

“While we owe much to America I do not feel that we owe them the whole island of Greenland”

How the triangular security relationship between Greenland, Denmark, and the United States is articulated in events of US’ attempts to purchase Greenland in 1946 and 2019, their reflections of the Arctic security political issues, and the effects in the triangular relationship



Iben Fejerskov Larsen

Culture, Communication & Globalization, Arctic Studies Specialization

Master's thesis Spring 2021

Aalborg University

Key Strokes: 191,466

Supervisor: Lill Rastad Bjørst

Department of Culture and Learning

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| ABSTRACT | 3 |
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 4 |
| 1.1. RESEARCH QUESTION | 6 |
| 2. LITERATURE REVIEW | 6 |
| 2.1. SUMMARY AND CONTRIBUTION | 10 |
| 3. METHODOLOGY | 10 |
| 3.1. RESEARCH DESIGN AND STRUCTURE..... | 11 |
| 3.1.1. <i>Research design</i> | 11 |
| 3.1.2. <i>Structure</i> | 13 |
| 3.2. DATA AND DATA COLLECTION | 13 |
| 3.2.1. <i>Data collection</i> | 13 |
| 3.2.2. <i>Data</i> | 14 |
| 3.3. THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS..... | 16 |
| 3.3.1. <i>Limitations of Securitization Theory</i> | 17 |
| 3.4. METHOD FOR ANALYSIS..... | 18 |
| 3.4.1. <i>Discourse analysis</i> | 18 |
| 3.5. LIMITATIONS AND CHALLENGES | 20 |
| 4. THEORY | 21 |
| 4.1. SECURITIZATION THEORY AND KEY CONCEPTS..... | 21 |
| 4.2. VIEWS OF SECURITY AND ORIGIN OF SECURITIZATION THEORY | 24 |
| 5. ANALYSIS | 26 |
| 5.1. 1946-PROPOSAL | 27 |
| 5.1.1. <i>Situational context</i> | 27 |
| 5.1.2. <i>US' arguments</i> | 31 |
| 5.1.3. <i>Danish and Greenlandic reactions and articulations</i> | 34 |
| 5.1.4. <i>Key points</i> | 36 |
| 5.2. 2019-PROPOSAL | 36 |
| 5.2.1. <i>Situational context</i> | 36 |
| 5.2.2. <i>US' arguments and articulations</i> | 38 |
| 5.2.3. <i>Danish and Greenlandic reactions and articulations</i> | 52 |
| 5.2.4. <i>Key points</i> | 65 |
| 5.3. DISCUSSION..... | 66 |
| 6. CONCLUSION | 68 |
| 6.1. FURTHER RESEARCH | 71 |
| 7. BIBLIOGRAPHY | 72 |

Abstract

The present thesis sets out to investigate how the triangular security relationship between Denmark, Greenland, and the United States of America was articulated in the events of the United States' proposals to purchase Greenland from Denmark in 1946 and 2019, how these reflect the Arctic security political issues and great power rivalry, and the effects on the relationship. Thus, the purpose is to establish whether or not there has been a paradigm shift and the role of external developments in this security relationship.

From a social constructivist stance, to answer these research questions, the author analyzes articulations, discourse and situational contexts, and speech acts in official documents, speeches, and statements from former and present officials in Greenland, Denmark, and the US. The data is obtained through internet- and document-based research and categorized according to which of the two proposals they relate to. Moreover, the author applies securitization theory by the Copenhagen School and the presented securitization concepts: securitizing actor, existential threat, referent object, audience, and facilitating conditions in order to establish how securitization is used by the US, Denmark, and Greenland, and thus to determine the discourses evident with regard to the two purchase proposals. The author concludes that there has been a paradigm shift in the articulations and discourses of the triangular security relationship, and that the relationship is to a great extent determined by external factors. Moreover, it is concluded that the US, Denmark, and Greenland each construct their reality in different ways, which impacts their approach to security. It is further found that there has been a change in discourses where in relation to the 1946-proposal, the dominant discourse was mainly related to security, whereas in relation to the 2019-proposal, the discourses have developed to include those of relationships, independence, and environment. It is further found that this change in discourses reflect a change in security perceptions, constructions of threats and thus what shall be securitized. This is seen in that in relation to the 1946-proposal, the constructed threat was, for all three parties, Germany in the context of the Second World War, which shifted to that of the Soviet Union with the Cold War. In relation to the 2019-proposal, the constructed threat by the US shifted to come from Russia, China, and climate change, whereas the threats constructed by Greenland and Denmark is mainly external threats, incl. Russia in particular, and external interference in the Danish-Greenlandic relationship and Greenland's self-determination and process towards independence.

1. Introduction

“Essentially, it’s a large real estate deal.” – President Trump (Pengelly 2019).

In August 2019, the US President Donald Trump expressed his wish to purchase the island of Greenland from Denmark. The proposal brought heavy critique of not only the President’s lack of up-to-date rhetoric (Hansen 2019), but also discontent from the Greenlandic population of the entire situation (Obordo et al. 2019). The response was loud and clear: “Our country is not for sale, but we are open for business” (Kielsen 2019). This proposal was not the first attempt by the great United States of America to purchase Greenland. In 1946, a similar proposal was set forth, along with two other proposals that would grant the US access to the big Arctic island, by then Secretary of State, James Byrnes (Dansk Udenrigspolitisk Institut 1997). Also back then, the answer was clear: “while we owe much to America I do not feel that we owe them the whole island of Greenland” (Marvel 1947). Thus, the US has been interested in Greenland for a long time. However, as existing research shows (Conley & Melino 2019), the US’ has had a rather stagnant approach to the Arctic over the past decade with the perception that the Arctic would remain of limited strategic value, and the US has further found its minimalistic, wait-and-see approach as sufficient. However, over the last couple of years, it appears that the military strategical balance in the Arctic is to a greater extent discussed in Washington and has shifted to a more active security political Arctic strategy (Kristensen & Mortensgaard 2021). Recent developments in the region in terms of climate change, Chinese interests in the region, and increased Russian military activities have spiked renewed great power competition, which has affected the geopolitical environment of the Arctic. Despite continued international cooperation on Arctic issues, the region is also increasingly seen as an arena for geopolitical competition among the US, Russia, and China (O’Rourke et al. 2021). Hence, the developments that have occurred in the Arctic region have resulted in different American understandings of conflict about the Arctic, in the Arctic, and on the edge of the Arctic. These understandings further affect opportunities and challenges to the Danish Realm, including Greenland (Kristensen & Mortensgaard 2021). Additionally, over the last several years, the international interest in Greenland has increased as a result of the increased great power competition and climate change with its opening up to military and commercial activity (Szymański 2021).

Moreover, the triangular relationship between the US, Denmark, and Greenland has a long history and has undergone significant developments with for example the pivotal event during the Second World War with Denmark’s occupation by Germany and the signing of the Agreement of Greenland’s Defense in 1941, through which the US initially got a foothold in Greenland and has been present

ever since. To clarify, while Greenland was cut off from Denmark during the Second World War, the US stepped in to secure the American continent, including Greenland (Dansk Udenrigspolitisk Institut 1997). In addition to the Defense Agreement from 1941, Denmark and Greenland have made several agreements in the past 70 years. In 1951, the Defense Agreement of 1941 was replaced by a new Defense Agreement in which the US was still granted access to Greenland, including other NATO members who could also get permission to utilize the defense areas. In 1960, Denmark allows the US to establish the defense facility, Camp Century, under the Greenlandic ice cap without consulting the Greenlandic provincial council. The agreement allowed the US to build nuclear reactors at Camp Century and that the US could dispose of nuclear waste water into the ice cap. Camp Century was closed in 1964. In 1991, Denmark, Greenland, and the US establish the Permanent Committee through which the parties inform each other on military affairs in and around Greenland. In 2004, all three countries accept the Igaliku Agreement according to which Greenland's Home Rule, now Self-Government, must be included in all affairs that involve Greenland and military activities in Greenland. It further gives the US permission to update the Thule Base to a missile shield in exchange for economic and technical support to environment, education, research, air traffic, and trade in Greenland. In 2020, the US reopened a consulate in Nuuk which should contribute to strengthening the relationship and cooperation between Greenland and the US. Finally, in 2020, it was published that the US will invest 12.1 million dollars in Greenland with the purpose to benefit the area for raw materials extraction, tourism, and the education- and business sector (Sørensen 2020). However, the triangular relationship has not been free of trouble. According to Olesen (2017), the American presence has caused periods of tensions between Denmark and Greenland and outright scandals, which were often blamed on the US, Denmark, or even both. Moreover, the US presence has been a factor in Greenlandic wish for independence and especially due to the tendency between Denmark and the US to act without Greenlandic involvement (Qvist & Schultz-Lorentzen 2019, 58). Hence, the purpose of the present thesis is to investigate how the security relationship between the US, Denmark, and Greenland was articulated with regard to the 1946-proposal and the 2019-proposal and in order to identify whether or not there has been a paradigm shift in this relationship. Moreover, the thesis also seeks to investigate what role the great power rivalry plays in this security political relationship between the US, Denmark, and Greenland. Hence, the research in the present thesis set out to answer the following research question from a social constructivist stance and by applying securitization theory by the Copenhagen School:

1.1. Research question

1. In the light of the renewed interest in the Arctic, and more specifically Greenland, how is the triangular security relationship between Greenland, Denmark, and the United States articulated in the event of the US' proposal to purchase Greenland in 2019 compared to the US' proposal in 1946?
 - a. How are these proposals reflecting Arctic security political issues and great power rivalry and with what effects in the relationship?

2. Literature Review

The following review is based on a literature search on Scopus, which is “the largest abstract and citation database of peer-reviewed literature” (Scopus 2020) that provides a wide-ranging overview of research in the world within the fields of science, humanities, and social sciences among others (ibid.). The search criteria were adjusted to the topic under investigation throughout the present thesis: the US' proposals to purchase Greenland in 1946 and 2019 in a security perspective. In addition to literature found on this database, grey literature also constitutes part of the literature used for the review. The purpose of the review is to get a sense of what has already been investigated, to get a lay of the land, and to find a gap that this thesis can potentially seek to fill out or at least contribute to existing discussions.

Extensive literature has been written on the Arctic region with regard to international relations based on various different approaches and theoretical considerations by academic scholars dedicated to Arctic research. Some overall themes, which the author finds important in relation to the topic of this thesis, have been identified: security, cooperation, competition and rivalry, conflicts, representation, narratives, and policy-making. Besides these themes, the relationship between the Kingdom of Denmark, Greenland, and the US has also been investigated, which is of relevance to this thesis. Furthermore, it emerges that the discussions in the reviewed literature take root, to some extent, in the effects of climate change and the challenges it brings in relation to geostrategic competition, especially between the great powers with interests in the Arctic: The United States, Russia, and the self-proclaimed Near-Arctic state, China. Based on the reviewed literature along with already obtained knowledge gained from the past couple of years of studying the Arctic, the author finds these themes as rather interrelated, and therefore, it can be somewhat difficult, if not impossible, to investigate these in a vacuum, and especially President Trump's proposal to purchase Greenland and the proposal in 1946 by Secretary of State James Byrnes. Therefore, the literature review will also

serve the purpose as being the base for further discussions in which this thesis seeks to contribute. Although the focus in this thesis is on the US' proposals of purchasing Greenland, these overall themes, so to speak, play an important role in understanding these specific events and the triangular security relationship.

Starting broadly, some of the highly debated topics within the Arctic region are cooperation and competition (Wilson 2020; Reinke de Buitrago 2019; Obradovic & Vailliant 2019; Åtland 2014). In fact, it seems as unavoidable topics when reading literature on the Arctic due to the significance of climate change and both the challenges and opportunities it brings, which seems to be one of the great factors impacting not only the physical environment, but also the political environment. Moreover, it emerges that geopolitics, strategy, security, and natural resources also play a great role in the Arctic region and its history. Great focus has been on the question whether the Arctic will continue to be a region of cooperation or if it will be characterized by conflicts and rivalry in the future. Both Rudbeck (2020) and Patey (2020) mention that Arctic Exceptionalism, i.e. keeping the Arctic a low-tension region characterized by cooperation, is threatened, however, scholars seem to agree that the chance of a full-blown war, such as a Cold War 2.0 referred to by Rudbeck in her discussion, is unlikely or at least very low (Rudbeck 2020; Olesen & Sørensen 2019; Perry & Andersen 2012). Moreover, Wilson (2020) argues that cooperation and rivalry will occur simultaneously and that state actions need to be seen in this context. Reinke de Buitrago (2019), on the other hand, who focuses on current developments in relation to hard security, finds that conflict may be on the rise if looking at the existing conflicts of interests, the uncertainty of future developments, and non-states claiming an Arctic interest, such as China. She concludes that the Arctic is likely to face growing conflict potential in light of security. Yet, she also agrees with Rudbeck, Olesen & Sørensen, and Perry & Andersen in that an outright war is unlikely, but conflict may lead to increased contestations and tensions involving military means. Åtland (2014) also highlights that the Arctic has been considered a region of cooperation, however, with enhancements of military capabilities and statements regarding the willingness among states to defend their interests, and thereby, Åtland also acknowledges that the region has potential for military tensions. Åtland further concludes that the measures states are taking are motivated by an uncertainty in relation to neighbors or outside actors' intentions, which makes the author raise the question on how the US' proposals to purchase Greenland fit in seen in relation to this context of insecurity and uncertainty. This further leads to the next part of the review on literature on the US in the Arctic.

Several scholars have discussed the US in relation to its role in and approach to the Arctic, especially in relation to security and policy-making (Conley & Melino 2019; O'Rourke et al. 2021; Reinke de Buitrago, 2019; Morrison & Nuttall 2019; Weingartner & Orttung 2019). Conley and Melino (2019)

argue that the US Arctic policy has been rather stagnant lately, which is something that Obradovic and Vailliant (2019) seem to agree with, who state that the US has not been paying much attention to the region until recently. Additionally, Reinke de Buitrago (2019) agrees that especially under the Obama administration, the focus towards the Arctic increased. Furthermore, according to Weingarter and Orttung (2019), President Obama and Trump's approaches towards the Arctic have been of significant difference with the Obama administration being more engaged in policy-making, whereas the Trump administration paid much less attention to for example science, and President Trump neither made any significant changes, although he paid much attention to the economic opportunities in the Arctic. Moreover, he reversed some initiatives made by President Obama (Conley & Melino 2019). Furthermore, in relation to national security and defense, they also took significantly different approaches in which President Obama focused greatly on diplomacy and remained largely neutral towards China and Russia compared to President Trump, whose approach was more aggressive, especially towards these countries. Conley and Melino (2019) state that the Arctic will continue to be of limited importance in the US perspective, however, O'Rourke et al. (2021) mention that the Department of Defense and the Coast Guard are devoting more attention to the region. Additionally, Conley and Melino (2019) state that the US finds its minimalistic approach to the Arctic as sufficient, but there seems to lack government-wide consensus on the future steps towards the Arctic. Moreover, Patey (2020) refers to some Arctic researchers and commentators as worried about the US' defense strategy, military exercises, and diplomacy, finding them as destabilizing and provoking China and Russia. Kristensen & Mortensgaard (2021) have published a report on American Arctic Policy with relevance to Danish decision-makers and the Danish public. In the report, Kristensen and Mortensen presents three American understandings of conflicts in the Arctic: conflict about the Arctic, conflict in the Arctic, and conflict at the edge of the Arctic. These all departures in an American understanding of the increasing great power rivalry, but they still differentiate from each other on what is at stake for the US and potential solutions to these, however, they do not rule each other out. Shortly, the understanding regarding conflict about the Arctic concerns a constructed threat towards American interest in raw material and access to sea routes. The conflict in the Arctic concerns a constructed threat to the US' status as an agenda setting great power and its role as an Arctic great power. Lastly, the conflict on the edge of the Arctic concerns a constructed threat towards the American main land, its people, and allies. Finally, Kristensen and Mortensgaard further make recommendations to the Danish Realm. Its overall recommendation is that Denmark should take advantage of possibilities that emerges with the new US Biden administration, such as identifying and presenting the Realm's agenda to the new American administration (Kristensen & Mortensgaard 2021).

Some literature has also been produced in relation to small states in the Arctic and how these are affected and challenged by the great power competition, but also how these can be players in this competition (Olesen & Sørensen 2019; Patey 2020). According to Patey (2020), small states can shape the behavior and policy of great powers and they should not let their policies be overwhelmed by narratives that flourish in the region. However, according to Rudbeck (2020), the Kingdom of Denmark should take into account that the region is not just a region of cooperation, but a region that is increasingly characterized by competition. Patey (2020) further states that Canada and the Nordic states should deepen their cooperation internationally and regionally in order to reinforce their development and security norms. Browning (2007) argues that the Nordic countries during the Cold War branded themselves as being different or better than the norm, i.e. the Nordic Model which stood for progress and modernization, and a model that others should seek to copy. Moreover, they presented themselves as bridge-builders in the East-West conflict, and being Nordic meant distancing themselves from the Cold War. However, according to Browning, with the end of the Cold War, this Nordic Model and brand was challenged and became more and more insignificant.

Additionally, several writings have over the past couple of years been produced on the relationship between the US, Denmark, and Greenland based on different approaches (Rudbeck 2020; Lindbjerg 2020; Jacobsen 2019; Morrison & Nuttall 2019; Olesen et al. 2020). Rudbeck (2020), based on applied history method and strategic narratives, investigates how the Kingdom of Denmark in its coming Arctic strategy should react to the increased interference in Greenland by the US, Russia, and China, and she further makes recommendations for how to include the adaption to a more competitive Arctic. Lindbjerg (2020) takes another approach and seeks to investigate how President Trump's proposal to purchase Greenland has changed the way Danish politicians talk about the US, but also how it has affected the relationship between Greenland and Denmark. Along somewhat similar lines of Lindbjerg and Rudbeck, Mikkel Runge Olesen (2017) looks into how reputations of Greenland, the US, and Denmark shape their mutual relations, and further refers to the history of postcolonialism in this regard, which is not exactly within Denmark's favor, but an advantage for the US as Denmark is the "lightning rod" for Greenland's grievances of the past, and moreover, Greenland can use this as leverage in negotiations. Olesen also emphasizes the need to consider how previous disagreements and cooperation may affect expectations of how the other parties in the triangular relationship will behave in the future, and also how these perceptions can possibly shape the attitudes related to bilateral and trilateral issues in the future (Olesen 2017).

Moreover, Jacobsen (2019a) has also investigated how foreign policy representatives are using the attention towards the Arctic to position Greenland and Denmark internationally. Jacobsen emphasizes the difference between Greenland and Denmark, where Greenland is more welcoming of attention

benefitting to Greenland's development, and it uses the attention to help alter the relationship with Denmark to be more equal, and also to enhance its foreign policy autonomy. For Denmark, the interest lies in securing the Danish Realm and Greenland's membership as Denmark is dependent on Greenland when it comes to its status as an Arctic state (Jacobsen 2019a).

2.1. Summary and contribution

Summing up, it can be stated that research has been done especially on geopolitics, strategy, and policy-making in the Arctic, but also in relation to small states in the Arctic, and, more specifically in this case, on the relationship between the US, Denmark, and Greenland. A lot of speculation and attempts to establish whether the Arctic will be a region of cooperation or conflict has characterized much of existing literature on this topic, but also how this competition affects these small states. However, limited research has been done on the specific event of President Trump's proposal to purchase Greenland in comparison to Byrnes' proposal back in 1946 in light of securitization and articulations. The news media has been paying a lot of attention to the event when Trump's proposal was first made public and confirmed by Trump himself (Blocher & Gulati 2019; McDonald 2019; Pengelly 2019), but the media may shape news in particular ways (de Vreese 2005) that may impact the public audience and policy-makers (Pincus & Ali 2016), and therefore, the author finds it relevant, if not necessary, to address this particular topic in a more academic way. The author finds that the present thesis can contribute to shed light on how the security relationship between Greenland, Denmark, and the United states was articulated in relation to the proposal in 1946 compared to 2019 and thus identify whether or not there has been a paradigm shift in how the security relationship was articulated. Furthermore, it can also contribute to an understanding of current the triangular relationship, and moreover, how current developments in the Arctic play a role in the relationship and thus affect the relationship.

3. Methodology

In the following section, the author will provide insights into the methodological considerations of the present thesis. In subsection 3.1, research design and structure of the thesis will be outlined, including motivation and theoretical stance (theory of science), i.e. social constructivism. Subsection 3.2 provides an overview of the selected data for analysis and method for data collection. Subsection 3.3 provides considerations on the theory, i.e. securitization theory, that the author draws on in the present thesis and why this theory was chosen. In subsection 3.4, the method for analysis, i.e. aspects of critical discourse analysis, will be presented, including arguments regarding choice and possible

limitations. In subsection 3.5, the author will present some limitations that the author met during the writing process of the present thesis.

3.1. Research design and structure

3.1.1. Research design

There are two types of research designs in international relations, which are the problem-driven research designs and the theory-driven research designs. The former takes departure in a phenomenon or problem that needs to be further understood, and draws on existing theories and methodologies (Shapiro 2002, 598; Jacobsen 2019, 18), indicating a deductive approach in which research is conducted with reference to a theory (Bryman 2012, 711). The latter takes departure in already existing debates on a theory with the aim of testing, modifying, or improving the theory through empirical studies (Shapiro 2002, 598; Jacobsen 2019a), indicating an inductive approach in which theory is generated out of research (Bryman 2012, 712). The research design in the present thesis is problem-driven, thus deductive, as the motivation and ambition of the present thesis is to understand the articulations of the triangular security relationship between Greenland, Denmark, and the US, and moreover, how these reflect the security political issues and great power rivalry in the Arctic and with what effects in the relationship, and finally, if there has been a paradigm shift.

The reason for focusing on the triangular security relationship is that, according to the author's understanding and perception, Greenland has had a significant role in US Arctic strategy throughout history and more so in recent years. Moreover, once again Greenland's geostrategic position and importance is a hot topic, and additionally, with Greenland's membership in the Danish Realm, Denmark is not to be avoided on the defense and security area: areas that still fall under the authority of the Danish Government (Rasmussen 2019, 5), however, with Greenlandic involvement as agreed upon in the Itilleq Agreement (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark n.d). Therefore, the author finds it intriguing to research the development and possible paradigm shifts that have occurred in the triangular relationship. Moreover, the author finds the historical aspect important when investigating the triangular security relationship as without the events, i.e. the Agreements on Greenland's defense from 1941 and 1951 among others (see Introduction), occurring in the period during and after the Second World War, the relationship would most likely have looked a whole lot different, e.g. according to former Greenlandic Premier, Kuupik Kleist, the US presence in Greenland set in motion the wish for independence (Qvist & Schultz-Lorentzen 2019, 58). Moreover, as Berry (2016) argues, because Greenland is developing into an independent actor today and the increased interest in

Greenland, it is essential “to understand the historical foundations of its current security arrangements and geopolitical orientation” (Berry 2016, 105).

Moreover, as there is a historical element in the present thesis in terms of the 1946-proposal, it should be noted that prior to 1946, the US also brought up the topic. During the American Civil War in the middle of the 19th century, Secretary of State William Seward also investigated the possibility to purchase Greenland and Iceland in order to exercise sovereignty over the North Pacific and North Atlantic, and thereby to control approaches to the North American Arctic (Dodds & Nuttall 2017, 143), and in 1910, American ambassador to Denmark, Maurice Francis Egan, also discussed trading the Philippines for Greenland (Berry 2016, 10). However, the author had to make some delimitations due to the scope and allocated time for the present thesis. Hence, the author decided to focus on the proposal of 2019 due to its actuality in the present debate in the Arctic and the proposal of 1946 due to its timely proximity to the agreement made on Greenland’s defense in 1941 when the US was given a foothold in Greenland, and thus, a significant event in the triangular relationship.

It is further deemed relevant to highlight the approach the author takes when doing research in order to understand how she goes about finding answers to the presented research question. The author positions herself within social sciences as she focuses on human interaction, i.e. articulations, and relationships rather than natural phenomena. Normally, in social sciences, the approaches are differing from each other in their ontological, epistemological, and methodological base. Ontology is about what is studied, i.e. the object that is investigated, epistemology is about how one knows things, and methodology is about the instruments the researcher applies in order to acquire knowledge (Della Porta & Keating 2008, 21-22). Applying these terms to the present thesis, it can be said that the ontology, i.e. the object that is studied, is the security relationship between the US, Denmark, and Greenland. The epistemological position is inspired by social constructivism through which the author creates knowledge. The social constructivist viewpoint of a given phenomenon claims that the phenomenon under investigation is created by humans and carries imprints of this human origin, i.e. it is shaped and influenced by human interests. According to Collin, there are two kinds of constructivism: epistemological and ontological constructivism. Epistemological constructivism claims that knowledge or science is created by societal processes, and ontological constructivism claims that specific aspects of reality are socially constructed, i.e. the social reality is constructed through human action and thought, but these are in turn shaped by the social reality (Collin 2015, 419-424). In this thesis, the author positions herself according to the latter as she finds that, in this case, the US, Greenland, and Denmark may construct reality and security differently, which is expressed in what they each seek to secure against constructed threats. Furthermore, these potential securitizations are

responses to how they perceive what is going on in the Arctic and the world in general. Thus, according to the author's perception, securitizations are socially constructed based on the securitizing actors' perceptions and thus constructions of reality, which are shaped by the social reality, i.e. the interactions in the world community. Moreover, according to Lassi Heininen, "security is not an objective concept but rather is a relative one and thus socially constructed" (Heininen 2010, 38).

3.1.2. Structure

At this point, the author has already presented the introduction, research question, an outline for the methodological considerations, research design, and motivation of the present thesis. For the sake of clarity, the author will briefly provide an overview over the remaining sections in the present thesis. In section 4, the author will be explaining the securitization theory by the Copenhagen School and additional comments on securitization by Ulrik Pram Gad and Ole Wæver, and additionally, the author's take on the theory. In section 5, the analysis of the present thesis will be presented, and constitutes three parts: two separate analyses of the 1946-proposal and the 2019-proposal, each examining the US' arguments and articulations, and Greenlandic and Danish reactions and articulations. The last part consists of a discussion based on the two former parts of analysis. Finally, in section 6, the author will present the findings and conclusions to the research question of the present thesis, including suggestions for further research.

3.2. Data and data collection

3.2.1. Data collection

To answer the presented research question (section 1.1.), the author will be analyzing secondary qualitative data, i.e. the author has not generated data herself, but rather relies on already existing data in forms of an official agreement, a memorandum, and a telegram, and furthermore, statements in news articles, books, and speeches. The data has been collected through desk research through document-based and internet-based research (Lamont 2015, 79). Generating the data, i.e. the documents and statements etc. presented below, has been done through the snowball method (see Lynggaard 2015, 157), to some extent at least. By researching and reading through academic books and articles, the author has become aware of existing documents of relevance for the present thesis by tracking the references both in text, bibliographies, notes etc. This is mainly the case with the material from around the time period related to the 1946-proposal. The actual collection of some documents proved to be rather difficult or not possible given the circumstances at the time of data collection, i.e. COVID-19 restrictions. Collecting data relating to the 1946-proposal proved to be

rather difficult as some documents, among others, are only available physically in National Archives in Denmark and the US, which made it difficult to access, nor did the author find the allocated time for thesis writing to be sufficient to collect this kind of data. For example, this was the case with a note by James Byrnes to Gustav Rasmussen in 1946 regarding the meeting in which Byrnes proposed to purchase Greenland. However, some documents of relevance related to this time period (1941-1947) were found available in a publication by the Danish Foreign Political Institute (Dansk Udenrigspolitisk Institut 1997). Data related to the 2019-proposal, was collected mostly through internet-based research with relevance for answering the research question as the main criteria.

3.2.2. Data

The data for analysis can be found in the appendix, but for clarity the author has outlined an overview of the data below with a short description of the data and the appendix number (table 1):

| App. | Type of data | Year | Description |
|------|---------------------------|------|---|
| 1.1. | Agreement | 1941 | A proposal for parliamentary resolution on the occasion of the Agreement made in Washington April 9, 1941 between Denmark and the USA on the defense of Greenland, May 16, 1945 (Dansk Udenrigspolitisk Institut 1997, 13-23) The Agreement that was made on the defense of Greenland and American continent between Henrik Kauffmann and the US in 1941 after the Danish occupation (ibid.) |
| 1.2. | Memorandum | 1947 | A memorandum of the meeting between the foreign minister, defense minister, and the military chiefs of January 2, 1947 (Dansk Udenrigspolitisk Institut 1997, 32-34). This is a résumé of a meeting in which then Danish foreign minister Gustav Rasmussen explained his meeting on December 14, 1946 with then US foreign minister James F. Byrnes (ibid.) |
| 1.3. | Telegram, incl. statement | 1947 | Quote of Gustav Rasmussen “while we owe much to America I do not feel that we owe them the whole island of Greenland” from the telegram Marvel to Sec. State, no. 56, 30.01.1947. 859B.20/1-3047, Decimal File, 1945-49, RG 59 NARA (National Archives |

| | | | |
|--------|-----------|------|---|
| | | | and Records Administration), a document provided to the author by Henrik Knudsen, senior research associate at the Danish National Archives, and Henry Nielsen, associate professor at Aarhus University, by inquiry. |
| 2.1. | Speech | 2019 | Michael Pompeo's speech in Rovaniemi Lapland May 6, 2019: <i>Looking North: Sharpening America's Arctic Focus</i> (Pompeo 2019) |
| 2.2. | Statement | 2020 | Statement from Carla Sands of April 20, 2020: <i>Wake up to the Arctic's Importance</i> (Sands 2020) |
| 2.3. | Statement | 2019 | Statement from President Trump regarding considerations on purchasing Greenland (Pengelly 2019) |
| 2.4.1. | Statement | 2019 | Statement from Mette Frederiksen regarding President Trump's purchase proposal (Kielgast 2019) |
| 2.4.2. | Statement | | Statement from Mette Frederiksen regarding Trump's reaction to her decline on his purchase proposal (Olsen & Jørgensen 2019) |
| 2.4.3. | Statement | 2019 | Statements from Mette Frederiksen in a debate on the US' foreign- and security political engagement in Greenland at the Danish Parliament (Folketinget 2019a) |
| 2.5.1. | Statement | 2019 | Kielsen's initial response to President Trump's proposal (Hyldal & Jakobsen 2019) |
| 2.5.2. | Speech | 2019 | Excerpts from Kim Kielsen's speech at the Arctic Circle Assembly on October 10, 2019 (Kielsen 2019). |
| 2.5.3. | Speech | 2019 | Excerpts from Kim Kielsen's New Year's speech 2020 (Naalakkersuisut 2020a) |
| 2.6.1. | Article | 2019 | Statement from Kuupik Kleist in an interview with High North News with Kleist's reflections on the present and potential |

| | | | |
|--------|------|------|---|
| | | | consequences of the geostrategic position of Greenland after President Trump's purchase proposal (Jacobsen 2019b) |
| 2.6.2. | Book | 2019 | Excerpts from <i>Kuupik Kleist. Drømmen om frihed</i> by Niels Ole Qvist and Christian Schultz-Lorentzen (2019). These excerpts are statements from Kuupik Kleist, former Premier of Greenland, on his perceptions of the relationship between Greenland and the US - and Denmark's role in this relationship |

Table 1: Data overview

Since the author applies securitization theory (see section 4) which focuses on securitizing actors, existential threat to a referent object that has to be accepted by an audience in order for an issue to be securitized, it seems natural to analyze statements directly connected to the two proposals. Moreover, according to the Copenhagen School, the way to analyze security is by analyzing speech acts, i.e. in articulations. Thus, in relation to the 1946-proposal, the documents will mainly serve to show the discourse at the time of this proposal and to open up for discussion. Additionally, these documents can be analyzed in order to establish and understand the situational context at the time of the 1946-proposal and whether or not there has been a paradigm shift in the triangular relationship and, if so, how this shift is seen.

Once the author had identified and collected potential data for analysis, the data was then read thoroughly with the purpose of identifying speech acts that could help answer the research question, to identify securitization concepts, and how these are used. Moreover, the data was categorized into which part of the analysis they would contribute to answering the posed research question. Finally, the data was revisited through the analysis.

3.3. Theoretical considerations

As mentioned previously, the theory that will be applied to this thesis is securitization theory as presented by the Copenhagen School in *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. This framework will serve both as the theory against which the proposals can be seen in a security perspective and also as an analytical tool combined with aspects of critical discourse analysis (see section 3.4).

In order to understand how the triangular security relationship was articulated in 1946 and 2019, regarding US' proposals, how these reflect Arctic security political issues, and how they affect the triangular relationship, the theory can be used to identify the securitizing actors, threats, referent

objects, audiences, facilitating conditions, and potential extraordinary measures (see section 4). Moreover, it can serve the purpose to establish whether or not these proposals can actually be seen as securitizing an issue or if they are rather securitizing moves, unable to make the, in the analysis, identified issue securitized, and furthermore, to see whether or not there has been a paradigm shift. Moreover, the theory can be used to answer the part of the research question related to how these two proposals reflect security issues in the Arctic at the two specific time periods, but also what is considered to be threatened in these two periods. Additionally, the application of securitization theory in this thesis can lead to a discussion on how these proposals affect the triangular relationship. Finally, the theory can also help understand Greenland's role in the US Arctic strategy. When applying securitization theory, the author's role needs to be established. The author's role is not to decide whether a threat should be considered a security problem, but rather to interpret the actions by the actors involved and discuss whether their actions fulfill the security criteria of securitization. Moreover, the actor that seeks to securitize an issue is not necessarily saying the word *security*, nor does the actual use of this word mean securitization (Buzan et al. 1998, 34). It should further be noted that the analysis is based on the author's interpretation and, therefore, the analysis and the findings cannot be fully objective, also due to the author's analytical position, i.e. social constructivist stance. Moreover, it is not up to the analyst to decide whether or not something is really a threat, but can reflect on whether a securitization of an issue is a good or bad idea (ibid., 204 and 34).

3.3.1. Limitations of Securitization Theory

The author finds that it can be relevant to briefly mention some shortcomings or limitations of the theory which the author has identified related to the present thesis. The theory, or framework, as it is presented by the Copenhagen School is rather broad in its dimensions as it takes a wide perspective to security, which means that it includes several sectors (see section 4). Due to the time frame and the focus of the present thesis, not all of these sectors are examined. However, the author acknowledges that in relation to the Arctic, as in other parts of the world, threats can be of varying character and degree, depending on the sector and the securitizing actor. Moreover, threats are also interrelated to a great extent, especially in the Arctic as environmental changes here due to global warming is seen states' increased interest due to the melting ice (see section 2). This brings challenges and opportunities that affect different sectors. Hence, the author acknowledges that there may throughout the analysis be presented threats related to various sectors, but due to the scope of time and length of the thesis, the author will not delve into each particular sector.

3.4. Method for analysis

As mentioned above, the concepts of the securitization theory presented by the Copenhagen School (section 4) constitute a part of the method for analyzing the chosen data as it helps identify what to analyze upon: securitizing actor, threat, referent object, audience, and facilitating conditions. Moreover, as is also argued by the Copenhagen School, the way to study securitization is by studying discourse and political constellations (Buzan et al. 1998, 25). The author will be applying some aspects of critical discourse analysis such as situational context, speech acts, and discourse types as these help understanding how the triangular relationship between Greenland, Denmark, and the US is articulated, i.e. discourses, and which security constellations this creates.

3.4.1. Discourse analysis

The way we speak is organized in discourses, which creates representations of reality. These representations are not, however, simply reflections of an already existing reality, but also create reality (Phillips 2015, 302). Discourse analysis is focused on interpreting linguistic forms of communication, which can be both written or spoken and informal or formal forms of communication. Language has an important role in discourse analysis as it is language that is investigated, and how and why specific “discourses emerge, become dominant and are used by actors” (Lamont 2015, 90). Discourse analysis seeks to understand how language makes up and produces the world that we find ourselves in (ibid.). What makes discourse analysis a useful tool for the present thesis is that, according to the author’s understanding, securitization can be considered as speech acts in which actors use language in order to present something as a threat to a valued referent object. Therefore, the securitizing actor is actively using language and thus a certain discourse in order to construct threats to certain referent objects, and thereby gaining acceptance from an audience, and hence take extraordinary measures to secure referent objects (see section 4). Moreover, securitization theory implies the use of discourse analysis, and, moreover, speech acts to analyze securitization and to identify the referent object that is threatened (Buzan et al. 1998, 39).

In order to analyze the collected data, the author has chosen to look towards the work of Norman Fairclough (2015). Fairclough presents three stages of critical discourse analysis framework, i.e. description, interpretation, and explanation stages, from which the author will take elements that are the present thesis: situational context, discursive practices, and speech acts, which fall under Fairclough’s explanation stage. These will be explained in the proceeding sections.

Situational context and discourse type

Fairclough poses a presentation on how interpreters interpret the situational context and how the process of interpretation can impact the decisions on what discourse is found appropriate to draw on. There are four dimensions of a situation: “what’s going on, who’s involved, what relationships are at issue, and what’s the role of language in what’s going on” (Fairclough 2015, 159). Related to these are four different dimensions of discourse, meaning that each dimension of discourse is associated with a given situation and are therefore determined by the situation. So to clarify (the situation on the left and discourse type on the right):”

What’s going on → contents

Who is involved → subjects

In what relation → relations

What is the role of language is what is going on → connections” (ibid.).

Moreover, the interpretation involves the interpreter’s MR (member’s resources), i.e. what is brought into interpretation, and more specifically, the feature of social order, meaning how the interpreter sees the social situation. Thus, depending on the interpreter, the situation can be interpreted differently depending on the interpreter and his or her understanding of the social situation. The situational context is therefore always present in interpretation, both when interpreting the context *and* the text (ibid. 162-163).

In relation to the present thesis, the situational context will help establish and understand why the two purchase proposals were presented. Moreover, according to the author’s understanding, the situational context also shows the discourses that were evident in the triangular relationship between the US, Denmark, and Greenland at the time of the two proposals, and can thus help show how the relationship was articulated and if a paradigm shift has taken place.

Speech acts

As Fairclough puts it: “speech acts are a central aspect of *pragmatics*, which is concerned with the meanings which participants in a discourse ascribe to elements of a text on the basis of their MR and their interpretations of context” (ibid., 166, Fairclough’s italics). Speech acts can be considered as what the producer of a text is doing when producing it, i.e. making a statement, promise, threat, warning etc., and a speech act is not necessarily one act, but can be multiple. Moreover, speech acts can tell the interpreter about the purpose of the text or utterance, and they can be both direct and

indirect expressions, which can tell something about power relations. For example, in cases where power relations are clear, commands or requests may not need to be direct expressions. Additionally, “in order to determine the speech act values or ‘forces’ [...] we need to know what sort of situational context they occur in, and therefore which discourse types are operative” (ibid. 167). Therefore, when looking at speech acts it is necessary to look at the situational context and discourse type.

Given that speech acts are constituting a great part of what is analyzed upon, the author finds it necessary to explain speech acts further as Fairclough only touches upon speech acts rather briefly.

There are three levels to analyzing speech acts:

1. Locutionary act is what is said, i.e. the act of saying something.
2. Illocutionary force is what is done with the words that are being said, i.e. the function of the words or the specific purpose that the one uttering the words has in mind.
3. Perlocutionary effect is the result of the words that are uttered, i.e. the effect on the listener or his or her reaction (Cutting 2002, 15).

Of these, the author finds that what is of most interest and relevance to look at in relation to the present thesis is the illocutionary force, especially with regard to the acts of the US presenting the proposals, whereas the perlocutionary effect is mostly relevant in relation to the reactions from Denmark and Greenland, but also the illocutionary forces expressed by Greenland and Denmark. Thus, the illocutionary force is through which the securitization concepts will be identified, and hence, whether or not the securitizing actors are succeeding in securitizing a referent object or not.

3.5. Limitations and challenges

As the final part of section 3 on methodology, the author will present some challenges faced by the author while working on the present thesis. Given that what is investigated dates back to the 1940's, the data needed for analyzing this part required skills in how to obtain these, and the author realized that she lacked some knowledge in how to search for these historical documents in archives. Additionally, as already mentioned, a specific note from James Byrnes given to Gustav Rasmussen at a meeting in December 1946 regarding Greenland would have been relevant to analyze in terms of potential speech acts and to identify the securitization concepts, however, the author was not able to get a hold of this.¹ Fortunately, the book published by Danish Foreign Political Institute (1997)

¹ The author reached out to Bo Lidegaard, who mentioned this note in his book *I Kongens Navn (In the name of the King)* (Lidegaard 1994). However, he mentioned he did not have this note, and that the trivial truth was that it may had been difficult and expensive to photo copy in 1994 when the book was being written, so he simply took notes instead and mentioned in his book where to find it.

proved helpful in relation to other documents from this time, including the 1941 Agreement on Greenland's defense and the UM-Memorandum. The memorandum seemed to the author to be the second-best option as it provides a résumé of the meeting Rasmussen had with Byrnes in December 1946. Moreover, the author reached out to Henrik Knudsen and Henry Nielsen, the authors of *Uranbjerget*,² who provided the author with the aforementioned telegram with Gustav Rasmussen's response to the 1946-proposal. Moreover, it should be noted that due to the extent of textual material and the required limited number of key strokes for the present thesis, the author found it necessary to select excerpts to analyze upon. This can cause for some blind spots both in terms of analysis and interpretation as this is dependent on the author's pre-existing knowledge, and thus may also be affected by the author's subjectivity, although the author has attempted to remain analytically objective. The author also acknowledges that there may be other data that would have been relevant for analysis, however, also due to the time and scope of the present thesis writing process, the author had to make delimitations, hence one of the reasons as to why the focus is on the 1946-proposal and 2019-proposal.

4. Theory

In the following section, the author will be outlining the main assumptions of securitization theory as presented by the Copenhagen School in the book *Security: A New Framework for Analysis* by Buzan et al. and with comments on the theory by Wæver (2017) and Gad (2017). Thus, the section will serve as the theoretical framework in the thesis.

4.1. Securitization theory and key concepts

The Copenhagen School has developed a framework for analyzing security consisting of key concepts employed by the analyst in security analysis. Moreover, the Copenhagen School takes a speech act approach to analyzing security, which requires a distinction between some of these key concepts: securitizing actor, referent objects, and functional actors. Other key concepts are also included in the framework: existential threat, audience, and facilitating conditions. Another important element in security analysis are sectors, i.e. the military, political, societal, economic, and environmental sectors, which are the arenas in which securitization takes place and where "different values can be the focus of power struggles" (Buzan et al. 1998, 196). The securitizing actor is the one securitizing an issue, i.e. referent object, or attempts to, by claiming that something is existentially threatened, hence the actor performs a speech act. It can be somewhat difficult to identify the securitizing actor and what

² The Uranium Mountain (author's translation)

the act is, and doing so can involve problems related to the level of analysis, i.e. the international systems, international subsystems, units, subunits, and individuals, as the same event can be perceived and understood differently at these levels. Moreover, the actor should be seen in relation to collectivities of which the actor is separated from. The actor can be an individual and may have a strong role, e.g. president or prime minister, which makes the actor a speaker for collectivities, e.g. state, and can be held responsible. Referent objects are what the securitizing actor perceives as existentially threatened and has a legitimate claim for survival (ibid.). A referent object can be a status or 'being', but also a process (Wæver 2017, 125). To identify the referent object, the analyst can study security discourse, and furthermore, the outcomes of such discourse to see if the referent object holds security legitimacy, which can result in acceptance or non-acceptance by an audience. The audience is who the securitizing actor seeks to convince in order to break free of the normal rules and employ extraordinary measures or procedures. Thus, the audience has a crucial role in the securitization process. Moreover, the securitizing actor speaks and acts on behalf of the referent object, and in general, threats are usually seen as coming from other referent objects (Buzan et al. 1998, 43). Additionally, functional actors, without being the referent object nor the securitizing actor, can influence decisions as these actors can affect the dynamics of a sector (ibid., 36), e.g. the US Senate. Lastly, there are the facilitating conditions. Security arguments are about the future, and thereby hypothetical, which makes it impossible to be objective about it. These arguments always involve two predictions: what will happen if security action is or is not taken. Here, it can be relevant to take a look at the facilitating conditions of the security speech act, which are "the conditions under which the speech act works, in contrast to cases in which the act misfires or is abused" (ibid., 32). The conditions for a speech act to be successful fall into two categories: 1) the internal, linguistic-grammatical and 2) the external, contextual, and social. This makes a successful speech act a combination of language and society. In the internal conditions, it is important "to follow the security form, the grammar of security, and construct a plot that includes existential threat, point of no return, and a possible way out" (ibid., 33). Within the external conditions, there are two underlying conditions of the speech act which are: 1) the social capital of the actor of the speech act, who has to hold some sort of authority, and 2) it is more likely that an actor can make something seem as a threat if the actor can refer this threat to some objects, e.g. nuclear weapons, which are not enough to make a securitization, but rather are facilitating conditions that can help make a securitizing act to be accepted (ibid.).

According to the Copenhagen School, threats and vulnerabilities can occur in many different areas, but for something to count as a security issue, the issue has to meet some criteria. It has to be presented as an existential threat to a given referent object by a securitizing actor. If the actor is successful with

presenting something as an existential threat, which means by having it accepted by an audience, the actor gets a “green light” to employ extraordinary measures, which are also accepted by the audience. Thereby, the issue distinguishes from a political issue which can be dealt with under normal rules (ibid. 5), so “‘security’ is the move that takes politics beyond the established rules of the game and frames the issue either as a special kind of politics or above politics” (ibid., 23). Thus, securitization can be considered as an extreme version of politicization. Imagine a spectrum of spheres in which at one end are things or issues not being dealt with. In the middle of the spectrum is the political sphere in which an issue is part of the public security and therefore requires government decision and allocation of resources. When an issue moves from not being dealt with to the political sphere, it is called politicization. Then at the other end of the spectrum is the security sphere, which is when an issue is presented as being an existential threat to a given referent object and therefore requires actions beyond the normal political procedure. When an issue is moved from the political sphere to the security sphere, it is a case of securitization (if accepted by the audience). This movement from one sphere to another can also go backwards, meaning that an issue can be desecuritized and/or depoliticized. So depending on the circumstances, any issue can be placed in any part of the spectrum. This does not necessarily mean that these processes happen through the state as other social entities can also raise an issue to general consideration or urgency (ibid., 23-24). However, what constitutes a security issue is not just adding the term *security* to some issue in the wider perspective, and it is also relevant to emphasize that security in an international relations perspective has a more extreme and distinctive meaning and is rooted in the tradition of power politics. Security is about survival, and in the wider perspective it works in somewhat the same way, but it can be more difficult to identify what is actually an existential threat to a referent object. Moreover, in some sectors it can be difficult to separate existential threats from lesser threats, and this distinction between existential threats and non-existential threats depends on the definition of the referent object, and in general, any threat could be existential with the “right” way of presenting it as such (Gad 2017, 108).

According to the Copenhagen School, “the exact *definition* and *criteria* of securitization is constituted by the intersubjective establishment of an existential threat with a saliency sufficient to have substantial political effects” (Buzan et al. 1998, 25), and studying political constellations and discourse is the way to study securitization. However, it is still important to be precise and understand the threshold of the securitization logic. Something can be presented as an existential threat to a referent object but this in itself is not creating securitization, rather; it is a securitizing move. When deciding what is an important issue or referent object compared to other issues, it is not necessarily size or significance that one should turn to, but rather the scale of chain reactions on other securitizations, meaning what impact a securitizing move has on wider patterns of relations between

units. Moreover, securitization is mainly interested in cases of successful securitizations, but unsuccessful or partial successful cases are also relevant for their insights into the “stability of social attitudes toward security legitimacy, the process by which those attitudes are maintained or changed, and the possible future direction of security politics” (ibid., 39). Gad (2017), who has used securitization theory for analyzing identity politics, also states that more can be learnt by studying cases of partial and unsuccessful securitizations as these provide information on how to avoid full securitization as securitization is not a good thing. Securitization can thus be considered a failure to deal with issues using normal politics, however, securitization is sometimes unavoidable, such as when a state is dealing with another aggressive state, for example. Instead, desecuritization is to be preferred as it moves issues out of the threat-defense context or zone and into “an ordinary public sphere” (Buzan et al. 1998, 29). Choosing securitization or accepting a securitization is not an innocent act, but a political choice (ibid.). Also, with securitization comes consequences as securitization can make other states feel threatened or the relationship with other states can be affected in other possible ways, which can influence how other states or actors respond to a security claim. What constitutes a threat can be different from state to state and nation to nation. So security is something that is determined by actors, which makes it a subjective matter, but this label is not necessarily fully adequate as what makes an issue a security issue is not decided by one individual alone, but rather, it is intersubjective and socially constructed (ibid.).

4.2. Views of security and origin of securitization theory

Now that the key concepts and the securitization process have been outlined, the author considers it relevant to outline what this securitization framework is developed from and builds on. In security studies, there are two views. There is the traditional view, which is centered around the military sector and the state, and then there is the wide view on security, which has been developed to include other sectors, which are mentioned above, and other possibly threatened objects after dissatisfaction with the narrow traditionalist view. Widening the security agenda to other sectors also makes for a discussion on what is and is not a security issue and how certain issues become securitized (ibid., 1-2). The securitization framework is built on classical security complex theory (CSCT), which has a regional focus with regions as objects for analysis but in the sense of the traditional view, which the new framework sought to expand to other sectors and units of analysis. How the Copenhagen School moves beyond CSCT can be seen in the renewed definition of security complexes compared to the original definition by the CSCT. The definition in the CSCT is:

“A security complex is defined as a set of states whose major security perceptions and concerns are so interlinked that their national security problems cannot reasonably be analyzed or resolved apart from one another” (ibid., 198, author’s emphases).

And the renewed definition by the Copenhagen School:

“A security complex is defined as a set of units whose major processes of securitization, desecuritization, or both are so interlinked that their security problems cannot reasonably be analyzed or resolved apart from one another.” (ibid., 201, author’s emphases).

In the former, the dynamics and structure within a region or security complex is shaped by states’ perceptions of interaction with each other in terms of security, whereas the latter expands the focus to other units besides states. The Copenhagen School presents two approaches to move beyond the CSCT, i.e. expansion to other sectors and units: 1) the heterogeneous complexes approach, which links actors across sectors, which makes it possible for the analyst to keep an overall picture within the same frame and to keep track of where the sectors overlap, such as impacts that one sector has in another sector, and; 2) the homogeneous complexes approach, which is sector-specific and requires that different frames are constructed for each sector. It further offers the possibility to look at dynamics in an isolated sector, however, the challenge is to reassemble separate frames into a holistic picture and can also lead to linkages across sectors to be obscured or even lost. So the difference between these two approaches is the assumption whether security complexes are locked into one specific sector or multiple sectors. Depending on the case that is being studied, the analyst needs to decide which approach fits best (ibid.).

A key point in relation to security complexes and the Arctic, and also the difference between CSCT and the move beyond by the Copenhagen School is that the Arctic is considered a regional security complex, meaning a distinct region in itself, by Exner-Pirot (2013), however, Ole Wæver argues that the Arctic is not a regional security complex, but rather a regional security constellation. This means that the Arctic, in Wæver’s point of view, has its own characteristics, but it is still linked to overall dynamics (Wæver 2017). So if the Arctic should be a security complex, the Arctic should be the “primary context for the dominant security problems of especially the major powers in the region” (Wæver 2017, 132). However, Wæver argues that this is not the case (ibid.). Even though the Arctic is not a security complex, a lot of the securitizations that occur in this part of the world are interconnected. According to Wæver, the dynamic in the Arctic is not driven by military security concerns and mutual moves of military nature as it was in the period from around 1940 to 1990.

However, this does not mean that this dynamic has entirely evaporated. Rather, it is simmering beneath the surface as the Cold War past “continues to be a structural underlying speculative reality” (ibid., 122) and despite the conditions for military competition is weak in the Arctic, everyone keeps an eye out for it. Moreover, there seems to be an agreement among researchers that the direction in the Arctic is not towards a scramble for the North Pole or a “semi-colonial race for the last ‘white spots’ on the map” (ibid., 123). However, this could be questioned as “northern military activity is at its highest level since the end of the Cold War” (Raspotnik & Østhagen 2021).

In the present thesis, the focus will be at the unit-level, i.e. on the states Denmark and the US and the nation Greenland due to the nature of the research area but as represented by politics and officials. Moreover, the research will be conducted with the wide view of security in mind, mainly due to the development in relation to the securitization concepts with regard to the 1946-proposal and 2019-proposal. Throughout the analysis, the author will be applying the securitization concepts to the speech acts and thus identify these concepts, i.e. the securitizing actors, threats, referent objects, audience, and facilitating conditions. These can help identify the discourse and thus these countries’ constructions of threats to referent objects, hence their securitizations or failed securitizations. Moreover, the concept functional actors, i.e. those who can influence decisions, can shortly be addressed at this point as the author finds that the three countries respectively influence each other in their security relationship, i.e. Greenland and Denmark are tied to each other in terms of the Realm and has a close security relationship with the US due to their membership in NATO and US interests in Greenland as will be shown in the analysis.

5. Analysis

In the following section, the author will be analyzing the chosen data (see table 1), primarily by using and applying the securitization concepts, presented in the previous section, in combination with some aspects of critical discourse analysis: situational context, speech acts (locutionary acts, illocutionary force, and perlocutionary effects), and discourse types, including power relations. The analysis will be divided into two parts followed by an overall discussion of the two events. Hence, the structure of the analysis will be as follows:

- The 1946-proposal

 - Situational context

 - US’ arguments and articulations

 - Greenlandic and Danish reactions and articulations

 - Key points

The 2019-proposal

Situational context

US' arguments and articulations

Greenlandic and Danish reactions and articulations

Key points

Discussion

Before proceeding to the analysis, it should be noted that some of the data for analysis is in Danish, and therefore, the author will translate the parts used in the analysis into English even though it may affect the understanding and interpretation of the data, although, not necessarily. The data in its original language and a translation can be found in the appendix.

5.1. 1946-proposal

As mentioned in section 3.2, the analysis of the 1946-proposal will mainly serve to open up for further discussion. The main documents for the analysis of this proposal are the 1941 Agreement on the defense of Greenland, the UM-memorandum from 1947, and the telegram with the quote of Gustav Rasmussen from 1947 (app. 1). Although the Defense Agreement is not directly linked to the proposal of purchasing Greenland, it can still help understand the relationship between the countries and where the proposal came from, and moreover, how the relationship was articulated through discourse. Moreover, the author finds that the documents can be used to show the discourse at the time and how the world situation was understood by the US, Denmark, and Greenland, and thus from the discourse, the author will attempt to identify the securitization concepts. The Defense Agreement will be analyzed in the situational context, whereas the memorandum and telegram will be analyzed under US' arguments as this is the event that is under investigation. It should also be noted that the memorandum will also be addressed in the situational context due to its capability to provide insights into how the security situation was in 1946.

5.1.1. Situational context

The 1941 Agreement of April 9 on the defense of Greenland, which is about the defense of Greenland as indicated by the title, was signed by both the minister of Denmark, Henrik Kauffmann, and Secretary of State, Cordell Hull. Thus, it can be considered a joint statement from Denmark and the US through the Agreement:

“In the course of the month of March 1941, the German war zone was extended to Greenlandic waters and the entire war situation in the northern Atlantic Ocean went through a critical development [...] To avoid this and to secure both Greenland and the American continent and Greenland’s preservation under Danish sovereignty, the United States of America under reference to its principle duties by the Havana Act of July 30 1940 to take over the responsibility for Greenland’s defense and to enter into an Agreement hereof” (Dansk Udenrigspolitisk Institut 1997, 14).

Security rhetoric is evident in this quote as seen by the underlined words “war zone”, “war situation”, “secure”, and “defense”, thus showing the security discourse at this time. Moreover, Germany can be identified as the threat as it is the “German war zone” that is expanding to the referent object that is Greenland, its “preservation under Danish sovereignty”, and also the “American continent”. Moreover, the US is presented as a solution to avoiding Germany to reach Greenland and the American continent, although Germany did make an attempt in the summer and fall of 1940. Thus, the US stepping in and protecting Greenland, its preservation under Danish sovereignty, and the American continent can be considered as the extraordinary measure, i.e. the 1941 Agreement. Moreover, in the following quote, the securitizing actors, Henrik Kauffmann, including Greenlandic chief administrative officers, and Cordell Hull can be identified:

“As a result of these negotiations, a note transaction took place and in connection hereto the signing on April 9, 1941 of the present Agreement which from the Danish side with the acceptance from the Greenlandic chief administrative officers, Henrik Kauffmann, and from American side, State of Secretary Cordell Hull.” (Dansk Udenrigspolitisk Institut 1997, 14).

Some interpretations regarding the relationships between these parties can be made in relation to power. First, that Greenland was not, as it appears from the document, to sign the Agreement alongside Denmark and the US shows that Greenland had less power than the other states. It was not until 1953 that Greenland “became an equal part of Denmark” (Heinrich 2017, 29) with its new status as a county prior to which there was a Danish idea that Greenlandic society was fragile, which had resulted in isolation and protection (ibid.). This development occurred due to a global wave of decolonization and Denmark realized that it would no longer be convenient for it to keep Greenland as a colony (ibid.). However, according to Heinrich (2017), due to the Second World War and the isolation from Denmark, two governors was given *de jure* authority over the island’s foreign relations,

and they saw their primary objective as keeping Greenland as part of Denmark and maintain the loyalty to Denmark. However, the governors were not included in the negotiation that led to the defense agreement, and neither were members of the provincial councils in Greenland, established in 1911 (ibid.). Thus, Greenland was not powerless, but still unequal to the other parties to the Agreement. Second, that Denmark was occupied by Germany resulted in Denmark not being able to make its own decisions, thus Kauffmann proclaimed himself as sovereign of Denmark and committed to the Agreement without Danish approval (Archer 1988). This shows that Denmark had little power and Kauffmann a great deal of power, and he could use Greenland as leverage due to US interests in cryolite used for aluminum and thus important in war production (Heinrich 2017, 31). Third, the US had the most power in this case as it had the capabilities to step in and protect Greenland during Danish absence. Moreover, the Agreement also shows that the US had a lot at stake as it assessed the threat from Europe to be of serious significance to the American continent, where Greenland happens to be located, thus Greenland came within the scope of the Monroe Doctrine, which is also how the Americans saw it (ibid.; Olesen 2013, 121). Moreover, Greenland's role is also expressed in the Agreement:

“[...] the United Greenland Councils at their meeting at Godhavn on May 3, 1940 adopted in the name of the people of Greenland a resolution reiterating their oath of allegiance to King Christian X of Denmark and expressing the hope that, for as long as Greenland remains cut off from the mother country, the Government of the United States of American will continue to hold in mind the exposed position of the Danish flag in Greenland, of the native of Greenland and Danish population, and of established public order” (Dansk Udenrigspolitisk Institut 1997, 14).

This shows a Greenlandic wish to remain under the Danish sovereignty. Moreover, it shows how the Greenlandic-Danish relationship was at this time, i.e. Denmark as the “mother” and Greenland as the “child”, and it may be argued that there was a mutual interest from Greenland and Denmark that this was what should be protected along with the Greenlandic and Danish population and public order from potential German invasion in Greenland. Additionally, why Greenland would turn to the US for help in the first place might be related to an incident in 1920 when the US informed Denmark that it would not recognize, hence accept, if a third country were to require Greenland if Denmark was to “dispose of it” (Archer 1988, 123).

Proceeding to situational context in relation to the UM-memorandum from January 2, 1947, the memorandum is about a meeting between then Danish foreign minister Gustav Rasmussen, the

defense minister, and the military chiefs. At this meeting, another meeting between American foreign minister James Byrnes, representing the US, and Gustav Rasmussen, representing Denmark and Greenland, on December 14, 1946, concerning US wishes to assume, partly and/or total, control over Greenland, was discussed but as experienced by Rasmussen. From the memorandum, some power positions between the participants are indicated: there is the rather dominant US contrasting Denmark and Greenland. Moreover, what stands out from this memorandum is that the parties involved in both meetings are Danish officials and with no Greenlandic representation present, i.e. a person who is from and lives in Greenland. However, Archer stated that in May 1940, Greenlandic authorities requested protection from the US, resulting in a US consulate in Godthaab (Archer 1988, 124), as also seen above in the 1941 Agreement. However, that Greenland was not participating in the meeting in 1946 regarding what Rasmussen initially perceived to be about the termination of the 1941 Agreement shows that Greenland did not have much power. Although, it could be assumed that Greenland also wished for a termination of the Agreement as it was stated in the 1941 Agreement that it should only remain in force as long as Denmark could not safeguard its interests and relationship with Greenland during the occupation and as long as the current threat remained. Furthermore, Greenland was downgraded to “the Greenlandic problem”, however, it is not clearly stated for whom, but perhaps for both the US and Denmark. For the US, it might be so that it with its purchase proposal simply wanted Denmark out of the equation so that the US could do whatever it wanted without consulting and getting the acceptance from Denmark. For Denmark, the issue was most likely that the US was difficult to get to leave even though the US was not needed anymore. So for Denmark the problem was perhaps more the US’ presence in Greenland than Greenland being the issue. From the memorandum it also emerges that Denmark was under pressure in relation to the Soviet Union, as shown in the following section, which was also perhaps the reason for Kauffmann not to get the go-ahead from Denmark as Denmark wished to remain neutral in relation to the great powers. Moreover, Denmark was also concerned about reactions from the Soviet Union emerging from the American presence in Greenland (Knudsen & Nielsen 2016, 65-66).

Furthermore, the author finds that the telegram with the quote of Rasmussen should be examined simultaneously with the UM-memorandum as it is positioned within the same context and is a response to the US’ proposals in December 1946. However, the response and also opinion was only expressed weeks after the meeting and with several reminders from the US as argued by Knudsen and Nielsen (2016): “while we owe much to America I do not feel that we owe them the whole island of Greenland” (Marvel 1947). Thus, from the situational context it can be argued that the discourse that was seen around the time of the 1946-proposal was characterized by security in a high-tense

situation in the context of the Second World War and also with regard to the Soviet Union and with the Cold War under development.

5.1.2. US' arguments

UM-Memorandum

“The conversation, which lasted from 10AM to 11AM, was initiated with Mr. Byrnes who provided a statement of his thoughts on America's security. He stated that Greenland was situated in the United States' geographical sphere, and that the modern weapon had simply changed the strategic problems” (Dansk Udenrigspolitisk Institut 1997, 32).

From the above quote, the securitizing actor can be identified as Byrnes, who argued that Greenland is located in the geographical sphere of the US, and he further presented the threat as “the modern weapon”, i.e. nuclear weapons. It may be argued from the quote that Byrnes thought that it would have made more sense if Greenland belonged to the US, which is in closer proximity to Greenland than Denmark, and, additionally, that Greenland is something to possess. Moreover, as mentioned above, Greenland was downplayed to the “Greenlandic problem” (ibid.) to perhaps Denmark and the US in each their own way: the US wanted access to Greenland in one way or another, i.e. as is seen with Byrnes' three proposals regarding Greenland, thus securitizing its interests in Greenland and US national security:

1. “[...] Denmark admitted the U.S.A. right to construct military stations in specified areas on Greenland and also a right for American forces to move freely across the country” (Dansk Udenrigspolitisk Institut 1997, 32)
2. “[...] that Denmark made an agreement with the United States that these should undertake Greenland's defense against attack and should have the right to construct military facilities necessary to do so” (ibid.)
3. “[...] the best solution, for Denmark too, would be to sell Greenland to America” (ibid.).

Denmark, on the other hand, wanted the US out of Greenland, which was the entire purpose with Rasmussen's visit to the US in December 1946, who wanted to terminate the Agreement from 1941. The three proposals above also indicate how the US constructed its reality in relation to Greenland's geographical position: that Denmark should “admit” the US the right to construct military stations in Greenland can be seen as an extension of the point made previously that Greenland should belong to

the US. The word “admit” also imply the power relations between the US and Denmark in that the US constructs reality as how the US sees it: that Denmark should realize this, i.e. that the US has a right to Greenland due to its geographical position. Moreover, in the second proposal the US’ perception of its own role as a protector is indicated as seen in its suggestion that the US should take on Greenland’s defense, i.e. protection, indicating Greenland as being a referent object. In the third proposal, i.e. the sale of Greenland, Byrnes is also expressing his opinion that he knows what is best for Denmark (but does not mention Greenland in this regard), which he backs up by referring to American investments and Greenland not being an asset, indicating an economic way of thinking:

“Mr. Byrnes had referred to the great amounts (50-60 M\$) that America had invested in military facilities in Greenland and had to this added some remarks that Greenland after all was not an economic asset to Denmark” (Dansk Udenrigspolitisk Institut 1997, 33).

Contradictory to US’ arguments that the US should assume control over Greenland, Byrnes had also repeatedly acknowledged Danish sovereignty over Greenland: “He had, moreover, multiple times emphasized that the United States fully acknowledges Denmark’s sovereignty over Greenland” (ibid.). This might be the case while it could also be considered as patronizing by the US in showing that the US is supportive of Denmark and its relationship with Greenland. However, this could be questioned as Denmark in 1917 demanded US’ recognition of Danish sovereignty over Greenland as a condition for selling the Virgin Islands to the US to which the US agreed (Olesen 2011, 118). So in this sense, it could be argued that Denmark bought this recognition, and in relation to the meeting with Byrnes, this recognition might be, from the US side, considered an inevitable formality. Moreover, regarding the Agreement from 1941 that the US should step in and protect Greenland, and itself, US recognition of Danish sovereignty over Greenland was emphasized. However, when Denmark wished for the Agreement to be terminated, disagreements on what was stated in the Agreement reached the surface. The Agreement stated that “[it] shall remain in force until it is agreed that the present dangers to the peace and security of the American Continent have passed” (Dansk Udenrigspolitisk Institut 1997, 20). At the meeting between Byrnes and Rasmussen, it was agreed that the present danger referred to Germany, however, in Byrnes note to Rasmussen, as it appears from the memorandum, it was stated that “[...] there not yet was created a new security system and that the conditions for the termination of the Greenland Agreement were not yet present” (ibid.). This might refer back to the threat of modern weapons and Greenland’s geostrategic position in relation to the Soviet Union. This is also implied in the Danish reaction, which will be analyzed later on.

“If Denmark were to agree to Mr. Byrnes proposal, we would confirm other powers’ suspicion and we would expose us to that the Russians not only would consolidate its position on Spitzbergen but that they might also would demand advanced bases in the Baltic Sea and other places in Europe” (Dansk Udenrigspolitisk Institut 1997, 20).

Hence, this shows that the threat shifted from that coming from Germany to the Soviet Union, and it also shows why the US was unwilling to leave Greenland now that it had achieved to get a foot inside the door despite its repeated recognition of Danish sovereignty. Moreover, this also implies what the threat was at this time, i.e. the modern weapons that could potentially come from the Soviet Union and why Greenland was important as also implied in the following:

“The foreign minister had hereafter explained his thoughts on the United States’ security. He stated that the security that the big oceans had previously provided had ceased to exist; the distance had with the modern weapons not the same significance as previously; in Europe they did not have the great distances between the countries and though they lived” (ibid., 32-33).

Modern weapons are again mentioned, i.e. nuclear weapons and missiles (Archer 1988). Byrnes backed up this assumed threat from modern weapons with the decreased proximity that these bring, thus again US national security could be argued as the referent object. Moreover, it is not clear from this quote who stated that even though the distances in Europe are shorter, they still lived. If it was Byrnes’ statement then it can be considered as opposing to his argument and could make Byrnes’ argument less convincing to the audience, i.e. Denmark. The above quote also shows that it was mainly the US that was considered threatened in the US’ perspective. Thus, the referent object is the US’ security. However, Greenland was also briefly mentioned in the second proposal by Byrnes in relation to the US taking over the protection of Greenland, and can therefore also be considered a referent object, but not the main referent object. This could imply how the US was somehow appropriating Greenland in its arguments as to why the US should have greater access to Greenland and thereby using Greenland as a bargaining object. Hence, Greenland can in this case be considered an extraordinary means for the US to achieve what it wished for: access and control over Greenland to protect itself. The last proposal on purchasing Greenland from Denmark also shows that the US wanted to take Denmark out of the equation so that the US could act as it wanted without having to negotiate every move with Denmark. Moreover, the threat is of great importance in this entire

discussion as it provided the foundation of the US' arguments, and it is implied by the memorandum that a change in what the threat was had occurred.

5.1.3. Danish and Greenlandic reactions and articulations

Before analyzing the reactions from Denmark and Greenland to the US' proposals, it can be relevant to apply one of the concepts from the securitization framework: audience. The Kingdom of Denmark, including Greenland, is the audience to the US attempt to securitize the American continent, and was to either approve or disapprove the securitizing acts by the US, i.e. Byrnes' proposal regarding Greenland. What will be shown in the following analysis, and what is also evident from the current status of Greenland being part of the Danish Realm but with Self-Governance, is that the proposal on purchasing Greenland from Denmark did not happen, and thereby, it can be stated that the audience, Denmark, did not approve the arguments relating to the purchase proposal. However, one should not forget that at this time, the purchase proposal was only one of three proposals. Moreover, as Rasmussen went to the US with the purpose of terminating the 1941 Agreement, this could be a Danish attempt to securitize its sovereignty over Greenland by making the US leave Greenland, but also an attempt to desecuritize as the threat from Germany had ended, thus the US was no longer needed. Initially, Rasmussen, as it appears from the memorandum, did not reply to Byrnes' thoughts at the meeting in December 1946, but aimed at remaining neutral with the purpose of not making Byrnes think that any of the three proposals were even considered or that any of the proposals were more likely to happen than the others:

“The foreign minister strove during the conversation not to take greater distance from the thought of a purchase than from the other two proposals as he emphasized that by making such a difference not to give the Americans [...] the impression that one of the proposals should have greater possibility to be carried out than the other” (Dansk Udenrigspolitisk Institut 1997, 33)

Moreover, Rasmussen also expressed concern regarding what impacts it could have if Denmark were to agree to the proposal, especially how other powers would react:

“If Denmark were to agree to Mr. Byrnes proposal, we would confirm other powers suspicion and we would expose us to that the Russians not only would consolidate its

position on Spitzbergen but that they might also would demand advanced bases in the Baltic Sea and other places in Europe” (ibid.).

Moreover, during the Cold War there was a tendency among the Nordic countries not to take sides in the conflict between the East and the West (Browning 2007). Thus, for Denmark the referent object was, besides its sovereignty over Greenland, also its attempt to remain neutral in the conflict between the US and the Soviet Union. By allowing the US further access to Greenland would risk that Denmark would get in bad standing with the Soviet Union. Hence, the consequences that would come of an agreement with the US on the proposals and continued US presence in Greenland could thus be perceived as a threat to the Kingdom of Denmark. To Byrnes’ proposal on transferring Greenland to the US and his statement that Greenland was not an economic asset to Denmark, the memorandum states:

“The foreign minister had to this responded that it was not money nor economy that was vital to Denmark’s interest in Greenland. The country was tied up to Denmark by an old historical and traditional relationship.” (Dansk Udenrigspolitisk Institut 1997, 33).

Thus, for Denmark, the referent object was also to maintain its close relationship with Greenland based on history. Moreover, the memorandum states:

“We can refer to the provisions in Article 43 in the United Nations Pact and claim that we according to these are cut off from giving one of the great powers exclusive rights to military allowances on Greenland” (ibid. 34).

Hence, Denmark’s solution to put an end to the discussion. However, the US kept bringing up the subject until Rasmussen’s response in January 1947: “while we owe much to America I do not feel that we owe them the whole island of Greenland.” (Marvel 1947). This is a rather direct speech act which is both an illocutionary force, i.e. a decline of the proposal, and perlocutionary effect, i.e. Rasmussen’s response and reaction to the proposal. It also shows how Rasmussen asserts that Greenland is not for sale despite whatever the US has done for Denmark and Greenland.

As for the internal facilitating conditions, it is evident that the actors, i.e. James Byrnes and Gustav Rasmussen used security rhetoric by constructing a plot in which they present existential threats. I.e. the shared threat from Germany and the Soviet Union with the points of no return being German invasion of Greenland that could spread to the US. Moreover, the potential attacks from modern

weapons coming from the Soviet Union to the referent objects, i.e. the American continent, Greenland and its population, and Denmark's sovereignty and status as an Arctic state. Both the US and Denmark present some possible ways out, i.e. the US' with its three proposals, incl. the purchase proposal, and Denmark that tries to dodge a bullet, i.e. US exclusive rights to Greenland, by referring to Article 43 in the UN Pact, thus presenting a way out of the US' proposals. With regard to the external conditions both representatives from the US and Denmark have authority, i.e. the social capital of a speaker, and the US referred the threat to objects such as the modern weapons, thus it did provide a convincing attempt to securitize the American continent through the acquisition of Greenland, however, not convincing enough for Denmark to buy into this securitizing attempt as it perceived the situation and its relationship with Greenland differently than the US.

5.1.4. Key points

From the situational context in relation to the 1941 Defense Agreement and the memorandum, it appears that the discourse in the relationship was to a great extent determined by external threats, which initially was that of Germany at the time of the Defense Agreement, thus the triangular relationship was also initiated in the context of war. Hence, the discourse within the triangular relationship was thus characterized by security. This security discourse was also dominant five years later in 1946 at the time of the US' proposal, although the threat had shifted to that of the Soviet Union from both a Danish and US perspective, however, for Denmark, the US also represented a threat to Danish sovereignty. Both at the time of the Defense Agreement and the purchase-proposal, there was a mutual understanding between Denmark and the US that Greenland should be protected, although for different reasons. For the US, Greenland was, and still is, located at the American continent, thus in close proximity to the US, which would make the US more vulnerable to attacks from first Germany if it had gotten a foothold in Greenland, and secondly from the Soviet Union in terms of modern weapons that could reach the Thule Air Base, and thus American defense. For Denmark, it was to a great extent protecting its own interests such as keeping its sovereignty over Greenland, but also to keep the Greenlandic population safe, although less explicated in the documents.

5.2. 2019-proposal

5.2.1. Situational context

Proceeding to the situational context with regard to the 2019-proposal, there are, according to Conley and Melino (2019), three main drivers that are shaping the Arctic. First, there are the "geopolitical

drivers of great power competition” (Conley & Melino 2019, 2), which involves Russia, the largest Arctic coastal state, and China, a self-proclaimed Near-Arctic state, and to some extent also the US, who has recently realized its rather laid-back approach as insufficient. Then there are the environmental drivers, “which are simultaneously transforming the Arctic maritime and terrestrial space [...] while fueling the development of flexible governance structures” (ibid.), and finally, there are the economic drivers, “which are highly correlated with global commodity process” (ibid.). Moreover, with regard to the triangular relationship, lately some changes have occurred at the government level: The Trump administration in the US has recently been replaced by the Biden administration with Biden’s inauguration in January 2021 (Sherman 2020) and with effects still to be seen in the relationship with Greenland and Denmark. Then there is also a new government as of April 2021 in Greenland with now Inuit Ataqatigiit in charge in a coalition with the party, Naleraq: both parties supporting the direction of working towards independency (Lindstrøm 2021) and are both positive towards international cooperation, including China (Gad 2021). The mining project at Kuannersuit (Kvanefjeld) was one of the main themes, along with social and environmental sustainability, in the election in Greenland in the Spring of 2021 and had a decisive role to play. The new government oppose to the project (ibid.), thus the victory to IA indicates the peoples’ wish for protecting the environment and the health of the people among other things, and that the development towards independence is not aspired after at all cost. To clarify, the Kuannersuit-project is a mining project located in close proximity to Narsaq in Southeastern Greenland, and it would create over 300 jobs and bring an economic boost to Greenland, which could have a great impact on the development towards independency (Herløv et al. 2021). However, the potential impacts on the environment and on health problems have caused insecurity and opposition as retrieving rare earth minerals will also mean, unavoidably, retrieving uranium as a by-product (ibid.). Thus, this could show that IA does not want to risk harm to the environment, nor the people, while pursuing development of the country, however, that does not mean that the new government does not wish for any mining projects at all (Gad 2021). According to Gad (ibid.), the government is “eager to initiate other mining projects and remains open to investment from China” (ibid.) to the wary of US and Denmark, and further argues that the US, along with the EU, needs to step up their game and present other green, viable alternatives (ibid.). Thus, the discourse prevailing in Greenland currently may be mostly related to economic and social development, however, with as little harm to the environment and the people as possible.

The involved parties regarding the 2019-proposal remain to be the US, Greenland, and Denmark as in 1946. What is one of the great differences from the situational context during the 1946-proposal and 2019-proposal is that Greenland has become a more active player with a greater voice due to first its Home Rule in 1979 and then Self-Government in 2009, although with Denmark having the

responsibility of foreign, security, and defense policy (Rasmussen 2019, 4). The Government of Greenland, however, does have some jurisdiction over some elements of foreign policy and also has influence on security policy that is conducted in the Arctic (Gad 2021). Thus, regarding power relations, Greenland has gained more power, however, the power relations among the three parties are still quite imbalanced with the US having the power to influence other states, such as Denmark and Greenland. Based on the data, the topic of these is to a great extent about security and military activities of the great powers, i.e. the US, China, and Russia, occurring in the Arctic and the interest in Greenland from the US' side, and moreover, the Danish and Greenlandic reactions to this interest. Compared to the first part of the analysis, i.e. the 1946-proposal, this part will include more Greenlandic viewpoints due to more involvement of Greenland today. Moreover, it can be stated that the main situation in which the analysis takes departure is the US' proposal to purchase Greenland from Denmark, however, in order to understand this proposal and the reactions to it, it is necessary to take a look at what underlies this proposal, mainly through the speech of Secretary of State, Michael Pompeo in May 2019 supported by a statement by Carla Sands, former US ambassador to Denmark under President Trump.

5.2.2. US' arguments and articulations

Speech by Secretary of State Pompeo

Beginning with Pompeo's speech, on behalf of the US, *Looking North: Sharpening America's Arctic Focus* given in Rovaniemi, Finland in May 2019 during the 11th Arctic Council Ministerial meeting. This speech, i.e. the locutionary act, was highly unconventional as Pompeo addressed issues that are normally not addressed in the Arctic Council as it is a forum that promotes cooperation, coordination, and interaction in the Arctic and in particular on issues related to sustainable development and environmental protection in the Arctic (Arctic Council 2019a). Yet, Pompeo addressed issues related to competition, security, strategy, and military actions for the majority of his speech with special attention to China and Russia as will be shown throughout the analysis. However, he also addressed the environment to a lesser degree at the end of his speech and in a way in which he shows the "greatness" of America through its actions while addressing the shortcomings of Russia and China in this regard as seen in the quotes below:

"Our administration helped the Arctic states seal the Central Arctic Fisheries Agreement. It was one of the first times in history that a region banded together to preemptively solve a threat to environmental resources. We should all be proud of that" (Pompeo 2019).

“Our administration has also freed up energy exploration in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. We’ve exported offshore energy production in the safest way possible, while also hosting [...] joint oil spill exercises with regional partners” (Pompeo 2019)

“Our black carbon emissions are down 16 percent since 2013 and are on track to drop by nearly half by 2035, the best of any Arctic country. Meanwhile, it isn’t clear that Russia is reducing emissions at all, despite being the largest emitter of black carbon in the entire Arctic” (Pompeo 2019).

Thus, the discourse evident in Pompeo’s speech, and thus in the US’ construction of reality, is mainly the security discourse, which will be shown throughout the analysis. Moreover, the use of security rhetoric will also be shown. Therefore, the speech can be analyzed in relation to Trump’s proposal as it was given a few months prior to Trump’s proposal, and also as it indicates the US’ construction of reality of what is going on in the Arctic and in relation to the Arctic. Moreover, it can help understand how the proposal can be seen in a security perspective, to understand US motives, and to identify securitization concepts. Additionally, the speech also corresponds to US conflict understandings of the Arctic presented by Kristensen and Mortensgaard (2021): 1) conflict about the Arctic, i.e. its resources and sea routes, 2) conflict in the Arctic, i.e. the Arctic as a military operational area, and 3) conflict on the edge of the Arctic, i.e. the US threatened from north or northeast and is articulated as a homeland security issue. How Greenland fits into these understandings will be discussed in section 5.3. After his introduction with formal politeness and anecdotes, Pompeo continues his speech by introducing the audience, i.e. the participating Arctic Council members, to the fact that his speech will address other subjects than what is usually the norm. He states that:

“I might, however, be the first to give a major address outside of those formal proceedings” (Pompeo 2019).

“[...] the region has become an arena for power and for competition. And the eight Arctic states must adapt to this new future” (Pompeo 2019).

The illocutionary force of this speech act is Pompeo, on behalf of the US, makes a statement, expressing how the situation is and what should be done, i.e. adaptation, and he further gives reason for why he addresses issues out of the ordinary. Moreover, he does not directly elaborate on what this adaptation requires, and it might be that the extraordinary measures are to be found within this

adaptation to the new future. Moreover, already at this point the audience is presented to what turn this speech is taking and to the discourse of power and security. The region has “become an arena of power and competition” (ibid.) and shows that things have changed and it is no longer, in the US perspective, a region of peace and cooperation to the same extent as in earlier times. He builds on his arguments by adding “we’re entering a new age of strategic engagement in the Arctic, complete with new threats to the Arctic and its real estate, and to all of our interests in that region” (ibid.) and expresses how the US sees the future, i.e. the illocutionary force. Already at this point, he declares that there are some threats in the Arctic and towards the Arctic, but also to “our” interests, which could be all Arctic member states and non-state members, but also only the US’ interests, thus Pompeo presents the Arctic and the interests as the referent objects. Hence, Pompeo is with this speech act aiming to convince the other Arctic states and non-states of the threats looming in the Arctic and something needs to be done, i.e. he is creating a shared threat.

Throughout the speech, Pompeo also asserts the US’ role in relation to these threats (and thus the securitizing actor can be identified): namely the US as a protector and its legitimacy as an Arctic nation, which he actually declares to be the “most fundamental principle” (ibid.), implying the US’ construction of it being a great, important country. Moreover, he states “this is America’s moment to stand up as an Arctic nation and for the Arctic’s future” (ibid.) in which he expresses US legitimacy to the Arctic and again its role as a protector of the future of the Arctic by referring to the US’ history with Alaska (app. 2.1.), which was purchased in 1867 from Russia, thus the US has a history with acquiring land. Moreover, how can it be then that President Obama was the first president to visit Alaskan Arctic in 2015 when chairing for the GLACIER (Global Leadership in the Arctic Cooperation, Innovation, Engagement, and Resilience) conference (which China and Russia did not sign)? (Conley & Melino 2019, 3). The US proclaims its legitimacy as an Arctic state through Alaska, but the Arctic has not been much of a priority until lately. Even now when it has taken a more active approach to the region rather than its previous ‘wait-and-see’ approach (Olsen et al. 2019), its addresses its focus towards Greenland, which further shows how security and geopolitics is of great importance to the Americans. Moreover, Pompeo states “Look, the facts speak for themselves: America is the world’s leader in caring for the environment” (Pompeo 2019), but probably not to the greatest extent during the Trump administration, which concluded US Arctic Council chairmanship (2015-2017) “without significant change” (Conley & Melino 2019, 3) and by disassembling the “Obama administration’s administrative structures” (ibid.), which were created as a reaction and realization that the US needed to “elevate climate change as a national security imperative” (ibid.). Moreover, the Trump administration reopened onshore and offshore areas in the American Arctic for resource development such as in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge among others, and has also

emphasized economic development and even dismissed the climate impacts in the region (ibid.). Among these actions, there is also the fact that the US in November 2019 presented its decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement, which aims “to strengthen the global response to the threat of climate change” (McGrath 2020), and its withdrawal officially entered into force in November 2020 (ibid.). However, President Biden was quick to reinstate the US to the Agreement only hours after being sworn in (Milman 2021), indicating a different approach than the Trump administration. So this entire narrative that Pompeo aims to construct with his speech in relation to the environment, as one of the referent objects, seems rather contradictory to American actions, or intended actions to be more accurate given the timeline of these events with Pompeo’s speech held prior to US’ withdrawal from the Paris Agreement. Based on this, the discourse of the US as a protector and caring for the environment is not really seen in the US’ actions, at least in relation to the mentioned cases and during the Trump administration, however, President Biden’s action shows a wish to correct this. So Pompeo is to some extent placing the US on a pedestal.

As mentioned under the theoretical considerations in section 4, security in international relations is rooted in the tradition of power politics, and this is evident in how Pompeo is almost attacking Russia and China, i.e. the more obvious threats mentioned by Pompeo, and at the same time, he highlights everything good about the US. Starting with China, Pompeo states:

“Our Pentagon warned just last week that China could use its civilian research presence in the Arctic to strengthen its military presence, [...] including deployment of submarines to the region as a deterrent against a nuclear attack” (Pompeo 2019).

The illocutionary force is here a wish to show how China is causing unease in the US government by using the, by the author, underlined words, and thus aiming to refer this unease to the audience and constructing China as a shared threat in the region. Moreover, it shows how security rhetoric is applied by the word choices, thus showing the security discourse. Using security rhetoric is one of the criteria of the internal facilitating conditions, and it is here used to convince the audience, which also includes Chinese representatives as observing participants (Arctic Council 2019b), of the insecurity that China causes with its presence in the Arctic. He further states that “China’s CO2 emissions tripled between 2000 and 2016. Do we want that kind of output in one of the most precious and pristine corners of the world?” (Pompeo 2019). Here, the illocutionary force is Pompeo asking the audience if they want China’s pollution in the Arctic, which can be considered to be one of the threats. However, this question could be perhaps considered a strategic question to provoke a reaction

from other Arctic states and to show that Chinese presence in the Arctic is bad, although, according to UNECE (United Nations Economic Commission for Europe), air pollution is a global problem already, even though it is often perceived as a local or regional problem (UNECE n.d.). Moreover, this problem caused by CO2 emissions is already seen in the climate changes with its rising temperatures, melting sea ice, just to mention a few (Eamer et al. 2013). He additionally describes the Arctic as pristine, another term for unspoiled, however, changes are happening according to Eamer et al. (2013). Moreover, it also identifies what Pompeo presents to be one of the referent objects: the environment and pristine character of the Arctic.

“Let’s just ask ourselves: Do we want Arctic nations broadly, or indigenous communities specifically, to go the way of former government in Sri Lanka or Malaysia, ensnared by debt and corruption? Do we want crucial Arctic infrastructure to end up like Chinese-constructed roads in Ethiopia, crumbling and dangerous after only a few years? Do we want the Arctic Ocean to transform into a new South China Sea, fraught with militarization and competing territorial claims? Do we want the fragile Arctic environment exposed to the same ecological devastation caused by China’s fishing fleet in the seas off its coast, or unregulated industrial activity in its own country? I think the answers are pretty clear.” (Pompeo 2019)

In this quote, the illocutionary force is Pompeo directly speaking to and asking the audience a question with the purpose to convince them why China in the Arctic needs to be controlled. Moreover, he refers to the threat of China’s activities to other parts of the world to back up this argument and asks if this is something that the audience wants in the Arctic, thus the Arctic, including its people, environment etc., is again presented as the referent object that holds security legitimacy. He additionally seeks to emphasize that China is a threat to “we” and thus creating multiple referent objects and also audiences, and additionally, he aims to create a sense of unity and an us versus them idea that he wants the audience to buy into. Moreover, the above statements in the shape of questions could perhaps also be regarded as points of no return in Pompeo’s security plot, i.e. a condition of the internal facilitating conditions, if China is not controlled. Moreover, he does not hide whatever the US finds to be wrong with China and its actions. The security discourse is also evident here in the security rhetoric with references to different cases of insecurity in the world: “debt”, “corruption”, “unsafe infrastructure”, “militarization”, and “ecological devastation”, i.e. everything bad brought by China, thus threats to the Arctic. However, his reference to the Arctic Ocean in relation to militarization and territorial claims is somewhat controversial, because is this not exactly what is going on currently? Perhaps, not to the same extent. The US, or Pompeo, is quick to point fingers at

others even though the US is also upscaling its military activities, and with his speech act below, he is also insinuating a link between the threat to the Arctic and the US:

“On the security side, partly in response to Russia’s destabilizing activities, we are hosting military exercises, strengthening our force presence, rebuilding our icebreaker fleet, expanding Coast Guard funding, and creating a new senior military post for Arctic Affairs inside of our own military” (Pompeo 2019).

As for territorial claims, this is already seen with for example the Lomonosov Ridge, a mountain range that runs from the Siberian continental shelf towards Canada and Greenland. Both Russia, Denmark, and Canada all seek sovereignty over the seabed around the North Pole and claim it as an extension of their territory (Henriques 2020), and then there is also the territorial dispute between Canada and the Kingdom of Denmark over Hans Island (Rudnicki 2016). Moreover, Pompeo states that “China’s pattern of aggressive behavior elsewhere [...] should inform what we do and how it might treat the Arctic” (Pompeo 2019) in which the illocutionary force is to warn about China’s aggressive behavior elsewhere with the potential to transfer to the Arctic as well. Thus, these statements can be seen as ways in which Pompeo legitimizes the US’ actions in the Arctic, i.e. the extraordinary measures. As for Russia in extension of his points relating to the Arctic Ocean, Pompeo is definitely not hiding his, and the US’, opinions and concerns:

“We’re concerned about Russia’s claim over the international waters of the Northern Sea Route, including its newly announced plans to connect it with China’s Maritime Silk Road. In the Northern Sea Route, Moscow already illegally demands other nations request permission to pass, requires Russian maritime pilots to be aboard foreign ships, and threatens to use military force to sink any that fail to comply with their demands” (Pompeo 2019).

Here, the illocutionary force is to place Russia in a bad standing with the audience, which also includes Russia, by calling out its illegal actions. Again, security rhetoric is used by mentioning “military force” and the verb “threatens”, and Pompeo aims to show Russia’s aggressive behavior, which he also points out more directly as will be shown later. The threat here is Russia’s aggressive behavior to foreign ships, thus other countries. The Northern Sea Route (NSR) is “a contested waterway” (Blunden 2012, 116) in which Russia claims sovereignty, and the US, along with EU, argue that it passes through international waters (ibid.), but according to Fedorov et al. (2020), the

NSR covers “inland sea waters, territorial sea, adjacent and exclusive economic zones of the Russian Federation” (ibid, 2). Pompeo further states:

“These provocative actions are part of a pattern of aggressive Russian behavior here in the Arctic. Russia is already leaving snow prints in the form of army boots [...]. Russia formally announced its intent to increase its military presence in the region in 2014, when it re-opened a Cold War Arctic military base” (Pompeo 2019).

The illocutionary force is here again to create awareness on Russian activities in a way that creates insecurity. By referring to the Cold War, he opens up to the idea of a new time of high insecurity, although the US is also present at Thule Air Base in Greenland (Krog 2020a), a US Cold War defense base established in 1951 (Archer 1988, 135), however, under different conditions today than at other times in history and with more benefits to Greenland (Krog 2020a). Moreover, that Russia re-opened the referred to Arctic military base, the US considered this a threat, but it does not emerge from the above quote to what, although Pompeo mentions the Arctic, and it could also be argued that given the forum in which this speech was given is the Arctic Council, also indicates that the Arctic is the referent object. Moreover, it could also be considered a threat to the region as a place of low tension and stability. Pompeo continues by mentioning all the actions of military upscaling of Russia to support his view that Russia is aggressive, such as Russian “claims to have built 475 new military sites, including bases north of the Arctic Circle [...] new sophisticated air defense systems and anti-ship missiles” (Pompeo 2019).

“We recognize that Russia is not the only nation making illegitimate claims. The U.S. has a long-contested feud with Canada over sovereign claims through the Northwest Passage [...] But Russia is unique. Its actions deserve special attention [...] of this Council, in part because of their sheer scale. But also because we know Russian territorial ambitions can turn violent. 13,000 people have been killed due to Russia’s ongoing aggressive action in Ukraine” (Pompeo 2019).

The illocutionary force is here to argue why Russia is singled out, as with China, which is due to its aggressive behavior as also seen elsewhere as in Ukraine. The security rhetoric is here evident by the use of the words “violent”, “killed”, and “aggressive”, thus presenting once again Russia as a threat. As it is stated in the theory section, securitization is at times unavoidable, such as when a state deals with another aggressive state, and this is the card Pompeo aims to play in relation to Russia, and thus

why Russia needs to be dealt with. Moreover, with the comment on other feuds in the Arctic, including the US itself, Pompeo is attempting to put Russia's actions into perspective and by emphasizing that Russia is aggressive. The statement that the US and Canada have a feud can also be somewhat contradictory to his point, and rhetorical question, whether or not the Arctic should be a place of territorial claims and disputes.

“[...] America could do more, and we will; we intend to. Today America is sharing its focus on the Arctic and securing its future. Under President Trump, we are fortifying America's security and diplomatic presence in the area [...] We are hosting military exercises, strengthening our force presence, rebuilding our icebreaker fleet, expanding Coast Guard funding, and creating a new senior military post for Arctic Affairs inside our own military” (Pompeo 2019).

In relation to Pompeo's statements regarding Russian aggressive behavior in the Arctic due to its military upscaling, then could the US' behavior not be considered aggressive as well, and thus contributing to making the Arctic a region of tension and militarization? As Reinke de Buitrago (2019) states, the military and hard-security activities of the US and Russia, along with Canada, actual conflict is more likely. Nonetheless, Pompeo is presenting the US and its capabilities as a way out and as a protector through its own military activities, i.e. the extraordinary measures. However, while the US lashes out to Russian behavior and military upscaling in the Arctic, the two superpowers also cooperate and work constructively in the Arctic Council, through the Arctic Coast Guard Forum, and bilaterally on maritime safety and fisheries law enforcement along the US-Russian Maritime Boundary Line in the Bering Sea (Conley & Melino 2019, 5).

Statement by ambassador Sands

Carla Sands, former US ambassador to Denmark and Trump supporter (Mouritzen 2021), agrees with Pompeo's views in her statement *Wake up to the Arctic's importance*: Russia and China are threatening the peace and stability in the Arctic (Sands 2020). As former US ambassador to Denmark, she presents her viewpoints in relation to Greenland, and she has also played a significant role in creating a closer relationship between Denmark, Greenland, and the Faroe Islands with the re-opening of a US consulate in Nuuk and close contact on the developments both politically, militarily, and commercially. Moreover, given that President Trump was the third president to make an offer to purchase Greenland, she argues, in an interview with the Danish news media, Berlingske, that there

is precedent to purchase Greenland (Mouritzen 2021), although without explaining this further. In the following, the author will mainly analyze excerpts of Sands' statement that relates to Greenland:

“While Greenland stands on the cusp of a new era of productivity, governments who operate by different standards are looking to exploit opportunities to bring their authoritarian set of values to the future development and governance of the region” (Sands 2020).

With this statement, Sands implies that Greenland can potentially fall victim to authoritarian states and their values, to which she later on refers to China and Russia, due to Greenland's rise in productivity. Thus, Greenland, and also the Arctic region, can be considered the referent objects that need protection from this threat. She further states: “In 2018, Russia opened an Arctic airfield at Nagurskoye which can accommodate bombers capable of reaching Thule Air Base in Northwest Greenland with little to no warning” (Sands 2020). Sands is with this statement aiming to show how Greenland, and especially the Thule Air Base, and thus American interests and personnel, is highly exposed to attacks from Russia, and thereby, making Russia a threat to Greenland and the Thule Air Base, i.e. the referent objects. Moreover, Sands is using security rhetoric in relation to Russia as seen in the word “bombers”.

“The U.S. government is working on a substantial package of economic support funds to help jumpstart growth in Greenland [...] the United States can help Greenland reach its great potential, open up new markets, increase sustainable tourism, and set new standards for development in the region” (Sands 2020).

Once again, the US is presented as some sort of protector and helper with sincere wish to help Greenland, and with the package, the US is also trying to keep Russia and China out of Greenland. Moreover, according to Humpert (2020), there is a hope from the US side that the US “will become a partner of choice for Arctic states” (Humpert 2020) and that this economic package will jumpstart this (ibid.). However, this particular statement was initially written as “substantial package of economic aid” (Lee & Olsen 2020) and was not received well by Danish politicians, who saw it as crossing a line (ibid.), as provocative, and with the purpose of driving a wedge between Denmark and Greenland (Krog 2020b). From the Danish point of view, this reaction could indicate that Denmark seeks to keep Greenland within the Danish Kingdom as its status as an Arctic state can only be kept with Greenland as part of the Danish Kingdom, according to Jacobsen (2016). Thus, Denmark has a motive in trying to securitize its status, i.e. referent object to Denmark, by keeping Greenland within

the Realm, and moreover, protecting the relationship between Greenland and Denmark. Greenland, on the other hand, showed a more positive attitude to this package, however with some concerns regarding possible US demands of new military bases in Greenland, which Sands reassured that they would not make. Moreover, Pele Broberg from Naleraq saw it as disappointing as a lot of the funds would be tied to financing American counselors, thus the money would not be directed to the Greenlandic people as such (Kruse 2020). Additionally, Sands aims to show how Greenland needs the US to reach its potential, but based on the analysis, it could also perhaps be the case that the US needs Greenland given its great interest in Greenland, the Thule Air Base, and its importance for US national security, and, moreover, the repeated attempts to purchase the big island. Moreover, according to Jacobsen and Gad (2017), if Greenland is not in a good (economic) relationship with the US, Greenland might look towards China. Greenland has previously had a relationship with China, such as for example in the late 1990's when the Chinese were seen as the saviors of Greenlandic national trade, i.e. sealing, or in 2011, when Ove Karl Berthelsen, then Minister for Industry and Labor, visited China and China's reciprocated visit to Greenland in 2012 (ibid, 18-19). Moreover, the economic package could also indicate a shift in its approach to Greenland after the decline of Trump's purchase proposal, and thus wrapping its interest in another way, such as through tourism as Sands also mentions in her statement and what also appears from a joint plan agreed to in October 2020 by Sands and Premier Kim Kielsen regarding the Thule Air Base and cooperation on trade, investments, education among other things (Krog 2020a; Naalakkersuisut n.d.a).

Sands continues: "In order to ensure the Arctic remains secure and prospers, the United States will work with our European and North American allies" (Sands 2020). The illocutionary force could here be a promise to keep the Arctic secure and prosperous, and again the security rhetoric is also present with using the words "security" and "allies." As Durfee mentions "states also obtain security through cooperation in international institutions, through alliances, and through arms control" (Durfee & Johnstone 2019, 87), which is evident from the above quote: The Arctic should be kept safe through cooperation with allies.

"The United States and the Trump Administration are setting out to wake the West up from our collective complacency before other less trustworthy governments shape the values of the region after their own repressive image" (Sands 2020).

The illocutionary force is here to show how the West should stand together against the threat from the "less trustworthy" governments and their repressive values, i.e. most likely Russia and China given the constant references to these throughout Sands' statement. Thus, Sands addresses this to the

western collective feeling and values, and further implies that not only is the US not satisfied with its own achievements in the region, but also other Arctic states' achievements. However, this is mentioned in a way that makes it seem less harsh to these other Arctic states, and thus, trying to protect its good standing with the other states. Hence, from the above statement the presented threat is the "untrustworthy" governments and their "repressive" values and images that the Arctic needs to be protected from through western cooperation. Moreover, as seen in the following speech act, Sands is trying to create an image that Russia with its behavior is a shared threat at a global scale: "Russia's pattern of aggressive behavior and increasing militarization in the Arctic is a looming global concern" (Sands 2020), and thus she perhaps tries to convince the audience to accept the US' construction of reality, and furthermore, she also aims to create unity and construct Russia as a shared threat.

As for facilitating conditions, Pompeo and Sands, both with social capital as speakers and representing the US, make use of security rhetoric as can be seen in their word choices, such as "power", "security", "threats", "aggressive behavior", "nuclear attack", "Cold War", and "militarization" just to mention a few. It is also seen in how they have built up their speech and statement around a specific plot in which Russia and China are the main threats to the security of the Arctic, its nature and environment, the people, the interests of the rightful Arctic states, cooperation, and Western values and democracy, all of which can be considered referent objects within the securitization framework. Moreover, they use the security rhetoric to argue why the US' actions of increased militarization are legitimate, and they presented, to some extent indirectly, ways to deal with the threats coming from Russia and China, which are through cooperation and increased vigilance, but also through increased militarization. They do not directly mention any extraordinary measures to be taken, however, it could be argued that these are perhaps already taking place, and in these statements, Pompeo and Sands are legitimizing US actions. Thus, their locutionary acts, i.e. the speech and statement, show the security discourse and also the power politics that is going on, such as through militarization for example. Between Russia and the US, it can almost be seen as a competition on who has the biggest military capacity and showing off their capabilities. Hence, Pompeo and Sands reveal to a great extent how they and the US experience and perceive what is going on in the Arctic, and thus how they construct reality which they seek to transfer to other states. Pompeo does not really mention the importance of Greenland, but Sands on the other hand, refers explicitly to the potential threat Russia makes out to be for Greenland, and more specifically, the Thule Air Base. Moreover, she talks highly of the relationship that the US has with Greenland and Denmark, and how the US can "help" Greenland reach its potential, thus implying that Denmark is not a desirable partner as Denmark, implicitly stated, cannot help Greenland to the same extent as the

US, especially with regard to the economic capabilities, i.e. points that can also be drawn from President Trump's statement in the following section.

Proposal by President Trump

Moving on to President Trump's proposal in August 2019:

"Greenland, I don't know. It got released somehow. It's just something we talked about. Denmark essentially owns it. We're very good allies with Denmark, we protect Denmark like we protect large portions of the world. So the concept came up and I said certainly I'd be, strategically it's interesting and we'd be interested, but we'll talk to them in a little bit. It's not number one on the burner, I can tell you that. Essentially, it's a large real estate deal. A lot of things could be done. It's hurting Denmark very badly because they're losing almost \$700 million a year carrying it, so they carry it at a great loss and strategically for the United States it would be nice and we're a big ally of Denmark and we help Denmark and we protect Denmark and we will. In fact, I'm supposed to stop, I'm thinking about going there, I'm not necessarily going there but I may be going. We're going to Poland and then maybe going to Denmark. Not for this reason at all but we're looking at it. It's not number one on the burner" (President Trump in Pengelly 2019).

There are several interesting things to take from this statement, which can first of all be considered a perlocutionary effect in that it is a response to that this internal discussion had been released: "[...] It got released somehow. It's just something we talked about." (ibid.). Hence, it is a response to the news media and perhaps also the situational context with regard to the actions of Russia and China in particular. Secondly, it can also be considered a locutionary act in itself as expressing an overall wish to purchase Greenland, presented by Trump on behalf of the US, i.e. Trump is the securitizing actor, or at least to have a discussion with Denmark about it. Within this overall statement, there are several illocutionary forces that to a great extent indicate how the US perceives Greenland and Denmark and also itself in this triangular relationship. What is interesting is that Trump presents an interest in purchasing Greenland, but he directs this wish to Denmark, which he mentions eight times, whereas he only mentions Greenland once, indicating Trump's perception of the power relations of the three countries with Greenland not having much power nor relevance or voice in the matter. Moreover, he refers to Greenland as some kind of burden to Denmark, and he does not seem to show much respect to the Greenlanders in doing so. For example, he describes Greenland as "the concept", "a real estate deal" and as it to be "hurting Denmark very badly", which refers to the economic loss

of Denmark by “carrying” Greenland. He presents Greenland as something bad for Denmark, and he does not show any knowledge of the relationship between Greenland and Denmark either, nor does he show respect for Greenland as a nation with Self-Government, hence that Greenland actually gets a say in this matter. So what can be drawn from this is that according to the US, Denmark could be considered the referent object, however, not in an existential crisis situation-way, which needs to be relieved of the implied burden on its shoulder: Greenland. In this relation, the US asserts its own role as a protector, not only to Denmark but to a large part of the world: “We’re very good allies with Denmark, we protect Denmark like we protect large portions of the world”, and thereby, showing the power relations: the great America as the world peacekeeper and protector with Denmark under its protective wing. This also shows the discourse of how the US sees itself in the world, but also how it sees Denmark and Greenland, at least from Trump’s perspective. Additionally, it also shows that the US has a tendency to think in economic terms and that the US is showing off its economic capacity, implying that taking on Greenland is not something that the US would feel severe economic consequences of. Thus, he is again showing the power relations in that for Denmark, it is a lot of money with an implicit reference to the size of Denmark vis-à-vis the great US, thus he presents the US as a better option for Greenland as well as the US has the economic capacity to help Greenland in its development.

Moreover, what the “existential” threat is can be perceived in different ways. Building on the previous discussion with Denmark as the referent object, the threat is, as perceived by the US, the economic loss that Denmark “suffers”, which Denmark needs protection from, and therefore, the US swoops in and offers a solution by offering to purchase it, presenting it almost as a favor. Moreover, Trump mentions twice that: “[...] strategically, it’s interesting” and “[...] strategically for the United States it would be nice” (President Trump in Pengelly 2019), hence, what is implied with the word “strategically” should be understood from the situational context and from the above analysis of Pompeo’s speech and Sands’ statement. What is interesting is that, according to Conley and Melino (2019), the US has for a while thought of the Arctic as a place that would remain of limited strategic value, however, this might be so due to the, among others, Ilulissat Declaration from 2008 and its reconfirmation in 2018 (Bagger 2020) and the cooperation in the context of the Arctic Council. According to Rasmussen (2019), the Ilulissat Declaration is an example of desecuritization. But with Chinese and Russian military and economic activities in the Arctic, Greenland’s geostrategic position has become interesting to the US and it, i.e. Trump’s proposal, could almost seem like a desperate reaction to the aforementioned activities in combination with a stagnant US Arctic policy for the past decade. Hence, the US has entered the great power game in the Arctic with quite the entrance, although it entered rather late to the party. So this is most likely what Trump refers to by uttering the

word “strategically”, but at the same time, he somewhat downplays its importance, almost like he does not want to show what cards he has on his hand, by referring to it as “nice”, “interesting”, and “not number one on the burner”. Hence, the threat is not as urgent so that it requires extraordinary means, however, he still puts it out there. So this attempt made by Trump to purchase Greenland could perhaps not even be considered a securitizing attempt as a potential sale of Greenland was not even on the table before the proposal, and moreover, because he did not present an existential threat, so in this regard it might be categorized more as a politicizing act, which is again quickly depoliticized by Mette Frederiksen and Kim Kielsen.

So as for the facilitating conditions regarding the internal conditions, President Trump does not use security rhetoric to the same extent as Pompeo and Sands in their speech and statements, however, some words can have security connotations such as “allies”, “protect”, and “strategically”, but he is not entirely following the security form to construct a plot. Denmark as a referent object is not existentially threatened by “carrying” Greenland, nor is there presented a point of no return, however, he does provide a solution (to a problem that exists in the US perspective): that the US should purchase Greenland and take over the burden. Moreover, with this, Trump is also presenting the US as an alternative to the Danish block grant. As for the external conditions, President Trump was, at this time, a superior speaker, thus with social capital, however, he did face a lot of heat following his statement (Obordo et al. 2019). Even though he referred this so-called economic threat to Denmark, Trump did not succeed in convincing the audience, Denmark and Greenland, that the US should take on the task of “carrying” Greenland. Moreover, according to Rasmus Leander Nielsen from Greenland’s University to Berlingske, a Danish news media, Denmark could not even sell Greenland if this was the case, as after the Second World War, rules were made for Indigenous peoples in the context of the United Nations, which makes it impossible for Denmark to sell Greenland, and additionally, the Self-Government law from 2009 states that the Greenlandic people are their own (Berlingske 2019).

Thus, summing up and clarifying the securitization concepts in the current situation from the US perspective, the US perceives the actions of mainly the other great powers, Russia and China, to be a threat to the multiple identified referent objects being the Arctic as a region, Greenland, and to some extent, Denmark (due to the economic burden that Greenland is according to Trump), and the US itself. The identified audiences are mainly Greenland and Denmark regarding the actual proposal, but also the Arctic Council members, participants and observers in relation to the forum in which Pompeo held his speech, and additionally also the rest of the world given the connected world that we live in and news coverage.

5.2.3. Danish and Greenlandic reactions and articulations

In the following sections, the author will analyze reactions and articulations from Denmark and Greenland, i.e. statements by Danish Prime Minister Mette Frederiksen and former Premiers of Greenland, Kim Kielsen and Kuupik Kleist.

5.2.3.1. *Danish reactions and articulations*

Statement by Danish Prime Minister Mette Frederiksen

Beginning with the Danish reactions to Trump's proposal to purchase Greenland, i.e. Danish Prime Minister Mette Frederiksen's statement, on behalf of Denmark, to the news media Danish Broadcasting Corporation (app. 2.4.1.), this statement, or reaction, is a locutionary act in itself as it is a mere act of saying something, but it is also a perlocutionary effect as it is a reaction to the proposal. She initiates:

"First of all, I thought it was important to go to Greenland as soon as possible after I became Prime Minister. It is, first of all, a visit where I wish to confirm the good relation between Denmark and Greenland. Then we will of course also talk about the joint projects we would like to initiate on the children's area, we will talk about the economy and the great agendas, and then we will of course also touch upon the approaching visit from the American president." (Frederiksen in Kielgast 2019)

First, in this particular quote, Frederiksen does not use security rhetoric such as by using words like "military" or "threat" etc. like Pompeo or Sands. However, by addressing the relationship to Greenland prior to her comment on Trump's proposal indicates that the relationship with Greenland is important to her, thus this relationship needs to be secured, which is also seen in her statement that it was important for her to go to Greenland as soon as possible after she became Prime Minister. Thus, the illocutionary force: Greenland and Denmark's relationship needs to be confirmed and secured. Her choice of words, i.e. "we", shows how she seeks to include Greenland in matters that concern Greenland, which is one of the main priorities of Denmark according to Olesen (2017): "to represent Greenlandic interests in coordination with the Greenlanders" (Olesen 2017, 72) in order to avoid scandals as has been seen in the triangular relationship with the US throughout history (ibid.). Maintaining a good relationship with Greenland can also be beneficial to Denmark as the other main priority for Denmark is to "continue to benefit from the boost to the kingdom's influence in

international affairs stemming from its Arctic status” (Olesen 2017, 72), thus maintaining a good relationship with Greenland is to be protected from potential dents to the relationship caused by Trump’s proposal, i.e. the threat to the referent object that is the good Greenlandic-Danish relationship. Thus, based on her statement, Mette Frederiksen is the securitizing actor from the Danish perspective. Frederiksen was further asked about her thoughts on President Trump’s proposal to which she replied:

“Well, I am not having any thoughts in relation to this. It is an absurd discussion, and Kim Kielsen has of course already made it clear that Greenland is not for sale, and then the discussion ends with this. On the other hand, there are many other things we would like to talk with the American President about.” (Frederiksen in Kielgast 2019).

The illocutionary force is here that Frederiksen attempts to distance herself by stating that she does not have any thoughts on the matter and then refers to Kim Kielsen, who clearly said that Greenland is not for sale, thus she also aims to show that this is not up to Denmark. Thereby, she also attempts to show Greenland Denmark’s loyalty and trust and how Denmark positions itself in relation to Greenlandic self-determination. It could also be argued that Frederiksen aims to depoliticize Trump’s proposal by her attempt to end the discussion. Moreover, Frederiksen has previously stated that she supports the Greenlandic wish for independence and that she understands the reasons for this by calling it natural and that it is an inherent wish for people to want independence. She additionally states that even though she supports the wish for independence she also appreciates the realm (Frederiksen to Sermitsiaq 2019a). Moreover, Frederiksen’s wish to maintain a good relationship with Greenland can also be seen in a public apology on behalf of Denmark to twenty two Greenlanders who were sent to Denmark in 1951 to take part in a social experiment in which they were to distance themselves from their Greenlandic roots and become a Danish-speaking elite in Greenland (Berlingske 2020). Thus, these can be considered further attempts to securitize a good relationship with Greenland and acknowledge some wrong-doings by Denmark. Moreover, it could indicate an attempt to improve the reputation that Denmark has in Greenland, which according to Olesen (2017) has been rather poor in some Greenlandic circles and caused Denmark to be a “lightning rod” (Olesen 2017, 79) for the problems in the triangular relationship (ibid.). Thus, the US proposal to purchase Greenland can also be considered a threat in how it potentially could negatively affect Danish-Greenlandic relations, although according to Peter Nedergaard, professor at Copenhagen’s University in political science, Trump’s proposal has strengthened the relationship as

he finds that Greenlandic independence would mean for Greenland to become dependent on other countries to which Denmark is the best alternative (Nedergaard 2019).

Continually, Frederiksen attempts to soften up her statement by stating that Denmark and Greenland still wish to talk about other subjects with the US, thus not dismissing the US entirely. Hence, Frederiksen aims to keep good relations with both Greenland and the US. However, as seen in the media, her choice of words caused harm in the US, and especially the word “absurd” seemed offending to President Trump, who then cancelled his trip to Denmark (BBC 2019), a visit he apparently invited himself to (Knudsen 2019). According to Knudsen, the word “absurd”, a word existing in both the Danish and the English vocabulary, has different meanings. In Danish, the word is used in relation to something surreal or unimaginable. In English, it is used when something is ridiculous or without common sense (ibid.). Regardless of the word’s different meanings, Frederiksen, most likely unintendedly, stepped on the President’s toes, and the US’ as well, who is not used to being put in place, and especially not by a small country (ibid.) as can be seen in his following response:

“I thought that the prime minister's statement that it was absurd, that it was an absurd idea was nasty [...] She's talking to the United States of America. You don't talk to the United States that way, at least under me” (Trump to BBC News 2019).

“I think it is a good idea because Denmark is losing \$700 million a year with it. It doesn’t do them any good” (Trump in Cho 2020).

The first statement by Trump shows that the US sees itself as superior to Denmark and that the US is a country that should be respected, although he himself is known for controversial expressions and straight-forwardness to other countries (BBC News 2020). In the second statement, he further shows his opinion that Denmark does not need Greenland, because it is expensive for Denmark and does no good for Denmark. Additionally, his expression “nasty” seems to be a go-to expression when he is dissatisfied and he takes it to a personal level by attacking the personalities of those who does not abide by him, such as Senator Ted Cruz who Trump has also called a “liar” and a “baby” or Omarosa Manigault Newman, Trump’s former aide, who he has called a “lowlife” and “nasty to people” (Cho 2020). However, Frederiksen responded more diplomatically by stating that:

“When you are close allies and good friends, which Denmark and the USA are, then there should be room for disagreements along the way. I hope we can soon end this discussion. We would like this from Danish side so we can use our energy on what matters, that is

strengthening our cooperation in a world that needs for countries to cooperate” (Frederiksen in Olsen & Jørgensen 2019).

The illocutionary force is here that Frederiksen wants to emphasize that there are other things more important than a feud with the US, however, still in a diplomatic way by highlighting the good relationship with the US that she wishes to maintain. Thus, this also shows the discourse from the Danish perspective that cooperation is needed worldwide and should be the center of attention instead of a war of words. Once again, the use of security rhetoric is rather limited besides the use of the word “allies,” which can be considered an opposite to “enemies.” Frederiksen continues in her initial response to Danish Broadcasting Corporation:

“The Arctic is becoming still more and more important for the entire world community. We wish for a stronger cooperation with the United States, and we hope that we can bring up all the different things related to this during the visit. And then it is important that Denmark and Greenland get the opportunity to talk properly before we meet with the American President. That is also why I am here” (Frederiksen in Kielgast 2019).

The illocutionary force is here that Frederiksen seeks to make clear that Denmark wishes for a stronger cooperation and relationship with the US, but that Greenland has a big role to play in this by mentioning that it is important that Denmark and Greenland can have a sit-down prior to the American visit. Thus, once again indicating one of the main priorities for Denmark and the referent object: the Danish-Greenlandic relationship. Furthermore, Frederiksen acknowledges that the Arctic is increasingly “important for the entire world community” (ibid.), but she abstains from using security rhetoric throughout the statement, which could indicate that this entire idea, i.e. the US attempt to securitize the referent objects, is desecuritized by Frederiksen and thus not accepted as Denmark and Greenland are the audiences to this proposal and securitizing move. Or at least, Denmark and Greenland are not accepting a Greenlandic sale as the means to secure the referent objects presented by the US, i.e. US’ interest and the Arctic region as a whole, incl. stability, cooperation, environment, etc. However, Frederiksen mentions “different things related”, i.e. to the cooperation with the US, and this may include security issues as the Kingdom of Denmark has a close security relationship with the US, which Frederiksen also states in a debate at the Danish Parliament on December 17, 2019 regarding the US’ foreign- and security political engagement in Greenland (Folketinget 2019a), and in which the security rhetoric is more outspoken than in her initial response to Danish Broadcasting Corporation:

“Our cooperation with the Americans [...] on the defense of Greenland has delivered peace and security since the 1940s, thus for quite many years. Currently, the US is strengthening both its political and military focus, like the Americans agree with us that there is a need for more strategic and focused cooperation on the Arctic and the North Atlantic, and I think this is positive” (Frederiksen in Folketinget 2019a)

The illocutionary force is here that Frederiksen attempts to show how US’ political and military focus can be considered as something positive by referring to the shared agreement among Denmark and the US in relation to strategic and focused cooperation, which could also indicate that the US has realized that it needs to change its strategy towards the Arctic that has been rather stagnant (Conley & Melino 2019). Moreover, Frederiksen shows that there is a willingness to engage in Arctic cooperation with the US. Additionally, she emphasizes how the US has helped keep Greenland secure since the 1940s, thus the relationship with the US can be considered a referent object as the US has “delivered” peace and security to the region for a long period of time. She further mentions that for the US, it is about taking care of its interests in which Greenland plays a role due to its geostrategic position being central to US’ national security. She relates the US’ interests to the actions of Russia and China in the Arctic and is perhaps almost making excuses on behalf of the US and US’ interest in Greenland, i.e. especially the Thule Air Base in relation to which she mentions potential Russian attacks that can reach Thule. In extension to this, she states:

“I would like to say today that in relation to the great power rivalry and the Arctic, I believe Denmark completely unambiguously should take the position that we are allied with the US and it is the US that is our primary ally when it comes to defense and security policy.” (Frederiksen in Folketinget 2019)

Here, the illocutionary force is to emphasize that the Kingdom of Denmark should position itself as a US ally, which she also directly states in the speech act. Thus, it may imply that Denmark agrees with the US’ construction of reality on some points related to defense and security as Frederiksen mentions the potential threat from Russia, i.e. the threat to Thule and thus Greenland (and the US), i.e. referent objects. Moreover:

“The alliance that we have with the Americans, with the US, builds fundamentally on very, very important mutual values. It also builds on an acknowledgement that we need each other

on the defense- and security policy and it also the case in relation to NATO's article 5 on the musketeer oath. We have across changing governments long been working towards that the American military presence in Greenland to a greater extent must benefit Greenland, besides the purely military, and [I] think that the increasing interest from the American side that this can also have a positive perspective" (ibid.).

The illocutionary force is here that not only does the Kingdom of Denmark need the US, but the US also needs the Kingdom of Denmark in the sense that the US needs Greenland and cannot really avoid Denmark in its relationship with Greenland. Moreover, from the statement, there are different types of "we" that need to be securitized, i.e. that of Denmark and the US, that of Greenland and the US, and that of Denmark and Greenland, and in which each constructs their own different reality.

In relation to Article 5, according to which if an ally is attacked, it can be considered an attack against all members and thus the allies must take actions to assist the ally that has been attacked (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2021). Thus, the Kingdom of Denmark is also tied up to the US through its NATO membership, which has also been a subject of tension in the Danish-Greenlandic relationship according to Olesen (2017), who states that some Greenlanders had mistrust to Denmark due to lack of transparency and that Denmark would get "discounts in NATO for letting the US keep its base in Greenland" (Olesen 2017, 74), i.e. the Thule Air Base, and this was one of the big themes in the 2015 election in Greenland (ibid.).

Furthermore, Frederiksen acknowledges and clearly states that the US military presence "must" benefit the Greenlanders, thus she aims to protect Greenlandic interests, and thereby its own reputation in Greenland. These benefits are also evident from a rather recent agreement concerning the Thule Base service contract, an agreement that had been discussed and negotiated for several years and was signed in 2020 by Carla Sands and Kim Kielsen (Naalakkersuisut 2020b; Naalakkersuisut n.d.). This also showed a mutual wish between Greenland and the US for future cooperation.

Based on Frederiksen's statements to Danish Broadcasting Corporation and during the debate in the Danish Parliament, Denmark acknowledges the changes and challenges occurring in the Arctic, and Greenland, especially in relation to security and military activities, however, based on the hard no from Denmark (and Greenland) on the US' proposal to purchase Greenland, there is no agreement with the US that transferring Greenland to the US is the way to deal with the challenges in the region. Furthermore, in her first response to Trump's proposal, Frederiksen brings this issue back to the realm of normal politics, or is even depoliticizing it, by quickly turning it down and by the lack of using

security rhetoric, and moreover, emphasizing the good relationship between Greenland and Denmark. However, in the debate on US' foreign- and security political engagement in Greenland, security rhetoric is seen to a greater extent by her word choices such as: "national security", "military presence", "attack", "missile launching", "defense", and "alliance" among others.

As for the internal facilitating conditions, Mette Frederiksen is in her initial response to Danish Broadcasting Corporation not following a security form in which she uses security rhetoric, which is seen in her lack of using words like "security", "defense", "ally", etc. She is focusing more on maintaining a good relationship with both Greenland and the US, while still asserting that when it comes to Greenland and the Greenlandic-Danish relationship, Denmark and Greenland cannot be expected to dance around the US' wishes. Thus, Frederiksen is desecuritizing Trump's attempt to purchase Greenland. In relation to the debate at the Danish Parliament, Frederiksen make use of security rhetoric to a greater extent by using words like "defense", "security", "attack", "peace", "national security", "alliance", "military presence" etc. She is constructing a plot in which she seeks to securitize the Kingdom of Denmark's alliance with the US, as the countries are mutually dependent, against the threat coming from especially Russia in which she refers to a potential attack on the Thule Air Base. Thus, she is also aiming at securitizing Greenland, and Greenland's benefits from US presence in Greenland from such an attack. She does not explicitly mention a possible way out, however, it could be argued that the close relationship with the US could be a way out, i.e. through the US' protective wings. As for the external facilitating conditions, Frederiksen holds authority as Prime Minister and thus she has social capital for an audience, i.e. in this case other politicians in the Danish Parliament, to accept her arguments and securitizing acts. Moreover, she does not in her initial response to Trump's proposal refer a threat to some objects, however, in the debate in the Danish Parliament, she, like the US representatives, i.e. Pompeo, Sands, and Trump, refers the threat, i.e. potential attacks from Russia, to the Thule Air Base, and thus Greenland and US' interests. Hence, what can be drawn from the facilitating conditions is that, in her initial response, she is not attempting to securitize as such but rather depoliticizing Trump's proposal, while in the debate in the Danish Parliament, she is attempting to get the other politicians to accept her securitization of the relationship with the US from which all parties can benefit from and are dependent on in one way or another. Moreover, this shows the discourse from a Danish perspective is emphasizing and maintaining mutual beneficial relationships both with Greenland and the US, while there to some extent is also the security discourse, although more related to the US than Greenland.

5.2.3.2. *Greenlandic reactions*

Statement by Premier Kim Kielsen

Former Premier of Greenland, Kim Kielsen, was even more brief in his response to Trump's proposal than Mette Frederiksen and stated that "Greenland is not for sale and cannot be sold. But Greenland is open to trade and cooperation with other countries - including the USA", i.e. the locutionary act and also perlocutionary effect to the proposal (Hyldal & Jakobsen 2019). The illocutionary force is here not only to state the fact that Greenland is not for sale, nor can it be sold, but also to state that Greenland is open for business with other countries, including the US, thus making a statement that the US is one of other countries that Greenland is willing to trade and cooperate with. Moreover, it could also indicate a statement to the US that Greenland will do business with whom it pleases, regardless of the US' dissatisfaction, and not just the US, and that it can make its own decisions, which could also implicitly be a statement to Denmark. From this brief statement, it is evident that there is no security rhetoric, thus Kielsen is desecuritizing the situation and not accepting the US' securitizing move.

A couple of months later on October 10, 2019, Kielsen gave a speech at the Arctic Circle Assembly in which he touched upon Greenland's significance in the Arctic and its relationship within the Realm, current and future developments in Greenland, its openness to cooperation, and also climate change (Kielsen 2019). In his speech, he stated:

"Our country is centrally located between two of the World's superpowers, and this is a fact which we can't ignore. The significant attention Greenland has received from other countries in recent years is also something which hasn't gone unnoticed by us. The media frenzy which arose this summer following the offer to buy our country certainly also caught our attention. The offer to buy our country is a concept which is alien to us, and does not go in line with our culture. Our people have been able to roam freely in our country without limitations, we do not have a tradition in purchasing land, instead it is possible for the inhabitants to lease land in which houses can be built, since land is common property.

Having clarified this, I can add that we stood as one nation in response to this announcement by saying: "Our country is not for sale, but we are open for business." (Kielsen 2019)

The illocutionary force is here that Kielsen first acknowledges that Greenland's physical location in the Arctic comes with a certain attention that Greenland needs to acknowledge. Moreover, based on the statement, it also shows a difference in how the US and Greenland perceives land and the

relationship to land. The US has an attitude of obtaining and possessing land, which is also seen throughout history with its different cases of land acquisition, such as Alaska (Olesen 2019). This is opposite to the Greenlandic view of land as it appears from Kielsen's speech in how this concept of purchasing and owning land is not something that Greenlandic society and culture know of. Thus, in relation to securitization, Kielsen is with his decline to Trump's proposal aiming to protect Greenland from becoming another case of US land acquisition and the limitations that this would bring to the Greenlandic people if Greenland would become part of the US, i.e. the threat to the Greenlandic peoples' possibility to freely move around. Hence, another illocutionary force of this speech act is to argue and give reason for this decline of Trump's proposal and why this would not be in the Greenlanders' best interest. Kielsen also stated:

“Greenland shares a unity of the Realm with Denmark and the Faroe Islands. 92 % of the size of the Realm amounts to the size of our country Greenland, which is located in the Arctic. Greenland has self-rule within the Realm and is in charge of its own development. The cooperation and respect which exists within the Realm is an indicator of the mutual understanding and support of the fact that we are aiming toward becoming increasingly independent” (Kielsen 2019).

The illocutionary force is here to establish that Greenland is in charge of its own development and that Greenland with its great size makes up the majority of the Realm, and with Greenland's location in the Arctic, the Kingdom of Denmark is only an Arctic state with Greenland in the Realm, a point that was also noted earlier in the analysis of Carla Sands' statement. While Kielsen clearly expresses that Greenland is its own and in charge of its own development, he also emphasizes that there is cooperation and respect in the Realm, however, dependent on the “mutual understanding and support” for future independence, i.e. also a reminder to Denmark that the good relationship is contingent upon this understanding. Thus, the referent object that Greenland seeks to protect is its own development towards independence from actions of external parties. Additionally, Kielsen, in his New Year's speech at the beginning of January 2020, also addressed the interest in Greenland and President Trump's proposal:

“I will use this opportunity to make clear that Greenland's place in the world community – our belonging and our future – is determined by the Greenlandic people alone and not by others! But I would very much like to see increased collaboration with the American government and with American companies. And I expect that we in 2020 will see the concrete

result of the American interest for investments in Greenland” (Kielsen in Naalakkersuisut 2020a).

The illocutionary force is here to make the statement that the Greenlandic peoples are the only ones who can decide their own future and how they fit into the world, and that this is not up to others, including the US. Moreover, it could be argued that this statement was also meant for Denmark with whom Greenland shares historical ties: According to Olesen (2017), Denmark still has a paternalistic view of Greenland and refers to Gad who uses the word “maternalistic” about the Danish-Greenlandic relationship with Greenland being the child, although, as Gad also states, Greenland has become a “teenager” (Gad 2008), and furthermore, Denmark is still needed for Greenland to “mature as an independent state” (Olesen 2017, 74). Thus, for both Greenland and Denmark, a good relationship is the goal, albeit for different reasons: Greenland who needs help to reach independence and Denmark who needs Greenland to be an Arctic state (Jacobsen 2016) alongside its support for Greenlandic independence - some day. In relation to Kielsen’s remark on the US in the above quote, the illocutionary force is here to express his expectations on behalf of Greenland that the US will uphold its intentions in relation to US investments in Greenland. Such intentions were stated in September 2019 in an official statement of intent on defense investments in Greenland, which acknowledges the development in the Arctic region for which reasons the US intends on strengthening US and NATO capabilities through strategic investments in Greenland with dual benefits to both the military but also to the civil society (Folketinget 2019b). In a security perspective, Kielsen is not using security rhetoric nor explicitly stating what can be considered a threat to a given referent object. However, the emphasis on Greenland’s development and foreign investments could indicate that Greenland wishes to secure its development and process towards independence, i.e. the referent object.

“We are now seriously seeing that Greenland’s position in the Arctic also has a central position in the international political game. This entails that the Danish government in 2020 must increase military investments and presence in the Arctic. The increasing investment interest in Greenland must be for the benefit for the population and support the development when it comes to the environment, climate change and infrastructure.” (Kielsen in Naalakkersuisut 2020a).

The illocutionary force is here to establish that Greenland has a central position in the “game” of international politics, and therefore, agrees with the US’ view that military investments and presence are needed in the Arctic and must be increased, which only touches upon security rhetoric by

mentioning military presence. However, it indicates that this position can be seen as a threat to Greenland in how he states that Denmark “must” increase its military presence and investments. Kielsen attempts to secure Greenland and seeks protection from Denmark, thus himself emphasizing this mother/child relationship to Denmark as mentioned earlier. Moreover, the quote further indicates that the environment, climate change, and infrastructure need to be kept in mind in relation to investments, thus these can also be considered referent objects.

With regard to the internal facilitating conditions, Kielsen is only to a limited extent using security rhetoric by mentioning “military investments and presence” (ibid.), thus Kielsen is also desecuritizing the attempt to purchase Greenland. However, he acknowledges Greenland’s importance in the international political “game” and thus turns toward the Danish Government to secure Greenland in this game. Moreover, Kielsen attempts to secure the process of Greenlandic independence by stressing to the audience, i.e. the participants at the Arctic Assembly, that Greenland is open for business, and thus open to investments and collaborations that can help this process, although he is not as such using security rhetoric in a traditional sense, i.e. using words such as “attack”, “threat”, “nuclear weapons”, etc. as seen in statements from the US and Denmark to some extent. Hence, Kielsen attempts to secure Greenland’s interest in a more modest way compared to the US’ representatives who are rather straightforward. As for the external facilitating conditions, Kim Kielsen was at the time of the US proposal the Premier of Greenland, thus holding social capital and authority. He is not explicitly referring threats to a given object, but from the discourse it can be argued that some threats may be the increased interest in Greenland, however, also an opportunity for Greenland to secure its own interests, and especially its development towards independence.

Statement by Premier Kuupik Kleist

In addition to Kim Kielsen’s statement, it can also be interesting to take a look at statements from Kuupik Kleist, former Premier in Greenland in the early years of Greenland’s Self-Governance (2009-2013) and with 30 years serving the Greenlandic community (Qvist & Schultz-Lorentzen 2019, 8-9). Kleist states in an interview with Marc Jacobsen for the High North News media that:

“The problem is that Trump's idea of buying Greenland has stolen the regional agenda so we are now merely watching while - once again - Greenland is at the centre of great power struggles over the Arctic like it was during the Cold War. It is very uncomfortable” (Kleist to Jacobsen 2019b).

The illocutionary force is here that Kleist is emphasizing and pointing out that Trump has with his proposal taken away the focus of what is important in the region, i.e. potential cooperation if referring back to Mette Frederiksen's statement, i.e. strengthening cooperation, which is what the world needs according to Frederiksen, and also how Greenland is once again the subject of a conversation taking place above their heads, i.e. the threat to the inclusion of Greenland in discussions. Moreover, what may also be considered a threat to Greenland, according to Kleist, is Greenland again is at the center of great power rivalry, and it moreover shows a Greenlandic perception of how the situation is in the Arctic, i.e. similar to the Cold War past, thus Kleist is using security rhetoric by referring to the Cold War. He continues:

“The Americans have obviously found out that they apparently have reduced their armaments in the Arctic too much. Specifically, in Greenland they have shut down many bases and airports. Now they are then showing interest in helping extend our infrastructure. That sounds nice, right? In reality, the Americans are saying: “Ups, we scaled down our armaments too much in Greenland. May we rebuild some of it?”. The reason for that is the so-called Chinese threat. But where the heck are the Chinese? They are nowhere!” (Kleist to Jacobsen 2019b).

The illocutionary force here is that Kleist aims to call out the Americans on their motivation behind infrastructure investments, i.e. a quid pro quo, and thereby he indicates that the only reason why the US wants to invest in Greenland is to secure its own interests. Moreover, he questions the Americans' constructions of how reality is in the Arctic, i.e. the threat from China, which according to Kleist is not really to be seen in the Arctic. However, according to a panel debate on May 5, 2021 regarding China's Arctic activities and ambitions, it was stated that China “has taken steps to exert greater influence in the region by joining its institutions [...] and engaging in high-level diplomacy” (Brookings 2021). Additionally, it was stated that China has increased its military investments, built its first icebreaker, and dispatched naval vessels to the region (ibid.). Thus, China can be considered as present in the Arctic, in one way or another. To Qvist and Schultz-Lorentzen (2019), Kleist has also expressed a reluctance towards the Americans and Denmark:

“A lot of things happen before and on the side of the negotiations. To which we don't sit along. I have therefore also been in situations where I had to ask Danish ministers and officials: “Are you on our side or the Americans’?” I am convinced that Denmark and the US together decide whether or not to be accommodating towards Greenland in relation to cases. Or just dismiss. And if the US says no, then it is a no” (Kleist to Qvist & Schultz-Lorentzen 2019, 57).

The illocutionary force is here to show how Greenland is still not fully included in the negotiations that occur in the triangular relationship and moreover that Denmark is compliant to US wishes, which he further connects to a case in which the Danish government has decided to grant 180 million Danish kroner to clean up twenty former American installations in the period of 2018-2024. However, this contradicts a Danish principle that it is the one who makes the mess who should clean it up (ibid.), which could make one wonder why the US would not clean up its own mess and perhaps thereby send a message to Greenland that it takes responsibility and respects Greenland. Moreover, to a question by Jacobsen in High North News regarding if Greenland can use the attention (of the US) to finance the construction of new airports, Kleist states:

“The question is if one wishes to receive financing as part of that agenda. What is it that one in fact is selling? One is selling the soul to the devil” (Kleist to Jacobsen 2019b).

The illocutionary force is here that Kleist yet again questions the motives behind the US’ interest in its investments with regard to infrastructure and raises the question about what kind of attachments and obligations it would bring to accept such kind of financing. So in this regard, the referent object that Kleist indicates is Greenland’s soul to the threat that is the US. However, in relation to the construction of airports, it should be noted that the Chinese company China Communication Construction Company (CCCC) was also interested in investing in the project, however, according to Rahbek-Clemmensen, pressure from the US may be the actual reason that CCCC pulled out of the project, and the US has repeatedly expressed concerns regarding Chinese engagement in Greenland. The US perceives any Chinese activity in Greenland as a potential security risk (Sermitsiaq AG 2019b). Thus, in relation to Kleist’s question on where the Chinese are then it could perhaps be argued that China may not be present in Greenland as such due to heavy opposition from the US, and Denmark, but China is present in the Arctic region through its status as observer country in the Arctic Council and for example through its naval vessels and military investments (Brookings 2021).

Kleist further states that:

“I have taken part in negotiation processes, among others in relation to the renewal of the defense Agreement and have encountered many obstacles and been told that Greenland had no say in the matter about this and this aspect” (Kleist to Qvist & Schultz-Lorentzen 2019, 59).

Here, the illocutionary force is Kleist showing how Greenland was dismissed in important decisions on matters regarding its own defense and even at a point in time when it was already stated in the Itilleq Declaration of 2003 that Greenland should be involved in the negotiations on the modernization of the 1951 defense Agreement among other things (Naalakkersuisut n.d.b.).

As for the internal facilitating conditions, Kleist is in his interview with Jacobsen to some extent using security rhetoric as seen in the words “power struggles”, “Cold War”, “armaments”, “bases”, and “threat”. Kleist is not as such constructing a security plot as he is not presenting a point of no return nor a way out. However, it appears from his statements what may be considered the threat from his point of view: the exclusion of Greenland in processes of decision-making and its geographical location in relation to great power rivalry. As for the external facilitating conditions, Kleist holds some social capital to speak given his long history in politics and as former Premier of Greenland (Qvist & Schultz-Lorentzen 2019), thus he has great experience with Greenland and its role in international relations, including that with the US. Moreover, from the discourse of Kleist’s statements, there is an insecurity and mistrust with regard to the US’ motivations and interests in Greenland, and therefore, as it also appears from Kielsen’s statements, Greenland wants to make sure that if the US has a presence in Greenland, they want to benefit from this presence.

5.2.4. Key points

Based on the above analysis of the US’ arguments and Danish and Greenlandic reactions and articulations, it appears that the discourse in the relationship is to a great extent determined by the constructed threats of the US, Greenlandic self-determination and interests, and a Danish wish for maintaining a strong relationship within the Realm and with the US. Moreover, the US seeks to securitize its interests in Greenland, such as its defense and the Thule Air Base, while also securitizing the Arctic region and the western norms and values from the threat mainly coming from Russia and China, but also to some extent the threat of climate change. However, this takes up less space in the analyzed US data. Compared to Denmark and Greenland, the US representatives applied security rhetoric to a greater extent. Denmark and Greenland were quick to reject the US purchase proposal, thus desecuritizing or even depoliticizing the US’ attempt to securitize its interests through obtaining Greenland. Denmark sought to securitize its relationship with Greenland and the US and also its status as an Arctic state, while Greenland sought to securitize its development towards independency through economic investments, investments in infrastructure, and through cooperation with other

countries. Moreover, Greenland also sought to securitize its voice in the international sphere, and, additionally, the environment.

5.3. Discussion

Compared to the first proposal around the time of the Cold War, Denmark is in 2019 more explicitly taking the stance as an American ally, whereas in the Nordic countries during the Cold War, the norm was to distance themselves from the great power rivalry and tension. This is seen in the Danish reaction appearing from the UM-memorandum and its attitude towards Byrnes' three proposals in relation to Greenland, thus Denmark taking part of the idea of Nordic Exceptionalism. Through the discourse in 1946, it was found that Denmark wished to remain neutral in the tensions between East and West, whereas in 2019, Mette Frederiksen explicitly recommended to the Danish Parliament that Denmark should take a clear ally position with the US. Moreover, in the period around the 1946-proposal, it appears from the analysis that Greenland was to a lesser extent involved in security discussions as it was still a colony under the Kingdom of Denmark, although Greenland did turn to the US after Germany's invasion of Denmark. The attitude from the Danish perspective has evolved with regard to Greenland and is now sharing the attitude that Greenland at one point will become independent. However, as can be drawn from Kleist's statements, there is still a tendency of Greenland being kept in the dark, but as it appears from the statements by Mette Frederiksen, there is a wish to change this. Additionally, the relationship between Denmark and Greenland is, as in the 1941 Agreement, still articulated as a mother/child relationship from both Danish and Greenlandic sides, but with Greenland growing up, i.e. becoming a teenager as Gad has expressed (2008) with Greenland still seeking protection from Denmark with Kielsen's remark at the Arctic Circle Assembly, while also wanting more influence (Kielsen 2019).

The US' perception of the Danish-Greenlandic relationship was both in 1946 and in 2019 considered a mainly economic relationship with Secretary of State James Byrnes in the UM-memorandum expressing his opinion that Greenland was not an economic asset to Denmark, and similarly in 2019, President Trump expressed a view along similar lines and moreover presenting the US as a better alternative to Denmark. Additionally, a purchase of Greenland was perhaps to some extent more realistic around the time of the 1946-proposal, as Greenland was still a colony, than today when Greenland is in route towards independency, and thus the US would have bought a "good" with an expiration date and Greenland would lose its right to independence unless this right would be written into a potential agreement (Olsen 2019). Greenland's future independence is also one of the major

differences in the two purchase proposals and in the discourse, especially seen in the Danish and Greenlandic reactions and their articulations of the triangular relationship.

According to the study of the present thesis, for Greenland today, it is important to be recognized and included in discussions and being treated as an equal party within the Realm, and thus also in negotiations with the US. Moreover, for Greenland it is important that whatever goes on in Greenland involving other parties, it must benefit Greenland, and especially with regard to resource extraction projects and building infrastructure, it must cause no harm to the nature. What also appears from the analysis is that Greenland has a great focus on economic development, which is necessary for independence one day, thus it wants to remain open to business for other countries and not just the US in order to meet its interests. For Denmark, it is about securing the good relationship with the US without stepping on Greenland's toes and thus also maintaining a good relationship with Greenland and additionally, under Mette Frederiksen as Danish Prime Minister, there is a great focus on Greenlandic involvement.

Moreover, from the analysis, it emerges that there also is a difference in the triangular relationship with regard to the use of security rhetoric and thus what should be securitized. Around the time of the 1946-proposal, the discourse was highly evolving around security in relation to warfare such as with the threat coming from Germany under the Second World War after which the threat shifted to come from the Soviet Union. In relation to the Second World War, the referent object, from all three countries, were Greenland and the American continent from foreign invasion, i.e. Germany, and moreover, the Danish sovereignty over Greenland. Based on the situational context of today and the analysis of what the three countries seeks to securitize, the security discourse is still revolving around the threat from Russia after its increased military activities in the Arctic, but also that of China. But another great difference in the two purchase proposals is that climate change has also brought emphasis on securitizing the environment as the effects of climate change are alarming, not only in the Arctic, but at a global scale.

Thus, different images of what constitutes a threat emerge from the analysis, and in the triangular relationship, the defense and military play different roles to each party, which for the US are, as seen from the analysis, that it needs Greenland to secure its defense and national security from the north in case of a Russian attack. Thus, Greenland plays an important role in the US' understanding of conflicts in the Arctic, i.e. the Arctic as a military operational area as seen in US' wishes to military presence in Greenland, and on the edge of the Arctic, i.e. US' national security is threatened from north or northeast, and the US' approach to these conflicts.

For Denmark and Greenland, the military is also needed to secure national security and sovereignty, but given the unique triangular relationship, it has caused some tensions as to military presence in

Greenland, which has demanded that this presence should be for their benefits. For Greenland today, it is important to be recognized and included in discussions and being treated as an equal party within the Realm, and thus also in negotiations with the US. Moreover, for Greenland it is important that whatever goes on in Greenland involving other parties, it must benefit Greenland and especially with regard to resource extraction project and building infrastructure, it must cause no harm to the nature. What also appears from the analysis is that Greenland has a great focus on economic development, which is necessary for independence one day, thus it wants to remain open to business for other countries and not just the US in order to meet its interests. For Denmark, it is about securing the good relationship with the US without stepping on Greenland's toes and thus also maintaining a good relationship with Greenland and additionally, under Mette Frederiksen as Danish Prime Minister, there is a great focus on Greenlandic involvement.

Another difference from the 1946-proposal to the 2019-proposal can be found in relation to the securitization theory and the situational context. With regard to the 1946-proposal, the view on security was more traditionalist, i.e. with focus on the military, the state, and national security as referent objects due to war time and potential attacks from enemies. Whereas in relation to the 2019-proposal, this view has expanded to other sectors, which can be seen in the discourse and what the three countries seek to securitize. National security is still of great importance, but other referent objects have emerged since the 1946-proposal, such as Greenlandic independence and a sustainable economy to reach this goal, relationships, and the environment, for example. Thus the threats have also evolved to not only come from other states, but also the effects of climate change. Hence, the discourse, at least in relation to Danish and Greenlandic perceptions and articulations, is less about threats from actual bombs and more about independence and the relationships to each other and the US. Whereas for the US, the discourse is (still) related to the threats from other countries, and especially Russia and China as seen from the analysis, which it attempts to make a shared threat to other countries as well. This construction, and hence the US' approach and articulations concerning Russia and China, also has an impact on the relationship with Denmark and Greenland in the sense that the US needs Greenland (and thus also Denmark) to protect itself from especially Russia, and therefore, it has to meet Greenland on its terms, i.e. US' military presence has to bring benefits to Greenland.

6. Conclusion

In light of the renewed interest in the Arctic, this research aimed to identify the articulations of the triangular security relationship between Greenland, Denmark, and the United states in the events of

the US' purchase proposals in 1946 and 2019, and furthermore, how they reflect Arctic security political issues and great power rivalry, and finally with what effects in this triangular relationship. To answer these, the author has been analyzing discourse and speech acts by applying concepts of securitization theory by the Copenhagen School and using aspects of discourse analysis due to their capabilities to provide insights into how the situational context impact the countries' constructions of threats and what should be securitized. Furthermore, the research has been conducted from a social constructivist stance both in terms of the analyst's own approach to research and in terms of how the states, the US and Denmark, and the nation, Greenland, attempts to securitize and/or accepting or not accepting attempts to securitize by the other countries in the triangular relationship, and thereby construct their realities. Thus, these reality constructions affect how the US, Denmark, and Greenland articulate their relationships with each other, which are also affected by the situational context, i.e. developments inside and outside the Arctic in which Greenland is the subject of great attention from the US and also other actors with interests in the Arctic. Through the articulations and based on the discourses, these developments have shown to have an impact on the triangular security relationship. It can further be concluded that the discourse of the triangular security relationship in 1941 was highly characterized, by all three countries, by a mutual threat from Germany due to the Second World War, but what should be securitized was to some extent constructed differently with the US aiming to securitize the American continent on which Greenland is located, whereas for Denmark it was about securitizing its sovereignty over Greenland and the Greenlandic people. In 1946, after the Second World War, and Greenland being back under Danish sovereignty, the threat shifted to coming from the Soviet Union and potential attacks from modern weapons due to the US' defense base, Thule Air Base, in Greenland, but for Denmark what was to be securitized was still Danish sovereignty over Greenland, its partake in the Nordic Model, i.e. distancing itself from the East-West tension and choosing sides, and moreover, Greenlandic society.

Thus, to answer the first part of the research question, the triangular security relationship was in relation to the 1946-proposal articulated mainly through security discourse and external threats from other states. This is also the case with the 2019-proposal, however, other discourses have emerged related to security since the 1946-proposal, which is now not only related to securitization based on threats from other states, but also from non-state threats, i.e. the effects of climate change. Moreover, the discourses of Greenlandic independence and self-determination have also emerged as seen in especially Greenlandic articulations of the relationship with both Denmark and Greenland. Hence, there has been a paradigm shift in how the triangular relationship is articulated in relation to security as in relation to the 1946-proposal focus was mainly on traditional security whereas in relation to the 2019-proposal focus was not only on traditional security, but also on what the Copenhagen School

refers to as the wide security perspective. Moreover, the countries' approaches to each other has also changed as seen through the articulations and discourses in relation to the 2019-proposal and the discourse in relation to the 1946-proposal with Greenland's development from colony to a nation with Self-Governance as the main cause for the paradigm shift. Whatever goes on in Greenland now has to benefit Greenland and this is seen in US' approaches to Greenland with its economic package announced in 2020, for example. Thus, if the US wants access to Greenland, it is now on Greenlandic terms. Moreover, Denmark now has less to say in the matter of Greenland's foreign relations and it has to include Greenland to a greater extent in discussions related to Greenland. However, Denmark has itself changed its perception of its relationship with Greenland in the future with its support for Greenlandic independence. Additionally, the articulations show that the US tries to convince why Greenland and the Arctic need protection from the great powers of China and Russia, whereas from the Greenlandic point of view, it is about protecting the process of future independence, but also gradually becoming less dependent on Denmark by levelling out its dependence to other states as well. Finally, for Denmark, it is more about maintaining a good relationship with Greenland in order to make Greenland wanting to stay in the Danish Kingdom, and thus securing Denmark's status as an Arctic state, while also maintaining a good relationship with the US.

To answer the second part of the research question, the two purchase proposals reflect Arctic security political issues and great power rivalry in the sense that US' interests in Greenland is highly determined by external factors, i.e. its constructed threats of other great powers. The security relationship between Denmark and Greenland is also highly determined or influenced by external factors, i.e. the US and its constructions of threats, but also its own internal struggles within the Realm, such as Greenland's inclusion in security discussions related to Greenland. Furthermore, the two proposals have been presented in periods of high tension between the US and other great powers, especially Russia and now also China, which shows what US' interests in Greenland derives from, i.e. its national security, keeping Russia in check, and keeping China out of the region. This moreover, shows the US' approach to the Arctic which again affects the relationship with Greenland and Denmark due to their close security relationship through their NATO membership. Hence, the situational context determines to a great extent the developments in the triangular security relationship, and thus, whether the Arctic is a place of cooperation or conflict, it impacts the triangular security relationship.

6.1. Further research

The research conducted in the present thesis opens up for further research of the triangular security relationship with focus on future developments, especially in terms of new governments in the US and Greenland and how these approach the Arctic, e.g. such as through cooperation.

Furthermore, based on a Greenlandic wish for more benefits coming from American military presence in Greenland, these benefits could also be investigated further, such as what these benefits entail and what these potential benefits can provide Greenland in the long run. Additionally, as seen from the analysis in the present thesis, the triangular security relationship is an evolving entity and with an unavoidable Greenlandic independence to come, it could also be further investigated how this future independence would impact the triangular security relationship. Moreover, the current developments occurring in the Arctic also make for further investigations on whether the Arctic will be a region of cooperation or conflict and how the Arctic states will handle tensions, and the topic of security, in the region for the time to come with or without a forum for security discussions.

7. Bibliography

- Archer, Clive. 1988. "The United States Defence Areas in Greenland" *Cooperation and Conflict XXIII*. 123-144. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/001083678802300302>
- Arctic Council. 2019a. "The 11th Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting" Last modified March 29, 2019. <https://arctic-council.org/en/news/the-11th-arctic-council-ministerial-meeting/>
- Arctic Council. 2019b. "List of Participants at the 11th Arctic Council Ministerial meeting, Rovaniemi, Finland" *Arctic Council*, March 2019. <https://oaarchive.arctic-council.org/handle/11374/2350?show=full>
- BBC News. 2019. "Greenland: Trump criticizes 'nasty' Denmark over cancelled visit" *BBC News*, August 21, 2019. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-49423968>
- BBC News. 2020. "US election 2020: What has Trump said about your country?" *BBC News*, October 31, 2020. <https://www.bbc.com/news/election-us-2020-54736485>
- Berlingske. 2019. "Ekspert: Danmark kan slet ikke sælge Grønland" *Berlingske*, August 16, 2019. <https://www.berlingske.dk/internationalt/ekspert-danmark-kan-slet-ikke-saelge-groenland>
- Berlingske. 2020. "Regeringen siger undskyld til 22 grønlandske børn" *Berlingske*, December 8, 2020. <https://www.berlingske.dk/politik/regeringen-siger-undskyld-til-22-groenlandske-boern>
- Berry, Dawn A. 2016. "The Monroe Doctrine and the Governance of Greenland's Security" In *Governing the North American Arctic. Sovereignty, Security, and Institutions*, edited by Dawn Alexandria Berry, Nigel Bowles, and Halbert Jones, 103-121. Palgrave Macmillan
- Blocher, Joseph and Mitu Gulati. 2019. "Sure, Trump Can Buy Greenland. But Why Does He Think It's Up to Denmark?" *Politico Magazine*, August 23, 2019. <https://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2019/08/23/donald-trump-greenland-purchase-sovereignty-denmark-227859/>

Blunden, Margaret. 2012. "Geopolitics and the Northern Sea Route" *International Affairs*, vol. 88, no. 1, 115-129. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1468-2346.2012.01060.x>

Buzan, Barry, Ole Wæver and Jaap de Wilde. 1998. *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Brookings. 2021. "China's Arctic activities and ambitions" Last modified May 5, 2021. <https://www.brookings.edu/events/chinas-arctic-activities-and-ambitions/>

Browning, Christopher S. 2007. "Branding Nordicity: Models, Identity and the Decline of Exceptionalism" *Cooperation and Conflict*, vol. 42, issue 1. 27-51. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0010836707073475>

Bryman, Alan. 2012. *Social Research Methods 4th Edition*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.

Cho, Diane J. 2020. "The Many People Donald Trump Has Called 'Nasty' (and It's Not Just Women)" *People*, August 13, 2020. <https://people.com/politics/everyone-donald-trump-has-called-nasty/>

Collin, Finn. 2015. "Socialkonstruktivisme i humaniora" in *Humanistisk Videnskabsteori*, edited by Finn Collin and Simo Køppe, 417-458. København: Lindhardt og Ringhof Forlag A/S

Conley, Heather A. and Matthew Melino. 2019 *The Implications of U.S. Policy Stagnation toward the Arctic Region*. Center for Strategic and International Studies. Accessed February 21, 2021. <https://www.csis.org/analysis/implications-us-policy-stagnation-toward-arctic-region>

Cutting, Joan. 2002. *Pragmatics and Discourse. A resource book for students*. London and New York: Routledge

Dansk Udenrigspolitisk Institut (DUPI). 1997. *Grønland under den kolde krig. Dansk og amerikansk sikkerhedspolitik* København: Dansk Udenrigspolitisk Institut.

Della Porta, Donatella and Michael Keating. 2008. "How many approaches in the social sciences? An epistemological introduction" In *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences*, edited by Donatella Della Porta and Michael Keating, 19-39. Cambridge University Press.

de Vreese, Claes H. 2005. "News framing: Theory and typology" *Information Design Journal + Document Design*, vol. 13, no. 1: 51-62.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/250888488_News_Framing_Theory_and_Typology

Dodds, Klaus and Mark Nuttall. 2017. "Materialising Greenland within a critical Arctic geopolitics" in *Greenland and the International Politics of a Changing Arctic*, edited by Kristian Soby Kristensen and Jon Rahbek-Clemmensen, 139-154. London: Routledge

Durfee, Mary and Rachel L. Johnstone. 2019. *Arctic Governance in a Changing World*. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Eamer, J., Donaldsen, G.M., Gaston, A.J., Kosobokova, K.N., L.russon, K.F., Melnikov, I.A., Reist, J.D., Richardson, E., Staples, L., von Quillfeldt, C.H. 2013. Life Linked to Ice: A Guide to sea-ice-associated biodiversity in this time of rapid change. CAFF Assessment Series No. 10. Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna, Iceland. ISBN: 978-9935-431-25-7

Exner-Pirot, Heather. 2013. "What is the Arctic a case of? The Arctic as a regional environmental security complex and the implications for policy" *The Polar Journal* 3, no. 1: 120-135.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/2154896X.2013.766006>

Fairclough, Norman. 2015. *Language and Power*. 3rd edition. New York: Routledge.

Fedorov, V. P., V. P. Zhuravel, S. N. Grinyaev and D. A. Medvedev. 2020. "The Northern Sea Route: problems and prospects of development of transport route in the Arctic" *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 434, 012007, 1-7.
<https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1755-1315/434/1/012007/meta>

Folketinget. 2019a. "F 18 Om USA's udenrigs- og sikkerhedspolitiske engagement i Grønland" *Folketinget*, December 12, 2019.

<https://www.ft.dk/samling/20191/forespoergsel/f18/beh1/forhandling.htm#tE938EC74786F4740AEF33CB26067233Btab1>

Folketinget. 2019b. “Det Udenrigspolitiske Nævn (UPN) Alm. del. Samling: 2018-19 (2. samling)” Accessed May 4, 2021. <https://www.ft.dk/samling/20182/almindel/UPN/bilag/48/index.htm>

Gad, Ulrik P. 2008. “Når mor/barn-relationen bliver teenager: Kompatible rigsfællesskabsbilleder som (dis)integrationsteori.” *Politica - Tidsskrift for Politisk Videnskab*, vol. 40, issue 2, 111-133. https://curis.ku.dk/ws/files/128941784/2008a_Gad_Politica_40_2_111_133_Mor_Barn_Disintegrationsteori_FINAL_DRAFT.pdf

Gad, Ulrik P. 2017. “What kind of nation state will Greenland be? Securitization theory as a strategy for analyzing identity politics” *Politik* 20, no. 3: 104-120. <https://tidsskrift.dk/politik/article/view/97157>

Gad, Ulrik P. 2021. “Opposition to the Kuannersuit project offers an opportunity for the EU and United States to pursue closer cooperation with Greenland” *Danish Institute for International Studies*, May 11, 2021. https://www.diis.dk/en/research/opposition-to-the-kuannersuit-project-offers-an-opportunity-the-eu-and-united-states-to?utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=DIIS%20Notifications%2012%20May%202021&utm_content=DIIS%20Notifications%2012%20May%202021%20CID_4d46a2a3da98cbf634118bd12ff2b366&utm_source=Email%20marketing%20software&utm_term=Read%20article

Hansen, Nukappiaaluk. 2019. “Aleqa til Trump: Begynd med at betale for jeres tilstedeværelse i Pituffik” *Sermitsiaq*, August 16, 2019. <https://sermitsiaq.ag/node/215447>

Heininen, Lassi. 2010. “Security in the Arctic” In *Polar Law Textbook*, edited by Natalia Loukacheva, 37-51. Copenhagen: TemaNord

Heinrich, Jens. 2017. “Independence through international affairs” in *Greenland and the International Politics of a Changing Arctic*, edited by Kristian Søby Kristensen and Jon Rahbek-Clemmensen, 28-37. London: Routledge

Henriques, Martha. 2020. "The rush to claim an undersea mountain range" *BBC Future*, July 23, 2019. <https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20200722-the-rush-to-claim-an-undersea-mountain-range>

Herløv, Palle, Kirstine Bilot-Knudsen and Lærke Kromann. 2021. "Ekspert: 'Mineprojekt for milliarder kan blive Grønlands første seriøse skridt mod løsrivelse'" *Danish Broadcasting Corporation*, March 29, 2021. <https://www.dr.dk/nyheder/indland/valgigroenland/ekspert-mineprojekt-milliarder-kan-blive-groenlands-foerste-serioese>

Humpert, Malte. 2020. "U.S. Says Arctic No Longer Immune from Geopolitics As It Invests \$12m in Greenland" *High North News*, April 29, 2020. <https://www.highnorthnews.com/en/us-says-arctic-no-longer-immune-geopolitics-it-invests-12m-greenland>

Hyldal, Christine and Sara K. Jakobsen. 2019. "Selvstyret: - Vi er åbne for handel men er ikke til salg" *Kalaallit Nunaata Radioa*, August 16, 2019. <https://knr.gl/da/nyheder/selvstyret-vi-er-abne-handel-men-er-ikke-til-salg>

Jacobsen, Marc. 2016. "Denmark's strategic interests in the Arctic: It's the Greenlandic connection, stupid!" *The Arctic Institute*, May 4, 2016. <https://www.thearcticinstitute.org/denmark-interests-arctic-greenland-connection/>

Jacobsen, Marc. 2019a. "Arctic Identity Interactions: Reconfiguring Dependency in Greenland's and Denmark's foreign policies" PhD diss., University of Copenhagen.

Jacobsen, Marc. 2019b. "Kuupik Kleist: The Cold War is Re-Introduced in Greenland" *High North News*, October 21, 2019. <https://www.highnorthnews.com/en/kuupik-kleist-cold-war-re-introduced-greenland>

Jacobsen, Marc and Ulrik P. Gad. 2017. "Setting the Scene in Nuuk" in *Greenland and the International Politics of a Changing Arctic*, edited by Kristian Søby Kristensen and Jon Rahbek-Clemmensen, 11-27. London: Routledge

Kielgast, Niels. 2019. "Mette Frederiksen: Nu stopper snakken om at sælge Grønland" *Danish Broadcasting Corporation*, August 18, 2019. <https://www.dr.dk/nyheder/indland/mette-frederiksen-nu-stopper-snakken-om-saelge-groenland#!/>

Kielsen, Kim. 2019. "Premier Kim Kielsen's speech" Naalakkersuisut, last updated October 10, 2019. <https://naalakkersuisut.gl/en/Naalakkersuisut/News/2019/10/101019-Arctic-Circle-Assembly>

Knudsen, Lisbeth. 2019. "Lisbeth Knudsen: Det burde være os, der var fornærmede over tonedøve Trump" *Altinget*, August 23, 2019. <https://www.alinget.dk/arktis/artikel/lisbeth-knudsen-det-burde-vaere-os-der-var-fornaermende-over-tonedoeve-trump>

Knudsen, Henrik and Henry Nielsen. 2016. *Uranbjerget. Om forsøgene på at finde og udnytte Grønlands uran fra 1944 til i dag*. København: Forlaget Vandkunsten KS

Kristensen, Kristian S. and Lin A. Mortensgaard. 2021. *Amerikansk Arktis-Politik i Forandring. Aktører og konfliktforståelser*. Denmark: Djøf Forlag.

Krog, Andreas. 2020a. "Thule-aftale på plads efter årlange forhandlinger" *Altinget*, October 29, 2020. <https://www.alinget.dk/artikel/thule-aftale-paa-plads-efter-aarelange-forhandlinger>

Krog, Andreas. 2020b. "Partier om USA-støtte til Grønland: Fornærmende og provokerende" *Altinget*, April 22, 2020. <https://www.alinget.dk/artikel/partier-om-usa-stoette-til-groenland-fornaermende-og-provokerende>

Kruse, Simon. 2020. "Grønland tager »med glæde« mod amerikansk hjælpepakke: Nu bærer charmeoffensiven frugt" *Berlingske*, April 23, 2020. <https://apps-infomedia-dk.zorac.aub.aau.dk/mediarkiv/link?articles=e7ad508d>

Lamont, Christopher. 2015. *Research Methods in International Relations*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Lee, Matthew and Jan Olsen. 2020. "US to boost aid to Greenland in bid to counter Russia, China" *Federal News Network*, April 22, 2020. <https://federalnewsnetwork.com/government-news/2020/04/us-to-boost-aid-to-greenland-in-bid-to-counter-russia-china/>

Lidegaard, Bo. 1996. *I Kongens Navn. Henrik Kauffmann i dansk diplomati 1919-1958*. København: NB PrePress

Lindbjerg, Signe L. 2020. “‘Essentially it’s a large real estate deal’: How the US’ proposal to purchase Greenland has changed the way Danish politicians talk about the US and the relation between Denmark and Greenland” MA thesis, Aalborg University.
[https://projekter.aau.dk/projekter/da/studentthesis/essentially-its-a-large-real-estate-deal-how-the-us-proposal-to-purchase-greenland-has-changed-the-way-danish-politicians-talk-about-the-us-and-the-relation-between-denmark-and-greenland\(88564487-3ae4-45bc-aa15-e7024995a6ec\).html](https://projekter.aau.dk/projekter/da/studentthesis/essentially-its-a-large-real-estate-deal-how-the-us-proposal-to-purchase-greenland-has-changed-the-way-danish-politicians-talk-about-the-us-and-the-relation-between-denmark-and-greenland(88564487-3ae4-45bc-aa15-e7024995a6ec).html)

Lindstrøm, Merete. 2021. “IA og Naleraq skal lede landet” *Sermitsiaq AG*, April 16, 2021.
<https://sermitsiaq.ag/node/228698>

Lynggaard, Kennet. 2015. “Dokumentanalyse” In *Kvalitative Metoder*, edited by Svend Brinkmann and Lene Tanggaard. Latvia: Hans Reitzels Forlag.

Marvel to Sec. State, no. 56, 30.01.1947. 859B.20/1-3047, Decimal File, 1945-49, RG 59 NARA (National Archives and Records Administration).

McDonald, Jordan. 2019. “Here’s why Trump wants to buy Greenland” *CNN*, August 21, 2019. <https://www.cnn.com/2019/08/21/heres-why-trump-wants-to-buy-greenland.html>

McGrath, Matt. 2020. “Climate change: US formally withdraws from Paris agreement” *BBC News*, November 4, 2020. <https://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-54797743>

Milman, Oliver. 2021. “Biden returns US to Paris climate accord hours after becoming president” *The Guardian*, January 20, 2021. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/jan/20/paris-climate-accord-joe-biden-returns-us>

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. n.d. “Rigsfællesskabet” Accessed March 10, 2021.
<https://um.dk/da/udenrigspolitik/lande-og-regioner/rigsfaellesskabet/>

Morrison, Charles E. and Mark Nuttall. *New U.S. Policies toward Greenland*. East-West Center, 2019. Accessed February 18, 2021.

https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep24981?Search=yes&resultItemClick=true&searchText=Greenland&searchUri=%2Faction%2FdoBasicSearch%3FQuery%3DGreenland%26acc%3Doff%26wc%3Don%26fc%3Doff%26group%3Dnone%26refreqid%3Dsearch%253A30c24ee53377f4653a9da8b06ea924e2&ab_segments=0%2Fbasic_SYC-5187_SYC-5188%2F5188&refreqid=fastly-default%3A99b148636b26279fe51baee4fda6c653&seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents

Mouritzen, Kristian. 2021. “Carla Sands siger farvel efter tre år i Danmark: » Jeg mener ikke, at Trump opdannede til vold «” *Berlingske*, January 17, 2021. <https://apps-infomedia-dk.zorac.aub.aau.dk/mediarkiv/link?articles=e8152ee9>

Naalakkersuisut. 2020a. “Nytårstale 2020” Accessed March 4, 2021.

https://naalakkersuisut.gl/~media/Nanoq/Files/Attached%20Files/Taler/DK/Nytaarstale_2020DK.pdf

Naalakkersuisut. 2020b. “Negotiations on the service contract at Thule Air Base have been concluded” Last modified October 28, 2020.

https://naalakkersuisut.gl/en/Naalakkersuisut/News/2020/10/2810_pituffik

Naalakkersuisut. N.d. “Fælles plan for samarbejde mellem USA og Grønland til støtte for vores forståelse I forhold til Pittuffik (Thule Air Base)” Accessed March 20, 2021.

<https://naalakkersuisut.gl/~media/Nanoq/Files/Attached%20Files/Udenrigsdirektoratet/Pituffik/NA%202020%20DA%20Udkast%20Common%20Plan.pdf>

Naalakkersuisut. N.d.b. “Fælles principerklæring mellem Regeringen og Grønlands Landsstyre om Grønlands inddragelse I udenrigs- og sikkerhedspolitikken” Accessed May 10, 2021.

<https://naalakkersuisut.gl/~media/Nanoq/Files/Attached%20Files/Udenrigsdirektoratet/DK/Itilleq.pdf>

Nedergaard, Peter. 2019. “Trump styrker Grønland og Danmarks forhold” *Kristeligt Dagblad*, August 22, 2019. <https://www.kristeligt-dagblad.dk/danmark/trump-styrker-groenland-og-danmarks-forhold>

North Atlantic Treaty Organization. 2020. "Member Countries." Last updated September 24, 2020. https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_52044.htm

North Atlantic Treaty Organization. 2021. "Collective defense - Article 5" Last updated February 8, 2021. https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_110496.htm

Obordo, Rachel, Naomi Larsson and Lucy Rowan. 2019. "Greenlanders on Trump: 'We are neither for sale nor can be bought'" *The Guardian*, August 21, 2019. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/aug/21/greenlanders-on-trump-we-are-neither-for-sale-nor-can-be-bought>

Obradovic, Lana and Bethany Vailliant. 2019. "The Arctic: An emerging area of conflict" In *Foreign Policy Issues for America: The Trump Years*, edited by Richard W. Mansbach and James M. McCormick, 72-86. London: Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/arctic-emerging-area-conflict-lana-obradovic-bethany-vailliant/e/10.4324/9781351186872-6>

Olesen, Mikkel R. 2017. "Lightning Rod" in *Greenland and the International Politics of a Changing Arctic*, edited by Kristian Søby Kristensen and Jon Rahbek-Clemmensen. London: Routledge. <https://www-taylorfrancis-com.zorac.aub.aau.dk/books/edit/10.4324/9781315162645/greenland-international-politics-changing-arctic-kristian-søby-kristensen-jon-rahbek-clemmensen>

Olesen, Mikkel R. and Camilla Tenna Nørup Sørensen. 2019. *Stormagtsspillet i Arktisk udfordrer småstaterne: Erfaringer fra Finland, Norge og Island*. Dansk Institut for Internationale Studier 2019. Accessed February 10, 2021. <https://www.diis.dk/publikationer/stormagtsspillet-arktisk-udfordrer-smaastaterne>

Olesen, Mikkel R., Flemming Splidsboel Hansen, Luke Patey, Steen Kjærgaard, Camilla Tenna Nyrup Sørensen, Rasmus Leander Nielsen, Marc Jacobsen, and Cecilie Felicia Stokholm Banke. 2020. *Nye sikkerhedspolitiske dynamikker i Arktis: Muligheder og udfordringer for Kongeriget Danmark*. Dansk Institut for Internationale Studier, 2020. <https://www.diis.dk/publikationer/nye-sikkerhedspolitiske-dynamikker-arktisk>

Olsen, Theis L. and Anna S. Jørgensen. 2019. "Mette Frederiksen: 'Jeg har ikke behov for at gå ind i en ordkrig med Trump'" *Danmarks Radio*, August 21, 2019.

<https://www.dr.dk/nyheder/indland/mette-frederiksen-jeg-har-ikke-behov-gaa-ind-i-en-ordkrig-med-trump>

Olesen, Thorsten B. 2011. "Tango for Thule: The Dilemmas and Limits of the 'Neither Confirm nor Deny' Doctrine in Danish-American Relations, 1957-1968" *Journal of Cold War Studies*, vol. 13, no. 2. 116-147.

<http://web.a.ebscohost.com.zorac.aub.aau.dk/ehost/detail/detail?vid=0&sid=ac1b86eb-2635-4859-974e-0654d73dd5ab%40sessionmgr4007&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZW9vc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=aph&AN=69650894>

Olesen, Thorsten B. 2013. "Between Facts and Fiction: Greenland and the Question of Sovereignty 1945-1954" *De Gruyter*, vol. 7, issue 2, 117-128.

<https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/ngs-2013-012/html>

Olesen, Thorsten B. 2019. "Buying Greenland? Trump, Truman and the 'Pearl of the Mediterranean'" *nordics.info*, September 10, 2019. <https://nordics.info/show/artikel/buying-greenland-trump-truman-and-the-pearl-of-the-mediterranean/>

Olsen, Martin B., Morten H. Vestergaard and Lars B. Struwe. 2019. "Grønland er af fundamental strategisk betydning for Danmark og USA" *Atlantsammenslutningen - forum for sikkerhedspolitik*, November 2019. <https://atlant.dk/media/2157/atlant-brief-groenland-er-af-fundamental-strategisk-betydning-for-danmark-og-usa.pdf>

Olsen, Theis L. 2019. "Selvstyret i Nuuk om Trumps interesse: 'Grønland er ikke til salg' *Danish Broadcasting Corporation*, August 16, 2019. <https://www.dr.dk/nyheder/indland/selvstyret-i-nuuk-om-trumps-interesse-groenland-er-ikke-til-salg>

O'Rourke, Ronald, Laura B. Comay, Peter Folger, John Frittelli, Marc Humphries, Jane A. Leggett, Jonathan L. Ramseur, Pervaze A. Sheikh, and Harold F. Upton. *Changes in the Arctic: Background and Issues for Congress*. Congressional Research Service, 2021. Accessed February 19, 2021. <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R41153>

Patey, Luke. 2020. *Managing US-China Rivalry in the Arctic*. Danish Institute for International Relations, 2020. Accessed February 12, 2021. <https://www.diiis.dk/en/research/managing-us-china-rivalry-in-the-arctic>

Pengelly, Martin. 2019. "Trump confirms he is considering attempt to buy Greenland" *The Guardian*, August 18, 2019. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/aug/18/trump-considering-buying-greenland>

Perry, Charles M. and Bobby Andersen. 2012. *New strategic dynamics in the Arctic Region. Implications for National Security and International Collaboration*. The Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis. Accessed February 14, 2021. <http://ifpa.org/pdf/StrategicDynamicsArcticRegion.pdf>

Phillips, Louise. 2015. "Diskursanalyse" In *Kvalitative Metoder. En grundbog, 2. edition*, edited by Svend Brinkmann and Lene Tanggaard, 297-320. Latvia: Hans Reitzels Forlag.

Pincus, Rebecca and Saleem H. Ali. 2016. "Have you been to 'The Arctic'? Frame theory and the role of media coverage in shaping Arctic discourse" *Polar Geography*, vol. 39, no. 2. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1088937X.2016.1184722>

Pompeo, Michael R. 2019. "Looking North: Sharpening America's Arctic Focus" U.S. Department of State, last modified May 6, 2019. <https://2017-2021.state.gov/looking-north-sharpening-americas-arctic-focus/index.html>

Qvist, Niels Ole and Christian Schultz-Lorentzen. 2019. *Kuupik Kleist. Drømmen om frihed*. København: Politikens Forlag

Rasputnik, Andreas and Andreas Østhagen. 2021. "No. 3. A Global Arctic Order Under Threat? An Agenda for American Leadership in the North" Last modified March 10, 2021. <https://www.wilsoncenter.org/blog-post/no-3-global-arctic-order-under-threat-agenda-american-leadership-north>

Rasmussen, Rasmus K. 2019. "The desecuritization of Greenland's security? How the Greenlandic self-government envision post-independence national defense and security policy" *Arctic Yearbook*

2019. https://arcticyearbook.com/images/yearbook/2019/Scholarly-Papers/15_AY2019_Rasmussen.pdf

Reinke de Buitrago, Sybille. 2019. "Risk Representations and Confrontational Action in the Arctic." *Journal of Strategic Security*, vol. 12, no. 3: 13-36.
<https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/jss/vol12/iss3/2>

Retsinformation. n.d. "Bekendtgørelse af aftale 6. august 2004 med Amerikas Forenede Stater om ændring og supplerung af overenskomst af 27. april 1951 om forsvaret af Grønland" Accessed February 29, 2021.
<https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/ltr/2005/6>

Rudbeck, Emma. 2020. "How should the Kingdom of Denmark react to the increased foreign interference in the coming Arctic strategy? An investigation of Chinese, Russian, and US interference in Greenland" MA thesis, University of Southern Denmark.
<https://thesis.sdu.dk/download?id=2260>

Rudnicki, Jan. 2016. "The Hans Island Dispute and the Doctrine of Occupation" *Studia Iuridica*, vol 68, 307-320.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321168908_The_Hans_Island_Dispute_and_the_Doctrine_of_Occupation

Sands, Carla. 2020. "Wake up to the Arctic's importance" U.S. Embassy & Consulate in the Kingdom of Denmark. Last modified April 20, 2020. <https://dk.usembassy.gov/wake-up-to-the-arctics-importance/>

Scopus. 2020. "What is Scopus Preview?" Last modified December 29, 2020.
https://service.elsevier.com/app/answers/detail/a_id/15534/supporthub/scopus/

Sermitsiaq AG, 2019a. "Mette Frederiksen: Mærkeligt hvis Grønland ikke ønskede selvstændighed" *Sermitsiaq AG*, August 24, 2019. <https://sermitsiaq.ag/node/215577>

Sermitsiaq AG. 2019b. "Analytiker: USA kan have lagt pres på Grønland" *Sermitsiaq AG*, June 4, 2019. <https://sermitsiaq.ag/node/214026>

Shapiro, Ian. 2002. "Problems, methods, and theories in the study of politics, or what's wrong with political science and what to do about it" *Political Theory*, vol. 30, no. 4: 596-619.

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0090591702030004008>

Sherman, Mark. 2020. "Electoral College makes it official: Biden won, Trump lost" *AP News*, December 15, 2020. <https://apnews.com/article/joe-biden-270-electoral-college-vote-d429ef97af2bf574d16463384dc7cc1e>

Szymański, Piotr. 2021. "Wrestling in Greenland. Denmark, the United States and China in the land of ice" *Centre for Eastern Studies*, March 2, 2021. <https://www.osw.waw.pl/en/publikacje/osw-commentary/2021-03-02/wrestling-greenland-denmark-united-states-and-china-land-ice>

Sørensen, Helle N. 2020. "Oversigt: Kongerigets aftaler med USA om Grønland" *Kalaallit Nunaata Radioa*, October 28, 2020. <https://knr.gl/da/nyheder/oversigt-kongerigets-aftaler-med-usa-om-grønland>

UNECE. n.d. "International cooperation" Accessed April 29, 2021. <https://unece.org/international-cooperation>

Weingartner, Kathrine E. and Orttung, Robert W. 2019. "US Arctic policymaking under Trump and Obama" *Polar Record*, 55: 402-410. <https://www-proquest-com.zorac.aub.aau.dk/docview/2482511445?accountid=8144>

Wilson, Elena R. 2020. "Analyzing frenemies: An Arctic repertoire of cooperation and rivalry" *Political Geography*, vol. 76. January 2020. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0962629818305158?via%3Dihub>

Wæver, Ole. 2017. "Afterword: The Arctic Security Constellation" *Politik* 20, no. 3: 121-136. <https://tidsskrift.dk/politik/article/view/97157>

Åtland, Kristian. 2014. "Interstate Relations in the Arctic: An Emerging Security Dilemma?" *Comparative Strategy*, vol. 22, no. 2: 145-166. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01495933.2014.897121>