DONALD TRUMP'S FOREIGN POLICY: WITHDRAWAL FROM INTERNATIONAL REGIMES AND ORGANIZATIONS

Muhammad Alfian Maulana[1*], Nur Rachmat Yuliantoro[2]

[1]Master in International Relations; Universitas Gadjah Mada
[2]International Relations Department; Universitas Gadjah Mada
*email: alfian.maulana37@gmail.com

Abstrak

Penelitian ini menyelidiki perubahan transformatif dalam kebijakan luar negeri Amerika Serikat (AS) selama masa kepresidenan Donald Trump, berfokus pada penarikan diri dari perjanjian internasional yang krusial seperti Perjanjian Paris, TPP, UNHRC, UNESCO, dan UNRWA. Dengan menggunakan teori Poliheuristik, penelitian ini bertujuan untuk memahami alasan di balik penarikan diri AS dari rezim dan organisasi internasional selama pemerintahan Trump. Penelitian ini menggunakan penilaian dua tahap dalam teori Poliheuristik: aspek kognitif, mempertimbangkan nilai-nilai pembuat kebijakan, dan aspek rasional, mengevaluasi potensi keuntungan dan kerugian. Presiden Trump dihadapkan pada tiga pilihan untuk organisasi internasional; tetap bertahan, melakukan negosiasi ulang, atau menarik diri. Teknik kualitatif digunakan untuk menganalisis prioritas janji America First dan menilai keterlibatan negara dengan entitas-entitas tersebut. Menolak opsi untuk tetap bertahan mengarah pada evaluasi rasional untuk melakukan negosiasi ulang atau keluar. Keputusan untuk menarik diri dibuat berdasarkan tuntutan negosiasi ulang yang tidak terpenuhi, yang secara strategis mengurangi beban keuangan yang signifikan bagi AS.

Kata Kunci: *Donald Trump, kebijakan luar negeri AS, rezim dan organisasi internasional, teori Poliheuristik*

Abstrak

This research delves into transformative shifts in United States (US) foreign policy during Donald Trump's presidency, specifically focusing on withdrawals from crucial international agreements like the Paris Agreement, TPP, UNHRC, UNESCO, and UNRWA. Utilizing the Poliheuristic theory, the study aims to comprehend the rationale behind the US withdrawal from international regimes and organizations during Trump's administration. The research employs a dual-stage assessment within the Poliheuristic theory; the cognitive aspect, considering policymakers' values, and the rational aspect, evaluating potential gains and losses. President Trump confronted three options for international organizations: remaining, renegotiating, or withdrawing. Qualitative techniques were incorporated to analyze the prioritization of the America First promise and assess the country's engagement with these entities. Rejecting the option to remain led to a rational evaluation of renegotiation or exit. The decision to withdraw was strategically made to address unmet renegotiation demands, minimizing significant financial burdens for the US.

Keywords: Donald Trump, international regimes and organizations, Poliheuristic theory, U.S. foreign policy

Introduction

In the wake of Donald Trump's inauguration as the President of the United States (US) on January 20, 2017, a discernible shift occurred in U.S. foreign policy compared to the preceding administration led by Barack Obama. The eight years of Obama's presidency (2009-2017) were characterized by a focus on multilateralism, bilateral cooperation, and the establishment of alliances and institutions to address global challenges and bolster security. Initiatives like Feed the Future, the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program, and the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development Data underscored the emphasis on collaborative international efforts (Secretary, 2016).

However, with the advent of President Trump, a stark departure from these diplomatic approaches became evident. The United States underwent a profound transformation in its foreign policy, marked by a proclivity for disengagement from the international community. By 2020, the U.S. had withdrawn from five significant international regimes and organizations, including the Paris Agreement, the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), the United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC), the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA).

The selection of these specific international agreements and organizations for analysis is deliberate, aiming to encapsulate the diverse facets of the shift in U.S. foreign policy. The withdrawal from the Paris Agreement symbolizes a departure from global environmental commitments, while the abandonment of the TPP signifies a re-evaluation of economic alliances. Exiting the UNHRC reflects a recalibration of priorities in human rights diplomacy, and departure from UNESCO and UNRWA underscores scepticism towards certain international institutions and a shift in the approach to geopolitical conflicts.

This drastic shift in policy prompts an exploration into the rationale behind President Trump's decisions, taking into account the boundaries of international organizations and regimes. The legal frameworks, norms, and standards set by these entities delineate the parameters within which nations operate. The decision-making processes, enforcement mechanisms, and membership obligations within these organizations influence and constrain policy outcomes. The issue-specific focus of these

entities shapes the relevance of their impact on policy decisions, while financial and resource constraints play a role in determining the feasibility of policy implementation.

It is crucial to understand the significance of comparing these policy differences, as they illuminate not only the evolution of U.S. foreign policy but also the dynamics shaping international relations. The contrasting approaches of the Obama and Trump administrations underscore the malleability of U.S. foreign policy and its susceptibility to changing political landscapes.

To comprehend the motivations behind Trump's divergence from his predecessor's strategies, this article employs the Poliheuristic theory as a comprehensive framework. By delving into the foreign policy-making process of the United States, particularly through the lens of Donald Trump's policy decisions, this analysis seeks to unravel the intricate factors influencing the nation's global stance. Recognizing the importance of international organizations and regimes as integral components of policy formulation, this exploration aims to shed light on the complexities that guide a nation's diplomatic trajectory. Furthermore, it intends to emphasize the critical nature of selecting a suitable theoretical framework, in this case, the Poliheuristic theory, for a nuanced examination of the multifaceted aspects inherent in foreign policy decision-making.

Methodology

Literature Review

The book "The Trump Phenomenon and the Future of U.S. Foreign Policy" by Daniel Mills and Steven Rosefielde describes President Trump as pursuing a nationalistic foreign policy prioritizing U.S. national interest over international obligations. The book discusses Trump's policies, including his nationalistic stance and the risks associated with their implementation (Mills & Rosefielde, 2017). However, it does not address why the United States left international regimes and organizations.

The book "World War Trump" contends that America First nationalism and Trump's unpredictable desires may lead to increased regional socioeconomic instability. The actions taken by Trump to increase the military presence in the United States could potentially lead to a division of the world into two distinct alliances. Trump's impatience with foreign policy leads rivals and allies to assume the worst-case scenario. Overall, the book offers the most pessimistic assessment of the dangers of an America First policy,

which could lead to international instability and even war (Gardner, 2018). The book's explanation focuses on the relationship between Trump's nationalistic stance and the international system concerning Trump's promises.

In the article "The 2016 Presidential Election and U.S. Foreign Policy," Nur Rachmat Yuliantoro, Atin Prabandari, and Dafri Agus Salim discuss the projected policies that Trump may implement during his presidency. The analysis examines Trump's campaign slogans and promises in various policy areas, including the economy, defense, and regional security. They anticipate a more nationalistic foreign policy emphasizing the significance of US interests and isolationist tendencies, reducing interventionism, and rejecting multilateral cooperation (Yuliantoro, et al., 2017). Although it provides an overview of Trump's position on multilateral agreements and international organizations, the analysis is not specific to the regimes and organizations discussed in this study.

Meanwhile, Agastya Wardhana and Vincensio Marselino Arifin Dugis published an article titled "Grand Strategy of Selective Isolationism in US Foreign Policy in the Trump Era" in the Global Strategic Journal on a topic related to this paper. Both argue that the foreign policy of the United States during the Trump administration was marked by a form of selective isolationism. Selective isolationism is a grand strategy that reduces U.S. international commitments to concentrate more on achieving national interests. The reduction of US commitments is rooted in the America First policy label, which emphasizes prioritizing domestic interests. This approach is evident in various actions taken by the United States, including the decision to withdraw from international agreements like the Paris Agreement and the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) (Wardhana & Dugis, 2019). This topic is related to this paper's discussion but with a different writing approach.

The four kinds of literature mentioned above have explained the policies that Trump may or may not have implemented in his foreign policy. The four works of literature perspectives refer to policy analysis, especially in Trump's foreign policy, which is based on the America First campaign promise. Meanwhile, the author will use a Poliheuristic approach to examine and analyze a more specific foreign policy, namely the United States' withdrawal from several regimes and international organizations.

Poliheuristic Theory

Poliheuristic theory is a foreign policy-making model that combines rational and cognitive elements through a two-stage policy-making process. In Poliheuristic theory, the policy formulation process includes cognitive aspects and rationality, which are implemented into two main stages, consisting of (1) the initial elimination of alternatives that conflict with the values or principles adopted by the policymaker and (2) choosing the best alternative from the remaining alternatives with consideration of the profit and loss ratio (Mintz & DeRouen, 2010: 79). These measures provide a more comprehensive understanding of the decision-making process in foreign policy by highlighting the interaction between cognitive processes and rational considerations that shape the final choices made by policymakers.

In the analysis of foreign policy, the collection of information plays a vital role as a fundamental element of this theory. This is because the information obtained by decision-makers is used to formulate alternative decisions when dealing with complex issues. The gathered data is then categorized according to the five primary characteristics of information processing that are most important in decision-making: non-holistic, dimension-based, non-compensatory, satisficing, and order-sensitive (Geva & Mintz, 1997). This process involves monitoring political changes, assessing available options, and identifying final policy choices in foreign affairs, information that does not fit into these five dimensions will be ignored.

The first stage of the policy-making process initiates with the identification of the alternative options to be selected using the five dimensions listed above. Non-holistic is used because comparisons between options are made using a limited set of alternatives and attributes. The selection process is "dimension-based," where every alternative policy option is assessed based on its significance in the most critical aspect (e.g., political dimension), and policies that do not meet a specific standard will be excluded from further consideration (Mintz, 1993). This dimension-based approach reflects the strategic prioritization of policy alternatives, streamlining the decision-making process by focusing on key dimensions deemed crucial to achieving policy objectives.

The decision-making process is also influenced by the non-compensatory dimension. According to this principle, alternatives that have very low values along certain important dimensions (such as the political dimension), but have higher values

along other dimensions (such as the economic or military dimension), will not be accepted. This process is referred to as "satisficing" rather than "maximizing" or "optimizing" since decisions regarding the acceptance or retention of alternatives (for the second stage) depend on their acceptability across specific dimensions rather than being judged based on all dimensions. The search for choices is also highly sensitive to order because the order in which different dimensions are considered (such as politics, military, economics, or strategy) affects the decision-making strategy and the choices that are ultimately chosen (Park, 2010). This is because the order in which dimensions are involved impacts both the decision strategy and the final choice.

The decision-making process is then simplified by leaders using cognitive shortcuts in the form of the five dimensions described above as they make choices. These shortcuts eliminate some potential solutions if they are not compatible with the cognitive capacities or perceptions of individual decision-makers (Mintz, 2005). This initial screening allows for efficient decision-making under pressure but raises concerns about possibly overlooking valuable options that are outside of the immediate focus.

Poliheuristic theory offers a perspective that places domestic politics at the core of decision-making processes (Brulé, 2005). According to this theory, when policymakers encounter foreign policy challenges, they are inclined to dismiss any potential actions that could have negative repercussions on their standing within domestic politics. The cautious attitude of individuals has transformed politics into a non-compensatory dimension. Policymakers, in their cautious approach, often dismiss any alternative that carries the possibility of risk, particularly in this specific aspect. This is the case even if the same alternative holds significant potential benefits in other aspects.

According to Mintz (2004), there are twelve indicators to avoid in domestic politics: (1) the prospect of electoral defeat, (2) a threat to the survival of a leader, (3) a significant decline in public support for a policy, (4) a significant decline in popularity, (5) domestic opposition, (6) a threat to regime survival, (7) intra-party rivalry and competition, (8) external challenges to the regime, (9) potential collapse of a coalition, government or regime, (10) threats to a leader's political power, dignity, honor or legitimacy, (11) demonstrations, riots, etc., and (12) the existence of a veto (e.g., parties in parliamentary systems) (Mintz, 2004: 7–9). These indicators serve as a comprehensive guide for leaders

to navigate the complex domestic political landscape, helping them anticipate potential challenges and strategize accordingly.

At the second stage of the policymaking process, the decision-makers evaluate about the potential benefits and losses by including a rational analysis of the various alternative options that are still available (Mintz & DeRouen, 2010: 78). This phase is characterized by the process of logical calculation decision-making. If in the first stage, there is a strong emphasis and priority on cognition it means that cognitive processes, such as thinking, understanding, and perceiving, take center stage. In the second stage, the emphasis on logical and reasoned calculations becomes the main focus of attention. During this phase, the leader carefully evaluates various options and makes decisions that focus on maximizing gains and minimizing losses.

Research Methodology

The method that this paper will use in reviewing this research is using qualitative methods. To collect research data, the author collects data and information by relying on literature studies in the form of books, journal articles, newspapers, and previous studies on research topics with the same theme.

Discussion

Changes in US Foreign Policy under Trump 2016 – 2020

During the Trump administration, United States foreign policy certainly cannot be separated from the economic benefits to be achieved. Trump does not want to cooperate with a country or organization if the United States does not benefit greatly from the cooperation. Trump stated that he would replace the outdated view of US foreign policy with a new vision that the primary focus is on prioritizing the welfare of the American populace and ensuring the security of the nation. He said America First would be the main theme in every policy taken by his administration: "My foreign policy will always put the interests of the American people and American security above all else. It has to be first. Has to be. America First will be the major and overriding theme of my administration." (The New York Times, 2016)

This attitude is consistent with what Trump expressed during the 2016 presidential campaign. Trump was extremely worried about the economy. He promised that the

economy would undergo significant transformations. Trump's objective is to strengthen the United States' position relative to all other nations, and he recognizes that strengthening the US economy is the key to achieving this objective and fulfilling his pledge to rebuild military power (Ross, 2017). As stated in the book National Security Strategy, Trump's policy, in this case, is toward a new path of foreign policy that places the needs of the American people and national security a higher priority. He stated, "As we rebuild America's strength and confidence at home, we are also restoring our strength and standing abroad." The new direction of the policy can be described in the following points (The White House, 2017):

1. Our objective is to protect and defend our way of life, enhance our economic well-being, ensure peace by being strong, and expand American influence globally.

2. The Trump administration maintains that economic security is an element of national security.

3. President Trump is enacting policies that accelerate job creation and bolster the economic foundation of the nation.

4. The phrase America First does not imply America alone but rather involves strengthening ties with nations that have similar values and interests to the United States, while collaboratively addressing radicalism and extremism.

5. President Trump is implementing a strategy of enhancing and reconstructing the United States' military capabilities to achieve peace. President George Washington once stated that being ready for war is one of the most efficient methods of maintaining peace (Vernon, 2023).

US Exit from International Regimes and Organizations

One of the most contentious aspects of Trump's foreign policy tenure was the strategic withdrawal of the United States from various international regimes and organizations. To comprehend the gravity of this move, it is essential to grasp the significance of international organizations and international regimes in the realm of global governance.

International organizations refer to collaborative entities formed by nations to address shared challenges, promote cooperation, and pursue common objectives on a global scale (Golia & Peters, 2020). The United Nations, World Health Organization, and

NATO are prominent examples. These organizations establish a framework for diplomatic interaction and policy coordination among member states. However, the effectiveness and appropriateness of policies formulated within these organizations are significantly influenced by the delineation of boundaries, encompassing geographic, legal, and jurisdictional limits that define the parameters within which member states operate.

International regimes, on the other hand, represent structured systems of rules, norms, and decision-making procedures within specific issue areas, such as trade, environment, or arms control. These regimes provide a framework for international cooperation, establishing shared expectations and guidelines (Benedict, 2015). The adherence to these norms forms a crucial boundary that shapes the contours of policy formulation within the respective issue area.

The controversy surrounding Trump's foreign policy decisions, particularly the exit from certain international organizations and regimes, underscores the intricate relationship between these entities and policy formulation. By disengaging from established international frameworks, the United States redefined its boundaries in the global arena. This repositioning had profound implications for the development and execution of foreign policies, as it altered the rules and expectations that traditionally guided diplomatic interactions.The emphasis on the boundaries of international organizations and regimes as integral parts of policy formulation becomes evident in such instances. These boundaries serve as the invisible scaffolding shaping the context and constraints within which nations navigate diplomatic negotiations and strategic decisions. As the global landscape continues to evolve, understanding and appreciating the role of these boundaries is pivotal for comprehending the dynamics of international relations and the consequences of decisions, such as the withdrawal from international regimes, on the geopolitical stage.

The international agreements and institutions from which the United States withdrew during Trump's administration encompass the Paris Agreement, TPP, UNESCO, UNHRC, and UNWRA. These will be further elaborated as follows:

1. Paris Agreement.

Declared in 2016, the Paris Agreement is an accord within the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) that addresses the reduction,

adaptation, and financing of greenhouse gas emissions. Representatives of 196 member states negotiated the agreement at the 21st Conference in Le Bourget, France, and it was finally approved by consensus on December 12, 2015. As of March 2019, 195 of the UNFCCC's members had signed the agreement, and 187 of them have ratified it (Phillips, 2015).

President Donald Trump announced the United States' withdrawal from the Paris Agreement in June of 2017. Under the terms of the agreement, November 2020 is the earliest date the United States may withdraw. In practice, the United States has enacted policy modifications that contradict the Paris Accord (Lipton, 2018). The withdrawal altered the dynamics of international cooperation on climate issues. The U.S. redefined its boundaries, impacting global expectations and commitments related to emissions reduction, adaptation, and financing.

2. Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP).

The Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) is a multilateral agreement on economic cooperation and investment in the Asia-Pacific region. It was negotiated by 12 countries, including Australia, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore, the United States, and Vietnam. The TPP is the largest agreement in the world. It covers 40% of the global economy and one-third of global trade. Its main goal is to make regional economic cooperation more dynamic, integrated, and competitive (Asian Trade Centre, 2017). Issues discussed within this collaborative effort encompass discussions on tariffs applicable to both goods and services, the protection of intellectual property rights, regulations about electronic commerce, labor policies, standards concerning environmental sustainability, and the establishment of protocols for resolving disputes (McBride et al., 2021).

As of the year 2018, the countries of Australia, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore, and Vietnam have all put their signatures on the agreement. The United States of America became a signatory to the agreement in the year 2016 while Barack Obama was still president (Office of the Press Secretary, 2016). On the other hand, President Trump signed a presidential memorandum to withdraw the United States from the TPP agreement on January 23, 2017, which took effect immediately (BBC News, 2017). The withdrawal reshaped the economic landscape, affecting discussions on tariffs, intellectual property, and other trade-related

issues. The U.S. decision to redefine its boundaries had ripple effects on the integrated and competitive goals of the TPP.

3. The United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC).

The United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC) is an organ of the United Nations with the primary objective of advancing and safeguarding human rights on a global scale. UNHRC investigates alleged violations of human rights in UN member states and addresses important thematic issues on human rights, such as the freedoms of association and assembly, expression, belief, and religion, among others. Additionally, the UNHRC prioritizes the rights of racial and ethnic minorities, women, and LGBT individuals (BBC NEWS, 2006). UNHRC was created by the United Nations General Assembly on March 15, 2006, as Resolution A/RES/60/251, to replace the United Nations Commission on Human Rights (International Justice Resource Center, 2011).

UNHRC consists of a total of 47 members who are elected to serve for three years. The selection of these members is made based on regional groupings. The allocation of member states is predicated upon regional representation, wherein 13 members originate from Africa, 13 from Asia-Pacific nations, 8 from Latin American and Caribbean nations, 7 from Western European nations, and 6 from Eastern European nations (OHCHR, 2022). On June 19, 2018, Nikki Haley, the US Ambassador to the United Nations, announced the withdrawal of the UNHRC (Koran, 2018). The U.S. withdrawal shifted boundaries in global human rights discussions, impacting the scrutiny of violations and the prioritization of specific rights. It reflected the U.S. redefining its role within the UNHRC framework.

4. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) was founded in Paris to promote worldwide collaboration in education, research, and culture. The main aim is to promote widespread recognition of justice, the rule of law, human rights, and the essential freedoms protected by the United Nations Charter (UNESCO, 2023). Additional objectives of the organization encompass the provision of high-quality education to all individuals and the promotion of lifelong learning. Furthermore, the organization aims to tackle social and ethical dilemmas, foster cultural diversity, and cultivate a culture of peace and inclusivity within a knowledge-based

society, achieved through the utilization of information and communication technologies (UNESCO General Conference, 2007).

UNESCO consists of a total of 195 member states and eight associate members. Its governance structure is composed of the General Conference and the Executive Board. The Secretariat, under the leadership of the Director-General, carries out the resolutions made by these two entities. UNESCO maintains a global presence through the establishment of over 50 field offices across various regions worldwide. The states that are parties to UNESCO consist of all United Nations member states, except for Liechtenstein, the United States, Israel, Cook Islands, Niue, and Palestine. The United States announced its withdrawal from UNESCO on December 31, 2018 (Lazaroff, 2018). The withdrawal altered the dynamics of global cultural and educational collaboration. The U.S. redefined its boundaries, affecting the organization's objectives related to justice, human rights, and cultural diversity.

5. The United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA).

The United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) was founded in December 1949 to provide aid and foster the socio-economic progress of Palestinian refugees. The definition of "refugee" as outlined by the UNRWA encompasses individuals of Palestinian origin who were displaced from their residences during the 1948 Palestine War, as well as those who experienced displacement during and after the 1967 Six-Day War, along with their descendants tracing their lineage through the male line (Dowty, 2012: 243). Originally, the primary objective of the agency was to offer employment opportunities through public projects and direct relief. However, UNRWA has since expanded its scope to encompass a wider range of assistance initiatives. These include provisions for education, healthcare, social services, infrastructure enhancement, microfinance aid, and emergency relief efforts, even during periods of armed conflict (Commissioner-General, 1999).

UNRWA relies predominantly on voluntary contributions provided by member states of the United Nations. UNRWA also obtains financial support from the general United Nations budget, primarily allocated to cover international personnel expenses. In August 2018, the United States terminated its role as a donor nation and ceased all financial contributions to the organization (DeYoung et al., 2018). The termination of

U.S. funding reshaped the boundaries of international assistance for Palestinian refugees, affecting their access to education, healthcare, and other essential services. It highlighted the interconnectedness between international organizations and the socio-economic well-being of displaced populations.

The Reason President Trump is Opting Out of International Organizations and Regimes

In this section, we will describe the process and stages of President Trump's foreign policy-making, focusing on the role of the United States in international regimes and organizations. Poliheuristic theory identifies two stages in this process; The first stage involves the use of non-compensatory, non-holistic, and satisficing dimensions, where policymakers consider policy alternatives based on the cognitive aspects of the individual policymaker.

The non-compensatory dimension is used to eliminate alternatives that are considered irrelevant, while the non-holistic dimension involves a cursory assessment of policy information. The satisficing dimension involves the elimination of alternatives that are "considered appropriate" without maximizing profits. In the poliheuristic model, policymakers can choose acceptable alternatives rather than maximizing all dimensions because not all dimensions are considered before the decision.

In the second stage, the decision maker weighs the gains and losses involving rational processing of the remaining alternatives. This stage corresponds to rational choice. If in the first stage cognitive is more important and prioritized, this second stage focuses on rational calculation calculations. In this stage, the policy will be chosen by the leader based on profit maximization and loss minimization.

According to Poliheuristic theory, the most fundamental step before making a decision is gathering information about the topic or issue in question. In this section, President Trump compiles data regarding U.S. participation in international regimes and organizations. President Trump implemented this policy by issuing two draft executive orders on January 25, 2017, entitled "Auditing and Reducing U.S. Funding for International Organizations and Moratorium on New Multilateral Treaties" (Fisher, 2017). Both contain executive orders to assess the United States' participation in international organizations. The President then has three alternative options: remain in

the international regimes and organizations unconditionally, remain but with renegotiation, or exit, which is processed in two stages, namely;

Stage One: Cognitive aspects or perceptions of individual policymakers

After information gathering produces policy alternatives, the process continues to the first stage, namely the use of non-compensatory, non-holistic, and satisficing dimensions based on the cognitive aspects or perceptions of individual policymakers. These dimensions greatly influence policymakers in eliminating policy alternatives. A policymaker will make decisions based on his/her beliefs and profiles or focus on information that leads to his/her profiles and beliefs.

Individuals simplify existing problems through their cognitive abilities by simplifying the choice of a decision to be taken from the available alternatives. Alternatives that are not under principles and beliefs will be ruled out, especially if the choice harms the country's domestic politics. To be able to understand the role of cognitive context and domestic politics in decision-making by President Trump can be described with three main points as follows;

1. America First as the realization of President Trump's political promise

America First represents President Trump's political agenda and campaign slogan, which emphasizes the prioritization of the United States' interests in its interactions with other nations. This strategy emphasizes the notion that the United States must prioritize its well-being when engaging with the international community. As Trump stated: "My foreign policy will always put the interests of the American people and American security above all else." By design, the "America First" policy emphasizes the nation's sovereignty as the primary compass for determining U.S. foreign policy (Crowley, 2016).

The principles of the "America First" approach exhibit several characteristics: (1) a voluntary withdrawal from global leadership; (2) increased reliance on unilateral actions; (3) reduced willingness to engage in cooperation through international agreements and multilateral institutions; (4) the pursuit of an isolationist policy, or one closely aligned with it, on specific international matters; (5) a more skeptical perspective on the importance of alliances for the United States; (6) a less critical stance towards authoritarian governments; (7) a less discerning approach to advocating and safeguarding certain universal values; (8) prioritization of bilateral trade balances and commercial

considerations over other foreign policy considerations; and (9) an implicit acceptance of the resurgence of 'might-makes-right' elements in the global order (Congressional Research Service, 2020). These characteristics collectively underscore a significant shift in the United States' foreign policy approach, reflecting a departure from traditional international engagement norms.

At this point, America First then becomes a heuristic point that Trump uses in deciding various foreign policies. Primarily regarding the assessment of whether a foreign policy such as cooperation with countries, regimes, and international institutions provides benefits to the United States as Trump interprets America First which will always prioritize the national interests of United States citizens above others. In this case, Trump will ignore various information that is not following this principle (Chong, 2020).

This approach reflects a non-compensatory, non-holistic, and satisficing dimension. Trump's "America First" principle acts as a non-compensatory heuristic. Alternatives not aligned with America First (e.g., prioritizing U.S. interests above all else) are immediately discarded, regardless of potential benefits. For example, consider the Iran nuclear deal. While alternative interpretations focused on its effectiveness in curbing nuclear proliferation, Trump's "America First" lens saw it as detrimental to U.S. economic competition and regional influence, leading to its swift withdrawal (Milutinović, 2023). This non-compensatory nature explains why seemingly beneficial partnerships or agreements get discarded if they don't align with Trump's narrow interpretation of U.S. interests.

The non-holistic described Trump simplifies decisions based on a limited set of information relevant to America First by simplifying choices based on predefined beliefs and profiles. Complexities and nuances might be overlooked. This "America First filter" prioritizes aspects like trade imbalances, military burden-sharing, and perceived threats to U.S. dominance. Issues like human rights, environmental concerns, or long-term geopolitical stability often fall outside this filter, potentially resulting in overlooking important nuances and unintended consequences (Fellmeth, 2017).

The satisficing dimension is evident when alternatives deemed to "fit" the America First principle are chosen without thorough consideration of all dimensions. Trump seeks a "good enough" solution that meets America First criteria, rather than maximizing all potential benefits. Instead of carefully weighing all options and maximizing benefits,

Trump uses the "satisficing" heuristic. He seeks solutions that meet the "America First" criteria without thoroughly exploring every potential benefit. This explains decisions such as imposing tariffs on allies without considering the broader economic impact or pursuing bilateral deals that offer immediate wins but lack long-term strategic cohesion (Oxford Analytica, 2018).

2. Support from President Trump's political parties.

President Trump is affiliated with the Republican Party. As the dominant political party with the highest number of members in the Senate, the support of the Republican party is certainly an advantage for the implementation of policies that will be decided by the president (The Guardian, 2018). This form of support can be seen from the high approval rating of the Republican Party for President Trump's leadership. Data in the Gallup Survey shows a summary of the approval rating of the Republican Party, which has consistently been above 70 percent from 2017 until October 2019 (GALLUP, 2022).

The data illustrates that Trump's policies received limited backing from the Independent Party, reaching just below 40 percent over three years, and the Democratic Party's support remained below 15 percent. Moreover, certain policies, like the United States' withdrawal from international organizations, garnered relatively low public support. For instance, when leaving the Paris Agreement, only 28 percent of respondents supported Trump's decision, while 59 percent opposed it (Clement & Dennis, 2017). Regarding the United States' decision to withdraw from United Nations (UN) entities such as UNESCO, UNHRC, and UNWRA, a 64 percent majority of Americans oppose the policy and want the United States to cooperate with UN agencies (Wittner, 2019). The high percentage rating of the Republican party's support then also becomes Trump's heuristic point. Trump tends to disregard alternative surveys gauging his overall support. He particularly overlooks surveys that reveal a negative correlation between support from the Republican party and other groups.

3. President Trump's powers as an executive body.

The President of the United States serves as the government's executive branch and holds the exclusive authority as the federal government's official representative for engaging with foreign governments on behalf of the country. This includes informing other nations of the United States' intentions regarding political commitments and international agreements (Mulligan, 2018).

There exist two instances in which the President of the United States has exercised his executive authority as the chief executive of the executive branch to withdraw the country from international treaties, either with or without the approval of Congress. These precedents include the court decision in the case of Goldwater v. Carter and the decision made by President George W. Bush in 2002 to unilaterally withdraw the United States from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (Scheffer, 1978). These examples represent heuristics because they enable swift action, aligning with Trump's preference for decisiveness and bypassing lengthy bureaucratic processes.

President Trump's cognitive processes are intricately shaped by three key factors above, namely the "America First" approach, support from his political party, and his executive powers. The "America First" principle functions as a heuristic, serving as a non-compensatory guide in decision-making. This heuristic prioritizes U.S. interests, leading to the swift dismissal of alternatives not aligned with this principle. However, it introduces a satisficing dimension, as decisions satisfying the "America First" criteria are chosen without exhaustive consideration of all dimensions.

The strong support from the Republican Party acts as another cognitive factor, functioning as a heuristic point for Trump. High approval ratings from Republicans become a guiding principle, potentially causing Trump to overlook alternative public opinions. This heuristic reliance on party support may contribute to disregarding dissenting voices and alternative perspectives.

President Trump's executive powers serve as a decisive heuristic in shaping cognitive processes. The ability to unilaterally withdraw from international agreements aligns with Trump's preference for swift action, bypassing bureaucratic processes. This executive authority becomes a cognitive shortcut, enabling Trump to implement policies without extensive deliberation or approval from other branches of government.

In the broader context of cognitive psychology, these factors significantly impact the evaluation and decision-making stages. Trump's cognitive processes are influenced by the overarching context of "America First," where decisions aligning with this principle take precedence. The heuristics involved, such as non-compensatory and satisficing dimensions, reveal a specific type of rationality focused on immediate benefits and adherence to predetermined principles.

In conclusion, the amalgamation of the "America First" approach, political party support, and executive authority intricately shapes the cognitive dimensions of the President. The implementation of foreign policy within the "America First" framework reflects a deliberate evaluation of the United States' position in international regimes and organizations. This strategic alignment underscores a conscious effort to redefine the nation's global role based on prioritized national interests.

Furthermore, the symbiotic relationship between political support and executive authority establishes the foundation for the President's legitimacy in policy execution. Drawing upon Mintz's 12 indicators of non-compensatory political loss aversion, the pursuit of campaign promises emerges as a deliberate, non-negotiable choice within the decision-making paradigm. This decision-making strategy, as illuminated by Mintz, indicates that Trump's adherence to campaign promises is chosen to mitigate potential risks to domestic politics and enhance his legitimacy as the President of the United States (Mintz, 2004). This mindset is conveyed in a communication presented by Trump in the document titled "America First, A Budget Blueprint to Make America Great Again", addressed to Congress on March 16, 2017 (The U.S. Government Publishing Office (GPO), 2017): "The American people elected me to fight for their priorities in Washington, D.C., and deliver on my promise to protect our Nation. I fully intend to keep that promise. Our aim is to meet the simple, a government that puts the needs of its own people first."

In this statement, President Trump stated his strong commitment to preserving the promises he has made to the citizens of the United States of America throughout his tenure as president. He emphasized the need for a government that prioritizes the interests of its citizens and aims to enable Americans to achieve their dreams, ushering in a new era of American greatness. Trump advocated for reducing foreign aid to shift resources towards the security and well-being of Americans while calling on other countries to take greater responsibility in the face of global challenges.

Consequently, the option of remaining aligned with the regime and international organizations is ruled out at this point, leaving only the choice between continuing with the negotiations or opting to withdraw.

Stage Two: Rational Choice and Calculation

In the second stage, decision-makers will employ rational analysis to weigh both the benefits and disadvantages of the remaining alternatives. Policymakers will perform rational calculations. In this stage, the policy that the leader will choose is based on maximizing the benefits and minimizing the losses of the remaining choices, namely the alternative of continuing to join the renegotiation and the alternative of leaving.

President Trump then evaluated the remaining alternatives for five international organizations, including the Paris Agreement, TPP, UNHRC, UNESCO, and UNRWA. In general, the analysis was based on a variety of official sources, including statements, annual reports, and press briefings issued by President Trump and administration officials. Briefly, the results of the analysis can be described in the following table:

Table 1 - Analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of the United States exiting International Regimes and Organizations.

Regime or International Organization	Advantages	Disadvantages
Paris Agreement	(1) Contribute to global climate change by reducing temperatures by 2/10 of 1°C by 2100 (Trump White House Archived, 2017)	(1) It will burden the domestic industry if the policy of reducing emissions is implemented while the US economy is sluggish (Dennis, 2019). (2) With a \$3 million commitment, the United States was the Green Climate Fund's largest donor (Sengupta et al., 2017).
TPP	(1) The US is part of the world's largest free trade ecosystem (Goodman & Remler, 2017). (2) Will increase exports by removing 18,000 tariffs imposed by other countries on products exported from the United States (Amadeo, 2016).	(1) There is no significant loss because the agreement has not been ratified. (2) Trump sees the losses as mostly being felt by US domestic workers. The free market creates unfairness in terms of wages. Other countries can produce products cheaply because of cheap labor. Meanwhile, in America, wages for workers are quite high (Wolf, 2017). (3) If the US can reach a "substantially better" arrangement, the accord will be reconsidered (Pramuk, 2018)
UNHRC	(1) Advocating for the principles of democracy, liberty, and the protection of human rights (C-SPAN, 2018).	(1) As the largest donor, it became a financial burden with a contribution of \$20 million in 2017 (TOI Staff, 2018). (2) Reform demands not met (Reuters, 2018).

		(3) Resulting in a policy that is biased against Israel (BBC, 2018).
UNESCO	(1) Advocate for the advancement of culture and education. (2) Having a world heritage site program aimed at tourism and creating pride for local residents. This program also supports the cultural sector in the US cities (U.S. Department of State, 2018).	(1) As the largest donor, a financial burden with arrears since 2011 of $600 million (Rosenberg & Morello, 2017). (2) Issue policies that are biased against Israel (Post, 2019).
UNRWA	(1) Promoting the United States' value of generosity and contributing to stability in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict (Bureau of Public Affairs, 2016).	(1) As the largest donor, a financial burden of $200 million in 2018 (DeYoung & Balousha, 2018). (2) Reform demands are not met (Sheva, 2018).

In President Trump's strategic decisions to withdraw from various international organizations, a comprehensive analysis reveals a dual-layered rationale. At the core of this decision-making process is a deliberate and rational evaluation with a predominant emphasis on economic considerations.

The Paris Agreement withdrawal, for instance, was primarily rooted in the perceived threat to domestic industries during economic downturns if stringent emission reduction policies were enforced. Trump's economic reasoning pivoted on shielding the domestic industry from potential adverse effects, aligning with his commitment to safeguarding national economic interests.

Similarly, the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) withdrawal showcased Trump's concern for domestic workers, highlighting the perceived unfairness in wages due to cheaper labor abroad. This decision underscored a commitment to rectifying what Trump perceived as imbalances in international trade practices, prioritizing the protection of U.S. workers' interests.

The UN Human Rights Council (UNHRC) withdrawal demonstrated a nuanced cost-benefit analysis, weighing the financial burden of being the largest donor against unmet reform demands and a perceived bias against Israel. Economic considerations played a pivotal role in assessing the overall impact on U.S. interests, guiding the decision to withdraw.

The withdrawal from UNESCO involved an economic assessment, considering the financial burden stemming from arrears since 2011 alongside the perceived bias against Israel. The decision-making process meticulously weighed the costs against potential cultural and educational advocacy benefits.

In the case of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), economic considerations, including the financial burden of being the largest donor and unmet reform demands, marked the decision. The evaluation strategically assessed economic costs against perceived contributions to stability in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

In summary, President Trump's rational decision-making process emphasized economic considerations as a central tenet. Each withdrawal was shaped by a careful analysis of the economic impact on domestic industries, financial burdens, and perceived unfairness or bias in international agreements and organizations. This commitment was driven by a strategic evaluation of advancing U.S. interests on the global stage.

Additionally, the explanation in the table suggests that Trump's choice of alternative exit options in the second stage stemmed from two underlying reasons. Firstly, the failure of the United States' demands for renegotiation and reform within these organizations led to the dismissal of the alternative option of continuing to join with renegotiation. Secondly, Trump opted for the alternative of leaving these organizations because he believed that the element of loss would be greater if the option of staying joined was chosen. This perception was grounded in Trump's assessment that continued membership would impose a significant financial burden on the nation's budget, particularly as the primary contributor to these organizations.

Conclusion

The application of the Poliheuristic theory offers valuable insights into Donald Trump's policy of withdrawing from various regimes and international organizations. The theory employs a two-stage analysis, combining cognitive aspects and rational calculations to yield clear answers.

In the first stage, three choices for US foreign policy towards international regimes and organizations are considered: staying in, staying in with renegotiation, or leaving. The cognitive dimension of President Trump, as exemplified by his "America First" perspective, holds significant importance when assessing the United States' involvement in international entities like the Paris Agreement, TPP, UNESCO, UNHRC, and UNWRA. America First is a campaign pledge that will always prioritize the needs of the United States above those of other countries. Realizing "America First" is a form of policy

that could be advantageous for Trump in maintaining his position as president because it would have no negative effect on domestic politics. In addition, Trump has the full support of his party, the Republican Party, and has strong constitutional authority to carry out his policies.

Given this cognitive framework, the option of staying in is eliminated as it conflicts with the "America First" principle. Instead, the focus shifts to the rational analysis of gains and losses related to the remaining alternatives: renegotiation and exit.

During the second phase, decision-making involves a rational calculation to maximize gains and minimize losses. Despite being considered, further renegotiation is discarded as the demands placed by the United States on these organizations were not met.

Consequently, leaving international organizations emerges as the most rational choice to uphold the "America First" policy and prioritize American interests. This decision directly reduces the influence of the United States in global affairs but serves Trump's objective of minimizing policy losses and reducing the financial burden incurred by the five regimes and organizations.

References

Amadeo, K. (2016). *Trans-Pacific Partnership: Pros, Cons, Obstacles*. The Balance. https://www.thebalance.com/what-is-the-trans-pacific-partnership-3305581

Asian Trade Centre. (2017). *Market Access for Goods in TPP11*. Asian Trade Centre. https://asiantradecentre.org/talkingtrade//o21f8fxzvhcao7qdsx0crhpzf8wos2

BBC. (2018). *US quits "biased" UN human rights council - BBC News*. www.bbc.com/news/44537372

BBC News. (2017). *Trump executive order pulls out of TPP trade deal*. BBC News. https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-38721056

BBC NEWS. (2006). *UN creates new human rights body*. BBC NEWS. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/4810538.stm

Benedict, K. (2015). Global Governance. *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences: Second Edition*, 155–161. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.75018-5

Brulé, D. J. (2005). Explaining and Forecasting Leaders' Decisions: A Poliheuristic Analysis of the Iran Hostage Rescue Decision. *International Studies Perspectives*, *6*(1), 99–113.

Bureau of Public Affairs. (2016). Framework for Cooperation Between the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East and the United States of America for 2017. In *U.S. State Department of State*.

C-SPAN. (2018). *U.S. Withdrawal from U.N. Human Rights Council | C-SPAN.org*. C-SPAN. https://www.c-span.org/video/?447326-1/us-withdrawal-un-human-rights-

council

Chong, J. (2020). *President Trump Believes He Has Absolute Rights - The Atlantic*. The Atlantic. https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2020/02/president-trump-absolute-rights/607168/

Clement, S., & Dennis, B. (2017). *Post-ABC poll: Nearly 6 in 10 oppose Trump scrapping Paris agreement*. The Washington Post. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/06/05/post-abc-poll-nearly-6-in-10-oppose-trump-scrapping-paris-agreement/

Commissioner-General, U. – A. report of the. (1999). *Report of the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East 1 July 1998-30 June 1999*.

Congressional Research Service. (2020). *U.S. Role in the World: Background and Issues for Congress*.

Crowley, S. (2016). *Transcript: Donald Trump's Foreign Policy Speech - The New York Times*. The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/28/us/politics/transcript-trump-foreign-policy.html

Dennis, B. (2019). *President Trump says United States will officially withdraw from Paris climate agreement - The Washington Post*. The Washington Post. https://www.washingtonpost.com/climate-environment/2019/11/04/trump-makes-it-official-us-will-withdraw-paris-climate-accord/

DeYoung, K., & Balousha, H. (2018). *Trump to stop funding UNRWA for Palestinians - The Washington Post*. The Washington Post. https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/middle_east/us-aid-cuts-wont-end-the-right-of-return-palestinians-say/2018/08/31/8e3f25b4-ad0c-11e8-8a0c-70b618c98d3c_story.html?noredirect=on&utm_term=.534d864e264d

DeYoung, K., Eglash, R., & Balousha, H. (2018). *Trump to stop funding UNRWA for Palestinians - The Washington Post*. The Washington Post. https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/middle_east/us-aid-cuts-wont-end-the-right-of-return-palestinians-say/2018/08/31/8e3f25b4-ad0c-11e8-8a0c-70b618c98d3c_story.html

Dowty, A. (2012). *Israel / Palestine*. Wiley.

Fellmeth, A. (2017). Viewpoints: Why "America First" is so dangerous. *Azcentral*.

Fisher, M. (2017). *Trump Prepares Orders Aiming at Global Funding and Treaties*. New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/25/us/politics/united-nations-trump-administration.html

Gallup. (2022). Presidential Approval Ratings -- Donald Trump. In *Gallup*.

Gardner, H. (2018). *World War Trump: The Risks of America's New Nationalism*. Prometheus Books.

Geva, N., & Mintz, A. (1997). *Decisionmaking on War and Peace: The Cognitive-rational Debate*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Golia, A., & Peters, A. (2020). The Concept of International Organization. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3659012

Goodman, M. P., & Remler, D. (2017). *President Trump Fulfills Day 1 Promise to Abandon TPP*.

International Justice Resource Center. (2011). *UN Human Rights Council*. International Justice Resource Center. https://ijrcenter.org/un-human-rights-council/

Koran, L. (2018). *US leaving UN Human Rights Council -- "a cesspool of political bias."*

CNN Politics. https://edition.cnn.com/2018/06/19/politics/haley-pompeo-human-rights-bias/index.html

Lazaroff, T. (2018). *Israel, U.S. slated to leave UNESCO today to protest anti-Israel bias*. The Jerusalem Post. https://www.jpost.com/international/israel-us-slated-to-leave-unesco-today-to-protest-anti-israel-bias-575875

Lipton, E. (2018). *As Trump Dismantles Clean Air Rules, an Industry Lawyer Delivers for Ex-Clients*. The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/19/us/politics/epa-coal-emissions-standards-william-wehrum.html

McBride, J., Chatzky, A., & Siripurapu, A. (2021). *What's Next for the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP)?* Council on Foreign Relations. https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/what-trans-pacific-partnership-tpp

Mills, D. Q., & Rosefielde, S. (2017). *The Trump Phenomenon and the Future of US Foreign Policy*. World Scientific.

Milutinović, P. (2023). The Iran Nuclear Agreement as a Reflection of Disagreements in the Transatlantic Relations during the Administration of the American President Donald Trump. *Politička Revija*, *76*, 189–217. https://doi.org/10.5937/pr76-43701

Mintz, A. (1993). The Decision to Attack Iraq: A Noncompensatory Theory of Decision Making. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *37*(4), 595–618.

Mintz, A. (2004). How Do Leaders Make Decisions?: A Poliheuristic Perspective. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *48*(1), 3–13.

Mintz, A. (2005). Applied Decision Analysis: Utilizing Poliheuristic Theory to Explain and Predict Foreign Policy and National Security Decisions. *International Studies Perspectives*, *6*(1), 94–98.

Mintz, A., & DeRouen, K. (2010). Understanding foreign policy: Decision making. In *Understanding Foreign Policy: Decision Making*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511757761

Mulligan, S. P. (2018). *Withdrawal from International Agreements: Legal Framework, the Paris Agreement, and the Iran Nuclear Agreement*.

Office of the Press Secretary. (2016). *Statement by the President on the Signing of the Trans-Pacific Partnership*. Obamawhitehouse.Archives.Gov. https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2016/02/03/statement-president-signing-trans-pacific-partnership

OHCHR. (2022). *Membership of the Human Rights Council*. OHCHR. https://www.ohchr.org/en/hr-bodies/hrc/membership

Oxford Analytica. (2018). US tariffs will test trade alliances and architecture. *Emerald Expert Briefings*, *oxan-db*(oxan-db). https://doi.org/10.1108/OXAN-DB235495

Park, J. G. (2010). *Poliheuristic Theory and Alliance Dependence: Understanding Military Coalitions*.

Phillips, S. (2015). *Paris climate deal: Historic climate change agreement reached at COP21*. ABC News. https://www.abc.net.au/news/2015-12-12/world-adopts-climate-deal-at-paris-talks/7023712

Post, B. (2019). *US and Israel exit Unesco, claiming bias*. https://www.bangkokpost.com/world/1603790/us-and-israel-exit-unesco-claiming-bias

Pramuk, J. (2018). *Trump says he would reconsider Trans-Pacific Partnership trade deal*. https://www.cnbc.com/2018/01/25/trump-says-he-would-reconsider-trans-pacific-partnership-trade-deal.html

Rachmat Yuliantoro, N., Prabandari, A., & Agussalim, D. (2017). Pemilihan Presiden Tahun 2016 dan Politik Luar Negeri Amerika Serikat. *Jurnal Hubungan Internasional*, *5*(2), 193–209. https://doi.org/10.18196/HI.5297

Reuters. (2018). *US expected to quit UN human rights panel over perceived anti-Israel bias / United Nations*. The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/jun/16/us-washington-nikki-haley-human-right-council-israel

Rosenberg, E., & Morello, C. (2017). *U.S. withdraws from UNESCO, the U.N.'s cultural organization, citing anti-Israel bias - The Washington Post*. The Washington Post. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-nation/wp/2017/10/12/u-s-withdraws-from-unesco-the-u-n-s-cultural-organization-citing-anti-israel-bias/

Ross, J. (2017). *Economic logic behind Trump's foreign policy - the key countries are Germany &China - Learning from China*. https://learningfromchina.net/economic-logic-behind-trumps-foreign-policy-the-key-countries-are-germany-china/

Scheffer, D. J. (1978). The Law of Treaty Termination as Applied to the United States Derecognition of the Republic of China. *Harvard International Law Journal*, *19*, 931.

Secretary, T. W. H. O. of the P. (2016). *FACT SHEET: President Obama's Commitment to Global Development /*. Whitehouse.Gov. https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2016/07/20/fact-sheet-president-obamas-commitment-global-development

Sengupta, S., Eddy, M., Buckley, C., & Rubin, A. J. (2017). *As Trump Exits Paris Agreement, Other Nations Are Defiant - The New York Times*. NYTimes. https://www.nytimes.com/2017/06/01/world/europe/climate-paris-agreement-trump-china.html

Sheva, A. (2018). *UNRWA head: U.S. cut was for diplomatic reasons / ערוץ 7*. https://www.israelnationalnews.com/news/240923

The Guardian. (2018). *How did the Republicans win the Senate when the Democrats got millions more votes? / South China Morning Post*. South China Morning Post. https://www.scmp.com/news/world/united-states-canada/article/2172431/how-did-republicans-win-senate-when-democrats-got

The New York Times. (2016). *Transcript: Donald Trump's Foreign Policy Speech*. https://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/28/us/politics/transcript-trump-foreign-policy.html

The U.S. Government Publishing Office (GPO). (2017). *America First A Budget Blueprint to Make America Great Again*.

The White House. (2017). *National Security Strategy of the United States of America*.

TOI Staff. (2018). *Having pulled out of UNHRC, Bolton says US will now cut its funding / The Times of Israel*. The Times of Israel. https://www.timesofisrael.com/having-pulled-out-of-unhrc-bolton-says-us-will-now-cut-its-funding/

Trump White House Archived. (2017). *President Trump Makes a Statement Regarding the Paris Accord - YouTube*. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G3wE7MO1uSw

U.S. Department of State. (2018). Department Press Briefing - March 8, 2017. In *YouTube*.

UNESCO. (2023). *UNESCO in brief*. UNESCO. https://www.unesco.org/en/brief

UNESCO General Conference. (2007). *Medium-term Strategy, 2008-2013 - UNESCO Digital Library*.

Vernon, M. (2023). *State of the Union Address George Washington's Mount Vernon*. State of the Union Address. https://www.mountvernon.org/education/primary-sources/state-of-the-union-address/

Wardhana, A., & Dugis, V. (2019). Grand Strategy Isolasionisme Selektif : Kebijakan Luar Negeri Amerika Serikat di Era Trump. *Jurnal Global & Strategis*, *13*, 141. https://doi.org/10.20473/jgs.13.2.2019.141-156

Wittner, L. S. (2019). *Most Americans Actually Reject Trump's "America First" Policy*. FPIF. https://fpif.org/most-americans-actually-reject-trumps-america-first-policy/

Wolf, C. D. (2017). *Labor Unions Applaud Trump for Withdrawing from TPP*. Insidesources. https://insidesources.com/unions-applaud-trump-withdrawing-tpp/