

Mr. Trump and Europe. How Would Trump Reshape EU Policies?

By [Peter Koenig](#)

Global Research, December 01, 2016

Region: [Europe, USA](#)

In-depth Report: [U.S. Elections](#)

Since this interview was given, an important event happened, important for world history. Fidel Castro died on 25 November, at the age of 90 (1926 – 2016).

Comandante Castro, a lawyer by education, with a true sense of justice for humanity, has led a Revolution in his native Cuba to free his people from a brutal dictator, murderer and of course, what else, a puppet of the United States, Fulgencio Batista.

Fidel has essentially freed Cuba from 500 years of colonialism. Fidel has defied Washington's multiple attempts to oust him, and more than 600 US secret service attempts to kill him. His Revolution has withstood a brutal, illegal, international blockade, initiated and also brutally enforced by Washington with sanctions against any country in the world that wouldn't follow the embargo dictate of the US, against his country for almost 60 years – and counting. Fidel's followers will continue in his spirit fighting against capitalists cum neofascists' ruthless exploitation

(see also <http://www.globalresearch.ca/hasta-siempre-dear-comandante-fidel/5559516>).

As a campaign pledge, repeated after his election, Mr. Trump wants to undo President Obama's agreement for new relations with Cuba. Here is his abject reaction to Fidel's passing:

"Today, the world marks the passing of a brutal dictator who oppressed his own people for nearly six decades. Fidel Castro's legacy is one of firing squads, theft, unimaginable suffering, poverty and the denial of fundamental human rights."

This is to be remembered. Everything that follows during his presidency is to be put in context of that man's way of thinking. The 45th President of the United States is either completely ignorant or has all the elements of becoming a ruthless 'dictator for corporate profit'. He is an unreliable rogue. Business and money is what drives him. Humanity is just a tool.

Russia TV24 Question

How would you describe the current political and economic situation in Europe if we take into account the latest events, Trump's victory for example? How would Trump in the future reshape the EU's policy?

PK Reply

The current economic situation in Europe is very uneven. There are some countries that

are doing better than others. For example, Germany and the Nordic countries are generally better off than the Southern European countries. Germany has benefitted the most from the EU's common market. But if you look at the benefit of the EU as a whole – because a union should be judged as an entity, not country by country – as a union – which it really isn't – the EU has done worse than if there would have been no so-called European Union.

This may be difficult to prove, of course, since no study can be done of what would have happened without the union – i.e. what would the countries of Europe have done socioeconomically without the EU.

Why the claim that the sum of the EU is worse than would have been the sum of all individual sovereign EU member countries? – Because the EU was never set up as a union to serve its members equally. It wasn't even created by the Europeans. Hard to believe, I know. Its creation was the idea of Washington, carried out by the CIA, right after WWII. Down-beaten Europe was to become a vassal for the US, already 70 years back. We have to understand the context, before we can understand what is going wrong in the EU and its equally false euro-based monetary system.

The European Union started by the creation of the Council of Europe (CoE), signed and opened in London on 5 May 1949, covering 47 countries, including the territories of today's 28 EU member nations which currently amount to about 820 million people. It is clearly an Anglo-Zion idea, brainchild of the CIA, where the UK played patsy for the US, as they still do today.

That's also why BREXIT was such a surprise. Nobody expected people actually standing on their own feet, asking to gain back their sovereignty. The UK as backbone of the 'establishment' and a Washington mole in the EU, was taken as a given.

The CoE was the precursor of today's European Union. The idea was born out of the Washington instigated WWII – planned and prepared already in the early 1930s, as the US economy was under deep depression, the result of the 1928 banking collapse. Building arms was then and is today an efficient engine for our sick economy – truly an economy of destruction and death – that eventually serves only the rich and powerful. Because after destruction you have to rebuild. And the winners, those who have the armament and weapons to destroy (and win), have also the industry and machinery to rebuild. For them – the US – war is a double whammy.

The CoE was followed by the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), the first big transatlantic market. In 1955 the Rockefeller-led Bilderberg Society – the semi-secret home base of the top movers and shakers, those that pull the strings on the US Presidents, like the Rockefellers, Rothschilds, other Wall Street (WS) banksters and CEOs of the war industry, pharmaceuticals, ag-corporations, like Monsanto – and last but not least of the six giant Anglo-Zionist media corporations – this Bilderberg Society pleaded already in 1955 for a common European currency. In 1958 emerged the Treaty of Rome, of which people falsely say it was the beginning of the European Union. This, and all the future treaties all the way to Maastricht (1992) and Lisbon (2007) were infiltrated and influenced by US agents.

What the US really wanted out of WWII is that Hitler defeats the Soviet Union, because of a pathological anti-socialist / communist sentiment, prevailing in the United States as

of this day. So – as Washington usually does, they danced on two weddings, i.e. with the one hand they financed Hitler's war against the Soviet Union via the Bank for International Settlement, the BIS in Basle Switzerland, created in 1930 to monitor German WWI reparation payments. In Basle, it is conveniently located at the border to Germany. The funds arrived from the FED via Wall Street (WS) banks at the BIS and were transferred to the German Reichsbank (then the German Central Bank). The President of the BIS at that time was Thomas McKittrick (1940-46), a Rockefeller confidant. He was a former WS exec and worked in close collaboration with the FED and WS. All this is documented in books, one of them is called *The Tower of Basle*.

Had Hitler defeated the Soviet Union, his army would have been weak enough to be beaten easily by the remaining Allied Forces. In fact, as it is, the Soviet Union defeated Hitler's army, and the US / UK came in towards the end of the war to 'liberate' – as they proclaim themselves, the various occupied territories, including France, and of course Germany. But the winner was clearly the Soviet Union – which lost 25 to 30million people in this war, a tremendous sacrifice for which the west should be forever grateful.

To continue their plan of creating Europe as a vassal of Washington, now *Plan B* kicked in: A Cold war with the Soviet Union had to be created. This continued justifying the US very lucrative arms race. Building up the Cold War went in parallel with rebuilding Europe with an entirely US funded Marshall Plan, then about US\$ 13 billion (today about 130 billion equivalent) – which bound the European countries together through a common reconstruction fund. The World Bank, alias Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the IMF were created (1944 – the Breton Woods Organizations) to respectively manage the Marshall Plan Funds and to monitor and control the so-called 'hard' currencies' adherence of the then also US imposed gold standard.

Europe was never meant to become a political sovereign entity, like the US. Lest Europe might have become an autonomous competitor to the self-styled US hegemon. It follows that the creation of a common EU currency the euro, was shaped and structured exactly according to the US-dollar.

A group of countries that has no binding constitution, no common political or even economic goals, no solidarity, can never sustain a common currency. Therefore, the EU as well as the Euro are doomed to fail. It is but a question of time. This is the opinion of renowned economists, including Joseph Stiglitz.

Under these circumstances, I doubt very much that Mr. Trump can do much for improving the lot of Europe. He shouldn't even try. He really shouldn't continue the US tradition of meddling in other countries affairs. This is eventually the task – and the obligation of Europe – not of an outsider. A new Europe has to be built from within, by Europe, for Europe and with the full participation of European citizens – and without any involvement of Washington.

Back to Mr. Trump – there is indeed a lot of uncertainty at this time. However, the 45th President-elect is apparently backtracking on some of his extreme rightwing appointees, especially those that may have bent over backwards to please Israel and AIPAC. It looks like former NY mayor Giuliani is no longer on the shortlist to become Secretary of State – or Attorney General. But we'll see.

On Syria, an apparent good news is that Mr. Trump's son reportedly met last month in Paris with Randa Kassis, a Syrian politician who strongly supports Russian intervention in her country. This may be an indication that the President-elect is serious wanting to partner with Russia and eliminate the US created IS and its affiliated terror groups, and freeing Syria and the democratically elected Regime of Bashar al-Assad from the ruthless claws of the empire. But the question always remains – how much freedom to act does Mr. Trump really have?

Russia TV24 Question

Which countries in your view economically benefit from being in the Eurozone and which do not?

PK Reply

As I said before, Germany has emerged as the 'winner' if there is a 'winner' in the EU, and some of the Nordic countries. Clear losers are the EU's southern countries; and this on purpose. They are bordering the highly strategic Mediterranean Sea; they are also NATO countries and must be kept under tight control. If they are economically weak, and of course not under a socialist government, they can much better be controlled and manipulated. Austerity brings poverty and poor people are extremely vulnerable, as their survival depends on earning just enough for the basic livelihood of their families. Poor people have no energy nor time to fight for their rights. That's a built-in axiom of the austerity programs.

Russia TV24 Question

French Jean-Luc Schaffauser recently said "the Eurozone stopped functioning and there are no prospects anymore". What do you think?

PK Reply

I fully agree with this statement. The EU as it 'dysfunctions' today is doing increasing harm to the nations of Europe – more austerity, more misery, more unemployment, which is always a sign of ultra-capitalist engendered economic decline, a neoliberal-fascist take-over. We are living today in a fascist economy. The only way out of it, is dismantling the EU, and returning to sovereign national currencies.

And possibly at some point in the future – rethink the idea of a common Europe, but under completely different circumstances – and not under the dictate of Washington. It will require honest, non-corruptible European statesmen- and women. In fact, it is our hitherto destructive generation's duty vis-à-vis the up-and-coming younger generations, those who will lead our civilization ahead, to dismantle the EU and the euro.

Russia TV24 Question

What is the reason for the economic crisis in the Eurozone? Some experts say this is a matter of the whole system and the rules under which the EU is functioning. The ECB monetary policy does not correlate with different economic policies of the EU members, e.g. the heads of JP Morgan and Morgan Stanley claimed one of the reasons for that is Brexit and this might lead to a collapse of the Eurozone.

PK Reply

Yes BREXIT could indeed inspire other EU members to decide exiting the EU. Next in line could be Italy, or France.

Take France – Mr. François Fillon, the new candidate of the French extreme right, would bring more austerity and more hardship to France. He has already said so. He may be Washington's candidate, as was Sarkozy at his time. He has been shoved in from outside, mysteriously ousting Mr. Alain Juppé, in the French Primaries of the Republican Party. He will, thus, become the prime opponent of Marine Le Pen, the current frontrunner for the Presidential elections next spring. Marine Le Pen wants to exit the EU, the Eurozone and NATO. This, of course, is a no-no for the Atlantists and Washington. They don't want to take such a risk. France has still relatively much social capital to be stolen by the neo-fascist oligarchs, like the health system, the pension funds, the workers relatively long leaves and short workweeks – all achievements of the syndicates and paid for by the workers – could be taken away by unbridled privatization under a Fillon Presidency.

Let's not even talk about the countrywide austerity programs he would bring to the French populace. And remember, austerity always comes with strings attached: debt – debt that needs to be serviced by interest and amortization, taking away some of the workers' output, shifting it to the bankers and other oligarchs, and weighing down people's mobility with the albatross of debt. Greece is a glaring example.

However, as mentioned before, there is Marine Le Pen, the 'independent' National Front ('Front National' – FN) candidate. The British Telegraph reports that "Marine Le Pen, the far-right leader of the Front National, "can win" [France's](#) presidency next year, [as] the country's shell-shocked mainstream Right predicted", adding that "Donald Trump's surprise triumph has thrown all political certainty into doubt." – And that's precisely why Mr. Fillon had to be 'pushed in' at the far right of the Republican Party. On domestic issues, he is pretty much in line with Marine Le Pen, but he does not vouch to exit the EU, euro and NATO. Therefore, he is slanted to defeat Le Pen in a second round.

Ms. Le Pen's key campaign promises would be a blessing for the vast majority of European electors- though not for their mostly undemocratically elected leaders, but for the electorate – exiting the EU and the Eurozone, as well as exiting NATO. For most Europeans, including parliamentarians, although the MSM ignore them, getting rid of NATO would be a benediction, as it would stop or largely diminish the constant, counter-productive and illegal threat on Russia, it would diminish the risk of a nuclear annihilation of mankind and it would open the doors for Europeans to reestablish the natural partnership with Russia that has been a tradition for hundreds of years, before the self-anointed *exceptional nation's* ascension to world tyranny.

Russia TV24 Question

There are more and more right-oriented politicians in the EU. Why? At the same time, Mme. Merkel is going to run for her fourth term in the next elections (Fall 2017). What would it lead to?

PK Reply

True, there are ever more right wing politicians in the EU, actually heading EU members. There is currently no country that comes to mind that has a true left-wing leader. None. You can imagine that this is not just a coincidence. This is a clear sign

that democracy has ceased to exist, that Democracy remains a dream of Greek philosophers some 2000 years back, and that elections are fabricated by the 'new' western fascism, especially by the unlimited and unrestrained lie-propaganda of the Anglo-Zionist MSM. Case in point is the recent 'soft' and hardly noticed parliamentary coup in Spain. The neoliberal President Rajoy, hated by at least three quarters of the population for the poverty and misery he has brought to Spain during his previous term from 2011-2015. See this election analysis <http://www.globalresearch.ca/spain-the-dice-are-cast-another-parliamentary-coup-instigated-from-outside/5553699>.

Interestingly, shortly after President Obama's fare well visit to Berlin, during which he had extensive talks with Angela Merkel, she emerged announcing her fourth-time candidacy for the Chancellorship of Germany. Obama called her the new leader of Europe. I wonder what he promised her and how he explained to her that she will win the elections, while two thirds of the population oppose her.

Let us also be reminded that Germany still has no Peace Agreement after WWII. Germany's status remains one of 'Armistice' in which it is clearly pointed out that the Chancellor shall never oppose the will of Washington. There it is. What better puppet Obama could have selected to continue with this absurd term in the Armistice Agreement, which currently acts as the German Constitution.

The agreement is being applied as it pleases Washington. For example, it also says that no military aggression shall ever emanate from German territory - which is outright baloney. Ramstein, in the center of Germany, is one of the most important US military bases in Europe. Most drone attacks in Pakistan and the Middle East emanate from Ramstein. Also, the German Luftwaffe has quietly joined the French, UK, US and NATO in bombing Syria and Iraq. A future German Chancellor with backbone might want to revisit this Armistice Agreement, in view of converting it into a Peace Agreement, giving Germany full sovereignty which would be a first step of liberating Europe from the fangs of the American vulture — eh, I mean eagle.

It depends now on what Mr. Trump has in mind, when he pledges no more US interventionism. Does he mean to give Europe back to the Europeans? That would be a strong feather in Mr. Trump's hat. - But would those who pull the strings on the western marionette leaders allow it?

Peter Koenig is an economist and geopolitical analyst. He is also a former World Bank staff and worked extensively around the world in the fields of environment and water resources. He writes regularly for Global Research, ICH, RT, Sputnik, PressTV, The 4th Media, TeleSUR, TruePublica, The Vineyard of The Saker Blog, and other internet sites. He is the author of [Implosion - An Economic Thriller about War, Environmental Destruction and Corporate Greed](#) - fiction based on facts and on 30 years of World Bank experience around the globe. He is also a co-author of [The World Order and Revolution! - Essays from the Resistance](#).

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Peter Koenig](#), Global Research, 2016

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Peter Koenig](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca