

Trump's New Strategy: Balancing Political Ambitions and Commercial Interests Within the Context of Redefining the Dynamics of Global Power

Dr. Awad Slimia⁵

ABSTRACT

This study examines the Trump administration's foreign policy as a complex strategy that intertwines political ambitions with commercial interests, resulting in global conflicts of interest. The authors employ a case study approach, policy analysis, and a review of existing literature to explore the impact of Trump's new orientations on reconfiguring international geopolitics. The analysis focuses on global issues the Transfer of Palestinians from Gaza Strip, Russian-Ukrainian War and the Precious Metals Deal, The Rupture in The Transatlantic Alliance, and the Trade War with China.

The findings indicate that Trump's policies, rooted in the pursuit of "Make America Great Again" "MAGA" from a businessman's perspective, are pushing the geopolitical landscape to move at a rapid pace; it is likely to damage the US relationships with its traditional allies while fostering closer cooperation between Moscow and Beijing in countering American dominance. This approach, driven predominantly by economic interests, poses a threat to international agreements and destabilizes the global order—a system that the US played a pivotal role in shaping in the aftermath of World War II and consolidating following the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Journal: Boston Research Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities

Keywords: Trump's New Strategies, Palestinian Transfer, Gaza Strip, the Middle East Riviera, Ukrainian Metals Deal – Tariffs – Western Allies.

Accepted: 31 March 2025

Published: 15 April 2025

ISSN: Online ISSN: 2834-4863 | Print ISSN: 2834-4855

Language: English

Research ID: df5c66d3-d446-4502-a3d5-e6025a91da0e

Type: Peer-Reviewed Research Article (Open Access)



The authors declare that no competing interests exist. The authors contributed equally to this work. This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License as an open access article. CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

Read Online: <https://bit.ly/3Yqepte>

Author(s): 5 – Researcher in International Relations, Palestine Institute for National Security Research

I. INTRODUCTION

Within just one month of assuming office, Trump's controversial remarks ignited global tension, introducing unconventional policies that left observers astounded. Among his bold and puzzling proposals were threats to take control of Greenland, efforts to reclaim dominance over the Panama Canal, aspirations to annex Canada into the US, and a suggestion to rename the Gulf of Mexico as the "Gulf of America" Not stopping there, he signaled his intent to reshape relations with the European Union (EU) according to his perspective, deeming those relations fundamentally unbalanced.

On the economic front, Trump has escalated tariff wars with China and several European and global countries. He proposed a dramatic plan to end the conflict between Russia and Ukraine that included asking Kyiv to give up half of its natural resources, ignoring the interests of his European allies in the Atlantic. The Middle East was not far behind. Trump's provocative visions included more threats to the Palestinians, with proposals to displace the population of the Gaza Strip and place it under US administration to create a luxury tourist zone on their ruins. These seemingly unrealistic ideas represent a clear deviation from the traditional trajectories of US policy and raise many questions about their impact on global stability and regional security.

However, the relationship between politics and trade is a major pivot in global dynamics, and Trump's trade interests are a clear example of how economic goals influence political strategies. In the context of this relationship, Trump's perceptions are challenged by the conflicts of interest that can arise when dealing with global actors, adding to the complexities associated with political decisions that affect the principles of international relations. and decades of free trade doctrine. Thus, analyzing these announcements requires a careful examination of the factors that influence political decision-making in the presence of these potential conflicts that may hinder the achievement of strategic goals for both the US and international partners.

In this paper, the authors aim to explore the Trump administration's foreign policy as a complex strategy in which political ambitions are intertwined with commercial interests, leading to inevitable conflicts of interest across global domains.

Additionally, the paper examines the potential long-term effects of this policy on regional stability and the global balance of power. To achieve this goal, the researchers provide further insight into the following areas.

- II. Transfer the Palestinians and the Riviera of the Middle East
- III. Russian-Ukrainian War and the Precious Metals Deal
- IV. The Rupture in The Transatlantic Alliance
- V. The Trade War with China and Tariffs

II. TRANSFER THE PALESTINIANS AND THE RIVIERA OF THE MIDDLE EAST

During a press conference with Netanyahu on Feb. 5, 2025, Trump unveiled an unconventional plan to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The core of this proposal involves transforming the Gaza Strip into the "Riviera" of the Middle East by relocating Palestinian citizens to Jordan, Egypt, and several other countries while imposing restrictions on their right to return to their homeland. As part of this real estate initiative, Trump envisions the US taking control of the land, displacing millions of Palestinians to Jordan and Egypt, and replacing the ruins of Gaza with modern glass towers and high-rise buildings that offer breathtaking views. as well as, the development of commercial ports that would create unlimited job opportunities for newcomers, inviting global investors to relocate to the Strip. This ambitious and innovative approach is presented as a solution that could potentially end the Israeli-Palestinian conflict permanently.

Indeed, what influences Trump, the political leader of the world's most powerful country and an international real estate mogul, is his loyalty to his original profession as a real estate developer of skyscrapers, resorts, and golf clubs worldwide. According to Alain Frachon [1] of the French newspaper Le Monde, Trump, rich in experience, defies conventions and envisions 40 kilometers of coastline along the eastern Mediterranean, featuring luxury villas nestled among olive groves and local-style buildings by the waterfront, complete with a golf course. That is the concept!

In his book *Trump: The Art of the Deal*, p. 32, Trump expresses his enthusiasm for deal-making, particularly favoring large transactions. He describes his straightforward approach to this process: "I set very high goals," he states, "and then

I keep pushing and pushing and pushing to get what I'm after. Sometimes I settle for less than what I was after, but in most cases, I get what I want." [2]. In this statement, the real estate mogul overlooks the contributions of his advisors and supporters who have influenced his ideas. His controversial "Gaza Riviera" was not solely his creation; it was based on a 49-page document drafted by economics professor Joseph Belzman. [3] On July 21, 2024, his plan for the Gaza Strip includes the construction of renewable energy plants, a light rail system, airports, ports, digital governance, and beachfront hotels. Belzman reveals in his proposal that countries investing in this project will become shareholders with an extendable 50-year lease. However, this assertion is only partially accurate.

Blizman's plan was not the only initiative to capitalize on Trump's business ideas, which regard the Gaza Strip as a real estate opportunity. During his first term in 2017, Trump unveiled a vision for a similar plan spearheaded by his advisor and son-in-law, Jared Kushner, aimed at fostering peace in the Middle East. Referring to the January 2020 "Deal of the Century", Trump stated at the time, "If Jared can't bring peace to the Middle East, no one can." However, on the ground, Jared has failed to achieve significant progress and has even experienced a major setback in his efforts to bring peace to the region, despite having read about the subject [4]. Despite his failures, Kushner's deals continue to haunt Trump. A Trump advisor once described the Arab-Israeli conflict as not more than a real estate dispute and spoke of the potential beauty of Gaza's Mediterranean waterfront [5]; However, in a February 2024 interview at Harvard University, [6] Kushner stated that "Gaza's waterfront property could be very valuable if people focused on building livelihoods" (12:57). He further expressed that if he were in charge of Israel, he would consider "getting the people out and then cleaning up the place" (13:15), "diplomatically" moving from Rafah to Egypt (9:39), while demolishing structures in the Negev and relocating other Palestinians there, so that Israel could enter the Strip and complete the task (9:57). As part of this vision, a report published by The Times of Israel revealed that Kushner is behind Trump's announcement to take control of the Gaza Strip and displace its citizens [7].

Trump, Pelzman, and Kushner's perceptions reveal a striking lack of understanding and naivety regarding the causes and roots of the conflict. This

was evident during an interaction in the Oval Office when Trump asked, "Why do they want to go back? It was hell." A reporter responded, "But this is their home, sir. Why would they leave?" [8] With apparent naivety, the mega-dealer-turned-president attempts to reduce one of the most enduring and acrimonious political conflicts of the modern era to mere development or reconstruction. He reiterates his failed diplomatic strategies by insisting on the removal of Palestinian citizens from the Gaza Strip, operating under the belief that every beautiful beach in the world should be owned by him and his companies. For instance, during his first term, Trump promised North Korean leader Kim Jong-un that he would assist in constructing luxury hotels and apartments along the country's east coast if North Korea relinquished its nuclear weapons. However, Mr. Kim opted to continue developing weapons rather than Trump's proposed five-star resorts [9].

Trump's initiative unveils more insights into whom he considers stakeholders in Gaza's future. Here, the focus is not on Palestinian civilians, but rather on the US, Israel, and the contractors capable of implementing his vision. This tenuous understanding of how to address the root causes of the conflict inherently contradicts the principles of the agreements that Trump claims to have brokered after a series of negotiations that are purportedly mutually beneficial to both parties; Given the exclusion of Palestinians from the equation, these proposals can be interpreted as ethnic cleansing from the perspective of international law, rather than the peace deal that Trump envisions.

Nevertheless, the Israeli right has been impressed by these ideas as "providing space for a serious discussion" on the same project but with alternative means [10]. This is what the editor-in-chief of The Jewish Journal aimed to convey through Trump's Jewish commercial perspective. "As rockets flew over Gaza," Suissa wrote, "I dreamed of a magnificent strip of hotels and casinos next to a shimmering ocean. I imagined thousands of proud Palestinians working with smiles on their faces to serve the thousands of tourists from all over the world who come to their little strip of ocean paradise." "Next to this paradise... Entrepreneurs have established software companies, banks, and advertising agencies; universities have attracted students from around the globe, and local culture and the arts have flourished [11]. However, Suissa overlooks the fact

that all these dreams he envisions could become realities for the Palestinians simply by ending the Israeli occupation of their land.

The boisterous manner in which Trump manages his employees, real estate companies, and properties appears to reflect his steadfast belief in the importance of free and unfettered competition between himself and the rest of the world [12]. The mixed perceptions, coupled with threats and being fired do not consider the interests of even his closest allies, often raising their concerns. The first to push back against his proposals are his country's supposed allies in the Middle East, with Egypt and Jordan rejecting Trump's ideas [13]. The vast majority of the international community has condemned these proposals as acts of ethnic cleansing, which are punishable under international law. Indeed, Trump appears to lack the cognitive complexity necessary to grasp the nuances of foreign policy, relies heavily on unreliable advisors, and often disregards their counsel when it conflicts with his preferences [14].

The aggressive bargaining tactics employed by Trump to enforce his controversial Arab and international vision are likely to strain relations with allies. The use of US tariffs—one of Trump's preferred economic tools—and/or the imposition of economic sanctions on Jordan and Egypt, both of which receive billions of dollars in US aid annually, could have disastrous consequences [15]; On one hand, the risk of imposing a unilateral vision not only threatens to alienate key allies in the region—such as Jordan and Egypt, which maintain strong relations with Washington—but also Saudi Arabia, the primary diplomatic hub in the region and the spiritual home of over 2 billion Muslims worldwide, all of whom support the Palestinian cause. Consequently, the increasing pressure on regional allies to embrace this concept will inevitably result in a deterioration of bilateral relations and push the entire region to the brink of crisis. The peace treaties between Egypt and Jordan with Israel are essential for regional stability, border security, and Israeli defense planning. While Jordan hosts U.S. troops, Egypt permits crucial military overflights, and both governments consistently share vital intelligence with Washington [16].

On the other hand, Trump's policies will undermine efforts to normalize relations between Israel and Saudi Arabia. Jordan and Egypt are

currently unable to facilitate the displacement of more than two million Palestinians from the Gaza Strip into their territories. Even if these countries were to yield to Trump's coercion, the US foreign aid they receive is inadequate to offset the geopolitical, economic, security, and social risks and repercussions associated with such a move [17]. In other words, the apparent shift in the US president's policy regarding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, along with plans to displace Palestinians from the Gaza Strip, is viewed by most Middle Eastern leaders as detrimental to all parties involved—neither beneficial to the Palestinians nor Trump himself. Despite the impracticality of these proposals, they have succeeded in uniting both allies and adversaries in their rejection of these ideas.

III. RUSSIAN-UKRAINIAN WAR AND THE PRECIOUS METALS DEAL

During his election campaign, Trump pledged to end the ongoing war between Russia and Ukraine, which he characterized as a senseless conflict that benefits none of the parties involved. He attributed the war's outbreak to his predecessor, Biden, claiming that his failed policies nearly led to World War III [18]. Trump says "We're going to stop people from these stupid, endless wars...We're not going to participate in them ourselves" [19]. Based on these statements, on Jan. 20, 2025, Trump signed an executive order prohibiting the disbursement of any foreign assistance from the US in a manner that is not fully consistent with the foreign policy of the President of the US [20]. This order also applies to US aid, which saw a heavy influx during Biden's presidency to support Ukraine.

In his latest post, Trump launched a social media attack on Ukrainian President Zelensky after the latter accused him of being in the orbit of Russian disinformation. Zelensky convinced the US of America to spend \$350 billion to enter a war that cannot be won, one that never should have been started, and a war that he will never be able to settle without the US and Trump, Trump posted on his Truth Social website. The US has spent \$200 billion more than Europe, while the US will receive nothing in return [21]. These figures announced by Trump fluctuate without accurate verification. The Kiel Institute for the World Economy, a Germany-based non-profit organization that tracks military, financial, and humanitarian support to

Ukraine, reported that European countries—primarily the EU, the United Kingdom, Iceland, Norway, and Switzerland—have allocated approximately \$140 billion in total aid to Ukraine, while the US has contributed around \$120 billion of the total aid; this assistance encompasses military, humanitarian, and financial support for Ukraine [22].

The media conflict between the two sides escalated significantly, reflecting a gradual progression on Trump's escalation ladder. Among the most notable controversial statements was his characterization of Zelensky as an illegitimate dictator, claiming that his popularity does not exceed 4%. He also urged Zelensky to prioritize organizing elections in his country [23]. Trump reiterated his accusation that Kyiv initiated the war with Russia [24], emphasizing the necessity of recovering the U.S. funds expended by Zelensky during the conflict [25]. He also asserted that there is no future for Ukraine within NATO. This escalation occurred just hours after U.S. officials convened with a Russian delegation in Riyadh to initiate discussions aimed at resolving the conflict, which has persisted for nearly three years [26]. Notably, representatives from Ukraine and the European Union, who are typically considered allies in this matter, were absent from these talks.

Amid a tense atmosphere and the beginnings of a complex crisis that increased uncertainty about the future of US support for Ukraine, President Zelensky held a meeting with Keith Kellogg, President Trump's envoy. By the end of the meeting, it appeared that Zelensky had caved under the weight of US pressure and threats, and the Ukrainian president wrote that "Ukraine is ready for a really strong and beneficial agreement with the President of the US on investments and security" [27]. Trump was quick to respond to Zelensky's post, stating, "We are informing Ukraine that it possesses very valuable rare earth materials." He added, "I told them I want the equivalent of \$500 billion worth of rare earth, and they essentially agreed to it" [28]. For his part, Zelensky highlighted some of the limitations of Trump's grand bargain, emphasizing that he would not accept any Trump-led peace deal with Russia unless his country was directly involved in the negotiations. This response came after Trump's statement that the US would begin negotiations with Russia [29]. According to The Telegraph, which obtained a draft of the pre-agreement, the United States proposed a 50% share of revenue from extraction, a 50%

share of all new licenses issued to third parties, and a right of first refusal on exports to other countries. The deal would be governed by New York law and would encompass access to minerals, oil, gas, ports, and other infrastructure as agreed upon, potentially leading to a form of economic colonization by the United States in perpetuity [30].

Trump, who does not consider Zelensky's presence at the negotiating table essential, concluded three years of unrestricted diplomatic and military support for Kyiv with a single decision, thereby deepening the divide and escalating tensions between Washington and Kyiv. Conversely, Washington and Moscow demonstrated a new rapprochement by collaborating on a plan to end the war in Ukraine during high-level talks in Saudi Arabia. This development raised concerns due to the absence of Ukrainian and European representatives, who were not invited to participate in the discussions [31]. Based on Trump's promises to end the war and bring peace to the region, as well as a realistic assessment of the battlefield, it is important to emphasize the following points: (1) returning to Ukraine's pre-2014 borders is an illusory and unattainable goal, particularly given the impossibility of reclaiming the Crimean Peninsula, which Russia seized in 2014, along with the territories occupied by the Russian army since the onset of the war in February 2022, which account for 22% of Ukraine's total area; (2) there is no commitment to include Ukraine in NATO or provide security guarantees; and (3) any deployment of international or European troops in Ukraine will not be subject to Article 5 of the NATO Charter [32]. That means the US will not intervene if NATO peacekeepers come under attack from Russian military forces.

On the other hand, Trump's statements regarding the promised peace are illuminated by the details of the discussions with Ukrainian leaders. Trump's messages are unequivocal: no more free aid. From this point forward, Trump intends to leverage Ukraine's significant mineral deposits to recoup the billions spent by the US in its efforts against Russia [33]. These rare elements, valued at \$500 billion in mineral wealth from Ukraine, could potentially repay the \$100 billion that Kyiv received during its conflict with Moscow [34]. Without a US commitment to the security and military guarantees that Kyiv requires, Washington proposed ownership of 50% of Ukraine's vital mineral resources in a revised draft to bridge the

gap [35]; Later, Ukrainian officials announced that Kyiv is prepared to sign an agreement for the joint development of its mineral resources, including oil and Gas after the US withdrew its demands for the right to \$500 billion in potential revenues from the exploitation of these resources [36].

Beneath the surface of military maneuvers and occasional peacemaking lies a deeper driver of armed conflict: Ukraine's vast natural resources. In fact, Ukraine possesses significant reserves of rare earth minerals that are vital to the world's most advanced technologies. In total, these minerals could be worth trillions of USD [37]; While the Trump administration is hesitant to provide additional US aid to Ukraine, it is now seeking to negotiate a deal on rare minerals that would enable US taxpayers to recover their investment [38]. On the other hand, Russia has successfully seized the resource-rich provinces of Donetsk, Kherson, Luhansk, and Zaporizhia, as well as Crimea and the Black Sea. These maritime regions and borderlands, abundant in hydrocarbons and essential minerals such as graphite, lithium, and uranium, are not only central to Ukraine's sovereignty but also crucial for Europe's energy independence and the competition between the US and China for technological dominance. Control over these resources is a critical, albeit often underappreciated, factor in shaping the course of the conflict and will almost certainly influence the terms of its resolution; Although frequently overlooked in the headlines, Ukraine's resources are a vital component of the evolving geopolitical landscape [39].

In his quest to alleviate the Ukrainian burden inherited from his predecessor, Biden, in early 2022, Trump is striving to translate his words into action. As part of this initiative, Washington has intensified its efforts and proposed its own draft UN resolution on the anniversary of the war in Ukraine, after rejecting a resolution drafted by Kyiv and supported by Europe [40]; this draft resolution does not condemn Russia as the aggressor in the conflict, nor does it acknowledge Ukraine's territorial integrity [41]. This perspective aligns with Trump's belief that the UN should return to its founding purpose, as outlined in the UN Charter, which is to maintain international peace and security, including through the peaceful resolution of disputes [42]. By contrast, the draft resolution submitted by the EU and Ukraine refers to the "total invasion of Ukraine by the Russian Federation" and demands the immediate and unconditional

withdrawal of all of Moscow's forces [43]. This dramatic shift in Washington's approach to Ukraine has undermined the positions of the political elite in the West on acceptable norms about ending the war [44]; It put Washington's closest friends on a direct collision course in the corridors of the UN

IV. THE RUPTURE IN THE TRANSATLANTIC ALLIANCE

"We don't have eternal allies; we don't have eternal enemies. Our interests are eternal and Lord Palmerston, House of Commons, 1848".

The US and Europe are allies, or at least that is the perception many Europeans wish to maintain. However, this does not imply that they do not compete economically or that they do not have disagreements on certain foreign policy issues. Both parties recognize that they are aligned when challenges arise and consistently strive to uphold unity as a fundamental objective. Nevertheless, the second Trump administration appears to support the notion articulated by Lord Palmerston, suggesting that European allies warrant no special consideration. For this administration, European partners can be engaged, disengaged, or coerced to align with US interests. If a deal can be struck with Russia on a specific issue without European involvement—or even in opposition to their interests—then that is deemed acceptable [46].

European leaders at the Munich Security Conference were taken aback by the revelation that President Trump had engaged in a direct phone call with Russian President Putin, without prior consultation with Ukraine or NATO allies. Trump disclosed the call after it occurred, along with the announcement that direct negotiations to resolve the conflict in Ukraine would commence immediately, with Riyadh designated as the venue for this meeting [47]. In Ukraine, European countries have several strategies to employ to establish a foothold in the ongoing game between Putin and Trump. They possess a significant portion of the frozen Russian assets that are intended to be part of their negotiations with Putin and they are also major consumers of Russian gas [48]. "If there is an agreement reached behind our backs, it simply won't work" says Kaja Kalas, High Representative of the EU, adding, "You need the Europeans to make this deal happen [49].

For the time being, the facts have become

painfully clear to pro-war Europeans. The US position on Ukraine and its alignment with the Russian stance have deepened the emerging divide between allies on both sides of the Atlantic. On one hand, some European leaders have rallied behind Kyiv and pledged to bridge the financial and military gap left by the US supply cutoff, rejecting the notion that America would secure the rare elements, the Russians would acquire the land, and the Europeans would merely pay the bills while jeopardizing their security. The German defense minister stated, "The US should not have made concessions to Russia before the peace negotiations by excluding Ukraine's membership in NATO and accepting that the country would have to cede some of its territory" [50]. Added, the "US also should not have made concessions to Russia before the peace negotiations".

On the other hand, some European leaders have expressed support for President Trump's approach to ending the war through direct negotiations between Washington and Moscow. Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orban emphasized that Kyiv lacked the leverage to negotiate with Moscow, stating, "The Americans have to reach an agreement with the Russians. And then the war will end." He added, "Anyone who thinks that this war will end through Russian-Ukrainian negotiations does not live in this world" [51].

While Washington is engaged in reconnaissance diplomacy—where the Trump administration sends out questions and awaits responses from the parties—White House staffers are making phone calls to minimize travel expenses. In line with this trend, Polish President Duda, French President Macron, and British Prime Minister Starmer have decided to travel to the US to meet with President Trump individually [52]. To bridge the gap and halt the rapid deterioration of relations, Macron and Starmer addressed the tariffs that the US President intends to impose on Europeans during their meeting with Trump. They also sought to persuade him of the necessity of establishing a US safety net to protect Ukraine, which would serve as an effective deterrent against Russia [53]; However, Trump maintained his stance, delegating the responsibility of maintaining peace in Ukraine to Europe. He conditioned this on the establishment of a ceasefire agreement with Moscow, a strategy designed to secure U.S. access to the valuable resources he believes are located beneath Ukrainian territory.

Trump's vision for peace in Ukraine and the precious metals deal he seeks to secure are not the only points of contention between him and European leaders. Earlier, Trump suggested that the European Union could be the next to face tariffs, following his imposition of 25% tariffs on goods from Mexico and Canada, as well as an additional 10% tax on imports from China [54]. On another occasion, Trump demanded that NATO members allocate 5% of their GDP to defense, a substantial increase from the current target of 2%. He reiterated that the use of military or economic action to pursue the acquisition of the Panama Canal and Greenland was not ruled out, and floated the idea of turning Canada into a US state [55]; However, these announcements left Europeans scrambling to secure additional funds to re-equip their militaries and heightened their anxiety regarding a US president who is rapidly redrawing alliances [56].

Misfortune appears to be catching up with European allies following the unsuccessful Trump-Zelensky summit, which was anticipated to announce the signing of a rare metal deal. Meanwhile, on the southeastern tip of Asia, the Biden administration dedicated four years to establishing a united front with Europe to confront China. just a month into Trump's second term, this united front has become collateral damage, as the new administration has significantly reversed former President Biden's approach, fostering a friendship with Russia while alienating Europe [57]. However, Trump's negotiations with Putin seem to be occurring not only at the expense of Ukraine but also carry broader implications for China. Historically, the opposite has been true; Henry Kissinger's strategic opening to China contributed to the eventual collapse of the Soviet Union [58].

V. THE TRADE WAR WITH CHINA AND TARIFFS

One significant issue confronting the EU is the lack of unity among its member states. Governments and national leaders hold varying perspectives on a range of topics, including strategies for engaging with China. Although most member states share a common viewpoint, some adopt divergent positions, complicating the ability of EU countries to reach a consensus on the direction and pace of their collective actions [59]. While the European bloc became increasingly embroiled in the Ukraine war, China maintained a

neutral stance that leaned towards Russia, further widening the divide between Europe and China. European leaders established a precondition for Beijing to alter its position on Russia as a prerequisite for reaching agreements in areas of cooperation [60]; Despite Beijing's repeated calls for a ceasefire and adherence to UN principles, it has reaped significant benefits from this conflict, including substantial economic advantages. Among these is the implementation of the gas pipeline project, which extends from Russia as part of the connection to the Shanghai gas network on China's southeastern coast [61].

On the other hand, the Trump administration is engaging in a strategic maneuver with Russia, seeking to obtain economic advantages, such as lower prices for raw materials, while concurrently reshaping Sino-Russian relations. The objective appears to be to distance Moscow from Beijing's influence and diminish its increasing alignment with China [62]. At the 61st Munich Security Conference, Foreign Minister Wang Yi portrayed Beijing as a steadfast advocate for a multipolar world and distanced China from Russia's war in Ukraine. In contrasting itself with the US, China underscored its commitment to neutrality and condemned Western interference in domestic matters, particularly concerning Taiwan [63]. However, this type of rhetoric has not deterred Trump from continuing to impose and tighten trade restrictions on Beijing. He has justified these actions by citing (1) the need to halt the flow of contraband drugs, such as fentanyl, into the US and (2) the perceived inaction of Chinese officials in addressing this issue and preventing money laundering by transnational criminal organizations. As a result, the Trump administration implemented measures to hold China accountable, including the imposition of an additional 10% tariff on Chinese imports. Furthermore, Trump announced prompt actions to safeguard US national security by applying 25% tariffs on steel and aluminum imports from several countries, including China [64]. Similarly, Trump signed a National Security Presidential Memorandum (NSPM) designed to promote foreign investment while safeguarding America's national security interests, particularly against threats posed by foreign adversaries such as China. He directed the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS) to limit Chinese investments in critical U.S. sectors, including technology, critical infrastructure, healthcare, agriculture, energy, raw materials, and others [65].

The US Secretary of Defense has intensified his rhetoric regarding China, labeling it a peer competitor to the United States. He accused Beijing of possessing both the capability and intent to threaten Washington and its core national interests in the Indo-Pacific region. Consequently, from the Secretary of Defense's perspective, this situation necessitates prioritizing U.S. deterrence in the Pacific, acknowledging the reality of resource scarcity, and implementing trade-offs to ensure that deterrence remains effective [66]. In response to these positions, a spokesperson for the China Council for the Promotion of International Trade (CCPIT) stated that the Chinese business community strongly opposes the US overextension of the concept of national security and the obstruction of bilateral economic and trade exchanges [67]; He revealed that Washington not only restricts investments in China across various sectors—including technology, critical infrastructure, healthcare, agriculture, energy, and raw materials—through security reviews, but also employs economic sanctions and financial assessments to enhance controls on investments in China regarding industry scope, types of investment, and sources of financing. [68]. These actions reflect a familiar pattern in US foreign policy. However, when a country imposes tariffs—higher taxes on imported goods—or other sanctions to damage another nation's economy, the outcome is often retaliation and the onset of a trade war. Although China's tariffs were a response to Trump's retaliatory measures, their impact on American importers was more severe because China swiftly identified alternative suppliers for the goods it previously sourced from the US easily turning to neighboring Russia and other countries. Meanwhile, the US faced challenges in replacing Chinese imports, forcing American businesses and consumers to absorb the consequences of Trump's tariffs [69].

Trump's policies illustrate Kissinger's/Nixon doctrine and his insights on the multiplicity of powers, as well as the European Union's contradictory policies, which he encapsulated in his sardonic remark, do I call when I want to talk to Europe"?[70]; His warning regarding the consolidation of the relationship between China and the Soviet Union during the Cold War. [71] (The heir apparent, the Russian Federation), have been broken or almost broken by Trump's policies. Upon closer inspection, the positions of the two major allies—Beijing and Moscow—align on the necessity

of dismantling US hegemony and reestablishing an international order based on multipolarity and strategic alliances. The relationship between Beijing and Moscow was notably closer prior to Trump's actions. Throughout the ongoing conflict in Ukraine, the two allies have provided each other with essential support, consistently conveying political messages to Washington and Brussels. Essentially, both superpowers firmly oppose any unilateral actions that disregard their national interests, particularly those taken by Washington, including decisions or actions that threaten their sovereignty, security, and developmental goals. In contrast, EU countries have exhibited a divergence in their positions, at times circumventing the sanctions they imposed on Moscow by utilizing third-party intermediaries to pursue their interests.

While Washington and its NATO allies sought to break Putin's war machine and tighten the noose on China. Moscow and Beijing deepened their economic and trade ties. Their trade volume reached a record high of \$244.8 billion in 2024, compared to a 26.3% increase in 2023 [72]. Equally, the two poles have increased the pace of coordination in security and political aspects to limit US influence and bend the international system in their favor. On the one hand, the Russian, and Chinese militaries have launched several joint naval maneuvers in the Sea of Japan and the Russian Far East. Beijing and Moscow are strengthening their alliance as a counterbalance to what they see as American dominance in global affairs [73]; Both sides have activated cooperation and coordination in important regions, including the Arctic and Central Asian countries. The influence of the two countries has expanded through the BRICS group to include several countries in the Middle East and the African continent, as well as Latin America, while maintaining a certain level of divergent relations with some European countries.

Trump's comments about imposing tariffs on European imports have created trade tensions within the group. In a reversal of previous positions, European Commission President von der Leyen signaled a recalibrated approach to its relationship with China. She reaffirmed the EU's commitment to what she described as "de-risking," but also highlighted opportunities to deepen trade and investment ties with Beijing [74]; in addition, commenting on Trump's decision to raise tariffs on steel and aluminum products by 25% and several other imported European goods, the EU will work to

protect its economic interests. "We will protect our workers, our companies and our consumers," she said [75].

Trump's White House return signaled a shift in U.S. foreign policy, prioritizing China as the main geopolitical challenge while easing tensions with Russia. The strategy reflects the view that antagonizing Moscow risks strengthening its ties with China. This approach assumes that a strong Sino-Russian partnership poses the greatest challenge to US dominance. Closer military, economic, and diplomatic ties between the two powers would create a significantly more complex threat for Washington. To counter this, the Trump administration aimed to weaken their alliance by offering diplomatic and economic incentives to Russia, reducing Beijing's ability to rely on Moscow's resources in a potential conflict with the US [76].

Trump believes that America's golden age has returned with his re-election as President of the US with a huge popular mandate. The US will soon be stronger, richer, and more united than ever before, and the entire planet will become more peaceful and prosperous as a result of this incredible momentum and what we are doing and will do [77]. In an attempt to activate the engines of American greatness, Trump has unleashed his interplanetary threats on allies and friends alike. Besides announcing Washington's withdrawal from several international organizations and bodies, the number of executive orders issued by Trump will be no less alarming for the international community. "If this continues, the consequences of Trump's second term will not only be measurable in the atmosphere but will also affect people, communities, and the natural world" [78].

VI. RESULTS

Clear contradictions in decisions and positions characterize Trump's strategy, aimed at restoring what he sees as America's lost greatness and getting rid of Biden's legacy. Despite his focus on promoting American interests, his foreign policies are bound to strain US relations with traditional allies around the world. These policies also weaken multilateral agreements, threatening the foundations of the rules-based international order and fostering global instability and insecurity.

Trump's visions of mechanisms to settle the Israeli-Palestinian conflict reflect his limited

understanding of this conflict and its historical and political dimensions, which is clear in the ideas he has put forward. From a business executive's perspective, Trump envisions that displacing the 2.3 million Palestinian citizens of the Gaza Strip would enable him to realize his utopian vision of a "Riviera of the Middle East," a model led by American capital and dominated by large corporations. According to him, this vision would create thousands of investment opportunities and jobs, but only for non-Palestinians.

Although during his first term Trump was deeply involved in the region's politics, including his decision to recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital and move the US embassy there, such a conceptualization reflects a lack of complexity and sensitivity in understanding the conflict, making it seem both simplistic and naïve. When reflecting on the disasters that have befallen the Palestinian Arab people since the infamous Balfour Declaration, the establishment of the State of Israel on the ruins of the indigenous population in 1948, the Great Naksa in 1967, and the subsequent occupation practices and policies aimed at displacing Palestinians from their historic land until today, one fact can be concluded that these colonial policies have led to the displacement of Palestinians from their historic land. It is that these colonial policies have failed to achieve their goals. Over the decades, the Palestinian Arab people have proven their deep attachment to their land and their strong will in the face of attempts to uproot and displace them. However, The Palestinian people have reached a resolute and collective decision: they shall never abandon their homeland.

Trump's policies toward Europe are pushing historic relations toward a conflict that could change the nature of transatlantic relations. These tensions are not limited to a single issue, but encompass a range of intertwined issues, from the demand that European countries increase their NATO spending to 5% instead of 2%, to visions of ending the Russian-Ukrainian conflict with Washington taking full control of Ukraine's resources, to tariffs on European imports, to dramatic proposals such as annexing Greenland or treating Canada as a US state, all of which have the potential to have a profoundly transformative effect. Overall, these issues will have a profoundly transformative effect on transatlantic relations, reshaping alliances according to new rules imposed by the Trump administration, and bypassing the

traditional rules that have governed these relations since World War II. If Trump persists in his demands without a comprehensive "grand bargain" that meets this new approach, a clash with the Europeans seems to be a matter of time. Here, EU countries may be forced to redefine their independent political and economic path away from the US. Considering the divergence in positions on contentious issues with Trump, the disintegration of the EU in its current form seems a distinct possibility.

President Trump's announcement that he wants to agree with Russia to end the conflict in Ukraine reflects a set of strategic goals. The most prominent of these goals is to open channels for the US to get rare earth resources, which are vital to the tech and military industries, in exchange for the billions of dollars it has provided to Ukraine over the last three years of the war. However, Trump did not offer any guarantees for the continued flow of US aid or tacit approval of Ukraine's entry into NATO. Ukrainian President Zelensky faced criticism during a live broadcast of a White House press briefing, where he appeared alongside President Trump and Vice President J.D. Vance.

These are clear signals aimed at wooing Moscow away from its growing alliance with Beijing, which developed during the war. This move reflects his conviction that the continued partnership between Russia and China poses a major threat to US hegemony over the global order, and may inspire other countries opposed to Washington's policies to join this alliance, further complicating the global geopolitical landscape.

As President Trump seeks the help of China, a close ally of Russia, to end the war in Ukraine, it has become clear that his plan to bring peace is problematic. He decided to impose across-the-board tariffs of 10%-25% on Chinese imports to the US, a move that could escalate tensions with Beijing, which had hoped to avoid a trade war with Washington. However, the war in Ukraine may represent a rare point of intersection for the two sides to cooperate. If Trump uses economic policy to establish positive relations with China, the latter also can manoeuvre. It is actively seeking to position itself as a potential peace broker in the conflict and has already made several proposals to resolve the crisis. However, the undeniable reality in the West is that so far, Beijing is leaning heavily toward Moscow in this war. With

the close ties between Chinese President Xi and Putin, the Chinese negotiating table appears to be an environment in which Russia has a greater advantage over Washington. For Trump, this reality poses a challenge. He must move carefully to avoid further isolating European allies that he increasingly sees as a financial burden on the US. On the other hand, he should read statements from Beijing and Moscow about his attempts to create a gap in the growing relationship between them that has become unbreakable.

When considering the broader ramifications, a second term for Trump could carry profound consequences, potentially posing challenges to the foundational principles of national security, state sovereignty, and the commitment to international law. Guided by his leadership and the strategic influence of his closest advisors, there is a possibility of a concerted effort to reestablish the US as the undisputed hegemonic power on the global stage. This ambition for dominance might drive a foreign policy heavily skewed toward showcasing unilateral strength, often placing less emphasis on collaborative efforts with other nations or longstanding global agreements. Such an approach could strain relationships with traditional allies, undermine widely accepted international norms, and contribute to growing instability within the international order. Over time, these dynamics might result in heightened geopolitical tensions and weakened structures of global cooperation

VII. REFERENCES

1. Alain Frachon (2025). 'Trump's announcement of a 'Riviera' in Gaza, would be laughable if the situation wasn't so grave'. *Lemond*, 13 Feb. 2025.
https://www.lemonde.fr/en/opinion/article/2025/02/06/trump-s-announcement-of-a-riviera-in-gaza-would-be-laughable-if-the-situation-wasn-t-so-grave_6737866_23.html
2. Trump: The Art of The Deal. Ballantine Books New York. 1987.
<https://www.propmgmtforms.com/forms/ebooks/trump-the-art-of-the-deal.pdf>
3. An Economic Plan for Rebuilding Gaza: A BOT Approach Joseph Pelzman. July 21, 2024.
https://ceesmena.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/10/An-Economic-Plan-for-Rebuilding-Gaza__A-BOT-Approach-_FINAL_July-21_2024.pdf
4. Bess Levin (2024). Jared Kushner Says Israel Should "Finish the Job" in Gaza So It Can Focus on Building Valuable "Waterfront Property". *Vanity Fair Web*, March 20, 2024.
https://www.vanityfair.com/news/jared-kushner-israel-gaza-waterfront-property?srltid=AfmBOooi6BUGhBbocllvPW_zOd2ulr98vV_TtSWUdbfdlrXlv4bVn9s
5. Viser, Alemany and Birnbaum, (2025). Riviera of the Middle East: How Trump sees Gaza as a real estate deal. *Washington Post*, Feb. 7, 2025.
<https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2025/02/07/trump-gaza-redevelopment/>
6. Middle East Initiative. Belfer Center.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dtalHr5S0ts>
7. Jacob Magid (2025). Jared Kushner behind Trump's plan to take over Gaza. *The Times of Israel*. Feb.5, 2025.
https://www.timesofisrael.com/liveblog_entry/report-jared-kushner-behind-trumps-plan-to-take-over-gaza/
8. Stephen Collinson, (2025). Trump's Gaza 'Riviera' plan is the most outlandish idea in the history of US Middle East peace-making. *CNN*, Feb.5, 2025
<https://edition.cnn.com/2025/02/05/politics/trump-gaza-takeover-analysis/index.html>
9. DNYUZ, (2025). 'Riviera' in Gaza and Aid Agency Assault Capture Trump's Vision of U.S. Power. *Feb.* 5, 2025.
<https://dnyuz.com/2025/02/05/riviera-in-gaza-and-aid-agency-assault-capture-trumps-vision-of-u-s-power/>
10. Archie Bland, (2025). The outlandish plan to turn Gaza into a 'riviera of the Middle East'. *The Guardian*, Feb.6, 2025.
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2025/feb/06/thursday-briefing-first-edition-gaza-riviera-a-middle-east-donald-trump>
11. David Suissa, (2022). The Gaza Riviera, Part 2. *Jewish Journal*, Aug. 11, 2022.
<https://jewishjournal.com/commentary/columnist/editors-note/350661/the-gaza-riviera-part-2/>
12. Michael Kruse, (2016). The Executive Mr. Trump. *Politico*, July/August,2016
<https://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2016/07/2016-donald-trump-boss-employer-company-hired-fired-employees-workers-management-business-214020/>
13. Aditi Bhaduri, (2025). Trump's Gaza 'Riviera' Plan Will Show How United The Arabs Really Are. *NDTV*, Feb 14, 2025.
<https://www.ndtv.com/opinion/trumps-gaza-riviera>

- viera-plan-will-show-how-united-arab-world-really-is-7707875
14. Homeira Moshirzadeh, Shayan Afrasiabi (2021). Trump's Cognition and His Unorthodox Foreign Policy Approach. *Journal of the World Sociopolitical Studies*, Volume 5, Issue 3. Summer 2021. https://wsps.ut.ac.ir/article_86722.html
15. Joseph Krauss, (2025). Trump wants Egypt and Jordan to let in Palestinian refugees from Gaza. Here's why the idea is rejected. Associated Press, Jan 26, 2025. <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/politics/trump-wants-egypt-and-jordan-to-let-in-palestinian-refugees-from-gaza-heres-why-the-idea-is-rejected>
16. Dennis Ross, Dana Stroul (2025). How Trump, Arab Leaders, and Israel Can Close the Gaps on Gaza. Washington Institute for Near East Policy, Feb 7, 2025. <https://www.washingtoninstitute.org/policy-analysis/how-trump-arab-leaders-and-israel-can-close-gaps-gaza>
17. Atlantic Council expert (2025). experts react: Is the US really going to 'take over' the Gaza Strip? February 5, 2025. <https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/new-atlanticist/experts-react/is-the-us-really-going-to-take-over-the-gaza-strip/>
18. Times of India (2025). 'World War III is not so far away': Donald Trump claims his leadership would prevent it. Feb 21, 2025. <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/world/us/world-war-iii-is-not-so-far-away-donald-trump-claims-his-leadership-would-prevent-it/articleshow/118434742.cms>
19. HT News Desk, (2025). World War III not far away but...: US President Donald Trump. Hindustan Time, Feb 21, 2025. <https://www.hindustantimes.com/world-news/us-news/world-war-iii-not-far-away-but-says-us-president-donald-trump-101740102352718.html>
20. White House (2025). Reevaluating and Realigning United States Foreign Aid, Executive Order. Jan. 20, 2025 <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/01/reevaluating-and-realigning-united-states-foreign-aid/>
21. Donald Trump. Truth Social, Feb 19, 2025. <https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/posts/114031332924234939>
22. Kiel Institute (2025). Ukraine support after 3 years of war: Aid flows remain low but steady - Shift towards weapons procurement. IFW, Jan.14.2025 <https://www.ifw-kiel.de/publications/news/ukraine-support-after-3-years-of-war-aid-flows-remain-low-but-steady-shift-towards-weapons-procurement/>
23. Daniel Dale, (2025). Fact checks: Trump falsely claims Zelensky has a 4% approval rating. It's above 50%. CNN, February 19, 2025. <https://edition.cnn.com/2025/02/19/politics/fact-check-trump-falsely-claims-zelensky-has-a-4-approval-rating-its-above-50/index.html>
24. Ivana Kottasová, (2025). Trump falsely calls Zelensky 'a dictator' after Ukraine's leader accuses him of living in 'disinformation space'. CNN, February 19, 2025 <https://edition.cnn.com/2025/02/19/europe/zelensky-trump-reaction-intl/index.html>
25. Daniel Dale, (2025). Fact checks: Trump falsely claims Zelensky has a 4% approval rating. It's above 50%. CNN, February 19, 2025. <https://edition.cnn.com/2025/02/19/politics/fact-check-trumps-lies-about-zelensky-and-ukraine/index.html>
26. Matt Murphy & Jake Horton, (2025). Fact-checking Trump's claims about war in Ukraine. BBC, Febr.19, 2025. <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/c9814k2jlxko>
27. David L. Stern and Ellen Francis, (2025). Amid a war of words, Trump's envoy meets Ukraine's Zelensky. The Washington Post, Feb. 20, 2025. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2025/02/20/ukraine-russia-trump-kellogg-europe/>
28. Tom Watling (2025). What are Ukraine's rare earth minerals, where are they and what will the deal with Trump involve? Independent, Feb. 28, 2025. <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/ukraine-minerals-deal-trump-rare-earth-b2702039.html>
29. Alison Durkee (2025). Zelensky Says He Won't Accept Any Russia Deal Trump Makes Without Ukraine. Forbes, Feb 16, 2025. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/alisondurkee/2025/02/16/zelensky-says-he-wont-accept-any-russia-deal-trump-makes-without-ukraine/>
30. Ambrose Evans-Pritchard (2025). Revealed: Trump's confidential plan to put Ukraine in a stranglehold. Telegraph, Feb. 17 2025. <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/business/2025/02/17/revealed-trump-confidential-plan-ukraine-stranglehold/>
31. Alexander Korolev (2025), Trump wants to do a

- deal for Ukraine's critical minerals. Will Zelensky give him what he wants – or will Putin? The Conservative, Feb. 19, 2025. <https://theconversation.com/trump-wants-to-do-a-deal-for-ukraines-critical-minerals-will-zelensky-give-him-what-he-wants-or-will-putin-250064>
32. US Department of Defence (2025). Opening Remarks by Secretary of Defense Pete Hegseth at Ukraine Defense Contact Group (As Delivered). Department of Defence, Feb. 12, 2025. <https://www.defense.gov/News/Speeches/Speech/Article/%204064113/opening-remarks-by-secretary-of-defense-pete-hegseth-at-ukraine-defense-contact/>
33. Warren Murray (2025). Ukraine war briefing: Zelenskyy waves away first US bid for critical minerals. The Guardian, Feb.17, 2025. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2025/feb/17/ukraine-war-briefing-zelenskyy-waves-away-first-us-bid-for-critical-minerals>
34. Reuters Web, (2025). Zelenskiy, on US minerals deal, says: I can't sell Ukraine. Reuters. Feb. 19, 2025. <https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/zelenskiy-us-minerals-deal-says-i-cant-sell-ukraine-2025-02-19/>
35. Jonathan Landay, Tom Balmforth and Dan Peleschuk (2025). Zelenskiy says draft US minerals deal 'does not protect' Ukraine. Reuters, Feb. 16, 2025. <https://www.reuters.com/markets/commodities/zelenskiy-says-draft-us-minerals-deal-not-ready-yet-it-does-not-protect-ukraine-2025-02-15/>
36. Christopher Miller, Alec Russell and Gideon Rachman (2025). Ukraine reaches minerals deal with United States. Financial Times, Feb. 25, 2025. <https://financialpost.com/financial-times/ukraine-agrees-minerals-deal-us>
37. Barak Ravid & Marc Caputo (2025). Scoop: U.S. and Ukraine discuss "improved" minerals deal after Trump raged at Zelensky. Axios, Feb. 20, 2025. <https://www.axios.com/2025/02/20/us-ukraine-rare-earth-minerals-agreement>
38. Emma Burrows (2025). US presented Ukraine with a document to access its minerals but offered almost nothing in return. AP. Feb. 17, 2025. <https://apnews.com/article/ukraine-us-zelenskyy-agreement-trump-minerals-4d5eefcc44c9f17f330db98d81720b29>
39. Robert Muggah & Rafal Rohozinski (2025). The Mineral Wars – How Ukraine's Critical Minerals Will Fuel Future Geopolitical Rivalries. CIRSD, 2025. <https://www.cirsd.org/en/horizons/horizons-winter-2025-issue-no-29/the-mineral-wars>
40. Jennifer Hansler and Shania Shelton (2025). The US proposes its own UN resolution marking anniversary of the war in Ukraine after refusing to back the European statement. CNN. Feb. 22, 2025 <https://edition.cnn.com/2025/02/22/politics/ukraine-war-us-proposes-un-resolution/index.html>
41. Jennifer Hansler and Shania Shelton (2025). US proposes its own UN resolution marking anniversary of the war in Ukraine after refusing to back European statement, CNN. Feb. 23, 2025. <https://www.msn.com/en-ca/news/world/us-proposes-its-own-un-resolution-marking-anniversary-of-war-in-ukraine-after-refusing-to-back-european-statement/ar-AA1zA7Sm?apiver=1&noservercache=1&domshim=1&renderwebcomponents=1&wcseo=1&batchservertelemetry=1&noservertelemetry=1>
42. Marco Rubio, Secretary of State (2025). UN Must Act to Bring Peace to Europe. Press Statement, US Department of State, Feb. 21, 2025. <https://www.state.gov/the-un-must-act-to-bring-peace-to-europe/>
43. RFE (2025). UN General Assembly Weighs Competing Resolutions Marking the Third Anniversary of War in Ukraine. Radio Free Europe, Feb. 22, 2025. <https://www.rferl.org/a/ukraine-russia-general-assembly-resolution/33323854.html>
44. Alexander Korolev (2025), Trump wants to do a deal for Ukraine's critical minerals. Will Zelensky give him what he wants – or will Putin? The Conservative, Feb. 19, 2025. <https://theconversation.com/trump-wants-to-do-a-deal-for-ukraines-critical-minerals-will-zelensky-give-him-what-he-wants-or-will-putin-250064>
45. Oxford Reference. Lord Palmerston 1784–1865. British statesman; Prime Minister, 1855–8, 1859–65 <https://www.oxfordreference.com/display/10.1093/acref/9780191826719.001.0001/q-oro-ed4-00008130>
46. Sven Biscop (2025). Trump's Europe Policy: No

- Longer Different from Russia and China? Egmont Institute, Febr.20, 2025. <https://www.egmontinstitute.be/trumps-europe-policy-no-longer-different-from-russia-and-china/>
47. Bronwen Maddox (2025). Trump's 'electroshock' on Ukraine ends the debate: Europe cannot rely on the US for its security. Chatham House, Feb. 14, 2025. <https://www.chathamhouse.org/2025/02/trump-electroshock-ukraine-ends-debate-europe-cannot-rely-us-its-security>
 48. Ibid.
 49. Jorge Liboreiro (2025). Worst-case scenario: Why Trump's push for negotiations has put Europe on total edge. Euro News, Feb. 21,2025. <https://www.euronews.com/my-europe/2025/02/21/worst-case-scenario-why-trumps-push-for-negotiations-has-put-europe-on-total-edge>
 50. Dan Sabbagh & Eleni Courea (2025). US should not have made concessions to Russia over Ukraine, says German minister. The Guardian Feb.13, 2025. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2025/feb/13/us-should-not-have-made-concessions-to-russia-over-ukraine-german-minister-says>
 51. Wilhelmine Preussen (2022). Viktor Orbán says Donald Trump's the one to end war in Ukraine. Politico, Oct. 11, 2022. <https://www.politico.eu/article/viktor-orban-donald-trump-end-war-ukraine-russia/>
 52. Katarzyna-Maria Skiba (2025). European leaders to visit Trump following realigned US commitments to Ukraine. Euro News, Feb.22, 2025. <https://www.euronews.com/my-europe/2025/02/22/european-leaders-to-visit-trump-following-realigned-us-commitments-to-ukraine>
 53. Patrick Wintour (2025). Starmer must take the baton from Macron in an effort to sway Trump on Ukraine: the Guardian, 25 Feb. 2025. <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2025/feb/25/starmer-must-pick-a-way-through-trumps-chaos-to-find-some-coherence>
 54. Nomia Iqbal, João da Silva & Michael Race (2025). EU tariffs 'pretty soon' but UK can be worked out – Trump. BBC News, Feb.3, 2025. <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/cn4zgx808g7o>
 55. Euractiv (2025). Trump says NATO members should spend 5% of GDP on defence. Euractiv & Reuters, Jan 8, 2025. [s/trump-says-nato-members-should-spend-5-of-gdp-on-defence/](https://www.euractiv.com/section/politics/new-s/trump-says-nato-members-should-spend-5-of-gdp-on-defence/)
 56. Laura Kayali, Jacopo Barigazzi, Jack Detsch and Joshua Posaner (2025). Trump's uphill battle to make NATO allies hit his mega defense spending target. Politico, Feb. 13, 2025. <https://www.politico.eu/article/donald-trump-nato-allies-defense-spending/>
 57. Lili Pike (2025). Trump's Europe Shock Creates an Opening for China. Foreign Policy, Feb. 20, 2025. <https://foreignpolicy.com/2025/02/20/trump-europe-china-tariffs-defense-spending/>
 58. Vita Golod (2025). What Trump's Tilt Toward Russia Means for China. The Diplomat, Feb. 21, 2025. <https://thediplomat.com/2025/02/what-trumps-tilt-toward-russia-means-for-china/>
 59. Andreea BRINZA, Una Aleksandra BĚRŽINA-ČERENKOVA, Philippe LE CORRE, John SEAMAN, Richard TURCSÁNYI, Stefan VLADISAVLJEV (2024). EU-China relations: De-risking or de-coupling –the future of the EU strategy towards China. European Parliament coordinator: Policy Department for External Relations Directorate-General for External Policies of the Union PE 754.446 – March 2024. [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2024/754446/EXPO_STU\(2024\)754446_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2024/754446/EXPO_STU(2024)754446_EN.pdf)
 60. Sven Biscop (2025). Trump's Europe Policy: No Longer Different from Russia and China? Egmont Institute Feb.20, 2025. <https://www.egmontinstitute.be/trumps-europe-policy-no-longer-different-from-russia-and-china/>
 61. China-Russia east-route gas pipeline now fully operational.shanghai.gov.cn| December 06, 2024 <https://english.shanghai.gov.cn/en-Latest-What'sNew/20241206/625271036d414f33946427023d6d12cb.html>
 62. Vita Golod (2025). What Trump's Tilt Toward Russia Means for China. The Diplomat, Feb. 21, 2025. <https://thediplomat.com/2025/02/what-trumps-tilt-toward-russia-means-for-china/>
 63. Johann C. Fuhrmann (2025). China at the Munich Security Conference. KONRAD ADENAUER STIFTUNG, Feb.18, 2025. <https://www.kas.de/en/country-reports/detail/-/content/china-bei-der-muenchner-sicherheit-skonferenz>
 64. Fact Sheet: President Donald J. Trump Imposes

- Tariffs on Imports from Canada, Mexico, and China. The White House, Feb. 1, 2025 <https://www.whitehouse.gov/fact-sheets/2025/02/fact-sheet-president-donald-j-trump-imposes-tariffs-on-imports-from-canada-mexico-and-china/>
65. Fact Sheet: President Donald J. Trump Encourages Foreign Investment While Protecting National Security, The White House, Feb. 21, 2025. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/fact-sheets/2025/02/fact-sheet-president-donald-j-trump-encourages-foreign-investment-while-protecting-national-security/>
 66. US Department of Defence (2025). Opening Remarks by Secretary of Defense Pete Hegseth at Ukraine Defense Contact Group. Feb. 12, 2025, Secretary of Defense Pete Hegseth, Brussels, Belgium <https://www.defense.gov/News/Speeches/Speech/Article/%204064113/opening-remarks-by-secretary-of-defense-pete-hegseth-at-ukraine-defense-contact/>
 67. Huaxia (2025). China's business community opposes the U.S. overstretching national security concept, hindering economic, and trade exchanges. Source: Xinhua Editor: Huaxia, Feb.24, 2025. <https://english.news.cn/20250224/2574f20e71fa4dd7b8671d91fc16f43c/c.html>
 68. China Daily (2025). China's business community opposes the US's overstretching national security concept, hindering economic, and trade exchanges. China Daily, 24 Feb. 2025. <https://www.chinadaily.com.cn/a/202502/24/WS67bbe72ba310c240449d6dff.html>
 69. Nancy Qian (2025). Trump's Trade War Is About More Than Trade. Kellogg Insight, Feb 17, 2025. <https://insight.kellogg.northwestern.edu/article/trumps-trade-war-china>
 70. John Downing (2023). Who do I call when I want to talk to Europe?' – Henry Kissinger's 'quote' illustrates EU foreign policy problems. Irish Independent, Apr. 15, 2023 <https://www.independent.ie/opinion/comment/who-do-i-call-when-i-want-to-talk-to-europe-henry-kissingers-quote-illustrates-eu-foreign-policy-problems/42433502.html>
 71. Henry Kissinger, The Architect of China shift to US from Russia is no more. [ABS News Service/30.11.2023]. <https://worldtradescanner.com/Henry%20Kissinger,%20The%20Architect%20of%20China%20shift%20to%20US%20from%20Russia%20is%20>Ono%20more.htm
 72. AFP (2025). China-Russia Trade Hit Record High in 2024. The Moscow Times. Jan. 13, 2025 <https://www.themoscowtimes.com/2025/01/13/china-russia-trade-hit-record-high-in-2024-a87590>
 73. Russia, China Kick Off 'Ocean 2024' Joint Naval Exercises. The Moscow Times, Sep. 10, 2024 <https://www.themoscowtimes.com/2024/09/10/russia-china-kick-off-ocean-2024-joint-naval-exercises-a86318>
 74. China Briefing Team (2025). EU-China Relations After the 2024 European Elections: A Timeline. China Briefing, Feb. 26, 2025. <https://www.china-briefing.com/news/eu-china-relations-after-the-2024-european-elections-a-timeline/>
 75. EU-US trade: how tariffs could impact Europe. European Parliament, 13-02-2025 <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/topics/en/article/20250210STO26801/eu-us-trade-how-tariffs-could-impact-europe>
 76. Hasim Turker (2025). Trump's Russia Strategy: Breaking the Sino-Russian Alliance or Strengthening It? Geopolitical Monitor, Feb. 23, 2025. <https://www.geopoliticalmonitor.com/trumps-russia-strategy-breaking-the-sino-russian-alliance-or-strengthening-it/>
 77. White House (2025). Remarks By President Trump at the World Economic Forum. Jan. 23, 2025. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/remarks/2025/01/remarks-by-president-trump-at-the-world-economic-forum/>
 78. Trump 2.0 – a threat to democracy, people, and the planet. Global Witness, 21 January 2025. <https://globalwitness.org/en/press-releases/trump-20-threat-to-democracy-people-and-planet>

This page intentionally left blank