

THE FUTURE OF EUROPE



by
KEVIN GALALAE
(12 March 2017)

If Geert Wilders wins the election in the Netherlands it's the end of the EU, which already hangs by a thread.

If the EU survives the upcoming Dutch and French elections, its leaders must make up their minds with respect to how they want to solve the demographic and economic problems caused by the depopulation / globalization international system created in 1945.

Absent concerted action from the global governance level, which seems more unlikely to happen with every passing day, they only have two options, which can be loosely referred to as the populist and the globalist options or the self-serving and self-sacrificial options:

1. The populist or self-serving option will necessitate the following:

- (a) close the bloc's borders to any and all immigration from outside the continent;
- (b) stop poisoning the people into sterility and morbidity to bring the total fertility rate up from 1.5 to 2.1 and keep it at replacement level and tell the truth with respect to the depopulation program so that limits to family size can be legislated and native Europeans can keep the population and therefore the economy stable on their own without the help of immigration and can reach sustainability by the end of this century, which means that the population will have to decrease by half from the current 500 million;
- (c) legislate assisted suicide to survive the last stage of the demographic transition when the old outnumber the young and pose an unbearable economic burden;
- (d) pump at least 10% of GDP for the next four decades into decarbonizing the economy and bring Russia within the EU otherwise it will sabotage the continent's decarbonization effort in order to save its own economy, which means that NATO must be dissolved;
- (e) fulfill international responsibilities by bypassing the UN and instead pumping enormous amounts of money, to the tune of at least 5% of GDP, directly into Africa to stabilize the continent and prevent its population from tripling by the end of this century, which would spell disaster not only for Africa but also for Europe because desperate hordes of immigrants would invade the continent and no one will be able to hold them back without committing mass murder;
- (f) hope that the US will take care of the western hemisphere, that Japan, China and India will take care of Asia, and that the Muslim world will take care of itself;

- (g) accept a smaller share of the international trade pie and a more modest and self-contained steady state economy because Europe's retreat from the international arena into a more isolationist position will have a domino effect that will result in a far smaller international market for European goods and services in order to make room for regional development throughout the developing world;
- (h) introduce universal basic income, dismantle the bureaucracies and replace most jobs with robots to free human resources for medical care and care for the elderly;
- (i) and last but not least, come up with a new international system to prevent world war, secure access to vital natural resources, and prevent environmental collapse.

2. The globalist or self-sacrificial option will necessitate the following:

- (a) allow enough immigrants into the EU every year to compensate for the continent's artificially low birth rates (which would require assimilating about 1 million immigrants annually to make up for the fertility gap caused by the use of covert methods of depopulation since the early 1950s);
- (b) continue to lie and to poison the population with chemical and biological toxins to keep the total fertility rate at sub-replacement level and increase morbidity among the old until the baby boom generation is dead, the EU has lowered its population from the current 500 million to a sustainable 250 million, and the global population stabilizes around 2050;
- (c) coordinate the process of decarbonization with the rest of the world and therefore at a much slower pace so that nations dependent on oil and gas exports for their survival are not starved to death by a quick transition to renewable energy sources and the Middle East and other regions are destabilized;
- (d) fulfill international responsibilities by continuing to rely on the UN and NATO to interfere and intervene in the internal affairs of developing nations, which will require allocating some 5% of the EU budget to foreign development and an additional 10% to military spending and would involve the EU in countless conflicts and mini-wars around the world but will prevent a world war as well as global economic and environmental collapse;

- (e) and solve its budgetary, unemployment and economic problems by further encroaching into the markets of the developing world to support large bureaucracies and feed larger corporations.

For either scenario to work all components must be adhered to and carried out. There can be no picking and choosing. If the outside world is ignored international problems will drag down the EU sooner or later.

The first scenario will preserve the continent's cultural and ethnic integrity but will lead to a much lower standard of living for the next two generations because the EU economy will be weighed down by an increasingly ageing population (since the median age will rise from the current 41 years to at least 45 years before the population stabilizes by the middle of this century), a crushing dependency burden posed by the elderly (since the proportion of elderly to the rest of the population will increase from the current 25% to 50%), and a decreasing tax base (due to a smaller work force). It will also result in poorer Europeans relative to the rest of the world because Europe will have to shrink its international market share to make room for developing nations. For this scenario to work, it also depends on others fulfilling their international responsibilities in their respective regions and in the absence of a coercive UN system and a united West willing to use force. Last but not least, it will lead to the dissolution of the UN and to a multipolar world that lacks a global authority to mediate conflicts, which will require the creation of a new system of global governance and the necessary institutional infrastructure to prevent a world war, ensure equal access to vital natural resources and avoid environmental collapse. The world will lose ten years that it cannot afford to lose and that may well trigger conflicts that get out of control and spell the end of human civilization. It is therefore an appealing but also a very risky option.

The second scenario will devastate the health of Europeans and their ability to procreate and police state controls will annihilate all fundamental rights to keep covert methods of depopulation in place out of solidarity with the rest of the world. It will lead to a multicultural, multiethnic and multi-religious Europe where mixed-race citizens will be the majority by the end of the century and a hybrid culture will emerge. It will however ensure the continuing dominance of the West in the political, military and economic fields and those who carry European passports will have a much greater standard of living than the rest of the world save for North America. And it will also ensure that the world moves towards global governance by expanding the role and powers of the UN, which will be in control of not only the depopulation program but also of globalization and decarbonization worldwide and will limit national democracies to marginal and insignificant roles. It will however succeed in bringing Europe to sustainability by 2050 and thus half a century faster than the populist option, in preventing world war and in completing nuclear disarmament and preventing environmental collapse. It is therefore a very oppressive but safe option.