

افغانستان آزاد – آزاد افغانستان

AA-AA

چو کشور نباشد تن من مباد
بدین بوم و بر زنده یک تن مباد
همه سر به سر تن به کشتن دهیم
از آن به که کشور به دشمن دهیم

www.afgazad.com

afgazad@gmail.com

European Languages

زبانهای اروپایی

Luis Gonzalo Segura

05.07.2022

Why it's a fallacy to say that Europe and the US are partners (and why Europeans don't need NATO)

What Europe needs is to accept and assume that there will be no peace in Europe until it takes Russia into account, until it considers that it must agree with Russia and establish relations of geopolitical neighbourhood. Until I respect it in geopolitical terms.



We are told that Europeans and Americans are partners, but there are unquestionable facts that dismantle this fallacy. On European soil, there are normally 70,000 U.S. military personnel deployed in military bases distributed throughout the geography of the Old Continent, a figure that currently rises to more than 100,000 troops. In addition, there are a multitude of American weapons in Europe, including weapons of mass destruction — but not like those that the United States claimed existed in Iraq, but the real ones.

www.afgazad.com

afgazad@gmail.com

Les bases militaires américaines en Europe



Now, having seen this fact, ask yourself how many European military bases there are in the United States. The answer is known to all: none.

Let's go to the other two great world powers: China and Russia. How many Chinese military bases are there in Russia or how many Russian military bases are there in China? Sure enough, none. Not only is there not, it does not even cross the minds of either country to allow the other to install military bases on its territory.

There will be those who can reply that there is a dissymmetry in the association between Europeans and North Americans, but the truth is that what exists is an abnormality. An abnormality if we consider Europe and European countries as sovereign and independent, but an absolute normality if we assume reality: Europe is a territory militarily subject to the United States.

This is the first truism that we must highlight before we can continue.



NATO is a non-defensive military organization commanded by the US.

NATO is a military organization. This is the second thing that should be made clear. And it's no small thing. If we are already clear that Europe is a territory militarily subject to the United States and that NATO is a military organization, the next step is a drawer: NATO subdues Europe militarily.

Unfortunately, there are still those who deny it, but history has little doubt about it. When the Americans did not want to evict Europe after World War II, there were many personalities, especially French, who protested strongly about it. They understood, and understood well, that European sovereignty could be in serious danger. When German reunification was being negotiated between 1990 and 1991, it was the Americans who refused to create a pan-European defence partnership in Europe in which the United States had no place.

But, if they were in Europe to protect Europeans from the perverse Soviets, what was the point of remaining on European territory when they no longer posed a danger? Protection? And when Emmanuel Macron declared NATO's "brain dead" and called for the formation of a European army and the Americans refused, did they also do it to protect us? Oh yes, for protecting us from the Russians... Really?



From left to right, Pedro Sánchez, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, Boris Johnson, Joe Biden and Jens Stoltenberg, listen from Madrid to the intervention by videoconference of the Ukrainian president, Volodymyr Zelenski. Europa Press. Photo source: [El País Internacional](#)

Europe does not need NATO

The problem with Europe's need to protect from the Russian threat is that if we go to the data we find serious loopholes:

Military spending: Europe as a whole spends four times more than Russia on defense (about 198 billion euros a year for about 51 billion euros, figures that have increased in both cases with the beginning of the war).

Military contingent: As far as military contingent is concerned, in Europe there are 1.3 million soldiers for about 900,000 in Russia, of which not all are professionals.

Demographically: Europe is almost four times larger than Russia, which goes from 550 million inhabitants to 150 million. This aspect is essential in terms of the mobilization of potential recruits and the economic potential in the event of war.

Economically: Europe (21 trillion) has a GDP almost twenty times that of Russia (1.5 trillion).

Nuclearly: Russia has more than 6,000 nuclear warheads, while Europe has almost no nuclear weapons and this is reduced to a few hundred nuclear weapons.

Therefore, Europe does not need anyone's help to confront Russia in military terms: it quadruples its military spending, almost doubles the contingent of professional military personnel, quadruples its population and its economy is twenty times higher. Russia can never, and will never, conquer the former Eastern Europe, let alone confront Europe or NATO. Such a statement is supine stupidity, because there is only one section in which Russia can intimidate Europe, the nuclear one, and, the truth, to protect ourselves from that threat we do not need the United States, because a Russian nuclear attack would end the planet.

One might think, after World War II, that the American military presence was necessary as a form of deterrence to the fearsome Red Army – and this is more than debatable – but to think that Europe needs today or has needed in recent decades the United States or NATO to defend itself against Russia is, in objective terms, unsustainable and absurd. If the difference between the two powers is not sufficiently dissuasive, nothing will be.

There will be no peace as long as NATO or the US is in Europe.

Europe needs neither NATO nor the American military, much less military budget increases, to maintain peace in Europe. What Europe needs is to accept and assume that there will be no peace in Europe until it takes Russia into account, until it considers that it must agree with Russia and establish relations of geopolitical neighbourhood. Until I respect it in geopolitical terms. As peace was not possible for decades in Europe while Germany was not taken into account and it was intended that it did not acquire the role that corresponded to it. In the case of Germany, we Europeans need two world wars and more than a hundred million dead to understand it, so hopefully we will not need so much this time.

This does not mean surrendering to Russia or antagonizing the United States, it means becoming independent, making one's own decisions, being an actor in the international context, having a European Army and that there is not a single American soldier on European soil. An actor who does what suits him best and not what is best for his lord, the United States. Because sometimes the interests of the United States and those of Europe are different, as in the case of Ukraine, where the Americans are interested in the opposite of Europe: war, tension, the wall, hatred. Russia's attrition. Just what they are watching with glee right now as they sit comfortably on the other side of the ocean eating popcorn. Don't forget: the United States will not stop until it humiliates Russia.

We do not know whether or not the Americans will win, but we do know that we Europeans are going to face a scenario of growing instability in which anything is possible. As everything was possible in the past. If we know that after World War I empires collapsed and that, after World War II, European countries became vassals, thinking about what can happen shudders. But more shakes that great certainty that too many want to ignore: there will be no peace in Europe as long as NATO exists.

Luis Gonzalo Segura

Edited by María Piedad Ossaba

Source: [Rambla Magazine](#), Independent Journalism, June 30, 2022

Originally published on RT.

La Pluma. net 03.07.2022