

# EAST AND WEST

[www.eastandwest2016.wordpress.com](http://www.eastandwest2016.wordpress.com)

No. 2 24 January 2026

## TRUMP AND GREENLAND WHY EUROPE WILL CAVE

By Thomas Fazi

**Europe's current leaders long ago ceased to think in terms of national or "European" interests, and have instead become beholden to a single objective: the preservation of transatlanticism at all costs.**

Just hours after kidnapping Maduro in a murderous attack on Venezuela, Trump once again reiterated his long-standing ambition to take control of Greenland, the self-governing territory of Denmark, an EU and NATO member. "We need Greenland from the standpoint of national security", Trump declared, without elaboration, as if the claim were self-evident.

European reactions were scattered, confused and deeply revealing. Denmark's prime minister, Mette Frederiksen, predictably responded by rebutting Trump's claims and warning that US aggression against Greenland would effectively mark the end of NATO. In a joint statement, the leaders of France, Germany, Italy, Poland, Spain, the UK and Greenland itself reaffirmed their commitment to NATO while stating that Greenland belongs to its people and that decisions regarding the island are for Denmark and Greenland alone. But these statements ring hollow.

Conspicuously absent was any response from the EU's institutional leadership. The same Brussels officials who routinely issue dire warnings about the alleged Russian threat to Europe declined to comment on an explicit US threat against European territory. And only hours earlier, most European leaders had offered either tepid or

implicitly supportive responses to Trump's unambiguous aggression against Venezuela. If there was a logic, it was to avoid confrontation with Washington at all costs. And yet ironically those same leaders quickly found themselves facing the prospect of similar US action directed against a European country.

A direct US military seizure of Greenland remains unlikely, though not unthinkable. A more probable scenario is an "association agreement" modelled on Washington's arrangements with Micronesia, the Marshall Islands and Palau. Under these agreements, the US exercises sweeping authority over defence and security in exchange for financial assistance. The states involved remain formally sovereign, but in practice are tightly bound to US strategic priorities. An analogous arrangement with Greenland would offer Washington the advantage of consolidating control while formally respecting Greenlandic self-rule, all while weakening Denmark's position. A 1951 agreement already allows the US to station unlimited numbers of troops on the island; today, only one active base remains, but the legal framework for expansion is firmly in place.

The ambiguity is intentional. Earlier this week, White House press secretary Karoline Leavitt

stated that the use of the US military was “always an option” as Trump and his advisers reviewed different annexation scenarios. Whatever path the administration chooses, it is determined to resolve the matter swiftly. And European leaders, judging by their response so far, are likely to acquiesce. How can one account for the seemingly irrational, and indeed outright suicidal, posture of Europe’s political leadership? By acknowledging a simple fact: European elites are deeply embedded in the transatlantic system from which they derive their power and legitimacy. They perceive that system as under threat and are prepared to defend it at almost any cost, even if that cost includes European sovereignty or territory.

After all, Europe has already sacrificed its core economic and security interests to US imperial diktats. It has joined a proxy war against Russia that has devastated Ukraine and hollowed out European industrial competitiveness. It has imposed sanctions that inflicted far greater damage on European economies than on Russia. It has remained conspicuously silent following the destruction of Nord Stream, a critical piece of European energy infrastructure — an act probably carried out with at least indirect US involvement and likely foreknowledge by some European governments themselves. If European leaders were willing to accept all of this, acquiescing to US control over Greenland — whether through military pressure or pseudo-legal arrangements — would not represent a radical departure.

So much for Europe’s much-vaunted “strategic autonomy”. The reality is that beneath the rhetoric of independence, European governments have systematically appeased Trump — from increased NATO military spending, much of which will flow directly into US defence contractors, to punitive trade conditions to accepting financial responsibility for sustaining the war in Ukraine.

From the perspective of Europe’s governing classes, NATO and the proxy war in Ukraine are less about security or prosperity than about preserving an imperial architecture in which they

can play a subordinate but privileged role. This is why NATO would likely survive even a US move against Greenland, albeit stripped of any remaining illusions of sovereign equality among its members.

This dynamic also helps explain a seeming paradox. Globalist European leaders openly despised by Trump — figures such as Emmanuel Macron or Friedrich Merz — have been more supportive of US aggression against Venezuela than right-populist forces openly favoured by Trump, such as Marine Le Pen or Viktor Orbán, who have adopted more cautious or critical positions. EU institutions, in particular, have been notably supportive of Washington’s actions, which is easily explained: the bloc is not a counterweight to US power, rather one of its central pillars.

It is therefore plausible that elements of the EU establishment are coordinating closely with factions of the US national security apparatus — or even with the Trump administration itself. After all, while it is true that Trump has abandoned any pretence of transatlantic unity and increasingly treats Europe in openly transactional, even neo-colonial terms, Europe’s political class has demonstrated its willingness to comply. Once one understands that Europe’s current leaders long ago ceased to think in terms of national or even “European” interests, and have instead become beholden to a single objective — the preservation of a dying system of Western hegemony, or the so-called “rules-based order”, and the benefits they derive from it in their sub-imperial role — their seemingly irrational behaviour begins to make sense.

What should alarm Europeans is not the prospect of US “abandonment” or NATO’s collapse — developments that could, in principle, create space for genuine autonomy. In fact, it’s the opposite: the likelihood that Europe remains locked into a subordinate role precisely as Washington adopts an increasingly aggressive and lawless posture.

*This article was first published on the author’s Substack.*

# Trump's Board of Peace: Not an Anti-UN

Never have I seen the blueprints of an International Organisation so reminiscent of a feudal kingdom.

By Pascal Lottaz

If it weren't so tragically linked to one of the worst genocides in my lifetime, it would almost be funny what Trump is doing with his "Board of Peace." Last week, he seemed to have finished the envisioned charter and sent it out over the weekend to dozens of governments around the world; he even invited Vladimir Putin to join the board.

While some have speculated that he might be building a United Nations rival organisation, what he is really doing is much more Trumpian. He is working on creating his own, highly personalized International Organization (IO)—one designed to concentrate authority in his hands and persist beyond his presidency of the USA.

## A Personalized IO

The whole endeavour rests on UN Security Council Resolution 2803, adopted in November 2025, which "welcomes" the establishment of the Board of Peace (BOP) as a transitional administration with international legal personality. This is key: it grants the BOP legitimacy under the UN Charter. The idea expressed in UNSCR 2803 is that the BOP deals with Gaza, but we see clearly how Trump is going far beyond that.

BOP setup at the moment. The actual political BOP is yet to be completely established.

In fact, the BOP Charter doesn't mention Gaza even once. Instead, it establishes the entire organisation basically as a personal little kingdom, with the Chairman as its supreme ruler. It even mentions Donald J. Trump explicitly as the first Chairman. What nonsense. International organizations normally designate offices that will be filled according to procedures, or with personnel *ex officio*, not private individuals. Here, however, the charter embeds Trump by name as the organization's permanent linchpin.

The actual board itself is currently being built as a political body, with membership restricted to states—except for the position of Chairman, who can really be anyone with a pulse. Trump is inviting countries to join the organisation by signing and ratifying the charter, and then either their head of state or government will sit on the board. However, membership is time-limited to three years, unless a state contributes over one billion dollars within the first year (clearly intended as a scheme to make interested parties pay up at the very

beginning and fill up the BOP coffers). You can be sure that Trump will offer renewal of membership, but will fix a big price tag on that one. So membership in the BOP will be a very expensive pay-to-play scheme. Oh, and it goes without saying that the three-year membership rule does not apply to the Chairman. That position is for life (and for free).

## Limitless Powers to the Chairman

Although the charter stipulates that the BOP would work by a one-country-one-vote rule and majority decision, in fact, the powers of the Chairman at any time reign supreme. He has sole discretion over who gets invited to join the BOP and who must stay out. He has a veto over all board decisions, and he alone gets to create sub-organs of the organisation.

Beneath the political board sits the Executive Board, also appointed by Trump. Its founding members include, at the moment, Marco Rubio, Jared Kushner, Steve Witkoff, and Tony Blair. This board will probably function analogously to a UN Secretariat, managing day-to-day operations. This board, too, remains fully subordinate to the Chairman's will. Agenda-setting power rests with the Executive Board

but requires Trump's approval, ensuring that no discussion or decision occurs without his consent.

Member states purchasing permanent seats in the organization and later injecting probably even more money through donations transform the BoP into an international wallet for Trump. The charter authorizes the BoP to establish accounts, hold assets, and receive funds without meaningful external oversight or even a dispute resolution mechanism. Combined with its international legal personality, this creates a vehicle for large-scale capital aggregation and investment insulated from national laws.

Succession rules further entrench Trump's power. Replacement of the Chairman may occur only through voluntary resignation or incapacity, as determined unanimously by the (political) board. If unanimity cannot be reached, no succession occurs. Trump may personally designate his successor, who can be anyone, which means the BoP might well become a tool for his dynasty-building.

The charter also contains an unprecedented "kill switch." In addition to the Chairman having the power to dissolve the BoP at will, unless renewed every odd-numbered year by him, the organization automatically dissolves.

#### **Legal Status and Immunities**

Once ratified by three states, the charter acquires treaty status

under international law and, in conjunction with UNSCR 2803, the BoP even becomes a United Nations-approved international organisation. Its officers and subsidiaries thereby gain diplomatic immunity and extraterritorial privileges. Like the UN, it will operate outside host-state jurisdiction, shielding its leadership—including Trump—from prosecution or domestic legal constraints.

A future host state agreement will likely mirror UN headquarters arrangements, preventing local authorities from entering BoP premises. Such immunity transforms the organization into a legally autonomous zone—a feature which, in theory, would give Trump's BoP the ability to acquire land and then build establishments on it outside national laws (much like embassies are not part of the territory they rest on).

#### **And Gaza?**

Where does Gaza feature in this whole plan, you might ask. Good question. It doesn't.

Through Trump's executive decision-making power (as granted by the charter), the nascent BoP has created a third board to deal with Gaza separately, meaning not as part of the BoP Charter setup itself. Trump announced last weekend that a "Gaza Executive Board" shall be tasked with liaising with the newly formed "National Committee for the Administration of Gaza" (NCAG). This Palestinian technocratic body, created on

January 16, is designed to administer Gaza post-conflict. Yet it enjoys no sovereignty. It is strictly an implementation partner, subordinate to the BoP's international oversight.

Under this branch of the scheme, the structure also envisions an International Stabilization Force (ISF) for Gaza—a military force. The ISF is not part of the BoP but rests on the authorization by the Security Council under UNSCR 2803, and is operationally coordinated through the BoP.

This is probably the only "good news" about this scheme, that the BoP is not designed to be an alliance or a military intervention force. The BoP itself has no military component.

#### **Sad Conclusion**

The Board of Peace is not a rival UN. It is something more idiosyncratic: a personalized international organization that will most likely function as a business vehicle for Trump and his entourage. Hence, the new charter speaks of "Peace Building" as the organization's main goal.

The shamelessness with which Trump is using the office of the President and the Genocide in Gaza to build an IO centered around him and him alone is quite breathtaking. But it seems the Wild West of the Multipolar Era belongs to the bold and the shameless. He will probably find enough support to make this thing a reality.

*This piece first appeared on the author's Substack.*

# DIE FOR IDEAS

## A Summary Of European Suicide

By Andrea Zhok

There was a time when a united Europe was presented as 1) a competitive bulwark against the US; 2) the establishment of a supranational body with a critical mass capable of asserting itself on the international stage. All this has proved to be a farce. Why?

### A) The ideological model

When the Maastricht Treaty was drawn up, the West was dominated by the legend of neoliberal triumph over the Soviet bear, and so the neoliberal system defined all the main legal mechanisms, the role of public industry and relations with finance according to that ideological model. This model assumes that free trade is an ideally accomplished substitute for democracy (in fact, an improvement over the crude mechanism of democratic elections) and privileges the dynamic role of big capital, in relation to which politics must play an ancillary, facilitating role.

### B) The sovereignty of the financial economy.

Outrageously abstract theories such as Nozick's model of the emergence of the state from self-interested free trade formed the backbone of a novel model, in which it was imagined that a political entity (a political union, a federal state, etc.) could emerge as a result of intense market interaction. The European model thus became the first historical experiment (and, given the results, also the last) in which it was thought that a common market (i.e. a system of mutual competition between states in a framework that forced maximum competitiveness) would be the precursor to a political union.

Obviously, what actually happened was what always happens in highly competitive market conditions without political filters (without customs barriers, without currency adjustments, etc.): there were winners and losers, there were countries that gained advantages and countries whose resources were

drained (Italy is among the latter).

The obsolete idea of democratic governments accountable to voters was replaced by the idea of "governance" as a system of rules for economic management, which led to the idea of politics managed by "autopilot".

### C) Winner takes all policy.

Financial systems are impersonal, acephalous, and supranational, but this does not mean that they do not have centres of gravity. The primary centre of gravity of the Western financial system is represented by the New York-London axis, where its primary political arm has always been the American government (whatever American government).

The Maastricht Europe that set out to play on the international stage according to neoliberal rules has inevitably fallen into the gravitational orbit of the main financial fund managers, embodied by American politics. In the US, policies of national supremacy and financial profit are indistinguishable: they are one and the same thing with

minimal stylistic variations. Maastricht's Europe has therefore returned entirely under the hegemonic wing of the US at precisely the historical moment when post-war economic development would have allowed it to become autonomous.

Since the 1990s, US hegemony has been financial, military and, above all, cultural, gradually demolishing all European internal resistance. On a cultural level, the last 30 years have seen the complete ideological Americanisation of Europe, where not only films and musical styles have been imported, but above all institutional models, models of school, university and public service management.

#### **D) Geopolitical suicide**

Cultural hegemony has facilitated the growth of US political and military hegemony, which, instead of retreating in the wake of the Second World War, has imposed itself in a new geopolitical dimension. Europe (the EU) began to systematically support all US geopolitical restructuring initiatives, from Afghanistan to Iraq, Yugoslavia and Libya. The ideological framework – the progressive legend of an international system based on rules and respect for human rights – allowed US policies to be passed without resistance from European public opinion. For two decades, European citizens have swallowed like fattened geese all the American

fairly tales of “emancipation of oppressed peoples”, “humanitarian interventions” and “international policing”. Meanwhile, while our newspapers exchanged medals for how civilised and enlightened we were, the United States severed all supply chains vital to Europe. It destabilised all oil producers in the Middle East that were not already US vassals (Saudi Arabia, UAE, etc.). Thus, Iraq and Libya were transformed from independent suppliers into piles of rubble where only military force counts. With the fairy tale of human rights for suckers, Iran was also sanctioned and isolated from the possibility of trading its resources with Europe. Finally, repeated provocations on the Ukrainian border succeeded in producing the war that is still ongoing, which has severed the main source of energy supply for European industry, Russia. With the Middle East and Russia out of the way, the geniuses of European politics threw themselves headlong into American LNG, causing European industry to lose competitiveness dramatically. At this point, of course, Europe's bargaining power vis-à-vis the US is exactly zero. If Trump wants Greenland, we will give him Greenland; if he wants *ius primae noctis*, we will give him *ius primae noctis* (all he has to do is pull the plug on LNG to bring the continent to its knees). What to do? Such a compromised situation is really

difficult to recover from. In fact, the neoliberal European Union and its institutions have sanctioned the most serious historical collapse that Europe has suffered in its history, worse even than the Second World War, from the point of view of comparative power. The theoretical solution is simple in theory (much less so in practice). The EU must close its doors, put up a “closed due to bankruptcy” sign, and remain a dark page in the history books. (The technical problem of what to do with the euro remains.) In place of the EU, strategic alliances between European states with similar interests must be formed immediately. All diplomatic and economic channels must be reopened immediately with all the countries that American soft power has presented to us as unwatchable monsters: Russia, China, Iran. Only in this way can the American siege of Europe (and the rest of the world) be broken. Only in this way can Europe reopen a future for the next generations. Obviously, in the cultural climate cultivated over decades, such a prospect can only meet with strenuous resistance. And if this is the case, once again Europe will have sacrificed itself for (stupid) ideas. But unlike in Georges Brassens' song, this time we will die for ideas, but not a slow death.

*Andrea Zhok is a Professor of Philosophy at Milan University*

# “We will soon see a Detroit in southern Germany”

## A conversation with the German magazine Overton

The war in Ukraine has been shaking Europe for almost four years. Political language has become significantly harsher, more moralistic and more polarised. The established media landscape and German politicians responded by closing ranks — there was talk of a *Zeitenwende*, a ‘turning point’, and the old motto ‘no weapons in war zones’ was replaced by ‘war readiness’. Pacifism became a dirty word. The sanctions against Russia, which were intended to destroy the Russian economy, have led to its ‘deindustrialisation’ in Germany. ‘The foreign policy pursued by this country is harming its citizens — it is causing price increases and ruining businesses,’ says Roberto De Lapuente, one of the founders of Overton magazine.

Until recently, it was considered impossible that anyone in Germany would want to have the largest army in Europe, as the new German Chancellor Friedrich Merz did. What was considered impossible yesterday can be presented as inevitable in an emergency situation. ‘Governments commonly do this with propaganda,’ says De Lapuente. ‘Yesterday, it was unthinkable that almost the entire German society would be enthusiastic about military preparedness and demand it loudly. Today, this is done unabashedly.’ There has always been a certain tendency towards uncompromising moralism in Germany. Many in Germany must have seen the war in Ukraine as an opportunity to finally ‘be on the right side of history.’

### Is Germany going down the drain?

When he talks about the situation in Germany today, De Lapuente describes a country that has

lost itself — materially, organisationally, emotionally. Hospitals that look like ‘run-down nursing homes’. Cities that are falling into disrepair. Entire neighbourhoods that are ‘neglected’. An administration that is already talking about its own decline in some areas: ‘We will soon see a Detroit in southern Germany,’ De Lapuente quotes from a conversation with an administrative employee from a large city. ‘Germany seems old, sedate and rather greasy.’

But the political process has narrowed. ‘Germans can change little,’ explains the Overton editor when the conversation turns to the election of Friedrich Merz. The alternatives are limited, almost cosmetic. He considers it absurd that the Left Party, of all parties, has stylised Merz as the ‘savior of democracy.’ ‘You can see from this that there are no options. The car is stuck deep in the mud. I honestly believe that the fact that some politicians dream of a power vacuum has less to do with fear of the Russians than with the realisation that the country is better governed in emergency mode.’

German politics, many media outlets and most people cling to the idea that the left-right divide offers immutable moral coordinates. ‘It’s not that left is good and right is bad — that’s the idea in this country,’ says De Lapuente.

On the other hand, according to De Lapuente, “there are groups that style themselves as radical opposition. Until recently, it was the climate activists — but since Bill Gates decided that the world is not going to end because of the climate, they are reorienting themselves. Then we have those motivated by identity politics: they act as if

they are the most radical thing humanity has ever seen — they break with everything, even history, want to take on language, make it clear what is moral and what is not, and publicly ostracize people who are not on their course. But in the end, these are just new variations of proto-fascist ideas being acted out here."

It is an emotionalisation of politics that particularly affects those groups that see themselves as morally superior.

### **Europe and Russia**

De Lapuente's diagnosis goes beyond Germany. Western Europe is falling behind. Europe is drifting. The Americans appeared strong, 'but at the expense of the empire'. De Lapuente has a clear opinion about Europe: "In the mid-1990s, many of us would have said: dare to embrace more Europe! But now things are different. Europe organised in an alliance is a fundamental evil — the EU under Ursula von der Leyen is a war project, hostile to citizens and rigid. The Digital Services Act severely restricts freedom of expression. The EU imposes sanctions that are enforced in Germany without any legal basis. I am thinking in particular of Hüseyin Dođru, who lives in Berlin and was sentenced to a professional ban by the German judiciary for allegedly spreading Kremlin narratives, which were not specified in detail. So, less Europe? No, very little EU! As little as possible!"

According to De Lapuente, Russia is not solely to blame for the confrontation between the West and Russia. 'The West never misses an opportunity to declare Russia an enemy. So the question is, who initiated this hostility?'

Today, this confrontation is often framed as a fight for Western values. "Yes, Western values are challenged by Russia. But here, too, the term needs to be clarified. Values that have flowed into society via so-called non-governmental organisations and foundations of wealthy individuals, such as gender division and the trans agenda, are frowned upon in Russia." According to De Lapuente, however, such values are not original Western values that form the basis of Western civilisation. 'The only problem is that these are not Western values with a long tradition

— they are particular interests that have been inflated into values.'

### **Independent media in times of war**

Three and a half years after its founding, Overton has established itself as one of the most important independent media outlets in Germany, alongside other online media such as Nachdenkseiten and Manova. Several hundred thousand readers access the Overton website every month, the vast majority of them from Germany, but also from other German-speaking countries. Overton's readers can be on the left or the right. Many of them are disillusioned leftists who now identify with the party of former left-wing leader Sahra Wagenknecht, others do not trust any party, and still others are close to the AfD, the Alternative for Germany, which is generally seen as right-wing. It is one of the few media outlets in Germany that has opposed the war frenzy against Russia.

"It's being made difficult, if not impossible, for the little guys," says De Lapuente. "Since debanking has been encouraged, this challenge has naturally become even greater." Debanking refers to the practice of denying certain companies, organisations or individuals access to bank accounts, payment processing or credit, often for political or ideological reasons. Unfortunately, such cases have become more frequent in Germany in recent years. Most recently, the online magazine Manova, the internet portal Apolut and the journalist Flavio von Witzleben were affected.

"Politicians naturally favour so-called quality or mainstream media. This may become even more pronounced in the coming months and years — the mere fact that some politicians in Berlin consider the tension necessary should make us sit up and take notice."

## **East and West**

**Independent, itinerant newspaper**

**Online since 2016**

[www.eastandwest2016.wordpress.com](http://www.eastandwest2016.wordpress.com)