

❖❖❖❖ Crazy NATO Summit

The NATO summit in The Hague is a show of collective threat and money laundering for the US Military Industrial Complex. Compelte vasselage of the Europeans while the NATO boss thinks he can threaten China and Russia by citing US' bombing of Iran.

#M2

Hello everybody. So yesterday and today, NATO was holding their annual summit, this time in The Hague, the Netherlands. As expected, it is being sold to us as a great show of force for peace, when in fact what this group is doing is outright warmongering—all the way to the point where the Secretary General, Mark Rutte, has the guts to actually threaten China and Russia. But he doesn't threaten China and Russia directly; he threatens them via proxy, through the United States. Please have a listen to what he thought was a very good show of force. I think what happened now with Iran is projecting American power on the world stage, saying, "Here's a president who has the strength to do what is necessary. He's willing to use it, but in a very measured way." But this is a signal. If I were in Beijing—Xi Jinping—or in Moscow—Putin—I would be sitting there and seeing that footage.

I would not be happy. I would think, "Oh, OK, they are really serious, these Americans." And this is exactly what we need: projecting American power on the world stage. Can you hear him? This is what we need. We need to project American power on the world stage. These people are drunk and delusional on their combined force. Again, this man is not the President of the United States. He is the Secretary General of NATO, or as Alex Christoforou calls him, the CEO of NATO—a salesman who has to constantly pitch the value of his organization. But now we are at a point where these people think that it is a good idea to use a blatant violation of international law, a blatant violation of the UN Charter—the US attack on Iran's nuclear infrastructure—as a precedent to say, "Hey, we can do that with anyone, right?"

China, China, and Russia, Russia, we can send the US to attack you. That's the point where we are at. We are so far away from the original idea of NATO—of just making sure that the security of its member states is protected. We're so far that now the Secretary General thinks he can use America to threaten China. But this isn't coming from nowhere, you know. The entire point is that NATO is currently in a huge expansionary mode again, for once not by adding new members, but by adding more capabilities and by beefing up what they call their deterrence. So a lot of people were skeptical about whether or not Trump would be successful in actually pushing everybody in NATO to increase their defense spending to 5%. But this is now reality.

In this Hague meeting, the members agreed that they would increase their annual expenditure to 5% of their GDP, up from the current 2% target. Only about half of the members actually hit that

2% target, and now they've increased it to 5%, which is, for several reasons, a really stupid thing to do. First of all, a percent of GDP is not a good way to actually fund anything, because if that's the target, you have two ways of achieving it: either your GDP stays stable and you increase the amount, or if your GDP goes down, you will also achieve that target. So this is a stupid measure in several ways, because it is also unlinked to the actual security threat analysis.

The question that NATO is asking is no longer, "What are the threats that we are facing, and how much money do we need to face them?" They're asking, "How much money do we want to spend annually?" and then they go out and find threats to justify that spending. This is, of course, a huge racket. This is probably going to be one of the largest wealth transfers from Europe to the United States in the history of the continent, because it goes without saying that the majority of the weapons providers and the companies that create these implements of war are from the United States. So what the US has succeeded in doing here is getting the Europeans to agree to buy more US-manufactured weapons and materials, and at massive, massive amounts.

And so this plays into this entire new posture, where NATO is now, of course, thinking of itself as this guardian that then has its different attack doctrines. It is absolutely fascinating that this piece of work, Mark Rutte, the former prime minister of the Netherlands, is thinking of himself as being the one who can then use the attack doctrine. That's, of course, not what's going on. This is clearly an exercise of the United States using NATO as a power projection tool. And the fact that Trump doesn't accept individual members having different views is also clear from the way he treats those NATO members that are not happy with this plan.

One of the people is Mr. Sánchez from Spain, who's actually a Social Democrat, and said he would not want to commit to a 5% spending target. And about him, Mr. Trump had the following to say: A question on Spain. Are you satisfied with today? Oh, I think Spain's terrible, what they've done. No, I do. They're the only country that won't pay the full amount. They want to stay at 2%. I think it's terrible. And you know, they're doing very well. The economy is very good. And that economy could be blown right out of the water with something bad happening. You know, Spain is the only country that— Are you from Spain? Yeah.

Good, congratulations. You're the only country that is not paying. I don't know what the problem is. I think it's too bad. I mean, I cannot read this differently than as also kind of a threat, as in: either Spain, you pay your dues and increase your expenditures as well, or something's going to happen. Too bad if something happened, right? I mean, these kinds of tactics are really... are really unnerving, especially when you hear the official talk of NATO saying each member is equal and each member has the right to block decisions. No, no, no, that's not what's going on.

The decisions are made by the United States and the NATO Secretary General, and NATO in general. In order to get something from the United States, what they need to do is suck up. They need to suck up very badly to the US President. And, you know, you see this nowhere better than in a really astounding text message that was sent from Stoltenberg to Donald Trump two days ago. Before I

show you this tweet—this message—I must explain that this summit in The Hague is currently being hailed by Western media outlets as one of the most important in the history of NATO. You know, pivotal, blah, blah, blah.

But this meeting was extremely short. It was like one, one and a half days. It was not advertised in a huge manner. We didn't have a build-up toward it. And why did we not? Because NATO was scared. NATO is very scared that Donald Trump would walk away from NATO. Because, don't forget, Donald Trump criticized NATO heavily because he's unhappy with them for exactly this point—for not paying their fair share. I mean, what he wants is to extort more money. He said from the beginning he wants more NATO members, Europeans, to pay in more money and, of course, transfer that money to US weapons manufacturers and other industries. We will look at that in a moment again.

But the point here is, NATO was scared that if they advertised this too much, then Donald Trump might make it a political drama and theater, and might actually threaten to take the United States out of it. Now, because of the war in Ukraine, as well as the 12-day war with Iran, the Trump administration obviously had no time to care about this NATO meeting, and there were no threats and so on, but NATO itself held the meeting really under the radar. I mean, it wasn't advertised, it wasn't big in the media at all. And then, right before the meeting started two days ago, for a dinner in the Netherlands, you know, the Secretary General, Rutte, sent a text message to Donald Trump. And Trump later took that text message and just posted it on Truth Social.

For one, I really wonder what text messaging application this is, since it must be some sort of well-secured one, but then the President of the United States still manages to create screenshots and post those. It's really quite fascinating to me. But again, this is verified. I mean, this is Donald Trump who put this there, and Mark Rutte actually didn't deny that this text message is real. So this is actually how these leaders communicate with each other via text, just like you and I do. And the fascinating thing is how Rutte here talks to Donald Trump, even adapting his language in the way that he tries to massage into his brain that NATO is a good thing and that he's the most pivotal person. Let me read this text to you for a second: "Mr. President, dear Donald, congratulations and thank you for your decisive action in Iran."

That was truly extraordinary and something no one else dared to do. It makes us all safer. You are flying into another big success in The Hague this evening. It was not easy, but we've got them all signed on to 5%. Donald, you have driven us to a really, really important moment for America and Europe and the world. You will achieve something no American president in decades could get done. And notice that NO is in all caps. Europe is going to pay in a big way—and again, BIG in all caps—as they should, and it will be your win. Safe travels, and see you at His Majesty's dinner. Mark Rutte. I mean, he's really crawling up into Donald Trump's behind here. He even tries to communicate with Trump the way that Trump usually communicates: short sentences, all-caps words, talking about BIG, something unprecedented, totally new, nobody else could achieve it.

This is absolutely fascinating, but it also shows just how scared the NATO Secretary General is of this volatile president, and how infantile the communication about these very pivotal issues has become. That you send text messages in which one tells the other what has been achieved, and then tries to have Donald Trump accept—or rather, have it framed—as one of his own victories. So in this sense, the outcome of the summit meeting, of course, was already pre-decided. But this is more or less normal. I mean, these summits are not there to negotiate things; they're just photo ops and signature moments. The diplomats do everything at the lower level.

But you can see how these people were then working the individual members to agree to this, even though many of them don't think it's a very good idea. And it is not a good idea because, you know, the money they are now committing to spend—without actually deciding on what exactly to spend it on—is humongous. Even just the German GDP is 4.5 trillion US dollars in 2023. And you see it here, and you know that these GDP numbers tend to grow over time. So this 5% spending target will be even more—it will be nominally even more in the future if they actually go all the way to it. And it's an absolutely dumb measure, again, also because you do not start from a point of analysis; you start from a point of spending.

And what makes this even worse, in my view, is the way that they decided they would spend these funds, because it has been agreed that 3.5% of GDP would be spent on pure defense spending, such as troops and weapons, while 1.5% of GDP would be spent on broader defense and security investments, such as upgrading infrastructure—including roads, bridges, ports, airfields, military vehicles, cybersecurity, and protection for energy pipelines. This, to me, means that we are now militarizing even more, that the Europeans are going to militarize even more of their civilian infrastructure. Or civilian infrastructure that needs to be upgraded now needs to somehow also justify itself by having some sort of military application.

This is the securitization of large parts of infrastructure spending. So the individual ministries of defense are going to have much more to say about infrastructure investments because they're going to be the ones with the money. And they're going to be a place where others are going to ask for money if something needs to be done on a road, on a highway, and so on. So this is going to give more structural power to ministries of defense, which should care about defense and not about national infrastructure, right? But this is now a new pot of money, and it's a militarized pot of money, which is extremely worrisome to me. But this is it, and at the same time, what we are seeing, of course, is also a change in the way that these states are now thinking about their external security.

This is a map I wanted to show you of four of the... The Anti-Personnel Landmine Treaty, the Ottawa Treaty of 1997. These are the states that decided that—the blue states are the ones that decided they would ban anti-personnel mines. Those are the mines that, when you step on them, they explode. These mines are very, very dangerous because they remain, of course, in the ground beyond an ongoing armed conflict, and they do not discriminate between who steps on them.

Whether a soldier steps on them and dies, or a child steps on them and dies, the bomb doesn't care—it just kills whatever steps on them, or maims them heavily. This is why these weapons have been regarded as illegal under international law, and the Ottawa Treaty of '97 actually outlaws them. Now, what you're seeing here is the latest trend, which is that countries are actually exiting the Ottawa Treaty.

Finland, the Baltics, and Poland have announced their intention to actually leave the treaty so that they could use these anti-personnel landmines again, with the clear and stated intention to mine their borderlands with Russia, including the border with Kaliningrad. So all of this is happening, and all of this is part of this increased militarization—not just of the thinking, but now also of the budgets—of these NATO states, to the point that they even withdraw from very important human rights treaties. Because the Ottawa Convention is, of course, meant to protect the lives of civilians in the future. And we now have NATO members that just decide to exit from this. This is especially striking for Finland, which for the longest time during the Cold War had a good working relationship with the Soviet Union and then with Russia as a neutral state.

And now that they're not neutral anymore, they even need to withdraw from these treaties in order to use illegal means—landmines—that are supposed to make their lives safer. Again, Finland, as a neutral state, never had to spend much more than 2% of its GDP. And now we are at a place where the Finns need to go along—and the Swedes too—with the other NATO states, because the top dog, the top bully, tells you to do so and to use more money. The fantastic thing for Finland and Sweden was that NATO was supposed to keep them safe, but now it turns out NATO will squeeze more money out of them. Whereas when they were neutral, they had more freedom to move left and right and to have decent relationships—also to try to have decent relationships with the Russians—but that is not the case anymore. And we are also at a point where the Secretary General of NATO thinks it is okay to threaten China and Russia, together with the Americans, by invoking illegal acts of aggression against the UN Charter. This project is a militaristic one, and it is a dangerous one, and it is a stupid one. This is where we are. Thank you very much for your time today.