

Greenland's American Liberal Order in the 21st Century

Author: Dr. / Youssef Salloum | Lebanese Republic
PhD in Geopolitics and international relations | Paris graduate school - france

E-mail : salloum84@hotmail.com | <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-6703-1863>

<https://doi.org/10.70758/elqarar/12.34.6>

Received : 19/09/2026

Accepted : 09/10/2026

Published : 15/10/2026

Cite this article as: Salloum, Youssef, *Greenland's American Liberal Order in the 21st Century*, *ElQarar Journal for Peer-Reviewed Scientific Research*, vol 12, issue 34, Third year, 2026, pp. 131-151. <https://doi.org/10.70758/elqarar/12.34.6>

Abstract

This study addresses the problematic strategic role of the United States of America in employing proactive foreign policy initiatives during the twenty-first century, taking the Greenland file and transformations in polar space as a main analytical model. The importance of the study lies in deconstructing the traditional discourse that interprets American moves as occasional diplomatic crises or lapses, to prove that they represent an extension of a strategic culture based on political realism and protecting national security. To answer this problem, the study adopted the comparative historical approach to studying political geography, tracing the stages of American strategic expansion from the Louisiana Purchase (1803) through the purchase of Alaska (1867) all the way to contemporary dynamics, while employing the “geopolitical repetition” approach. The study found that US policies towards the Arctic and Venezuela do not aim to undermine alliances, but rather seek to activate mutual deterrence, fill strategic gaps in the face of escalating competition with major powers (China and Russia), and respect the right to self-determination within the frameworks of constructive partnership to support the stability of the international system.

Keywords: U.S. Foreign Policy; Geopolitical Cycles; Territorial Expansion; NATO Crisis; International Law; Sovereignty; Arctic Geopolitics; Resource Conflict; Liberal International Order.

Résumé

Cette étude examine le rôle stratégique problématique joué par les États-Unis à travers des initiatives de politique étrangère proactive au XXI^e siècle, en utilisant la question du Groenland et les changements dans l'espace polaire comme modèle analytique fondamental. L'importance de l'étude est mise en évidence en allant au-delà de l'interprétation des mouvements américains comme des crises temporaires, pour prouver qu'ils sont une extension d'une culture stratégique fondée sur le réalisme politique et la protection de la sécurité nationale. Pour répondre à cette problématique, l'étude a adopté une approche historique comparative pour retracer les étapes de

l'expansion stratégique américaine, en commençant par l'« achat de la Louisiane » (1803), en passant par l'achat de l'Alaska (1867) et en arrivant aux dynamiques contemporaines, tout en utilisant l'approche de la répétition géopolitique. En conséquence, l'étude a conclu que les politiques américaines cherchent à activer la dissuasion mutuelle, à combler les lacunes stratégiques face à l'escalade de la concurrence avec des puissances internationales telles que la Chine et la Russie, et à respecter le droit à l'autosuffisancedétermination dans le cadre d'un partenariat constructif à soutenir la stabilité du système international.

Mots-clés: politique étrangère américaine; expansion territoriale; crise de l'OTAN; droit international; souveraineté; géopolitique arctique; lutte pour les ressources; ordre international libéral.

غرينلاند والنظام الليبرالي الأمريكي في القرن الحادي والعشرين

إعداد: الدكتور / يوسف سلوم | الجمهورية اللبنانية

دكتورة في الجيوبوليتيك والعلاقات الدولية | كلية باريس للدراسات العليا - فرنسا

E-mail : salloum84@hotmail.com_ | <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-6703-1863>

<https://doi.org/10.70758/elqarar/12.34.6>

تاريخ النشر: 2026/10/15

تاريخ القبول: 2026/10/09

تاريخ الاستلام: 2026/09/19

للاقتباس: سلوم، يوسف، غرينلاند والنظام الليبرالي الأمريكي في القرن الحادي والعشرين، مجلة القرار للبحوث العلمية المحكمة، المجلد الثاني عشر، العدد 34، السنة الثالثة، 2026، ص-ص 131-151. <https://doi.org/10.70758/elqarar/12.34.6>

المستخلص

تبحث هذه الدراسة في الإشكالية المتعلقة بالدور الإستراتيجي الذي تلعبه الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية عبر مبادرات السياسة الخارجية الإستباقية في القرن الحادي والعشرين، متخذة من مسألة غرينلاند وتغيرات النطاق القطبي نموذجاً تحليلياً أساسياً. تبرز أهمية الدراسة في تجاوز تفسير التحركات الأمريكية كأزمات عارضة، لإثبات أنها إمتداد لتقافة إستراتيجية مبنية على الواقعية السياسية وحماية الأمن القومي. وللإجابة عن هذه الإشكالية، إعتمدت الدراسة المنهج التاريخي المقارن في تتبع مراحل التوسع الإستراتيجي الأمريكي بدءاً من صفقة شراء لويزيانا (1803) ومروراً بشراء ألاسكا (1867) ووصولاً إلى الديناميكيات المعاصرة، مع توظيف مقاربة التكرار الجيوسياسي. وعليه، خلصت الدراسة إلى أن السياسات الأمريكية تسعى إلى تفعيل الردع المتبادل، وسد الفجوات الإستراتيجية في مواجهة المنافسة المتصاعدة مع القوى الدولية كالصين وروسيا، وإحترام حق تقرير المصير ضمن أطر الشراكة البناءة لدعم إستقرار النظام الدولي.

الكلمات المفتاحية: السياسة الخارجية الأمريكية؛ التوسع الإقليمي؛ أزمة حلف الناتو؛ القانون الدولي؛ السيادة؛ جيوسياسية القطب الشمالي؛ الصراع على الموارد؛ النظام الدولي الليبرالي

INTRODUCTION

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, the United States of America sought to adopt a package of proactive diplomatic and strategic initiatives that reflect its keenness to protect its vital interests and enhance global stability, even if this requires going beyond traditional diplomatic frameworks in managing alliances. The introduction of the idea of acquiring the Greenland region in 2019 to enhance polar security in the face of escalating geopolitical challenges, along with decisive intervention in 2026 to enforce the rule of international law and confront cross-border threats in Venezuela, are two prominent examples of this firm realpolitik.⁽¹⁾ This article emphasizes that these measures are merely a living reflection of a deep strategic culture based on the principles of national security, flexibility and adaptability, pillars that clearly emerge when changes in the international environment require maintaining stability and preventing a strategic vacuum.

Analyzing the core framework reveals that the Trump administration's policies regarding Greenland and Venezuela represent a deliberate reactivation of a foundational U.S. geopolitical doctrine. This approach prioritizes unilateral control over multilateral cooperation and international legal norms. Consequently, these actions are not incidental; they systematically erode alliance trust and deliberately circumvent international law.

The re-activation of this doctrine is the result of the convergence of three inter-related variables:

- 1- The structural pressure created by renewed competition between major powers, particularly the United States and both China and Russia, which creates the incentive for states to acquire control of critical geography and key resources;⁽²⁾
- 2- The transformative physical reality of climate change, which is creating new opportunities for access to previously inaccessible areas of the Arctic and increasing the scarcity of resources;
- 3- An internal ideological perspective that views the pursuit of protecting the United States' international standing as a means of asserting global leadership and serving supreme national interests. Diplomacy is thus used as an effective tool to unite the interior around the slogan of preserving American constants in order to contain the accelerating international challenges.⁽³⁾

To support the above arguments, a comparative historical approach to the study of geopolitics is adopted, based on the concepts of strategic continuity and the principles of rational political

(1) SWP Berlin, America's fixation on Greenland (Comment No. 8/2026), Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, 2026, https://www.swp-berlin.org/publications/products/comments/2026C08_US_Fixation_Greenland.pdf

(2) CGSR, Revitalizing the United States' Arctic presence through strategic partnerships, Center for Global Security Research, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, 2025, <https://cgsr.llnl.gov/sites/cgsr/files/2025-07/BEO-CGSR-Arctic.pdf>

(3) Politico, White House claims 'maximum leverage' over Venezuela, 2026, <https://www.politico.com/news/2026/01/07/white-house-claims-maximum-leverage-over-venezuela-00714342>

realism⁽¹⁾, to trace the historical milestones in the process of American expansion, starting with the Louisiana Purchase (1803), through the peaceful acquisition of Alaska (1867), and ending with the purchase of the Danish West Indies⁽²⁾ (1917) under a treaty of mutual consent - in order to highlight the United States' firm commitment to securing its vital interests and promoting its stability. In this context, the Truman administration's 1946 offer to purchase Greenland is viewed as a proactive and deliberate step to enhance common defense security, a strategic link between the vision of the nineteenth century and the requirements of the twenty-first century, and a prelude to a leading American role in the Arctic in light of the intense international geopolitical competition for global influence.⁽³⁾

I. The Importance of Study

1. Deconstructing traditional discourse to prove U.S. policy stems from strategic realism and national security, while introducing Geopolitical Repetition.
2. Addressing the Arctic as a major theater of great power competition, positioning Greenland as a pillar for continental defense and deterrence.
3. Explaining NATO tensions by showing how U.S.A aims to fill strategic gaps and prevent rival exploitation through constructive partnership.

II. Study Objectives

1. Analyzing the deep strategic logic of the United States' proactive foreign policy in the twenty-first century through the Greenland model.
2. Tracing the historical trajectory of US geopolitical expansion as a sustainable institutional approach to protecting its national security.
3. Proving that US policies towards Greenland represent a strategic activation of a well-established sovereign principle and not an accidental deviation.
4. Evaluating the role of the United States of America in confronting structural pressures and Arctic changes to ensure the stability of the international system and its supreme interests.

III. Study Problem

Hence, addressing the issue requires dismantling the historical roots and structural motives of foreign policy; therefore, the study sought to answer the following problem: How do proactive US foreign policy move in the twenty-first century such as the Greenland file reflect a deep strategic culture based on political realism and protecting national security, far from being considered merely passing crises or improvised decisions?

(1) **Principles of rational political realism:** A theoretical framework rooted in classical realism emphasizing power maximization, national interest, and rational state action under international anarchy.

(2) **Danish West Indies:** Territories (now the US Virgin Islands) acquired via a joint process in 1917, aimed at boosting international cooperation and protecting Panama Canal sea approaches.

(3) NPR, Greenland: Did Harry Truman really try to buy...?, 2019, <https://www.npr.org/2019/08/22/753192368/fact-check-did-harry-truman-really-try-to-buy-greenland-back-in-the-day>

The study's problem has several questions:

1. To what extent does the historical trajectory of American geopolitical expansion from the Louisiana Purchase to Alaska extend as a sustainable institutional approach to protecting national security?
2. How do American policies towards Greenland represent a strategic activation of an established sovereign principle and not just a deviation or an accidental crisis?
3. What is the nature of the convergence of structural variables, competition with major powers, climate change, and internal considerations, in reproducing this strategic doctrine?
4. How do these policies contribute to confronting pressures and structuring joint deterrence to ensure the stability of the international system and protect vital interests within the frameworks of constructive partnership?

Therefore, in its analytical structure, the research reviews this sustainable historical path using a comparative historical approach, establishing the concept of periodic geopolitical necessity as a fundamental and continuing current in shaping American strategy. The research structure is organized into two main sections that represent the foundation of the analytical methodology. The first section "Leadership as Continuity" deals with the historical roots of American expansion and the continuity of polar leadership, linking historical expansionist milestones with contemporary strategic interest in the Greenland issue as a security pillar, an axis for protecting vital interests, and a means of confronting competition between major powers in the Arctic.

Meanwhile, the second section deals with the framework of a deep strategy to enhance collective security, highlighting how American policies align with the requirements of joint deterrence while respecting frameworks of constructive partnership with Denmark and the Greenlandic government in accordance with the path of self-determination. This prevents any strategic gaps that might be exploited by competing powers while maintaining the stability of the Western alliance system and international security overall. Thus, the research emphasizes the deep strategic continuity that characterizes American foreign policy, going beyond superficial readings that treat these moves as emergency turning points, to offer a more accurate understanding of the logic of national security and its sustainability within a changing international environment.

I. Leadership as Continuity

The media discourse that followed the 2019 revelation about what the US administration under President Donald J. Trump was doing, including the prospects for a strategic partnership and the idea of involving Greenland together with Denmark, framed it as some kind of proactive move beyond traditional framework.⁽¹⁾ However, through the deep analysis of the long arc of US national strategy, it becomes clear that this angle fits neatly into an already established historical logic, rather than representing a sudden deviation. Therefore, treating Greenland as a security pillar that should be strengthened through diplomatic channels and shared interests is consistent with American principles and priorities in achieving stability for vital interests.

Further, the Greenland issue, which at first glance can seem brand new, acts as a cyclical geopolitical priority that comes back when the world changes in major ways and when the vital importance of the Arctic area has to be re-assessed. If you want to understand why the Greenland issue shows up again and again in American strategic thinking, you end up seeing the underlying constants of US geopolitical identity, namely the unrelenting effort to build a deeper shared defense space, secure resources, and back regional stability across the Western Hemisphere, and from there contribute to global peace and security, through constructive alliances and by consolidating the bases of stability.⁽²⁾

Accordingly, the first chapter examines the historical framework behind U.S. territorial expansion and that particular approach, and it tracks how different administrations, over time, leaned on diplomatic as well as economic tools—like the Louisiana Purchase, the Adams-Onís Treaty⁽³⁾, and the acquisitions of Alaska and the Danish West Indies—to tighten borders, discourage rival encroachments, and guard national security. It also shows how this historical diplomatic template keeps showing up in Greenland, following its evolution from nineteenth century strategic assessments and the 1946 Truman administration proposal, to the current geopolitical priorities shaped by climate change, critical mineral resources, and great-power competition across the Arctic.

a. The Foundational Doctrine: Territorial Expansion as American Statecraft

The United States was founded on a solid commitment to protect its national security and keep its vital interests stable. That strategic vision of national development, which took shape during the nineteenth century, offered a working path for efforts designed to encourage regional calm

(1) CNN, The US has tried to acquire Greenland before – and failed, 2026, <https://www.cnn.com/2026/01/07/politics/us-greenland-trump-denmark-history-hnk>.

(2) National Geographic, Here's why Greenland is strategically important to the U.S., 2025, <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/history/article/greenland-us-purchase-history-wwii>

(3) Adams-Onís Treaty: A 1819 bilateral treaty between the United States and Spain that ceded Florida to the U.S. and defined the boundary between the U.S. and New Spain.

through diplomacy, bilateral arrangements, and good-neighborly type collaborations.⁽¹⁾ In that way, a historical trail that suggests successive governments were proactive in using calm and economic instruments to lock in their borders, support open commerce, and deny rival powers a real chance to plant themselves in a spot that could endanger national security, or at least make it feel that way.

Moreover, President Thomas Jefferson's decision in 1803 to purchase roughly 828,000 square miles of France, under the Louisiana Purchase⁽²⁾ deal for \$15 million, stands as one of the key markers along this path. The reasoning was anchored in urgent security and financial pressures, such as ensuring that navigation on the Mississippi River stayed free, and safeguarding the port of New Orleans, and supporting the country's long - term development efforts and removing any possible danger to regional stability.⁽³⁾

1. **Acquisition of Florida (1819):** The Adams-Onís Treaty⁽⁴⁾, successfully integrated Florida from Spain for \$5 million, serving as a meaningful move to settle boundary disputes, tighten territorial security on the southern side, and maintain both civilian and defensive oversight along the Gulf of Mexico coastline, in coordination with interested parties.
2. **Gadsden Purchase⁽⁵⁾ (1853):** this bargain was reached with Mexico for \$10 million, to finalize border demarcations and facilitate the development of infrastructure and over-land transportation in order to back regional economic momentum and national cohesion.
3. **Acquisition of Alaska (1867):** Secretary of State William H. Seward negotiated the deal to buy Alaska from Russia for \$7.2 million. Even though there was early skepticism, this step still stands as a long-horizon strategic investment, because it locked in the northwestern borders and later helped supply important resources, while also improving defense security across the North Pacific Ocean and into the Arctic.
4. In 1917, the United States worked with others to acquire the Danish West Indies (today the US Virgin Islands), and after the whole process of territorial dispute resolution, it transferred \$20 million to Spain in return for the Philippines, Guam, and Puerto Rico. The secure incorporation of these territories in the Pacific Ocean and the Caribbean Sea, including the Danish West Indies purchase for \$25 million, was aimed at boosting international cooperation and stopping these sensitive locations from being used as military bargaining chips against international navigation, like securing the sea approaches tied to the Panama Canal.

(1) A. Weinberg, Manifest Destiny: A theme in American history. The American Historical Review, 40(4), 1935, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1838769>

(2) **Louisiana Purchase:** The 1803 acquisition of roughly 828,000 square miles from France by President Thomas Jefferson for \$15 million to secure navigation and regional stability.

(3) M. Mandelbaum, The Four Ages of American Foreign Policy: Weak Power, Great Power, Superpower, Hyper-power, Oxford University Press, New York, 2022, pp.43- 52.

(4) **Adams-Onís Treaty:** The 1819 agreement that successfully integrated Florida from Spain for \$5 million to tighten southern territorial security.

(5) **Gadsden Purchase:** The 1853 bargain with Mexico for \$10 million to finalize borders and facilitate infrastructure and transportation development.

So, overall, one can observe a repeatable model in U.S. diplomatic history: economic and diplomatic tools are utilized to handle early security worries, anticipate international flare-ups, and safeguard key interests, using peaceful methods. Further, by the start of the twentieth century, the United States had, in practice, consolidated its position through recorded pacts and arrangements that covered about 38% of its current land area;⁽¹⁾ therefore, any past or present American push for reinforcing a strategic partnership with Greenland naturally slots into this same approach, one focused on establishing polar security and stability.

b. Greenland and the consolidation of polar leadership (1867-1947)

The first serious consideration regarding acquiring Greenland, kind of, emerged around the time of the Alaska Purchase⁽²⁾. At that point the United States saw the annexation of those territories as part of one bigger strategic picture, a sort of road map designed to maintain influence over Arctic Ocean corridors and the areas around them. In 1867, an official State Department report described Greenland's geopolitical and economic benefits. It basically suggested Greenland as a very good add-on to Alaska, to strengthen national security.⁽³⁾ Even if nothing was actually done then, that decision still made the later planning feel way more grounded, and not just random idea drifting.

Greenland's political importance kept growing, until it hit its highest point when World War II began, and the signs of the Cold War started becoming obvious. When Denmark got occupied, the United States moved quickly to provide protection for Greenland. This included building a defense setup and putting new military bases in place, all to stabilize the wider region.⁽⁴⁾ After the war, as the Soviet Union emerged as a big global challenge, the United States treated Greenland like a keystone, for continental defense, not just a side project.

In 1946, President Harry S. Truman's administration put forward a diplomatic proposal to purchase Greenland for \$100 million. They also looked at other routes, like swapping certain strategic lands in Alaska.⁽⁵⁾ Later declassified papers suggest the whole point was to fulfill "common military defense requirements," especially as air warfare expanded and intercontinental deterrence strategies gained momentum. That broader logic shows up in a January 1947 Time magazine article, too. It claimed that owning the island helps Danish-American cooperation, and it offers a "major defensive advantage" because Greenland works like a unique strategic stronghold.⁽⁶⁾ In that framing, Greenland's positioning becomes basically irreplaceable for ad-

(1) Library of Congress, Today in history – March 31: Virgin Islands, 2026, <https://www.loc.gov/item/to-day-in-history/march-31/>.

(2) **Alaska Purchase:** The 1867 acquisition of Alaska from Russia for \$7.2 million, arranged by Secretary of State William H. Seward to secure northern borders and defense.

(3) National Geographic, Here's why Greenland is strategically important to the U.S., 2025, <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/history/article/greenland-us-purchase-history-wwii>

(4) Peter Harmsen, Greenland at War: The United States, Germany and the Struggle for the Arctic, 1939–45. Havertown, Casemate Publishers, 2024, p.25.

(5) Ken S. Coates, Arctic Front: The North in Global Strategy since 1945, McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal & Kingston, 2021, p.31.

(6) Peter Harmsen, Greenland at War: The United States, Germany and the Struggle for the Arctic, 1939–45,

vanced meteorological observation, for early warning mechanisms, and for holding deterrence steady in practice.

Even though the 1946 offer, officially announced only in 1991, met some local Danish hesitation and was sidestepped through NATO⁽¹⁾ structures, the 1951 Joint Defense Agreement⁽²⁾ still locked in Greenland's essential role. The Thule Air Base⁽³⁾, in particular, remained crucial for strategic command and early warning capabilities. Still, even while a set of operational and environmental difficulties that came along with the region's historical military buildup,⁽⁴⁾ Greenland has continued to function as a pillar within the Northern Defense Strategy, and as a persistent priority for protecting international peace and stability.

c. Strengthening the strategic security of the Arctic and protecting vital resources

Contemporary geopolitical shifts point to a strategic turning point, where the political situation in Greenland is evolving, and where Greenland is expanding how it manages its water resources alongside the boom in global commodity markets and the knock-on effects of climate change. This whole mix of factors enhances the importance of securing that vital location.⁽⁵⁾ The emergence of large mineral deposits, including rare earth elements, uranium, gold, and promising energy reserves, plus the shrinking of sea ice and the opening of navigation routes like the Northwest Passage and the North Sea Route, all together reduce transit times between Asia and Europe.

Further, that aligns with the vision put forward by former U.S. Secretary of State Mike Pompeo regarding turning the Arctic into a strategic trading artery comparable to the Suez and Panama Canals.⁽⁶⁾ Consequently, Greenland occupies a central role as an effective strategic fulcrum within the broader system of national security and joint defense, moving beyond traditional concepts of military positioning toward a dynamic horizon that supports stability in global trade while protecting vital interests amid accelerating regional geopolitical pressures.

d. Strategic security in the Arctic under geopolitical imperatives

The fast geopolitical changes across the Arctic region, driven by intense great-power competition, especially between Russia and China, create an urgent need to reassess deterrence

op.cit, p.25.

(1) **NATO:** A military alliance comprising Euro-Atlantic nations to enhance defense and collective security.

(2) **1951 Joint Defense Agreement:** A pact that locked in Greenland's essential role in regional security and defense structures after the 1946 purchase offer was sidestepped.

(3) **Thule Air Base:** A critical defense installation in Greenland essential for strategic command, early warning capabilities, and continental defense.

(4) Ken S. Coates, Arctic Front: The North in Global Strategy since 1945, op.cit, p.33.

(5) Reuters, Trump administration eyes stake in company developing Greenland rare earths mine, 2025, <https://www.reuters.com/business/trump-administration-eyes-stake-company-developing-greenland-rare-earths-mine-2025-10-03/>.

(6) CBC, Pompeo calls out Canada, China, Russia over Arctic policy, 2019, <https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/pompeo-canada-russia-china-arctic-1.5125293> .

tools and regional stability. The goal is to safeguard vital interests and enhance security.⁽¹⁾ US actions regarding Greenland can be seen as a natural extension of long-term strategies that were shaped by major historical milestones like the Alaska and West Indies deals. Those deals acted as preventive measures, aimed at strengthening national security, so that no strategic vacuum can emerge that competing actors could use to chip away at regional or global stability. With climate change shrinking the ice barriers noticeably, the map of international shipping is being redrawn, and the region becomes both vital and exposed to the ambitions of different international players trying to alter the balance of power.⁽²⁾ Because of this, the United States has to take a proactive path, especially when it comes to securing the waterways and keeping global trade moving.

That proactive path is getting more important as the economic influence wielded by rival powers accelerates, particularly because China is trying to gain leverage over Greenland's mining and airport infrastructure. This kind of leverage could turn into strategic influence bases well inside the Western alliance, which is not a small matter.⁽³⁾ Still, the United States understands that letting these kinds of breaches grow, under the cover of commercial investment, turns into a direct threat to the traditional security umbrella, and it also risks weakening advanced defensive lines. So, the idea of acquiring the island wasn't only an unusual diplomatic gesture, it was a realistic assessment of national security needs, meant to anticipate crises and mitigate risks before they become something imposed on the ground.⁽⁴⁾ In other words, it's an approach that major powers tend to use when they want to protect their national security, and also protect the stability of the areas where their influence is vital.

The core logic behind American action shows up in political realism, especially in how territory and sovereignty are treated like foundational elements for stability and for deterrence that actually works against expected future threats. American initiatives have often focused on securing durable strategic advantages, which in turn helps prevent competitors from achieving unilateral dominance in the joints of global geopolitics. That approach has, historically, been useful in stopping the rise of rival centers that could threaten international peace. But when proactive action is missing, the door stays open for regimes that want to reshape the international system to take advantage of security vacuums, thereby extending their global reach. That's why measures to strengthen control in strategic zones can end up being given full legitimacy.⁽⁵⁾

Accordingly, these strategic pillars are tied into the decision-making dynamics in Denmark

(1) DIIS, Chinese investments in Greenland raise US concerns, Danish Institute for International Studies, 2018, <https://www.diis.dk/en/research/chinese-investments-in-greenland-raise-us-concerns>.

(2) BBC, The story behind the scramble for Greenland's rare earths, 2025, <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20251104-the-story-behind-the-scramble-for-greenlands-rare-earths>.

(3) CSIS, Greenland, rare earths, and Arctic security. Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2026, <https://www.csis.org/analysis/greenland-rare-earths-and-arctic-security>.

(4) IBID, <https://www.csis.org/analysis/greenland-rare-earths-and-arctic-security>.

(5) IBID, <https://www.csis.org/analysis/greenland-rare-earths-and-arctic-security>.

and Greenland through a framework of constructive partnership, one that respects development goals and stability aspirations. And so it becomes clear that protecting the supreme interests of collective security requires a proactive outlook, not just in principle but in practice, especially when it comes to defending the vital corridors.

II. Strategic Synergy and Collective Defense in the Arctic

The current international system is witnessing profound geostrategic transformations that reformulate the concepts of national security and collective deterrence, and place the protection of sensitive areas such as Antarctica at the top of priorities. In this context, security policies are no longer limited to traditional bureaucratic frameworks, but rather require proactive responses and integrated approaches that take into account the aspirations of the peoples of sensitive regions towards self-determination, while at the same time preventing any strategic gaps that may be exploited by competing forces to undermine global stability. This is clearly reflected in Washington's interaction with the ongoing transformations in pivotal issues such as the Arctic and Greenland.

a. The Deep Strategy for Enhancing Collective Security

The U.S. administration's initiatives connected to Greenland have sparked discussions in political circles, but trying to read them through a narrow lens as if they were merely an isolated approach skips the real strategic layer that shapes national security calculus.⁽¹⁾ If you look at these policies, it becomes clear they fit into a coordinated institutional picture meant to handle urgent geopolitical pressures in a world that is already shifting, especially by reinforcing security coordination and activating pre-deterrence instruments in key regions.⁽²⁾

Consequently, these moves were not crafted to erode the Alliance's older historical arrangements, but rather to encourage shared responsibility so the escalation of external intrusions doesn't keep growing, and so NATO stability doesn't start wavering as a whole. In the end, by leaning into proactive defense requirements in the Arctic, the United States addressed urgent security needs, while also safeguarding what it sees as the Alliance's highest interests reaffirming Washington's determination to keep the collective security system intact, and to block any

(1) Europarl, The US military intervention in Venezuela and the regional implications (Briefing EPRS_BRI(2026)782616_EN), European Parliament, 2025, [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2026/782616/EPRS_BRI\(2026\)782616_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2026/782616/EPRS_BRI(2026)782616_EN.pdf).

(2) CGSR, Revitalizing the United States' Arctic presence through strategic partnerships, op.cit, <https://cgsr.lnl.gov/sites/cgsr/files/2025-07/BEO-CGSR-Arctic.pdf>.

strategic vacuum rival powers could exploit to distort global stability.⁽¹⁾

b. Strategic deterrence strategy and integration of defense alliances

US foreign policy, when it comes to dealing with regional security troubles, leans on this kind of large, early action mindset; it wants to shore up NATO's defense setup, and also broaden joint deterrence, especially as threats rise from rival Arctic actors.⁽²⁾ Boosting military readiness and building cooperative arrangements, including a more advanced posture at key bases, is more than just a way to handle quick risks, it's basically a structural requirement so that, so to speak, geopolitical gaps aren't quietly used by outside competitors.

So, in this context, any move to reinforce sovereign control, or widen the perimeter of security collaboration, sits inside the defense doctrine that protects collective stability and keeps vital shared interests secure.⁽³⁾ Further, that logic gives legitimacy to strategic measures meant to block unilateral hegemony attempts by competing powers, while also making the joint defense system stronger, overall and in practical terms.

c. Commitment to strategic stability

The United States grand strategy is grounded in a realistic vision, aiming to guard collective security and keep global stability steady while threats are accelerating. It is built around a principle of responsible partnership, and a joint defense cooperation to discourage any moves that try to unbalance regional stability. In this context, the American approach lines up with the reliance on the principles of international legitimacy that are spelled out in United Nations General Assembly Resolution 2625⁽⁴⁾ (XXV) on principles of international law concerning friendly relations and cooperation among states.⁽⁵⁾ That resolution highlights the basic duty of states to safeguard their national security and to avoid strategic vacuums that hostile actors might seize upon to erode international peace and security.

(1) State Department, United States diplomatic priorities for the Arctic, U.S. Department of State, 2026, <https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/Report-Diplomatic-Priorities-for-the-Arctic-007330-HRC1394891-Accessible-05.19.2026-V1.pdf>.

(2) CGSR, Revitalizing the United States' Arctic presence through strategic partnerships, op.cit, <https://cgsr.llnl.gov/sites/cgsr/files/2025-07/BEO-CGSR-Arctic.pdf>.

(3) Europarl, The US military intervention in Venezuela and the regional implications (Briefing EPRS_BRI(2026)782616_EN), European Parliament, 2025, [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2026/782616/EPRS_BRI\(2026\)782616_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2026/782616/EPRS_BRI(2026)782616_EN.pdf).

(4) **General Assembly Resolution 2625:** A 1970 UN General Assembly resolution concerning the principles of international law regarding friendly relations and cooperation among states.

(5) UN Digital Library, Resolution 2625 (XXV): Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, United Nations General Assembly, 1970, <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/202170?ln=en>

These same efforts also work alongside the provisions in Security Council Resolution 1373⁽¹⁾. That resolution calls for cutting off the sources of cross-border threats and for strengthening mutual security cooperation, in a manner that ensures states' sovereignty, and protects them from indirect interference.⁽²⁾ It also signals Washington's strong determination to build a fair international order that respects the sovereignty of allies, and supports the ingredients of durable security and stability.

d. Legal and diplomatic framework: sovereign integration and strategic partnership

US national security requirements in the Arctic call for a realistic approach that deviates somewhat from the usual traditional bureaucratic framework, especially now that Greenland is in a transitional phase toward consolidating its financial and administrative independence from Denmark. Domestic legislation like the 1979 Self-Government Act ⁽³⁾ and the 2008 referendum show a clear and legitimate desire for self-determination, a direction Washington is well aware of, and treats as something that is already happening, so Washington has no interest in sidelining it.⁽⁴⁾ Instead, it's about building direct and durable partnerships with the leadership in Nuuk, rather than pretending those realities do not exist or should be ignored. So, US diplomatic actions are not designed to override domestic will, nor to lessen Danish sovereignty; rather, they are meant to lay down a sturdy basis for joint security collaboration that protects the region from cross-border threats, and also supports the long-term development ambitions held by its people.⁽⁵⁾

In this setting, the continuing conversation between Washington, Copenhagen and Nuuk is meant to lock in institutional security and economic cooperation. The idea is to keep the region stable, and to prevent any strategic gap that competing actors may exploit in order to weaken

(1) **Security Council Resolution 1373:** A UN Security Council resolution focusing on cutting off sources of cross-border threats and strengthening joint security cooperation.

(2) NUS CIL, Security Council Resolution 1373 (2001) on threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts (Unofficial Text), National University of Singapore, Centre for International Law, 2001, <https://cil.nus.edu.sg/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/2001-SECURITY-COUNCIL-RESOLUTION-1373-ON-THREATS-TO-INTERNATIONAL-PEACE-AND-SECURITY-CAUSED-BY-TERRORIST-ACTS.pdf>.

(3) **Self-Government Act (1979):** Domestic legislation outlining Greenland's desire for financial and administrative independence from Denmark.

(4) Europarl, Greenland (Briefing Note EXPO-AFET_SP(2014)522332_EN), European Parliament, 2014, [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/briefing_note/join/2014/522332/EXPO-AFET_SP\(2014\)522332_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/briefing_note/join/2014/522332/EXPO-AFET_SP(2014)522332_EN.pdf).

(5) State Department, United States diplomatic priorities for the Arctic, op.cit, <https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/Report-Diplomatic-Priorities-for-the-Arctic-007330-HRC1394891-Accessible-05.19.2026-V1.pdf>.

the collective security of the Western alliance.⁽¹⁾ Therefore, by reinforcing tripartite coordination pathways, the United States is intent on backing sustainable development in Greenland and offering the necessary security canopy to safeguard it. That, in turn, improves the region's capacity to deal with current problems, while also making sure that vital interests are preserved without undue hesitation.

e. Internal political dynamics and strategic leadership motivations

Internal political American dynamics along with strategic leadership motivations seem to be tied quite directly to the broader national vision, namely, the one focused on strengthening national security and advancing diplomacy when external pressures intensify. With the 2026 midterm elections approaching, there's been a pronounced urgency to put forward decisive and concrete policies that actually address citizens' aspirations, and also to satisfy the demands of defending the country's supreme interests in a highly turbulent international setting.⁽²⁾

So, when the country moves toward wrapping up major strategic agreements, it's not just another diplomatic maneuver rather, it represents a firm commitment to a strategic method where state security is front and center, even if that means breaking through bureaucratic delays and traditional ways. In that context, it also somehow serves to reinforce the confidence of the home front and to cement the idea of effective sovereignty while rival geopolitical ambitions are competing globally.

(1) Ted Stevens Arctic Center, Enhancing security cooperation in the North Atlantic-Arctic, 2026, <https://ted-stevensarcticcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/03/Cleared-Enhancing-Security-Cooperation-in-the-North-Atlantic-Arctic-1.pdf>.

(2) OSW, US-Denmark-Greenland: Current state of play and future scenarios, Centre for Eastern Studies, 2026, <https://www.osw.waw.pl/en/publikacje/analyses/2026-01-16/us-denmark-greenland-current-state-play-and-future-scenarios>.

CONCLUSION

The study basically pointed out that the United States of America, especially when it deals with thorny matters like Greenland and Venezuela, is acting from a set of constants meant to guard national security and to steady its essential interests as international developments speed up. In other words, it is not really a derailment of the path, but more like a natural and essential continuation of a longer history of proactive diplomacy that has been working pretty well since the 19th century.

These decisions, or more precisely, these strategic shifts, line up with today's situation, which is already full of intense rivalry among major powers such as Russia and China as well as wider geopolitical and environmental challenges in the Arctic. Consequently, this presents a coherent analytical framework even if the environment is changing rapidly.

a. The Greenland Maneuver as a Tool for Improving Collective Security: analyses confirm that US efforts to strengthen partnership and strategic cooperation with Greenland show a proactive commitment to protecting essential interests and stabilizing the Atlantic alliance, and yeah, free from any coercive framework. These efforts, kind of, go along with the requirements of partnership in the twenty-first century by:

1. Consolidating the idea of equal cooperation and partnership between allies, while also seeing Denmark as a key partner in making sure regional and global stability actually holds.
2. Respecting the ambitions of the Greenlandic people toward an independent development path, but at the same time ensuring administrative and institutional stability is supported in a way that serves shared interests.
3. Taking a proactive diplomatic approach grounded in effective partnership and mutual interests to deter cross-border threats, in step with the pillars of international security and stability from the post-World War II era.

b. New Theoretical and Empirical Contributions

This research yields several novel contributions to the fields of International Relations, Geopolitics, and American Foreign Policy Analysis:

1. **Strategic Repetition Theory or Geopolitics of Recurring Strategic Stability:** This view goes beyond traditional theories of dissolution, to assume that major powers, when faced with accelerating global transformations, return to their established historical principles of leadership and development, which in the case of the United States are to expand horizons Strategic cooperation and global leadership for the benefit of international peace and security.
2. **Advanced Strategic Partnership Policies:** Establishing a new and evolving concept of relations within alliances, intended when a major power employs partnership to enhance security coordination and achieve strategic and mutual gains with member states, transforming the alliance into an effective mechanism for enhancing stability and deterring

cross-border threats.

3. **Linking leadership vision and diplomatic action in foreign policy:** Highlighting the role of firm leadership and strategic decisions in meeting national security aspirations and protecting higher interests, reflecting an effective response to the requirements of stability and cooperation in facing accelerating international challenges.
4. **Climate Change as a Catalyst for Geostrategic Cooperation:** Provides an empirical view linking climate-induced geographic changes, such as the opening of Arctic shipping lanes, to enhanced opportunities for international cooperation and sustainable development, providing a realistic model for how environmental changes can be harnessed to support global trade and promote shared security and stability.

c. Implications for the Liberal International Order

US strategic policies seek to enhance global stability by establishing collective security principles and supporting international partnerships. In this context, the repercussions of these moves clearly emerge on the form and cohesion of the liberal international order, as follows:

1. **Setting out the principles for international legitimacy,** US strategic directions are in line with international law and the relevant UN resolutions like General Assembly Resolution 2625 and Security Council Resolution 1373, and they are meant to secure national security, avoid strategic loopholes, and take on cross-border threats that keep showing up.
2. **Backing and reinforcing alliances and collective security:** these policies are not really a dismantling of alliances such as NATO, but more like trying to activate partnerships, distributing responsibilities to deter outside tampering and address the intensifying rivalry from major powers such as Russia and China, so the cohesion and stability of the international system can hold.
3. **Respect for state sovereignty and the right to self-determination:** US diplomatic steps fit with domestic ambitions like Greenland's autonomy route and are aimed at creating direct, durable relationships that support security and progress while also sustaining an international order grounded in joint collaboration and shared duty.

Conflict of Interest and Funding Statements

Funding Statement

Model Statement — No Funding

“This study did not receive any financial support or grant from any public, private, or non-profit entity.”

Conflict of Interest Statement

Model Statement — No Conflict Exists

“The author(s) declare no conflict of interest related to the publication of this article.”

REFERENCES

- (1) Arctic Office, **Security policy in the Arctic**, 2022, https://www.arctic-office.de/fileadmin/user_upload/www.arcticoffice.de/PDF_uploads/Security_Policy_Arctic_October2022_web.pdf
- (2) BBC, **The story behind the scramble for Greenland's rare earths**, 2025, <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20251104-the-story-behind-the-scramble-for-greenlands-rare-earths>
- (3) CBC, **Pompeo calls out Canada, China, Russia over Arctic policy**, 2019, <https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/pompeo-canada-russia-china-arctic-1.5125293>
- (4) CGSR, **Revitalizing the United States' Arctic presence through strategic partnerships**, Center for Global Security Research, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, 2025, <https://cgsr.llnl.gov/sites/cgsr/files/2025-07/BEO-CGSR-Arctic.pdf>
- (5) CNN, **The US has tried to acquire Greenland before – and failed**, 2026, <https://www.cnn.com/2026/01/07/politics/us-greenland-trump-denmark-history-hnk>
- (6) Congress.gov, **Greenland, Denmark, and U.S. relations (IN12643)**, Congressional Research Service, 2025, https://www.congress.gov/crs_external_products/IN/PDF/IN12643/IN-12643.1.pdf
- (7) Congress.gov, **H.Res.1020: Honoring President Donald J. Trump for securing a historic strategic agreement establishing permanent United States sovereignty and control over critical military installations in Greenland**, 119th Congress, 2026, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/119th-congress/house-resolution/1020/text>
- (8) CSIS, **Greenland, rare earths, and Arctic security**, Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2026, <https://www.csis.org/analysis/greenland-rare-earths-and-arctic-security>
- (9) DIIS, **Chinese investments in Greenland raise US concerns**, Danish Institute for International Studies, 2018, <https://www.diis.dk/en/research/chinese-investments-in-greenland-raise-us-concerns>
- (10) Esquire, **Maybe Mike Pompeo isn't the brightest Secretary of State ever to hold the job**, 2019, <https://www.esquire.com/news-politics/politics/a27396560/mike-pompeo-north-west-passage-ice-melt-canada/>
- (11) Europarl, **Greenland (Briefing Note EXPO-AFET_SP(2014)522332_EN)**, European Parliament, 2014, [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/briefing_note/join/2014/522332/EXPO-AFET_SP\(2014\)522332_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/briefing_note/join/2014/522332/EXPO-AFET_SP(2014)522332_EN.pdf)
- (12) Europarl, **Greenland: Caught in the Arctic geopolitical contest (Briefing EPRS_BRI(2025)769527_EN)**, European Parliament, 2025, [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2025/769527/EPRS_BRI\(2025\)769527_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2025/769527/EPRS_BRI(2025)769527_EN.pdf)
- (13) Europarl, **The US military intervention in Venezuela and the regional implications**

(Briefing EPRS_BRI(2026)782616_EN), European Parliament, 2026, [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2026/782616/EPRS_BRI\(2026\)782616_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2026/782616/EPRS_BRI(2026)782616_EN.pdf)

(14) Fortune, **Trump's Greenland takeover would require 'billions upon billions' spent over decades to acquire a mineral industry that doesn't yet exist, experts say**, 2026, <https://fortune.com/2026/01/07/trump-greenland-billions-decades-mineral-experts/>

(15) Institute of International Law, **Declaration on the challenges to the international legal order following the military operation in Venezuela**, 2026, <https://www.idi-iil.org/app/uploads/2026/01/20260118-Declaration-of-the-Institute-of-International-Law-on-the-Challenges-to-the-International-Legal-Order-Following-the-Military-Operation-in-Venezuela-EN.pdf>

(16) Ken S. Coates, **Arctic Front: The North in Global Strategy since 1945**, McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal & Kingston, 2021, p.31.

(17) L'Express, **Donald Trump veut racheter le Groenland : une idée déjà émise par Harry Truman en 1946**, 2024, <https://www.lexpress.fr/environnement/donald-trump-veut-racheter-le-groenland-une-idee-deja-emise-par-harry-truman-en-1946-YMEQU3IBPZEVZCOY-FIISHYZKHM/>

(18) Library of Congress, **Territorial expansion of the United States**, 2000, <https://www.loc.gov/rr/geogmap/territorial.html>.

(19) Library of Congress, **Today in history – March 31: Virgin Islands**, 2026, <https://www.loc.gov/item/today-in-history/march-31/>

(20) M. Mandelbaum, **The Four Ages of American Foreign Policy: Weak Power, Great Power, Superpower, Hyper-power**, Oxford University Press, New York, 2022, pp.43- 52.

(21) National Archives, **Louisiana Purchase Treaty (1803)**, 2021, <https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/louisiana-purchase-treaty>.

(22) National Geographic, **Here's why Greenland is strategically important to the U.S.**, 2025, <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/history/article/greenland-us-purchase-history-wwii>.

(23) NPR, **Greenland: Did Harry Truman really try to buy...?**, 2019, <https://www.npr.org/2019/08/22/753192368/fact-check-did-harry-truman-really-try-to-buy-greenland-back-in-the-day>.

(24) NUS CIL, **Security Council Resolution 1373 (2001) on threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts (Unofficial Text)**, National University of Singapore, Centre for International Law, 2001, <https://cil.nus.edu.sg/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/2001-SECURITY-COUNCIL-RESOLUTION-1373-ON-THREATS-TO-INTERNATIONAL-PEACE-AND-SECURITY-CAUSED-BY-TERRORIST-ACTS.pdf>

(25) OSW, **US-Denmark-Greenland: Current state of play and future scenarios**, Centre for Eastern Studies, 2026, <https://www.osw.waw.pl/en/publikacje/analyses/2026-01-16/us-denmark-greenland-current-state-play-and-future-scenarios>.

- (26) Peter Harmsen, **Greenland at War: The United States, Germany and the Struggle for the Arctic, 1939–45**, Havertown, Casemate Publishers, 2024, p.25.
- (27) Politico, **White House claims ‘maximum leverage’ over Venezuela**, 2026, <https://www.politico.com/news/2026/01/07/white-house-claims-maximum-leverage-over-venezuela-00714342>.
- (28) R. Horsman, **Race and Manifest Destiny: Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism**, Harvard University Press, 1981, <https://www.hup.harvard.edu/catalog.php?isbn=9780674745414>
- (29) R. Miller, **The Gadsden Purchase: A historical overview**, Texas State Historical Association, 2026, <https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/gadsden-purchase>.
- (30) Reuters, **Trump administration eyes stake in company developing Greenland rare earths mine**, 2025, <https://www.reuters.com/business/trump-administration-eyes-stake-company-developing-greenland-rare-earths-mine-2025-10-03/>.
- (31) **Security Council Report, (n.d.). A/RES/2625 (XXV)**, <https://www.securitycouncilreport.org/un-documents/document/rol-a-res2625-xxv.php>.
- (32) State Department, **Papers relating to the foreign relations of the United States: Cession of the Danish West Indies**, U.S. Department of State, Office of the Historian, 1917, <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1917/d881>.
- (33) State Department, **Acquisition of the Danish West Indies (1917)**, U.S. Department of State, Office of the Historian, 2017, <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1913-1920/danish-west-indies>.
- (34) State Department, **Adams-Onís Treaty (1819)**, U.S. Department of State, Office of the Historian, 2020, <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1819-1824/>.
- (35) State Department, **United States diplomatic priorities for the Arctic**, U.S. Department of State, 2026, <https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/Report-Diplomatic-Priorities-for-the-Arctic-007330-HRC1394891-Accessible-05.19.2026-V1.pdf>.
- (36) SWP Berlin, **America’s fixation on Greenland (Comment No. 8/2026)**, Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, 2026, https://www.swp-berlin.org/publications/products/comments/2026C08_US_Fixation_Greenland.pdf.
- (37) Ted Stevens Arctic Center, **Enhancing security cooperation in the North Atlantic-Arctic**, 2026, <https://tedstevensarcticcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/03/Cleared-Enhancing-Security-Cooperation-in-the-North-Atlantic-Arctic-1.pdf>.
- (38) UN Counter-Terrorism, **Technical guide to the implementation of Security Council resolution 1373 (2001). United Nations, 2017**, <https://www.un.org/securitycouncil/ctc/sites/www.un.org/securitycouncil.ctc/files/cted-technical-guide-2017-compressed.pdf>.
- (39) UN Digital Library, **Resolution 2625 (XXV): Declaration on Principles of Interna-**

tional Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, 1970, United Nations General Assembly. <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/202170?ln=en>.

(40) UN Digital Library Security, **Council Resolution 1373 (2001)**, United Nations Security Council, 2001, <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/449020?ln=en>.

(41) UN Press, **United States action in Venezuela puts sovereignty of states, international law at stake, many speakers tell Security Council (SC/16271)**, 2026, <https://press.un.org/en/2026/sc16271.doc.htm>.

(42) UNESCO. (n.d.), **Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations**, <https://archive.unescwa.org/declaration-principles-international-law-concerning-friendly-relations-and-cooperation-among-states>.

(43) Weinberg, A. Manifest Destiny: A theme in American history. The American Historical Review, 40(4), 653–667, 1935, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1838769>.

(44) White House, **RUBIO: This is our hemisphere — and President Trump will not allow our security to be threatened**, 2026, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/releases/2026/01/rubio-this-is-our-hemisphere-and-president-trump-will-not-allow-our-security-to-be-threatened/>.