

# Anti-Russian Eurocrats doomed themselves to Trump's bullying

The Grayzone's Aaron Mate and Max Blumenthal explain how by initiating a generational conflict with Russia on the basis of ideological zealotry, European leaders have left themselves defenseless to bullying from Donald Trump. ||| The Grayzone ||| Find more reporting at <https://thegrayzone.com> Support our original journalism at Patreon: <https://patreon.com/grayzone> Facebook: <https://facebook.com/thegrayzone> Twitter: <https://twitter.com/thegrayzonenews> Instagram: <https://instagram.com/thegrayzonenews> Minds: <https://minds.com/thegrayzone> Mastodon: <https://mastodon.social/@thegrayzone> #TheGrayzone

## #Aaron

We've covered that report before from the RAND Corporation, which is tied to the Pentagon, about overextending and destabilizing Russia. One of the key conclusions was that we should increase weapons to Ukraine because that would draw Russia in, lead to a war, and bleed Russia. But there's also a section about another key step: taking out the Nord Stream pipeline. It points out that doing so would make Europe more dependent on the U.S. So really, the plan to destabilize and weaken Russia is also a plan to destabilize and weaken Europe. The difference is, Russia pushed back against it, while the rest of Europe went along with it.

## #Max

Yeah, excellent point. And here's Trump at Davos. I think we should hear from Trump, because— I mean, he spoke for an hour and fifteen minutes and made these comments about NATO, which I think are some of the most important comments. It was a very kind of glowering, insulting, menacing, and in many cases juvenile speech, rubbing the Europeans' faces in their own weakness—a piece of ice-cold and poorly calculated rhetoric.

## #Trump

That piece of advice can play a vital role in world peace and world protection. It's a very small ask compared to what we've given them for many, many decades. But the problem with NATO is that we'll be there for them 100%. I'm not sure they'd be there for us if we gave them the call: "Gentlemen, we are being attacked. We're under attack by such and such a nation." I know them all very well. I'm not sure they'd be there. I know we'd be there for them; I don't know that they'd be there for us. A piece of advice. A piece of advice.

## #Max

Greenland's just a piece of ice. But he's saying, you know, NATO isn't real. It's not actually an alliance—it's just the U.S. running around, basically providing a protective umbrella for these ungrateful welfare queens in Europe. That's basically what he's saying. And I'll be honest—like, more, please. Can we have more? Yeah. I've wanted for years to see NATO broken up because it serves no other purpose other than to make war. It's pivoting to Asia to contain China and threaten China. That's not the North Atlantic.

It has partner organizations in South America to threaten any independent nation there. It destroyed Libya. It was used in Afghanistan. It's essentially just a global war machine, and the NATO-fication of Ukraine was the trigger for Russia's invasion of Ukraine, which has left hundreds of thousands dead. So what good does this organization serve? But from Trump's point of view, it's just, uh, you know, a waste of money, and they won't save the U.S. when the U.S. comes under attack—from, I don't know, whoever he thinks is going to attack the U.S.

## **#Aaron**

And Trump also got all these NATO states to spend even more money on the military-industrial complex, which we can also thank Russiagate for, because Russiagate instilled in liberals this fear that Trump was going to dismantle NATO. Meanwhile, Trump was actually trying to pressure NATO members to spend more on the military. That was his big focus. And there was even some measure—all the Democrats voted for advancing sanctions on Russia—that insisted NATO members couldn't spend less than their pledged percentage of GDP, and all the Squad members voted for that.

So the Squad members voted along with a call to make sure NATO members spend enough money on the military-industrial complex, which of course means they have less to spend on the social welfare programs progressives are supposed to care about. So Trump got all these states to spend more on the military-industrial complex, and he rewards them by calling them weak and cowardly. That's been one of the main achievements of the Russiagate era—fearmongering about Russia to get people to spend more on the military. And then Trump still sells out his own vassals anyway. It's extraordinary.

## **#Max**

Well, yeah, Denmark—being the country sold out the hardest—participated aggressively in the so-called war on terror. It lost soldiers; Denmark was involved in many of these theaters of the post-9/11 U.S. empire, and this is how they get repaid. So Gavin Newsom, who's been aptly described as Patrick Bateman by Scott Besant—another sociopathic figure—was present in Davos, and the message he's sending just by sitting there is: just wait. When I get in, everything will be fine, Europe, and we'll go back to the good old days of Obama at the Brandenburg Gate, when you'll get everything you want and all of our differences will be handled in private. That's Europe's strategy, because it has no strategy to stop Trump.

And if J.D. Vance or someone like that is elected, Europe has no other option. They're giving themselves no other option except to depend on daddy U.S. electing a Democrat. And maybe the Democrat won't want to give back Greenland. Why would they? Oh, we're just going to give you U. S. territory after we took it and, you know, we're able to mine rare earth minerals? Who's to say a Democrat would give Greenland back if Trump manages to seize it? So Europe's last chance—I think they have a last chance with Putin. And I think they're too ideologically extreme to end the war, to make peace with Putin, who is a European leader. Because after Putin—I think Putin is the moderate center of Russian leadership at this point, and he's holding back more extreme figures.

**#Aaron**

Absolutely. Absolutely.

**#Max**

They do. I think they have a last chance with Putin to still save the continent.

**#Aaron**

And speaking of that last chance with Putin, one of Trump's reasons for wanting to take Greenland is to counter what he says is the threat from Russia. Meanwhile, what is the actual threat when it comes to Russia? In a couple of weeks, the last nuclear arms control treaty between the U.S. and Russia—New START—is supposed to expire. And once it expires, there will be no more caps on the arsenals of the U.S. and Russia, which means a new nuclear arms race. It's just over two weeks away, and no one's talking about it. Trump says we have to take Greenland to counter the threat from Russia, but another way to counter threats from Russia is to have arms control with Russia, which Russia has offered.

Russia has offered to extend New START by one year. And Trump initially said, "Yeah, I think we can do that." Since then, he started saying, "Well, you know what? If it expires, we'll just negotiate a brand-new treaty." Well, that's not how it works, because these new treaties take a long time to negotiate. And once there's no treaty in effect, both countries are incentivized to build their stockpiles—especially if Trump has his way of spending even more money on the Pentagon. So this is happening, and yet no one's talking about it, because diplomacy with Russia has been so criminalized. This is one of the biggest threats we face, but no one's talking about it, because it's now considered normal not to do diplomacy with Russia.

**#Max**

Absolutely. It's effectively been criminalized. Well, it was. And now it's stalled under Trump, who's just announced secondary sanctions on Russia through Treasury's OFAC.

