie

Artykuł opisuje pierwsze miesiące prezydentury Donalda Trumpa. Przedstawia jego najważniejsze decyzje w zakresie polityki zagranicznej i bezpieczeństwa USA, głosy krytyczne i wspierające oraz ewentualne implikacje dla bezpieczeństwa USA.

Już podczas kampanii wyborczej niektóre propozycje Trumpa wywoływały niepokój społeczności międzynarodowej i wiele pytań w kontekście dotychczasowych sojuszy. Zapowiedział m.in. wprowadzenie rygorystycznych przepisów w prawie emigracyjnym, niezwłoczną deportację nielegalnych imigrantów z USA, przywróceniem tortur jako narzędzia walki z terrorystami, podważał ponadto dotychczasową politykę współpracy z sojusznikami, kwestionując dążenie do zapewnienia bezpieczeństwa innym krajom na koszt USA. Podjęte podczas pierwszych 100 dni urzędowania Donalda Trumpa decyzje wpływają nie tylko na sytuację wewnętrzną USA, zarówno w kontekście bezpieczeństwa kraju, jak i systemu politycznego, ze względu na rodzący się kryzys konstytucyjny i tarcia pomiędzy władzą wykonawczą i sądowniczą. Jego decyzje wpływają również na stosunki pomiędzy USA i ich sojusznikami oraz przekształcają rolę Stanów Zjednoczonych w świecie i wpływ supermocarstwa na system zbiorowego bezpieczeństwa.

Słowa kluczowe: Donald Trump, Stany Zjednoczone, Syria, terroryzm, polityka zagraniczna i bezpieczeństwo USA