Editorial

International Politics Reviews (2016) 4, 43–44. doi:10.1057/s41312-016-0019-8;
published online 21 December 2016

The 2016 U.S. presidential election is over, but we now have to live with the aftermath. This has been an extraordinary election season and not in a good way. To the extent that issues have been part of the campaign, foreign policy has featured more than many of us, including me, would have expected. A series of terrorist attacks over the course of the year brought foreign policy to the fore in ways that made it seem as if the world was doing everything possible to make it tough sledding for Barack Obama's would-be successor Hillary Clinton. Of course, her ultimate opponent's lack of experience somewhat neutralized what might have been a traditional source of advantage for Republican candidates.

The – to put it mildly – unconventional GOP candidate Donald Trump railed against free trade and America's historic alliances including NATO. In so doing, he laid siege to many of the animating tenets of his party. In a bizarre turn of events, the Trump campaign cozied up to Russia, which sought to insert itself in an unprecedented way in the US electoral process. Russian hackers penetrated the email accounts of the Democratic Party and senior political operatives and made those leaked emails accessible to the radical anarchist group Wikileaks. This barely scratches the surface of an election season characterized by Donald Trump's heaving bluster of intemperate attacks on rivals, Mexicans, Muslims, women,

the media, the foundations of American democracy, and more.

Altogether, this electoral season was anxiety inducing, and I write with the relief (or at least expectation) that it is now mercifully over. Given the result and the nature of the transition, I find one form of anxiety merely to have replaced another. The sources that gave rise to such a deep well of popular sentiment that fed the rise of Trumpism remain – the hostility to elites and mainstream media, economic dislocation in areas that once had health manufacturing centers, the opioid epidemic, the changing demographic landscape of America that has discombobulated some white Americans. Other sources of anxiety also are with us for the foreseeable future such as the diffuse threat posed by terrorism in a war without end and the rise of new global health emergencies and problems like climate change.

In this context of an incredible election, literally one suffuse with moments you would not believe, we bring you this issue of the journal. The issue features reviews and discussion that speak to many of the issues raised in the recent campaign. Rick LaVere reminds us the outcome of another important election was a harbinger of the US election, that is Brexit, the 2016 British referendum on the European Union. Months later, LaVere writes that the UK can maintain its influence and relationship with the US by a

parallel pivot to Asia and an effort to expand its military capabilities.

While Donald Trump was casually dismissive of the importance of historic military alliances like NATO, James Sperling and Mark Webber reflect on the importance of NATO and common security efforts in wider European politics. In their reviews of Stephanie Hofmann's book, Sperling and Webber assess the sources of support for multilateral cooperation in the security sphere and the extent to which they share Hofmann's perspective on the importance of ideology. For his part, Marjan Ajeviski in his article speaks to the wider challenges of legitimization that the global order faces as the system of global governance evolves, and he urges us to reassess the foundational assumptions upon which it is built.

Language, foul and crude language, was at the heart of this recent election season. Ron Krebs' book speaks to the importance of rhetoric in the making of US national security. He argues that crisis moments like 9/11 do not select specific interpretations and require agency by actors to interpret their significance. When presidents take advantage of unsettled moments in dominant foreign policy narratives, they have tremendous power to re-shape how the environment is understood, America's role in the world, and what should be done. Donald Trump's lasting influence on the dominant narrative remains to be seen.

The exchange on Adia Benton's book on Liberia and HIV/AIDS takes on a different valence in light of the Ebola and Zika crises. Public health emergencies now have a higher salience in international politics than they once did, motivating transnational responses in the name of global public goods but often with idiosyncratic impacts and importance in specific places. Benton brings an ethnographic lens to the experience of foreign aid recipients, reminding international audiences of the performative aspects of people who receive global health money, the conditions under which they appear worthy of assistance and the extent to which international actors know what they are doing.

While the Zika virus played almost no role in the recent presidential election, the issues Benton and her reviewers discuss will likely remain salient as the next president assumes office.

For his part, Micah Zenko's book *Red Team*, reviewed by Michael Horowitz, identifies a strategy that governments, companies, and other actors increasingly are deploying to stress test their operations by creating a group that seeks to simulate the thought process of adversaries. While this has great relevance for actors facing antagonists with purposive intent, other approaches like scenario analysis may be more appropriate for diseases and environmental change that may arise without being deliberately employed by human beings.

I end this review where I started, on the topic of elections. This issue includes an essay on youth participation in politics by Ana Isabel Pontes and collaborators. Young people in the United States are a difficult group to motivate and mobilize, but they also have served to buoy the political aspirations and careers of Barack Obama and Bernie Sanders. The challenges of youth political engagement are not confined to the United States, and concerns about youth participation go beyond apathy to alienation and the potential attraction by young people to violence. In this election season in which demagogues like Donald Trump have encouraged supporters to violence, Pontes' research helps us better understand how these processes of political engagement work and could work better. Before the election, I wrote this final line "Let us hope this election signals a turn towards decency and the light rather than away from it." Now that we have instead embraced darkness, it is difficult to derive a source of optimism other than maybe it won't be as bad as feared.

Joshua Busby
LBJ School of Public Affairs,
University of Texas, Austin, USA.
E-mail: busbyj@utexas.edu