

Donald Trump's election to the White House, as it is known, has surprised many political analysts. And it is by now well-known, as the Nobel prize winner of the Literature Mario Vargas Llosa has also underlined, that, because of a world trend, the populist movements are enjoying increasing popularity: according to Vargas Llosa, in fact, first Brexit, then the election of Trump (which could be followed by the election of Marie Le Pen to the Eliseo) are that epiphenomena of the populist wind, that strong coil in the whole West. In what form, nevertheless, this wind will take root in Latin America, considered by most, as the most fertile land to foster this populist phenomena, is not clear yet.

There is no doubt that the arrival of Trump to the Presidency of the United States has aroused some perplexities in the Latin-American ruling classes. The Us President, in fact, has conducted a hard and severe electoral campaign against Latin immigration in the States: one does not forget, for instance, his proposal to build a wall along the border between United States and Mexico. A border whose porosity has been, during the years, a theatre of many illegal passages (both of people and of goods), brought to light some years ago also in the film 'Traffic' (2000, directed by Steven Soderbergh). Of the same nature are the observations made by Trump, still candidate to the Presidency of the Usa, toward the international politics held by Obama towards Latin America, in particular the way in which the Us reproached Castrist Cuba.

Today the American electoral campaign ended, Trump won, Fidel Castro is dead and the future of the inter-American relationships appears pretty uncertain. Two certainties, however, can serve as prop. The first, evident: unless a huge Us economic effort, the gigantic wall between Mexico and United States won't be erected. It is more probable, rather, that a great presence of the American police is anticipated to garrison the border. As for Cuba, the trial started by Obama is hardly reversing. The total embargo toward the island, won't be proposed in short. Very probably there will be a deceleration (or straight an arrest) of the process of amplification of the relationships Usa / Cuba. It is reasonable, therefore, that how much Trump said during the electoral campaign won't be realized to the letter.

Always in sight of possible future projections, it can be useful to remember some events of the recent past. As it happened for that of George W. Bush jr., the international agenda of Trump would be able to ignore on Latin America and on the inter-American relationships. The newly elected President, as well as his republican predecessor, seems to have a preference for other arenas, what Russia, the extreme and the Middle East¹. This would not be without consequences for the Latin American politics.

A similar approach, in fact, could cause (as it is happened in the first years of this century) a new wave of Latin American populism that feed themselves whit some anti-American rhetoric and practices: one can to think about the season, intervened among 2001 and 2008, in which at the top there were political exponents such as Hugo Chávez in Venezuela, Age Morales in Bolivia, Néstor and Cristina Kirchner in Argentina, Daniel Ortega in Nicaragua or Luiz Inácio Lula from Silva in Brazil. In those case, the perception not to be to the centre of the foreign politics of the administration of Bush jr. was clean for Latin American Stats. Well, the absence of the strategic leader of the hemisphere, the United States, lent the side to a new floruit of sub-regional guides: the Brazilian case and the Venezuelan case are two paradigmatic examples. The last, particularly, also exploiting the proceeds from the sale of the oil whose price to the barrel in that years exceed broadly the roof of the 100 Us \$, was conclusive for the construction of a strong alliance of the anti-American rhetoric, for a long time very rooted in the political culture in the South America.

1 In the case of J. Bush jr., this program was due also to the not expected attack of 9/11.

The risk is, today, that experiences as those can be repeated; that is, the anti-Americanism returns to be a cultural tool and used by government for addressing the strategies of the foreign politics of the Latin American countries; that, in short, ancient jealousies are waked up again, mechanisms of revenge and retaliation.

During the XX Century history, the anti-Americanism is manifested in different forms in the Latin American sub-continent. Neither, in the time, its rhetorical power seems to be him redoubt.

For some aspects, the strongly evocative image of the U.S. citizen interested only to exploit the sources, the goods and Latin American primary products for 'to make business' is still very strong in the society and in the culture of Latin America: these are, for instance, the ideas that have given sap to the works of the Uruguayan writer Eduardo Galeano or that they still inspire the songs of the Calle 13, very successful musical group in Latin America. An imaginary, this, that the figure of the future State Secretary, Rex W. Tillerson, can hardly eradicate. Rather, it could be fortified by his recent past, as Ceo, in the oil company Exxon Mobil, firm that historically has had interests in Latin America and continue to have interest by now in Mexico and in Venezuela (here, in 2014, this company has won an arbitration against the central State for the expropriations of the 2007).

If, the electoral campaign climate fed by Trump till now, won't leave in short, space to a foreign political strategy able to gather the specificities of Latin America, we could be in the middle of a real *déjà-vu*: Latin American populism, that have given voice, in the years, to the anti-American rhetoric and that was defeated by the last electoral consultations, would be able to awaken finding again of Latin America their ideal crib.