

The US presidential election of 8 November 2016 was won by the Republican candidate Donald Trump, who became the 45th president elect of the United States. In addition the Republicans won a majority in both the Senate and the House of representatives.

The election of Trump has come in spite of all odds. Everybody forecasted Democratic candidate Hillary Clinton to win the elections. Trump also has overcome the hostility of the establishment of the Republican Party, the so-called Republican "elitists" and the Bush family, with the former President George W. Bush who said they had voted for Clinton.

Trump victory is, therefore, considered to be the victory of an outsider against Washington establishment. According to some, Trump was able to meet the desire for change of the American middle class, to tell truth the factors that led to his victory are many, and notwithstanding the conventional wisdom of mainstream journalism and opinion surveys, they could be foreseen since summer 2016.

As a matter of fact, once Trump has won the Republican election platform and he became the official candidate, Trump had become a credible candidate with a good chance of being elected, if compared to Clinton's continuity with the Obama administration. He could be supported by discontent with incumbent governments caused by the crisis economic.

In addition, any Republican candidate could have in its favor the traditional two-terms "turn over" between Democratic and Republican presidents, which has a few exceptions, since in 1951, the 22nd Amendment to the Constitution has forbidden to be able to carry more than two terms. Even between 1960 and 1981 in spite of traumatic events such as Kennedy assassination or Watergate, it was confirmed the alternation of two mandates for each party, though with different presidents. The only two exceptions were: Jimmy Carter, who served only one mandate and George H. Bush, who served one term, but he followed on the two Reagan presidential terms, with a total of three consecutive mandates for Republicans. But Reagan was the president who won the "cold war". After Bill Clinton, all American presidents have served two terms, then followed by a president of the opposite party.

In Europe, Trump election elicited surprise. The first European politician to meet with Trump was the former UKIP leader, Nigel Farage. He was even rumored to be reserved a job in Trump administration or as American ambassador in London, Farage himself denied these rumors. In a move that defied diplomatic "red tape", Trump via Twitter asked the British government to appoint Farage as British ambassador to Washington: A proposal that has not been dropped into the void by prime minister May. At the same time, Prime Minister May had already made a blunder to describe Trump electoral campaign as "inadequate" in his tone. According to a few observers, Trump would be in favor of a rapprochement with the United Kingdom in case of Brexit. This is in accordance with the statements made during his election campaign. In order to contradict President Obama who stated that in case of Brexit "The UK is going to be in the back of the queue" for negotiating bilateral trade agreements, Trump retorted by saying that if he were president he would never put the UK in the queue, but that he would assure a favorable treatment. In other European countries, Trump is known as a businessman and has followers mainly in the opposition parties and among the few conservative governments. For example, the Hungarian Prime Minister Orbán, leader of the conservative Fidesz party, was the first European head of government to be invited to the Trump Tower, on 26 November 2016.

The key Trump statement on European defence is that the US does not intend to contribute to the defence of Europe if the Europeans do not increase their efforts, especially by contributing to the budget and to NATO common expenses.

The question of burden sharing in NATO and the disproportion of defence investments between the United States and Europe for the defence of the European continent is at least 30 years old.

It is interesting to recall that in 1987, Trump bought a whole page in "New York Times" to protest the fact that rich countries, such as Germany, Japan and South Korea enjoyed US security umbrella without paying for it .

Today, the United States account for almost 70% of NATO funding and military capabilities, while the EU Member States of NATO just amount to 21%. This figure does not include Canada, Turkey, Norway and the United Kingdom, which are not (or with Brexit will not be) part of the EU. Many American presidents have called for a greater European commitment, but the issue had never been evoked in these terms, by putting into question the principle of intervention of art. 5 of the Washington Treaty.

President Obama had launched ERI plan (European Reassurance Initiative) by sending troops and military aid to the Baltic States, Poland and other eastern European countries for a total of \$ 3.4 billion in 2016. It is not known what will be of the ERI, it could be resized or cancelled or utilized as a bargaining chip.

Besides, Trump statement that in case of Russian aggression to the Baltic State, the US would evaluate whether it is "worth" to intervene, it is potentially dangerous because it could be considered as a US non-interference principle, and a "free hand" for Russians in Eastern Europe.

In any case, NATO has now established since a few years the target of 2% of GDP for the defence budget and 20% of the defence budget to be dedicated to investments in military equipment acquisitions and related R & D.

Probably, the president-elect Trump will insist on this issue, in order to boost European defence spending, but may have some "strings to its bow" to impose more military spending to Europeans.

The first could be to tie ERI to a stronger European contribution to defence. The second could be to refuse to contribute to NATO common assets, for example for replacement of expensive AWACS (airborne early warning and control) fleet. The main problem is that without US "enablers", European military capabilities are insufficient. As it was clearly demonstrated by the intervention in Libya in 2011.

The expectations of a general increase in defence budgets in the US and Europe have caused a jump in the shares of the American and European aerospace and defence company. The day after the election night on November 9, Lockheed Martin, Northrop Grumman and General Dynamics shares have reached respectively +5 and + 7%, + 7.45% and Raytheon Leonardo reached even +7.61.

To tell the truth, investor confidence is probably due not much to Trump election, as to Republican majority in both houses of Congress. This is due to the fact that the Republicans are traditionally strong supporters of defence spending.

On the contrary, the president-elect Trump, however, has criticized via Twitter on December 6 the "out of control" costs of the new Air Force One of Boeing. On 12 December 2016, he judged too expensive the F-35 programme of Lockheed Martin, and he announcing that funds will be diverted on other military programs. These comments have made the two companies' shares to lose value. Therefore, the positive effect on the stock market for defence industry is too volatile and linked to specific statements to be regarded as an established trend.

In conclusion, most of Trump's statements made during the election campaign and before taking office, will be harnessed by the "checks and balances" of the US government, and the Trump staff will likely be more moderate than one may think today.