

To the Honorable Members of the United States Congress,

I submit this letter as a formal grievance concerning any attempt—direct, indirect, rhetorical, or operational—by the United States to acquire Greenland through coercion, forced purchase, economic pressure, or threat of force, despite the express opposition of Greenland’s elected leadership and the sovereign state of Denmark.

Such actions would be unlawful, unconstitutional, destabilizing to NATO, and wholly unnecessary given existing binding treaty authority that already permits U.S. military presence and operational access in Greenland.

Congress has both the authority and the duty to intervene.

I. Greenland Is Not Property, and the United States Has No Right to “Buy” It

Greenland is a self-governing territory within the Kingdom of Denmark. Its people possess the internationally recognized right of self-determination. No nation may lawfully purchase, annex, or otherwise acquire territory over the objection of its people or sovereign government.

Any “purchase” advanced under diplomatic, economic, or military pressure would constitute coercion, not consent, and would violate binding international law, including:

- U.N. Charter, Article 2(4) – Prohibiting the threat or use of force against territorial integrity or political independence**

- U.N. Charter, Article 1(2) – Affirming self-determination of peoples
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Art. 1 – Recognizing the right of peoples to freely determine political status (ratified by the U.S. in 1992)

A coerced transaction is annexation in disguise.

II. Any Threat or Use of Force Would Be Illegal and Unconstitutional

Any attempt to seize or coerce Greenland—directly or indirectly—would constitute an act of aggression under international law and would require congressional authorization under the U.S. Constitution.

- U.S. Constitution, Article I, §8 –

Congress alone may declare war and authorize military force

– Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer, 343 U.S. 579 (1952) – Presidential power is weakest where Congress has not authorized action

– War Powers Resolution, 50 U.S.C. §§ 1541–1548

Absent explicit congressional authorization, any executive action threatening Denmark or Greenland would be constitutionally infirm.

III. Denmark Is a NATO Ally—Coercion Would Undermine the Alliance Itself

Denmark is a founding NATO member. Greenland's strategic relevance exists precisely because it already cooperates with the United States within lawful

alliance frameworks.

Threatening or coercing a NATO ally would violate:

- North Atlantic Treaty, Article 1 – Obligation to resolve disputes peacefully**
- North Atlantic Treaty, Article 5 (by implication) – Undermined if allies fear coercion from within the alliance itself**

Such conduct would destroy U.S. credibility and fracture alliance trust.

IV. The United States Already Has Treaty Authority to Station Troops in Greenland – Making “Purchase” or “Invasion” Legally Absurd

Critically, the United States does not need to buy, seize, or coerce Greenland to meet

its defense objectives.

Under the 1951 Defense of Greenland Agreement between the United States and the Kingdom of Denmark, the U.S. already possesses broad authority to operate militarily in Greenland.

Key provisions include:

- Authorization for U.S. forces to establish, operate, and maintain military bases in Greenland
- Permission to deploy troops, equipment, and defense infrastructure as deemed necessary for collective security
- Recognition of Danish sovereignty while granting extensive U.S. operational access

This agreement is still in force and has enabled long-standing U.S. presence,

including Thule Air Base (Pituffik Space Base).

The existence of this treaty renders any suggestion of purchasing or forcibly acquiring Greenland not only unlawful, but irrational. If additional basing, radar, missile defense, or Arctic operations are required, they can be pursued lawfully, cooperatively, and immediately under existing agreements.

The failure to even acknowledge this treaty while floating coercive alternatives raises serious concerns about executive intent and competence.

V. Historical Analogies Do Not Justify Modern Violations of Law

Invocations of the Louisiana Purchase or

Alaska acquisition are legally irrelevant.
Those transactions occurred before:

- The U.N. Charter
- Modern prohibitions on territorial conquest
- Binding self-determination norms

Post-1945 international law explicitly rejects imperial acquisition. The United States helped construct that legal order and is bound by it.

VI. Congressional Duties and Formal Demands

Congress is not a passive observer. Silence may be construed as acquiescence.

Accordingly, I formally request that

Congress:

- 1. Publicly affirm that Greenland's sovereignty and self-determination are non-negotiable**
- 2. Reject any funding, authorization, or executive action aimed at coercive acquisition of Greenland**
- 3. Reaffirm the validity and sufficiency of the 1951 U.S.–Denmark Defense Agreement as the sole lawful framework for U.S. presence**
- 4. Exercise immediate oversight over any diplomatic, military, or economic actions related to Greenland**
- 5. Reassert Congress's constitutional role in foreign conflict and territorial matters**

VII. Preservation of Record

This grievance is submitted for inclusion

in the public and legislative record. Any future actions taken in contravention of the constitutional, treaty, or international obligations outlined herein may give rise to further congressional, judicial, or international remedies.

Respectfully submitted,

[Your Name]

Concerned Citizen

United States

[Optional: City, State]

