

# JIM HOAGLAND

Contributing Editor, The Washington Post

## Sean CLEARY

Thank you very much. Right, you have heard three interesting perspectives across the European landscape. Jim Hoagland is here, with two hats on, I think. One is that he is an extremely knowledgeable commentator on the world at large, and has wide experience of the European space. He is also a US citizen, who operates out of Washington DC and has a perspective on the world that has been changed quite considerably by Mr Trump's election and a new focus on issues pertaining to migration in the United States as well. Jim, your view.

## Jim HOAGLAND

Sean, I will gladly accept your invitation to put my hand on a very hot stove and see how long I can keep it there. That is what discussing migration and populism today is. I think it is necessary after having heard our friends from Central Europe, to ask a subsequent question: is populism an effective answer to the problems of migration and the other aspects of globalisation to which we are seeing a backlash, both in Europe and the United States? Let us think about what globalisation has been. It has been the movement of capital, goods, ideas and yes, of people, across frontiers. The migration piece of it, the people part of it, since 2011 has been the most controversial part. By some estimates, in the period since World War II we had more people moving across borders, being displaced, being moved than we have had in recent history, for diverse causes as you all well know. The causes include poverty, war, economic advancement, climate change and increasingly a growing population imbalance that has not been noticed very much, but that we need to pay attention to, being driven by demographic forces. This is occurring at the same time as the upheaval in communications and the social media revolution, which occurs at two levels. Through social media, we get to know more about other places, other countries. We get visions of a land where things can be very different for us and that sets people on the move. There is also a political effect that we have seen in the United States, and that we have seen in Europe as well. That is, through social media, people can directly mobilise people. You can turn politics, you can turn government into a kind of plebiscite which is one step away, as we have seen in the United States, from an invitation to mob rule. Migration comes to us both as a result and a cause of the fundamental and economic change that is occurring but is poorly understood. There is a belief by my President and other leaders, that you can resolve these problems essentially through political means. I think that is a misreading of the nature of the change and in that singular personality that he has, Donald J. Trump has once again identified a problem that he then makes worse, a lot worse. He has comrades in arms in Europe as well.

I want to single out what the next stage of the economic revolution that Donald Trump sees, that he has embarked on. A year ago, we talked very much about how Mr Trump defines relations with other countries on the basis of a misunderstanding of trade deficits and how trade actually works. It has become clear quite recently to me that the Trump administration is in fact embarked on an effort to destroy the global supply chain that has fed so much of globalisation, that has played such an important role in lifting billions of people out of poverty. This is allied to the Trump administration's efforts to destroy the WTO. If there is one thing that we could point at, or several things we could point at that would talk about the efficacy of global governance, I would nominate the global supply chain and WTO. However, the United States, or at least this administration, is determined to dismantle as much of those planks of global governance as it can. Unfortunately, we are likely to wind up with a much more chaotic world as a result.

The migration pressures that we have seen have driven populist victories, but I am not sure we have seen populism and populist parties come up with solutions to the pressures that created their victories. It has produced an unhealthy change in my country in the kind of debate that makes many people think that Trump follows a divide and rule strategy when it comes to dealing with the American people. We have heard a description here today. A little bit of the tensions that exist in Europe between Western European and Central European countries and these are divisions that are not good for the EU and they go into the national fabric of so many countries.

I want to touch briefly on the demographic factors that will cast quite a dark shadow in the future unless we take some actions to deal with them. It is well known that population growth in Russia and in Europe has stabilised, that is a



euphemistic way of saying that in fact native -born population has been shrinking. In Europe that is because of the fertility rate, in Russia largely because of life-expectancy declines and an appalling healthcare situation. Now we have in the United States quite recently, a new trend of a drop in fertility rates among native-born Americans. The causes are not quite clear yet, but this could add to the kind of pressures that we are going to see in Europe, particularly coming from Africa. I was interested in doing a little research for this speech, to see how controversial a subject population growth is. There are few studies on population growth and they are very carefully written. President Macron of France discovered the same thing recently, discovered how sensitive this subject is when last year he was seen to be wagging his finger by suggesting that African women chose to have seven or eight children rather than to get graduate degrees. This was announced at a minimum as inelegant and at a maximum as somewhat racist. However, it is a looming reality for Europe that Africa poses a population bomb, because of the combination of poverty. Of the 25 countries with the highest total fertility rates, 23 are in Africa. Africa's population will triple between 2000 and 2050, going from roughly 800 million to roughly 2.4 billion, and most of those people, the large majority, will be living on less than USD 2 a day. Africa is also urbanising quite rapidly.

The pressures of today will seem small compared to the pressures of tomorrow, unless we begin to take action to prevent the new migration waves that are likely to come, particularly from Africa and the Middle East, where strife is still apparent. The combined effect of these changes, including the social media, is the political polarisation. We need to begin to construct media literacy as a component of civil education, to make people understand what they can and cannot trust on social media. That is just part of the problem that our generations face. One of the pleasures of being a journalist is that you occasionally, actually quite frequently, get to talk to very smart people, and particularly in politics. One of the things I have noticed over the years in talking to people like Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, Margaret Thatcher, Giorgio Napolitano and others, was the emphasis they put to me on how my generation and the generations that are coming after, were essentially untested. We had not lived through the Great Depression. We had not really been involved in World War II and we had not proven ourselves. Here is the chance to do that now, I think. This is the generation that will have to reinvent, or at least redesign democracy, taking into account the pressures of a world in constant movement now and connected in ways that are both good and bad. Sean, I will conclude there.