

Discursive Power and Geopolitical Imagination: A Critical Discourse Analysis of  
Donald Trump's Rhetoric on Greenland

Naem Abbas

[naemabbasrajpoot@gmail.com](mailto:naemabbasrajpoot@gmail.com)

Iqra Girls College, Sargodha, Pakistan

Ume Habiba

[habibathaheem1@gmail.com](mailto:habibathaheem1@gmail.com)

Iqra Girls College, Sargodha, Pakistan

Corresponding Author: Naem Abbas [naemabbasrajpoot@gmail.com](mailto:naemabbasrajpoot@gmail.com)

Received: 15-01-2026

Revised: 29-01-2026

Accepted: 14-02-2026

Published: 01-03-2026

ABSTRACT

*This study provides evidence about the strategic use of language to build and legitimize the geopolitical power by concentrating on the rhetoric of Donald Trump on Greenland. Doing Critical Discourse Analysis and getting insight from Michel Foucault and Norman Fairclough's ideas, the research analyses the chosen statements from 2025-2026 to scrutinize how discourse helps shaping narratives of power, security and regional legitimacy. The study uses Fairclough's three-dimensional model to evaluate textual features, discursive practices and social contexts. The results show that Trump's use of language proves Greenland as a strategic asset for America and legitimizes the U.S. authority to hold it by establishing the rhetoric of nationalism, security and economic promises. Moreover, he uses binaries, bullying diplomacy and debasing the local authority to justify intervention. The study summarizes that political language not merely highlights the political fact but also establish them by strengthening the global power and shaping international relations through discourse.*

**Keywords:** Geopolitical imagination, Donald Trump, Greenland, Discursive approach

INTRODUCTION

Language along with all its intricacies is still the most noticeable and debatable topic of linguistics and sociopolitical scholarship. Researchers are of the view, language doesn't only reflect the realities rather constitute them. It is used exclusively to construct the identities, power relationships and institutions. Foucault (1969, 1975) mentions that discourse does not only build reality but also organizes and governs it. Its role is very crucial in the construction of meanings, developing ideological positions and projecting the geopolitical thoughts. Norman Fairclough (1989) says language produces political and institutional realities. Thus discourse becomes pivotal and influential source to exercise and maintain power in sociopolitical spheres.

The present geopolitical controversies around the world exhibit this fundamental and crucial relationship. Especially, Donald Trump's political stance about Greenland is best exhibited in his use of language. The linguistic presentation by Trump projects the social, economic and political power of USA. The statements of Donald Trump about Greenland significantly project it a discursive event that indicates how national interest are linguistically projected.

Donald Trump's use of language has been studied with reference to nationalism, populism and media presentation (Ejaz, 2025, Kjeldgaard, 2024, Brandt, 2020) but very little studies have concentrated on his rhetoric about geopolitical stance about Greenland. Trump has aptly used discourse to make realities instead of to describe reality. He creates social realities for his supporters with the help of repeated slogans and metaphors. He through his discourse consistently constructs binary realities such as "pure people vs corrupt elite", "nation vs outsiders". By using performative

slogans such as, “Make American Great again”, “Fake News”, “America First”, he establishes the political reality. His use of language mirrors his love for nation and nationalism (Kellner, 2017). The present study is interested in addressing this gap and aims at applying Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to explore the use of language to establish and demonstrate the geopolitical power.

The study aims at exploring:

- How do language used by Trump projects geopolitical power and territorial legitimacy?
- How Trump build ideological narratives of security, authority and nationalism in his rhetoric?

By finding the answers of these queries, this article aims at proving that language is a powerful source used to construct geopolitical power. Through discourse and rhetoric political realities are made and legitimized.

### **Theoretical Background**

#### **Language as Social Practice**

The idea behind the concept of language and social practice is that language is not a neutral source but is a form of social action triggered by power, ideology and institutional structure. In discourse study, it is a form of social action that shapes and is shaped by social relations. Fairclough (1989) explains that discourse functions at three consistent level: text (linguistic features and vocabulary), discursive practice (how texts are produced and interpreted) and social practice (broader social and institutional contexts). By studying these three levels, researchers can explore how language is used to construct, transform and maintain ideology, to establish dominance and create social inequality.

Language is a constitutive force used by different institutions to exercise power and shaping social reality. Foucault (1972) argues that discourse is an important tool to produce knowledge, truth and subjective identities. He (1969) narrates that institutions like law, medicine and politics use discourse to legalize what can be said and who can said. Fairclough (1972) create a distinction between power in discourse and power behind discourse. Power in discourse is exhibited by developing rhetoric to show authority and power behind discourse indicates towards the practice of institutional forces shaping meaning. This difference is also a fundamental and central to political rhetoric, leaders used to legalize and organize their actions.

#### **Discourse, Knowledge and Ideology**

Discourse, in simple, is a force that determines the ways of speaking, thinking, and representing reality. It is not merely a source to reflect the reality. Discourse organizes a system and guides, what can be said, who may speak and makes rules of truth and knowledge. Therefore, Foucault (1969) takes it as a productive force that creates objects of knowledge as “madness, “criminality”, and “citizenship”. He is of the view that power and knowledge are the two sides of one coin. Knowledge and truth are constructed through social institutions such as law, medicine, education and politics. He (1975) elaborates how knowledge is created to control the individuals. Thus discourse establishes the social realities with the help of knowledge production. Berger and Luckmann (1966) emphasis that language and discourse strengthen these actions of producing knowledge by making social meanings appear natural.

Ideology is an established system of values, ideas, beliefs and signs that help understanding social setup, social relations of power and justify social inequality and practices of social institutions. Ideologies aid in naturalizing worldviews. Social and historical realities are their relations are

normalized, made inevitable, and a common sense is developed through ideologies (Eagleton, 1991; Fairclough, 1995). In Critical Discourse analysis approach, ideology is reflected in language use and rhetoric. It serves in establishing social realities, identities, relations and system of knowledge. Ideologies are socially common beliefs that are reflected in discourse production and interpretations (Dijk, 1998). By integrating discourse, knowledge and power, a simple framework is established: Discourse is used to produce knowledge, knowledge is socially expressed to maintain the social reality and ideology sustains power through discourse.

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

CDA researches, geopolitical studies, discourse theories and academic scholarships have demonstrated consistently that language is not merely a neutral tool to describe or reflect the reality but a vital source to constitute the reality. The relationship of knowledge and power is suitably expressed with the help of discourse that establishes the nature of truth within social and historical contexts (Foucault, 1969). Language plays a central role in constructing and deconstructing power structure and social institutions. Fairclough (1989) demonstrates that discourse is a social practice embedded in ideology and domination. He states that the use of language in different social institutions projects the hegemonic relationships that later on trigger to resistance or transformation.

Language helps in expressing the global political imagination. Said (1978) openly discusses the reality constituted by Westerns about “Orient” as uncivilized, irrational and inferior with the help of discourse. He states that geopolitical regions are discursively produced and constructed with the help of cultural narratives and political language. Expanding the idea of political language, Tuathail (1996) declares that geopolitics itself is a discursive practice. He demonstrates that how leaders, media and institutes construct the narratives such as threats, borders and civilizations. Geopolitical imagination, therefore, emerges from language, symbolism, and representation, not merely from material geography. Anderson (1983) theorizes that nations are imagined communities formed through shared narratives and imagined communication. This perception indicates that geopolitical sense of belonging and territorial identity are shaped through language and culture. The genuine territorial facts are discursively constructed.

Literature has discussed Trump’s linguistic verbalism from different aspects. Trump uses language skillfully and strategically in building impactful rhetoric about nationalism, national security and popular media representation. Scholars of political language argue that Trump’s rhetoric is embedded with assertive nationalism. He asserts on supremacy of nation, culture and shows concerns about national security. Scholars categorize this as ethno-cultural or civic nationalism, which has some shared values and a perceived thread for national unity (Kaufmann, 2018; Norris & Inglehart, 2019). Discursive style of Trump also includes populism. Trump divides social world into categories like “the pure people” vs “the corrupt elite” (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017)

So far as the populist framing is concerned Trump uses binaries, address his audience directly and the repeats his opinions to get emotional attachment of his supporters (Bonikowski & Gidron, 2016). He uses simple phrases like “us” vs “them”. The use of “we” in contrast to elite people creates a sense of a community which is crucial to mobilize the population (Wodak, 2015). His speeches also demonstrate his narratives related to national security. When he narrates external threats, border control and a strong military he actually is concerned about the security and power of nation (Jackson, 2018).

### **METHODOLOGY**

This methodology outlines about Critical Discourse Analysis CDA, framework to examine how Donald Trump’s language constructs and projects power regarding Greenland.

CDA as per Fairclough (1989) and Van Dijk’ (2008), treats discourse studies as Ideological

Positioning, revealing how text enacts dominance through Grammar, oratory and context. It focuses on collection of **Trump's 2025-2026** statements that reflects U.S supremacy, negotiable sovereignty and resistance.

### **Research Design**

The approach used here is Three-dimensional CDA by Norman Fairclough 1992. It includes

- Level 1 Text Analysis: deals with micro level as words or syntax.
- Level 2 Discursive Practice: deals with production and consumption, means us of that text in rallies, on tweets and at media. It is a discourse practice, how all spreads.
- Level 3 Social Practice: deals with the macro level, power such as geopolitics. How power play.

### **Data Collection (building a Corpus) and selection criteria**

Data collected from recent activities or Donald Trump, prioritize 2025-2026 posts for current and real time power display. Data relevant to Greenland exclude other such as general Arctic Talk. Corpus building is to be representative, balanced through mix collection of both formal (Davos speeches) and informal (X) for style contrasts.

### **2025-2026 Speeches**

Davos (only U.S protects it), Truth Social Post (anything less unacceptable), interviews (we'll do something, whether they like it or not)

### **Analytical Procedures**

#### **Step 1: Textual Analysis (micro level)**

It is descriptive level, framing

- **Lexical Choices**  
Hyperbole (e.g absolute necessity), euphemism (e.g. gone to a better place)
- **Grammar and Syntactic level**  
Short sentences, use of passives, hiding agents.
- **Deixis/pronouns**  
Dominancy of I and We, they as diminutives (Denmark and Greenland)
- **Modality**  
Use of modal words, absolutes (e.g must have), use of threats (e.g remember it)
- **Metaphors**  
Use in speech for commodity

- **Syntax**

Use of short sentences, all caps shouts (e.g UNACCEPTABLE)

**STEP 2: Discursive Practice Analysis**

- **Production**

Trump writes tweets solo (e.g rally chants legitimize)

- **Intertextuality**

2026 escalation of control, borrows real estate talk (deal)

- **Consumption**

Media amplifies outrage, resistance by Greenland. Base cheers (“USA!”)

- **Spread**

Viral on X, Memes mock Denmark.

**Step 3: Social Practice (Macro level)**

It is level three of explanation

- **Power relation**

Studying U.S hegemony vs. Small Allies (norms get ignored). NATO threats.

- **Ideology**

Nationalism and coercion is normalized (e.g one way or other). America first. Greenland “belongs” to North America.

- **Context**

Is it NATO strains, China or Russia Arctic rivalry, Tariff Man “Trump” securitize island.

- **Impact**

Denmark rejects. Greenland says “not for sale”

This methodology yields several replicable insights as if Trump’s Greenland Discourse use language as coercive power, framing strategic assets as purchasable.

**ANALYSIS**

Donald Trump statements about Greenland, drawn from 2025-2026 as reported verbatim in news sources, analyzed through Fairclough three dimensional model.

**January 25, 2025**

**Trump states that**

**“I think Greenland we’ll get because it has to do with freedom of world . It has nothing to do with the United States.”** (BBC)

According to Fairclough three dimensional model it is;

**Text level (Description)**

**Simple predict and global moral framing**

**Casual confidence:**

“I think Greenland we’ll get” uses informal prediction (we’ll get) to sound certain and inevitable, like a done deal.

**Universal Framing:**

“Freedom of the world” uplifts the issue to a global moral good, making U.S action seem selfless and noble.

**Paradoxical Denial:**

“It has nothing to do with the United States” directly contradicts the self-interest implied in “we’ll get” it, creating ironic strain that downplay U.S gain.

**Personal modality marker:**

“I think”, a personal modality marker that lowers the certainty of action, it softens as “opinion” but projects confidence via first person authority.

**Hyperbolic Moral abstraction:**

“Freedom of world”, it positions Greenland as Global site, not only U.S territory.

**Negation:**

“It has nothing to do with the United States”, it denies, thus Direct contradiction rejects self-interest accusations. Antithesis creates rhetorical tension.

**Simple structure:**

Short sentences with dichotomy, make it easy to grasp for and persuasive.

**Deictic “we”:**

“We” assumes U.S as a natural actor, excluding others.

**Discursive Practice (interpretation)**

**Legitimization strategy:**

Frames acquisition as a global service, not U.S imperialism, to forestall criticism.

**Intertextual Echo:**

Ties to Trump’s pattern of “security for all” rhetoric (protecting Russia and China), harmonizing with audience familiar with his Greenland narrative.

**Audience targeting:**

Spoken in press remarks, it circulates via media to build public support and opinion by creating sense of appeal for patriotic behavior and the zero sum resentment.

**Power Asymmetry:**

It positions U.S as world’s sole protector by marginalizing Denmark and Greenland’s voice.

**Social Practice (Ideology and power relations)**

**Hegemonic ideology:**

Reinforces U.S exceptionalism: America as Global guardian, where its control ensures “freedom” for everyone else.

**Disguised Imperialism:**

It masks territorial ambition, as normalizing great power intervention in sovereign regions.

**Binary world order:**

Creates “us” (positive people, Freedom fighters) vs. implied “them” (threatening people like Russia and China), justifying dominance.

**Sovereignty Erosion:**

Ignores Greenland and Denmark people, treating territory as a global asset U.S must “get” for collective good.

**Power reproduction:**

Naturalizes U.S as inseparable, sustaining structures where string dictate security for weaker ones.

**March 5, 2025 (Address to Congress, Washington DC)**

**Trump states that;**

**“We will keep you safe, we will make you rich ,and together ,we will take Greenland to heights like you have never thought possible before” (Reuters)**

According to Fairclough three dimensional model, it is as;

**Text level**

At text level, statement uses repetitive promises, inclusive language and hyperbolic imagery.

**Vocabulary and word choice:**

Three parallel promises as “we will keep you safe”, “we will make you rich”, “we will take Greenland to heights” creates a rhythmic, memorable structure. Each promise targets a different desire (security, wealth, progress)

“**Safe**” addresses security fears (Russia and China threats from other statements).

“**Rich**” economic inducement, implying U.S investment development

“**Heights like you have never thought possible**” a hyperbolic, suggesting transformation beyond local imagination.

**Use of Pronouns and Positioning:**

“We” (U.S) vs. “You” (Greenland people ) creates benefactor client tie. Here “we” sounds generous and protective.

“Together” it softens unilateral acquisition rhetoric, suggesting partnership.

**Simple wording:**

Use of simple, direct clauses, accessible to no experts having conversational tone.

**Use of metaphor:**

“Take Greenland to the heights” it is aerial dominance of progress, presenting promises for future possibilities.

**Tone and Modality:**

Use of high certainty by no hedging, no might, hope or try usage. Paternalistic confidence positions U.S as capable of being parent or a great developer.

**Discursive Practice (Production and Interpretation)**

At Discursive level, statement functions as political salesmanship within Trump’s Greenland campaign.

**Intertextuality:**

It reverberates Trump’s repeated security threats (Russia and China will take over) and economic pitches from Mar a Lago or Whitehouse remarks. It shows build on prior oratory. Mimics real estate pitch (make you rich, heights never thought possible) showing sales Discourse. Trump’s background as developer shapes style.

It also connects to Colonial civilizing mission tropes through promise development, by safety reflection of historical great power offers to backward territories.

**Audience targeting:**

Delivered as address to Congress, a high visibility platform, aimed at both Greenlandic audience via media and U.S domestic support. It is direct address to “you” Greenlanders sidesteps Danish government.

**Consumption and strategies:**

It is done by Security strategy based on fear, protect from threats, Economic strategy, a greed based aiming to get rich, visionary strategy hope based, showing unique progress.

**Inclusive Strategy:**

“Together” masks power imbalance, making annexation sound collaborative. Short, quotable phrases designed for social media and news cycle for repetition potential.

**Social Practice (Ideology and power relation)**

**American Exceptionalism:**

U.S as sole provider and protector of safety and prosperity (“we will”). Reinforces only America can save and develop your narrative.

**Neoliberal Development Ideology:**

It equates “richness” with U.S style capitalism or minerals extraction, assuming local needs.

**Security State Ideology:**

Greenland framed as security lapse only U.S can fill.

**Patron client Dynamic:**

U.S as generous benefactor, Greenlanders as dependents, needing rescue. Marginalizes Danish sovereignty and Greenlandic self-determination.

**Economic Coercion:**

“Make you rich” implies refusal leading to poverty, normalizes takeover of territory.

**Naturalizes U.S dominance:**

Presents acquisition as mutually beneficial “partnership” hiding sovereign logic.

**Reproduces Global Inequality:**

Powerful state dictates “heights” for weaker territory.

**Legitimize Exceptionalism:**

It justifies pressuring treaty associates (Denmark or NATO) for strategic gain.

**March 4, 2025 (Address to Congress , Washington DC)**

Trump states that

**“We firmly endorse your right to shape your own destiny, and if you wish, we invite you to join the United States of America” (Reuters)**

According to Fairclough three dimensional model it is as;

**Text Level:**

Statement uses formal, diplomatic phrasing with superficially inclusive structure.

**Word choice:**

“We firmly endorse your right” here firmly endorse sounds official and supportive, borrowing legitimacy from human rights and self-determination language.

“Shape your own destiny” it is evocative, ambitious phrase implying freedom and agency.

“If you wish, we invite you to join” it is conditional appears voluntary, softens appropriation as polite offer.

**Pronouns and Positioning:**

“We” vs. “you” creates respectful distance while positioning U.S as noble authority.

**Future Oriented Modality:**

It projects empowerment without timelines or obligations. ( Shape, join)

**Passive benefactor:**

In this U.S role is to invite not demand.

**Tone and Modality:**

There is diplomatic certainty, having no hedgers ,present self-determination supports as established fact. Paternalistic politeness is found that sounds respectful but exerts U.S holds the power to “invite”.

**Discursive Practice (Production and Interpretation)**

**Intertextuality:**

Self-determination discourse that borrows phrasing from decolonization to legitimize U.S intervention in Danish territory.

Connects to prior Trump oratory by following security threats, economic promises.

**Audience targeting:**

Delivered as formal legislative setting lends dignity, aimed at Greenlandic public. Direct “you” addresses Greenlanders, ignoring Danish government as sovereign authority.

**Consumption and strategies:**

**False choice strategy**, presents self-determination as leading naturally to U.S union.

**Legitimation through right talks**, it wraps communalism in universal rights language, harder to oppose without seeming anti-Democratic.

**Social Practice (Ideology and power relation)**

**Selective self-determination:**

Strengthens “right to shape destiny” only if it leads to U.S orbit.

**American Messianism:**

U.S positioned as destination for destiny, exerting superior system.

**Asymmetrical invitation:**

U.S (superpower) invites small territory shows power imbalance obvious despite polite wording.

**Undermines Danish Sovereignty:**

Treats Greenland as separate from Denmark, despite legal status.

**Naturalizes U.S expansion:**

Frames seizures as empowering choice not compulsion.

**Reproduces Hierarchy:**

Only powerful states “invite” and small entities “join”.

**January 9, 2026 (Whitehouse press interaction)**

**Trump states that**

**“We are going to take action in Greenland, whether they approve or not, because if we don’t, Russia or China will dominate Greenland, and we cannot allow them to be our neighbours.” (CNN)**

According to Fairclough three dimensional model it is as;

**Text level**

**Declarative certainty:**

“We are going to take action” it removes doubt, presents as destined fact.

**Dismissal of consent:**

“Whether they approve or not” explicitly shows rejection of Greenland and Denmark Sovereignty.

**Conditional Threat:**

“If we don’t ....Russia or China will dominate” it creates false binary situation, US control or opposed seizure.

**Spatial Threat:**

“Cannot allow them to be our neighbor’s” frames Arctic as U.S territory, not an international space.

**Pronoun Power:**

“We” vs “They” here we plays as actor with agency and them are passive objects.

**Rhetorical Power:**

Short sentences, use of strong modal (will, cannot) create urgency and certainty.

**Discursive Practice (Production and Interpretation)**

**Legitimization through threat inflation:**

Russia and China “domination” presented as immediate, certain threat.

**Binary Framing:**

Through this U.S actions as security and U.S inaction as rival seizure. It eliminates plurilateralism solutions.

**Intertextual Echoes:**

Repeats Trump’s consistent Greenland narrative, “strategic real estate” into “security imperative” then into “moral duty”.

**Audience targeting:**

At domestic level, audience appeals to nationalist “strong America” sentiment while at international level it pressurizes Denmark publically while claiming moral high ground.

**Social Practice (Ideology and power relation)**

**U.S Exceptionalism:**

Only America can secure strategic spaces. Others are incapable.

**Imperial Sovereignty:**

Strategic territories belong to capable powers, not current legal owners.

**Power relations reinforced:**

Denmark and Greenland as subordinate, incapable, Unites States as Hegemon, a protector and judge, Russia and China as external threat justifying intervention.

**January 9, 2026 (Whitehouse press interaction)**

**Trump states that**

**“I would prefer to negotiate ‘the easy way, ‘but if that’s not feasible,we will pursue ‘the hard way” (CNN)**

According to Fairclough three dimensional model it is as;

**Text Level**

**Preference and threat binary:**

“I would prefer ...easy way” it is diplomatic yet cooperative tone vs. “hard way” is implicit compulsion. Creates a false choice between cooperation and force.

**Easy vs. Hard:**

It is colloquial, everyday language makes aggressive policy sounds like simple business negotiation.

**First person Authority:**

“I would prefer” centers Trump personally as decision maker, not “the U.S government”.

**Future certainty:**

“We will pursue” treats “hard way” as tirade diplomacy fails.

**Discursive Practice (Production and Interpretation)**

**Coercive Diplomacy Framing:**

Presents aggression as reluctant “plan B”, making refusal seem unreasonable.

**Intertextual Echoes:**

“Easy or hard ways” mirrors Trump’s deal making persona and past threats (tariff on Mexico, NATO spending ultimatums)

**Audience Positioning:**

Denmark and Greenland must choose easy path to avoid circumstances. U.S audience sees as strong leadership not communalism. Global audience, hears as unpredictable deal makers.

**Social Practice (Power and Ideology)**

**U.S dominance over Allies:**

Constructs Denmark as subordinate who must accommodates U.S security interests

**Sovereignty hierarchy:**

Greenland’s future decided by great powers, not local populations.

**Security Exceptionalism:**

U.S claims unique right to control strategic territory for global stability.

**January 9, 2026 (Whitehouse)**

**Trump states that**

**“I would prefer to negotiate a deal, you know, t h e straightforward way. However if that doesn’t happen, we will pursue it the tough way” (CNBC)**

According to Fairclough three dimensional model it is as;

**Text Level**

**Preference for “easy” negotiation:**

“I would prefer....way” uses conditional modality (would prefer) to sound reasonable and diplomatic at first. You know is a colloquial filter that makes the speaker seem casual and relatable, making the threat. Straightforward way euphemistically frames negotiation as simple and fair.

**Shift to threat:**

“However, if ....tough way” introduces a contrasts (however) and shifts to high certainty (we will). Tough way is a vague euphemism for unspecified compulsion, avoiding explicit words like force or sanctions. This creates ambiguity that implies power without transiting to details.

**Structure:**

Short sentences and dichotomy (straightforward vs. tough) simplify complex geopolitics into a personal choice, positioning Trump as pragmatic but firm.

**Discursive Practice (Production and Interpretation)**

**Intertextuality:**

The easy way and hard way binary reflects Trump’s real estate negotiation style and past discourse. It mixes business discourse (deal, negotiation) with security discourse, treating Greenland like a property transaction.

**Audience Positioning:**

“We” includes the U.S as unified actor, while Denmark and Greenland are implied as obstacles. The statement is produced in high visibility settings (Whitehouse press interaction, Davos) where it circulates via media, normalizing annexation as destined.

**Strategies for Power:**

Soft threat (euphemism) allows plausible deniability (“I prefer negotiation!”) while intensifying pressure.

**Presupposition** that “pursue it” (Greenland control) is certain frame refusal as the problem, not the demand itself.

**Coherence and Flow:**

The casual tone (you know) builds rapport before the threat, making the shift feel rather than aggression.

**Social Practice (Ideology and power relation)**

**Imperialist Ideology:**

The statement naturalizes U.S entitlement to Greenland, treating Danish or Greenlandic Sovereignty as negotiable. Tough way, exerts hegemonic power (economy or military leverage) to supersede smaller states, reflecting Manifest Destiny or colonial logics.

**Normalization of coercion:**

By framing force as a way alongside negotiations, it blurs diplomacy and expansionism, potentially shifting norms towards unilateral territorial claim in public discourse.

**Power asymmetries:**

Denmark and Greenland are positioned as weak parties who must choose between “easy” adherence or “tough” consequences, legitimizing U.S dominance in alliances like NATO.

**January 20-21, 2026 (Davos, World Economic Forum)**

**Trump states that**

**“It’s the United States alone that can protect this giant mass of land ,this giant piece of ice,develop it and improve it. That’s the reason I’m seeking immediate negotiations to once again discuss the acquisition of Greenland by the United States.”.** (ndtv)

According to Fairclough three dimensional modal it is as;

**Text Level**

**Simple, declarative assertions establish authority:**

The repeated “United States alone” and “that’s the reason” use absolute, unqualified terms to frame U.S superiority as self-evident fact not opinion.

No hedging language as (perhaps, maybe) \_\_\_\_\_the certainty eliminates debate space.

**Dehumanizing spatial metaphors reduce Greenland to geography:**

“Giant mass of land”, “Giant piece of ice” strip human presence, framing Greenland as raw territory awaiting U.S “development” and “improvement”.

This resounds colonial Discourse where territories exist for external exploitation.

**Active verbs position U.S as sole agent:**

“Protect, develop, improve” vs. passive Greenland that results in United States acts that Greenland receives.

**Binary logic:**

“United States alone” implies all other like Denmark, Greenland, Arctic, NATO, fail at their protection and development.

**Discursive Practice (Production and Interpretation)**

**Intertextual repetition normalizes narrative:**

Trump’s discourse consistently reflects (only we can protect, Russia and China threats) across speeches, creating discursive familiarity.

**Strategic Positioning:**

Frames acquisition as problem solving, not aggression. “That’s the reason I’m seeking” positions Trump as rational strategist vs. emotional rivals.

**Exclusionary Pronoun use:**

“United States alone” excludes Denmark and Greenland from security competence and “I’m seeking” centers Trump personally as an administrator.

**Social Practice (Ideology and power relation)**

**Reproduces U.S Exceptionalism ideology:**

Dominance extended to Arctic, normalizes great power Veto over smaller nation sovereignty.

**Neocolonial development Discourse:**

“Develop it and improve it” shows underdeveloped territories need informed external management. Erases Greenlandic self-determination, treating locals as development beneficiaries not stakeholders.

**Security as ownership ideology:**

Protection is as to acquisition, equating security with territorial control.

**Legitimizes coercive Diplomacy:**

“Immediate negotiations” signals pressure on Denmark while maintaining urbane mask. It obstructs sovereignty arguments by framing inactivity as security failure.

**CONCLUSION**

The present study endeavored to explore how language is used as a constitutive force to shape the geopolitical realities by concentrating on the rhetoric of Donald Trump on Greenland. By getting insight from Michel Foucault and Norman Fairclough, and using Fairclough’s three dimensional model of Critical Discourse Analysis, the study concludes that language is not only reflective but also acts as an active agent in production of power, ideology and geopolitical facts.

The results indicate that Trump uses language as a strategic instrument to build and legitimize the U.S geopolitical authority. The textual level shows that his discourse is embedded with characteristics of simplicity, repetition, binary oppositions, and strong modality. The vocabulary items such as “we will”, “must”, and “cannot” exhibit certainty and metaphors like “giant piece of ice” indicates the Greenland

as a commodity. The dichotomy of pronouns such as “we” versus “they” draws a strong and clear distinction between U.S as an active and authoritative and Greenland/Denmark as passive and submissive entities. Such type of language use reinforces the dominance and subdue the alternative ideology.

The level of discursive practice reflects that the rhetoric of Trump is the blend of political, economic and media discourses. His use of language projects capitalist logic especially when he offers deals, he exhibits real estate strategies. His use of intertextual references regarding security threats (Russia and China), economic growth, and national sublimity develops such a narrative as can get media attention easily. His discourse can get viral due to its repetitive and slogan driven nature and it helps him to get favour of domestic audience assert pressure on international entities. In this way, discourse is used as a tool to produce and contest power.

The analysis reveals at social practice level that his rhetoric projects the ideological structures such as nationalism, populism and American exceptionalism. Through his discourse he build the world view that America is the only country that can secure and develop the territories that are strategically important around the world. This attitude shows the form of disguised imperialism, where the ambition of expansion is covered with array of global responsibility and mutual benefit. The repetitive use of security threats creates sense of insecurity that legitimize the intervention. Thus through the use of discourse geopolitical inequality is reproduced.

By the use of binaries such as “us vs. the”, “civilized vs. backward” and “security vs. threat” complex geopolitical facts are simplified. With the use of these binaries he convinces his audience, domestic and international, that interventions is essential and morally acceptable. The result claims that discourse is a crucial tool to legalize the use of power and to establish the public perception and align the public to a specific ideology. This supports Foucault’s notion that power and knowledge are constructed side by side and moreover, the role of discourse is critical in defining and establishing what is accepted as truth.

The important point is that the analysis of Trump’s statements on Greenland covers a gap in existing literature. There are a number of studies that focus on his rhetoric related to populism, media and nationalism but a limited attention had been paid to his geopolitical discourse regarding certain territories. By analyzing the case of Greenland, this research highlights that how discourse can be used to transform a geographically distant and politically independent territory into a strategically necessary assert within U.S. geopolitical imagination.

Finally, the result of this study indicate that language is a powerful instrument which helps in constructing, negotiating and legitimizing geopolitical power. Trump’s use of language shows how political leaders use rhetoric to reshape facts, impact perceptions and rationalize the global actions. Through the method of Critical Discourse Analysis, this research provides evidence about the use of language that it is not merely a medium of communication but a tool of social practice that works as an active agent in the production of power and ideologies. Thus to comprehend the present geopolitics it is necessary to understand the role of language use.

The final point, this research stresses on is that it is discourse that construct the geopolitical realities rather than the material forces. Therefore, the study of language is indispensable to unfold the dynamics of power in modern world.

**REFERENCES**

- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities*. Verso.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality*. Anchor Books.
- Bonikowski, B., & Gidron, N. (2016). The populist style in American politics. *American Journal of Sociology*, 121(4), 1–30.
- Brandt, S.L. Donald Trump, the Reality Show: Populism as Performance and Spectacle. *Z Literaturwiss Linguistik* 50, 303–321 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41244-020-00170-3>
- Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso.
- Ejaz, M. A., Fatima, A., & Urooj, T. (2025). Making America Great Again: Rhetorical Analysis of Trump's Return to Nationalism and Its Global Implications. *Qualitative Research Journal for Social Studies* 2(2): 1436–1450. DOI: 10.63878/qrjs192 – A discourse analysis combining nationalism and populism in Trump's 2024 speeches with media strategies.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Longman. Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and punish*. Pantheon.
- Foucault, M. (1969). *The archaeology of knowledge*. Routledge.
- Jackson, P. T. (2018). Confronting the bomb: National security and rhetorical strategies. *Security Studies*, 27(1), 23–45.
- Kaufmann, E. (2018). Trump and the politics of immigration and nationalism. *American Political Science Review*, 112(4), 1–6.
- Kellner, D. (2017). Donald Trump and authoritarian populism. *Fast Capitalism*, 14(1).
- Kjeldgaard-Christiansen, J. *The Voice of the People: Populism and Donald Trump's Use of Informal Voice*. *Soc* 61, 289–302 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12115-024-00969-7>
- Mudde, C., & Kaltwasser, C. R. (2017). *Populism: A very short introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Ó Tuathail, G. (1996). *Critical geopolitics*. University of Minnesota Press. Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. Pantheon.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage.
- Wodak, R. (2015). *The politics of fear: What right-wing populist discourses mean*. Sage.