

Detailed summary powered by AI

The motion: This House believes that Greenland should be granted full sovereignty.

Date: 19 January 2026

Contents:

- 1. Detailed transcript**
- 2. Analysis of the outcome**

Transcript:

Chair: Okay, so we're looking for the proposer and opposer to the motion.

The Proposer: Okay, so the motion is that this House would fight to protect Greenland's sovereignty. And I think to make that argument, I need to convince you of three things. First, that it will be a just war to fight. Secondly, that it is a fight worth fighting. And thirdly, it is a fight that we can win. And perhaps to set the scene, I think this motion is phrased as "this House would fight for Greenland's sovereignty," but just imagine, rather than the Houses of Parliament, we are in the Cabinet. We are currently in a COBRA meeting. There are British troops in Greenland right now, and we've just heard from the Danish Navy that there is a task force, a United States task force, heading to Greenland. As we speak, Chinooks are flying to capture the capital, and they've started shelling the anti-aircraft defences. What do we do?

Well, in saying why we should fight: firstly, it would be a just war. And in arguing why it would be a just war, it's easy to say that because the war by the Americans is so unjust. It is a naked act of aggression to take a sovereign land which does not belong to them and to annex it to their own territory, against the consent of the Danish government and against the consent of the Greenland people. All the rational bases, or supposed rational bases that are given for the annexation, are completely baseless. It is not needed for national security; the US already has military bases there which they could use and expand to protect both Greenland and itself. It is not needed for any economic purposes; if they wanted to do mining there, they could just ask, and Denmark would say yes. Nor is it needed to expand the Golden Dome which he's proposing, largely because if he asked, the Danish would say, "Sure, go ahead." So the fact that it's a completely unjust war that results in deaths and the oppression of the Greenland people means it is clearly a just war to fight against it.

The second point is why it is worth fighting. Firstly, I want to argue why it's worth fighting in and of itself. And secondly, it's worth fighting for wider principles and geopolitical issues. First, why

it's worth fighting in and of itself: we already have troops there. They are currently being shelled by United States forces attacking the anti-aircraft guns. In some sense, our decision has already been made; we are fighting this conflict. Secondly, it is important to fight this conflict for the previous reasons that I gave, in that this is a clearly just war to fight. We are protecting the self-determination of Greenland, a principle in international law that has been established since the start of the 20th century. Likewise, it is part of our NATO obligations to defend NATO countries, which includes Denmark and therefore includes Greenland. It will be an act of cowardice to simply surrender now or simply remove our troops from Greenland. So it is important to fight, in and of itself, to protect Greenland.

Secondly, the wider implications. If we did not fight now I imagine the arguments of my learned friend will be based off, "Well, if we fight America, NATO is dead." I'd argue that by America fighting in Greenland, NATO in its current form will be killed in and of itself. The question is, what lives in its aftermath? Do we have a European core and Canada basis of NATO that will stand up to ensure that NATO members are protected, both from outside aggression and also from within NATO? If we fight, we show that NATO still exists as a force. If Russia attacks the Baltic States, the European member states, UK and Canada will intervene, which will ensure that Russia thinks twice about doing that. If NATO is completely destroyed because Article 5 of the NATO Treaty attack against one, attack against all is completely destroyed because nothing happens, then it's open season for Eastern Europe. It is important to have this fight so that we do not have other fights and we show our strength.

Likewise, outside NATO, if might is shown to be right in Greenland, it will be shown to be right in Taiwan. China will say, "Well, if America can take Greenland, we can take Taiwan." India and Pakistan will be at each other's throats; Israel, Iran, Saudi Arabia. If we show spine now, there will be less conflict in the world and more peace.

Finally, my final point, which links to that point: why we can win. Now, the issue is that the US Army is far greater than any European army; in fact, their special forces are as large as the UK army in and of itself. However, remember, Trump always chickens out. Venezuela went well because everything went perfectly. If a few Danish rockets, British rockets, take down a few American helicopters, he will think twice and immediately back down and take some sort of peace treaty. He did it with China on rare metals. He did reciprocal tariffs. He will do it here. If we fight, there will be no long-term conflict. We can go back to having peace, provided we show strength now. We should fight. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you. Thank you very much, the proposer. And opposing the motion we have the opposer. Good evening, everybody.

The Opposer: Happy New Year. So this is something that we need to consider very, very carefully, and we do not want our emotions to get the better of us. The Opposition is not suggesting that we give the US Greenland. The Opposition is not suggesting that we succumb to their threats of 10% tariffs going up to 25% tariffs. But the Opposition cautions against the word "fight" against the Americans.

My learned colleague has created a very dramatic picture of Chinooks flying in and us going in with our military might to take on the Americans. And my learned friend is correct that it would be a danger to NATO. And that is not the only argument, but one of the goals, New Year's resolutions, I suppose, for 2026 is to at least try to keep NATO together. If we do lose it, then we are in for a big shock. I'll go into our dependence on the United States shortly, but I want to go into this area that my learned colleague mentioned. He said that fighting the United States would lead to less conflict and more peace, and the Opposition suggests that it actually would lead to more conflict, not less. I mean, the proposition is suggesting conflict with the United States, but the repercussions globally would be indescribable.

We can look at, for example, the Middle East and what's happening there. The situation is awful at the moment, but it could become a lot worse. And I'm not in favour of the Americans' position in the Middle East, but it could become a lot worse. Things could get so much worse. In East Asia, we've got Japan making noises against China. The thinking is, because Japan has relied on a post-Second World War US-led world order, lots of things have happened in Japan's economy that has forced them to compromise, for example, strengthening their currency. Now the thinking is that there is a push there from the Americans, or for Trump anyway. Without the Americans, we risk danger in East Asia, Japan, China, the Middle East and Ukraine. So the argument that it would result in less conflict, more peace, we reject as false.

It will be interesting to see what the audience thinks, but the Opposition suggests caution and not rushing into fighting the most potent keyword in the motion and not surrendering, but also going the route of negotiation and peace. The Opposition believes that that would lead to a better outcome for us in Europe and the Americans. And don't forget, Trump is a one-term president. We don't know what's going to happen to the West as we know it and when I say the West, I mean the US, Europe and East Asia and the globe as a whole. Opposition rests.

Chair: Okay. Thank you very much, the opposer. Now we will have anybody from the floor, anyone who'd like to come up and speak for up to three minutes, either agreeing or disagreeing with the motion. Any volunteers? Okay, gentleman at the back, the speaker. Speaker, this is the speaker.

The Speaker: My learned friend... I am actually thanking the speaker for the Opposition, and because I think he makes some interesting points, I'd like to add my own as to why there is no need to fight. All we have to do is wait. And we can wait in two ways. We can wait and drag out what Trump and his army is intending to do. We can prevaricate. We can tease out the time. We can promise little and not really... and then change our minds and keep on having more and more negotiations until they finally get a bit annoyed. And finally, in practice, do decide to go in. And once they do, we just wait for the new president who, with any luck, will say, "That's a load of nonsense, we're getting out of here." Thank you very much.

Chair: Sorry. Do we have the next speaker? Welcome.

The Speaker: Hello all. Happy New Year to you all. Hope all are well. Apologies, residual cough from a couple of weeks ago, hopefully not contagious. So I hope to socialise with you all shortly. How long do we have again? Three minutes. I thought the proposer's speech was very well, tightly delivered, very few wasted words and he made a convincing case.

I think the weakest part of his, or the most potentially weak part of his speech, was the part about asserting that Trump would chicken out. And I just want to quickly explore this notion: will Trump double down, or will he chicken out? Is his vehemence, his irrationality and his impulsiveness going to lead him to extend this crazy step he's already taken? A step down this road, will he not? I think it's a good idea, and it's a good hypothesis to raise, that he will chicken out. Trump chickening out has developed the acronym TACO: Trump Always Chickens Out. It seems like he might. He might, like all bullies. Will he respond well to being punched on the nose? Will he back down? Or will he engage in the classic dictatorial or colonial pattern of antagonising and then eliciting a reaction and then using that reaction to justify a continuum? Many would say that this has been his pattern domestically with ICE. He antagonises the population with a proto-fascistic masked force, elicits a violent reaction and then uses that to double down and clamp down on civil liberties in his mass ethnic cleansing campaign, or roughly, that's what it is seemingly like. It seems definitely oppressive. But will he extend the domestic to the international? Will he antagonise a defensive, violent reaction by the Europeans and then say that the Europeans are a threat and then take over Greenland more vehemently? When American troops die not that many die in pursuit of these foreign wars, wars for the Middle East, wars for Israel, blah, blah, blah, all good, fun stuff when the flag flies at half-mast and the US flag-adorned coffins of troops, American troops, come back, that has a sobering and negative effect, a deleterious effect on the mission. Will fighting Europeans, shocking as it is, will that have that reaction? Will it have such a bad reaction? Trump campaigned on being anti-war, being against war. This is clearly a very voluntary exercise, as the proposer pointed out. How will the Americans react? They view us with fraternity, especially maybe the UK sharing their language. Who knows? I don't yet know, and we can't predict. I don't know what the American reaction would be. That's worth exploring. I hope you will.

Chair: Thank you very much, the speaker. Yes, gentleman at the back. Sorry, your name is the speaker? Speaker. This is the speaker. Thank you.

The Speaker: Right. So I don't know how this works, but I thought I'd throw my thoughts on the idea. So since I am a fighting-age male, I come from a class that's traditionally been used as cannon fodder for the elites that decide to go to war. And I have no doubt that if we're talking about Russia or China invading a sovereign country, no one in here would have any problem sending me, and probably some of my likewise males, to go die in a foreign land for some soil that in some sense affects me in no way.

That said, so obviously, I'm naturally sort of opposed to this sort of general idea of just, "let's go in, send them in," because obviously there's a much more material consequence for me. That said, the Americans, whilst they propose they are friends, they've never been friends of Great Britain. They've always acted to undermine us, even while portraying they're friendly, and have always acted against us. So if we are to oppose Russian imperialism, Chinese imperialism and

imperialism in the Middle East, why would we not oppose US imperialism? If I am potentially sent to fight and die against these countries for human rights abuses and imperialism, why would we not also make the stand against the United States of America? And that's my thought.

An earlier speaker (Interjection): Can I take a question here? Yeah, please. I think we virtually agree that it's wrong. It's more the pragmatic effects. Would it be bad for NATO, our security against Russia? Will the US, will Trump nuclear bomb London?

The Speaker: Russia could nuclear bomb London, but we would still be sent in. If Russia launched an attack into the Baltics, we'd still go into Russia and they could nuclear bomb London. The same way as America could nuclear bomb London, the same way we could nuclear bomb Washington. So I think whilst yes, the idea of nuclear bombing a city of millions of human beings is a bad idea, the Russians would do it to us, we possibly would do it to the Russians. The fact that the Americans could do it to us should be no reason that we would not stand up to American imperialism. Which, the Empire is considered one of the worst things, probably the worst thing this country's ever done. Why would we allow the Americans to do the exact same thing we've done when we spent the last 70 years saying how bad we acted? Why we stand now? And that's what I meant to say.

Chair: Okay, thank you very much. Gentleman behind the previous speaker. Sorry, your name is the speaker. Speaker. Okay. You have three minutes.

The Speaker: Yeah, I oppose the motion based on the concept of self-determination of international law. Because when you try to intervene or try to do anything on behalf of anyone else, you need to ask those living there, especially the Greenlanders. I guess you should have a referendum or certain votes to decide whether they would like to live under the US rules or under the Danish rules. With the majority of the people living in Greenland, actually, I... love to be under the rule of the US. Why not? That is my reason for opposing the motion. This is also true for Taiwan as well. If Taiwanese people want to be under the Chinese PRC, of course they can do so. No one can intervene or do anything to change that. If they want to be friendly with the US or to the Western countries, of course they can choose to do so. So my main point is that the most important thing is that we need to consider the self-determination of the Greenlanders before we can do anything to intervene. Thank you.

Chair: Okay. Thank you. Would anybody else like to come up? Okay. Lady here, sorry I've forgotten your name. The speaker. Welcome the speaker. Three minutes.

The Speaker: I kind of have it recently with not reading anything about Trump's enemies, because it takes me so much. So I would like to just set a new way of approaching this, because I don't really agree that he's gonna approach anything peacefully, and I'm not a fan of the opposer. So I Googled or ChatGPT'd, "How do you help a toddler when they're in a tantrum?" So in the moment when the tantrums have me stay calm, even when they are... which, you know, support, short sentences. Get down to their level. I'm not really sure how to get down to Trump's level, but, you know, get down to their level and then name the feeling.

Say, "Trump rejected for a Nobel Peace Prize," hence why he'll never do peace. So he's already said that he's not going to play ball. So how do we get down to his level? I think if we give him a different type of lollipop, it might help. And then lastly, hold the boundary kindly, which is why I support the fact that we cannot let NATO down by actually not standing off the wall. That's all I've got to say.

Chair: Okay, thank you. The speaker... ladies first, I'm afraid. An earlier speaker, okay.

An audience member: Excuse me, I'm not feeling very well, so I might actually have to leave after I say this. Okay, the previous speaker, thank you for what I can say about what you said about the lollipop. Well, let's put it this way. Trump was hoping to go into Ukraine and set up his hotels and everything else, and it looks like he's not going to be able to do that. So maybe he's looking to do it in Greenland. Maybe that's his lollipop.

Now, I think I'm going to talk about Americans. They don't want to go to war. They haven't wanted to go to war for the last 10 years or so because they haven't got the money. So this isn't really about America. This is about one person who basically is a dictator. He just wants every country that he's going into. They've got something. Venezuela... we all sat back and thought maybe nothing would happen in Venezuela. Okay, right? They've got minerals. They've got something there. What have they got in Ukraine? They've also got minerals and something. And just remember, we're not being told the truth about a lot of things. I read somewhere that Greenland is only 10 times the size of Britain. If you actually look on the map, it actually looks a lot bigger than 10 times the size. And until recently, did anyone here know, except for you really interested, how many of you knew that Greenland was a sovereign state of Denmark? Right? So if this would... this will happen, we wouldn't even know. And I do, I even know... I don't want our soldiers to go to war. I don't want any more deaths, because I've got nieces and nephews or rather grandnieces and nephews who would have to. I actually say we have to try and fight because Trump needs to have his toys taken out. He's just a bully. He's an absolute bully. If we just sit back and like the person before the previous speaker said, look what we wanted to say, it couldn't happen, and we sent money over and things. Why don't we want to do the same if we sit back and be complacent, right and allow Trump to go in? Because look what he's done in Venezuela. Previous speaker, what's going to happen? We're just a little island surrounded by water so we can sit back and let things happen to us, and that is what's actually happening at the moment. We're sitting back and letting things happen, and bullies are not supposed to get their way. Just another form of toxic masculinity.

Chair: Okay, thank you. The speaker, the long-awaited contribution.

The Speaker: Chair. This august body. An earlier speaker... I rise to speak. It's anticipation that I will get a fair hearing. Those who advocate war, more war, when there's 70-odd conflicts already with the consequences that we see every day on our television sets: hunger and famine and pain and suffering. Do we want more? Well, some people with a certain mentality probably do. When I read the motion, I thought it was about Tesco making a takeover bid for Iceland. Well, of course, it's more serious than that. I think we should strengthen our humanity. We are...

this body is a thinking, caring organisation. We are not like sheep. We don't want to be led by leaders and personalities who have got questionable morals, ethics and perhaps mental conditions. This august body should renounce violence, renounce fighting, renounce war of all kinds, and promote peace in ourselves and peace in others. Vote to abstain from this motion.

Chair: Okay, no. Welcome.

An audience member: Hi, I'm like an earlier speaker. I like peace, and I wish that we can have peace all the time, right? But I think in this case, I don't think we will get any peace if we continue to allow Trump to get what he wants. Pretty much think about Hitler. You know, you let him have one thing, and you say, okay. Trump is playing games. Give him another long term. He's already got two. In terms of his price, he's got this awful thing from, I think it's from the football, right? That was one. And then he got a second-hand medal. I call it second-hand. It's like, you know, charity shopping, right? And he got that one as well. But no, it doesn't stop him. That is the problem. The Opposition says, "Yeah, let's wait and see." You see, it doesn't work. Trump is a bully, and he only responds to another bully, another strong person. That's why he likes Putin, and I think secretly he worships Xi Jinping. But besides that, why we need to stop him... just look at the US Republicans, the Congressmen. During his first term, people said, "Wait and see. You know, let him make mistakes while reigning him in." And then, one by one they resigned. They got forced out and then, oh, Biden became the president. Everybody was happy, right? They didn't think Trump would come back, but once he came back, he came back with a colleague, and he's persecuting everybody who he thinks there's some against him or there's something wrong with him. So I just want to say that we got to stop him. And I go with the proposition, because collectively NATO minus the US, you still got 20-something countries stand up to him, and I think we might be able to avoid war, because he only responds to strong power.

Chair: Okay, the speaker. Yeah, welcome the speaker. The speaker is new here.

The Speaker: Absentee, founding member, right? Chair. It's been a great debate, and we're getting different aspects as different people come up. That's exactly what you want. I'd love to respond to different points, but I want to come back to the motion a little bit. It's been touched upon. But the question is, is it worth fighting? Why would it be worth fighting? I get the point about standing up to a bully. So there's all kinds of reasons potentially for it: standing up for democracy, standing up for self-determination, as an earlier speaker brought up, of Greenlandic people. Although I would point out that, according to the surveys, a vast majority of them do not want to become part of the US. So if you're looking at that basis, then there are some reasons there why potentially it would be worth fighting.

I think it's really... I think for me, it's impossible to think that there could be actual shots fired between the US and Europe. I just don't see that ever happening. But if we want to stand up to the bully, we need to make the cost of Trump taking Greenland very, very high. And there are many ways of doing that. European countries, including the UK, are already sending military representatives to Greenland. All we need to do is set up a tripwire, send in some military

personnel. Don't give them any weapons. If we have European military presence in Greenland, even if Trump invades, has he taken over the country? Has he not taken over Greenland? Probably not. They're never going to fire on military personnel from Europe who don't pose a threat to them. It would never happen. And then it goes back to the point where one of the other speakers said, an earlier speaker, when Trump goes out, there's a good chance that it could be reversed. Is it worth any lost lives over Greenland? There could be one caveat, though. What if the Greenlanders themselves actually wanted to fight and they wouldn't accept that type of a situation? I think then the dilemma is a little bit tougher, because, you know, Denmark and other European countries should be showing solidarity with them if they would actually be willing to fight. And if the Greenlanders didn't want to risk, you know, a temporary invasion that might be temporary, but might not be temporary. Who knows? I don't know what it is.

An audience member: Can you consider if European countries are, you know, getting together collectively and Trump would not invade?

The Speaker: So exactly, that's the point. Make the cost of it doing it very, very high. European troops are there. He's not going to be able to take it over effectively. He can't get rid of them. He can't forcibly remove them. Just put them there, and he can't actually take it. The other thing, though, is so this motion, everyone's taken it as a military fight, and I think that's how we should define it. The other fight is an economic fight, right? There's a tariff war that's going to happen. And the question is, are we going to fight that battle? We can make it expensive for Trump. If we could hold out against these tariffs for six months, the election is coming up in the US, and that will put massive pressure on him. I think if we... if we make it expensive for him to take Greenland, then TACO comes into effect. If we're not strong and don't make it expensive, he's won on his little Chavez thing in Venezuela. He's going to gamble. He's going to bet big, he's going to double down. That is his nature. And if we don't push up, you know, make it costly for him, he will try it. I think we can stop it. Sorry.

Chair: Thank you. Anybody else would like to make a contribution? So the next speaker.

The Speaker: Chair, at the moment, American power is based on the proposition that might is right, the proposition that American power is more important than international law. And so if he's allowed to get away with it, then that's what's going to happen in future. He's going to proceed on that basis that American power is more important than international law. But if we send troops, if we send people to Greenland, as was pointed out, are the Greenlanders going to actually fight American troops? But more importantly, are our troops going to fight American troops? I can't see it happening. I mean, if we sent our army to Greenland, I can't really see our troops actually firing on American troops. And I have difficulty seeing American troops actually firing on European troops. It could happen because Americans tend to sort of get a bit gung-ho sometimes, but as far as Europeans are concerned, I can't really see us engaging in combat with American troops. I could be wrong about that, but certainly that's my feeling.

And yes, we have to obviously make it difficult for Trump in various ways. And there are lots of ways that can happen, but is he going to be a one-term president? I mean, I have a feeling that

he's going to find some sneaky way of saying, you know, I've got to stay on. You know, you can't do without me, and find some way of getting himself a second term. Now, I might be wrong about that, but I think that's what he's going to try. The one thing that I think will give him pause is the international markets, and especially the bond markets. If there is fighting and the bond markets take a nosedive, I think that that might, in fact, be the sort of lever to bring him back from the brink. I think that international finance, and if it turns out that it's extremely costly for America to take this sort of action, I think that might be the determining factor, rather than an actual confrontation on the ground.

Chair: Thank you, the speaker. And there was a gentleman here, contribution. Sorry. Your name is the speaker. Speaker. Okay.

The Speaker: Yeah, I think... one second. Yeah, I think there's a... it seems like it's a consensus that, generally speaking, we should... if the war with the US, or the conflict of Greenland happens, we should fight this war. I think I feel like there is a consensus, because obviously it's a just war, and imperialism should be stopped. Because if you look at the examples throughout history, when you allow dictators to take a little bit, they usually come for more. And we've seen it with Hitler, we've seen it with Putin, and I don't think Trump would try to be any different. I think more the question I wanted, the point I wanted to discuss, the rather more practical one, is whether we would fight for Greenland. Whether we would be able, as a country, as Europe, even to fight for Greenland. If, as the sample suggests, the UK population is not ready to fight for the UK, why would we expect that the UK's population is going to be fighting for Greenland? But the latest voltages are that 33% only on this would be ready to fight for this country, while 50%... Plus, UK's military is in an awful state. We have two aircraft carriers. One of them is currently, I think, in the repairs, and one is in the Indian Ocean. We have whatever, six, eight frigates, which half of them also cannot really do anything. We have no defence, basically, against ballistic missiles, which are a massive part of American ammunition. There is a genuine argument that Europe and the UK cannot fight this war.

Moreover, to launch a nuclear weapon, UK needs America. The point that someone suggested that we can nuke Washington... we can't. The satellite system that our missiles use are American-based. And also, even to go further, I'm not sure that UK and Europe are ready to fight us economically. As a previous speaker suggested, yes, it would be great if Europe unites and gets and manages to put up pressure, put up a fight against the tariffs. But Europe cannot organise itself for the last three years. I think if any countries will start to fall apart, like... it will require Europe and the UK all to present a united front. And I don't think at this point we can really rely on that, as Hungary will most likely quickly fall off, Slovakia will really quickly fall off. And I think if you... if some countries will start falling off, all others are falling off. And even the UK, for example, today, Starmer's speech is very tepid. I think the UK is really trying to find a kind of a neutral answer, but still presenting an opinion. And I think this is a scary part, that I don't think like... I think this House, if it could, would fight for Greenland, but I think the UK, as the country, would not. Thank you.

Chair: Okay, thank you. Anybody else? Okay, the next speaker. Good evening.

The Speaker: Evening. Trump Derangement Syndrome has reached new dimensions. This is phantasmagoria. It's a new symptom of it. This is utterly preposterous. What we're talking about now... would you now [defend] Gibraltar? Spain has a claim on Gibraltar. Would you fight with the Spanish against a British military, a conscripted army or Citizen Army? Spanish would regain Gibraltar. The answer, to be consistent... the answer would need to be yes, if you support this motion. If it's not, you're inconsistent. There's no rationality here.

Now Trump, do not understand how the way in which Trump works, what he says. If you listen exactly to what he says, his intention is to purchase the island. Now the Greenlanders, the Danish, launched a eugenics programme against the Greenlanders about 20, 30 years ago, through contraception. There are no friends of the Danish. The percentage is 80%, 90% for independence, but they're financially tied to it. The way forwards here, and Trump knows, and every sane person knows this is not the... which is beset by this deranged syndrome... is that Greenland will become independent. They will sell a certain large percentage of the ice, sorry, of Greenland to the Americas. They have their own non-contiguous territory because they're settled around the coast. That's what will happen. Now. Likewise, I take it that if Russia now... considering that the NATO and UK are fighting Russia, where this Putin monster is going to make all of Europe... and at least politically isolate. Sorry, Greenland considers itself to be in Europe, although geographically it's in the Western Hemisphere, in the Americas, and therefore falls under the Monroe Doctrine. But that's part for another time. Then I take it you would fight Russia, and also, as also, you would volunteer to fight Russia. To take a look at yourselves that not just you in particular, the whole West has been manipulated by the press, and also Trump manipulates the press, and in turn, manipulates the punters. If it's only three minutes, I can't say anything more. It's all gonna be settled. And to the satisfaction of the Greenlander, of the Inuit. There's no love lost between them and the colonising Danes. So it's a time for...

Chair: 30 seconds. 30 seconds.

An earlier speaker (Interjection): This all sounds consensual, but you're missing the fact... sorry, this all sounds consensual, but you're missing the fact that Trump is saying he's going to invade.

The Speaker: No, did he say he's going to be invaded? He says... "Trump" word has now become an expletive. It's like a swear word. One has meant... It's been... people have been conditioned a reflex emotional reaction to it, and it can't think straight. If you listen to what he says, to purchase it. Why would he? Why would he... Countries only fight wars for two reasons. One is strategic, for strategic importance to broader [goals], and secondly, economic. Now, Greenland, like Ukraine, has no strategic interest to this country. Yeah, I see it. No strategic interest in this country or economic importance. But look at what are the real reasons behind it. Think that's important. You get it?

Chair: Anybody else like to say a few words? No. The previous speaker?

The Speaker (Responding to an earlier speaker): Can I say a few words? Yeah, okay, I've got 15 minutes, right? Trump Derangement Syndrome is actually something created by Trump to demean the people who are saying, "Trump, you are mad." Which he is. He is the most dangerous politician to arrive on our shores or on our planet for a long, long time. He doesn't care about the American people. He only cares about power. He will go into Greenland by force. That is what he has said. To ignore the fact that he has actually said that—"I'm going to take it one way or another"—okay? And then so he will... he will, he will go in. He No, he will go in. He will go in militarily. He's... you know, I mean, when he was re-elected, I became very, very worried immediately. And I said it in these meetings that, you know, he... he will not step down. He will find a reason to continue in power. He will create his ICE agents are basically the Gestapo running around America, and they're going to get worse. They ain't going to get better. Most Americans are embarrassed by their president. There's never been anything like it. He is a danger. We do not appease people like that. You stand up to people like that. I mean, European politicians are in a very, very difficult situation because they know that politically, economically, it's difficult. For me, I think the only way that we can do it is by citizens of Europe boycotting American goods and services. And it has an economic impact, a soft economic impact on the Americans. I... The anyway, the earlier speaker, sorry, what would you like to say?

An earlier speaker (Interjection): So we should all boycott the Google and Internet search engines, Bing, Tech, Meta, etc.?

Chair/The Speaker: Okay, that's a very good point. Okay? Internet effectively? No, I'm not... I'm not saying that. Okay, I'm just about if I can respond. Yeah, okay, yes, I understand. It's very difficult to boycott Amazon, Google, whatever, but people can do things. You know, even if you go to a local supermarket and you see a product that is made in the USA versus a product that's made somewhere else, you can... you can make that decision.

Chair: You got five to 10 seconds.

An earlier speaker (Interjection): Can I ask you, or either speaker, what is it we haven't yet talked about... what the off-ramp is? What is the off-ramp we provide to Trump?

Chair: I think someone touched on it. Okay, all right, okay, well, my time is up, right? Anybody else like to come up? No, okay, it's just gone eight o'clock. The speaker, sorry. Are there a couple of one minute... three minutes, three minutes for each of the guys, okay? And so we... the opposer, I think you've got three minutes first as the opposer.

The Opposer (Summation): Thank you for your contributions. Fascinating topic, really. I mean, we could have like 25 different debates now. Look, so the Opposition isn't advocating not responding. We're not advocating succumbing, appeasing him and allowing him to bully us. The Opposition is just saying, look, we're not going to go into a hot war with the Americans, right? The Opposition is saying there are ways to push back against this bully, lunatic. Let's raise it right? You know, there is economic sanctions, right? We can... if he's imposing tariffs on us, we can impose tariffs on him. It's, you know, if they stop buying our goods, we stop buying their

goods, you know, the economy tanks. It's going to be painful, but it's less painful than going to war.

Lots of really good points. I don't even have time to bring them up. I've heard horrific words here. I mean, honestly, nuclear bombing has been mentioned. I mean, a nuclear bombing has been mentioned, right? This idea that it will be contained within the US and Europe is false. It would actually create more flashpoints around the world. You know, if Pandora's box, I think we're opening up here. NATO... we're not really talking about NATO going to war with the US, because there may be some small amount of European countries, right, that will go to war against it, other European countries within NATO, perhaps wouldn't. Turkey, perhaps wouldn't. We may find that Israel is against us. It goes against us in a war against the United States, because their survival depends on the United States. All sorts of Pandora's box is going to be... are going to open up.

The really interesting... I mean, so you understand the position. I want to touch on some really, really interesting points that were raised. The whole idea of opposing American imperialism. We're fighting the good fight. If anyone believes that imperialism ended in 1945, it really didn't. I mean, you can... did it end in '56 Suez? No, right? South Africa was supported until 1994, right? We've had regime change, covert, overt by the CIA, MI6. Right? Go on today. If you lived in the Global South, you don't believe colonialism ended. You still believe that you're subject to it, right? So don't think that we're fighting the good fight. And this idea of international law, the UN, right? And you know, the US has veto power. You know whether Greenland would actually legally become a part of the United States. None of that is guaranteed. The Opposition is saying, calm down, please. Right? There are alternative ways of pushing back against this bully that are as painful. And the Republicans are against it, right? They've been, you know, subdued at the moment, but they are against it. The American people are against it. So, you know, let's not rush into a hot war, which is what's being suggested. Opposition rests.

Chair: Thank you and the proposer, your summary.

The Proposer (Summation): "It is a quarrel in a faraway land between people of whom we know nothing about." Neville Chamberlain, 1938. Why do we care about fighting in Greenland? I think it's also important to finish the debate: this would be a defensive war. You don't fight a defensive war aggressively. So this only happens... conflict only happens if the Americans start shooting. If the American 82nd Airborne Division wants a holiday in Greenland and they leave all their weapons behind, fine, they can do that. It's only if they fight that we fight. So I think that's important to frame it.

Now, in that scenario, should we fight? Now, I am also a male of an age who would probably be conscripted. I would be shit, but I would still do it, because there are principles worth fighting for. The Greenlanders do not want to join America, and for good reason. They have Danish healthcare. They will be exchanging that for American healthcare, which I think amounts to aspirin and if you're lucky, Oxycontin. If we do nothing now, nothing... to be let down people of Greenland, but it will show that aggression, and that might is right throughout the world. Conflict

would erupt. There's been this notion that the world would be safer if we did nothing and allow this annexation. That is complete tosh. You must show now that other nation states don't get the idea they can simply invade their neighbours and nothing will happen.

And on the TACO point, this is important. What this war would look like is that British troops are already there in Greenland. If the 82nd Airborne Division starts hurting towards Greenland, guns blazing Trump announced it on Truth Social already, so that you know the invasion is coming shoot down a couple of those Chinook helicopters. Trump immediately has a bloody nose, all on CNN. You have helicopters burning. American soldiers dying. US probably can go, "What the fuck is going on here? I thought this president was for peace, and instead we're fighting the British in Greenland." Immediately, he will have to... he will have to step down. And what are the off-ramps? Just jangle some keys a bit. Let's say like, "Oh, you can have some ExxonMobil oil deal in, you know, the middle of the tundra winter in Greenland." Great. He can say that. "Look, mission accomplished. Give him some Golden Dome saying, well, we could have some military bases there." Fine. He will take that and say, "Look, what a brilliant job I've done," when actually, the sovereignty of Greenland has been secured, and NATO as a principle for its European ally, has also been secured.

Finally, the economic one. We have to fight economically. If we don't, Greenland will be annexed by the Americans, and so the principles that might is right will still be established. Taiwan, next day, will be blockaded by China. The Saudi Arabians cut off the Red Sea and blockade Israel. You need to show that both economically and militarily, aggression is not on. And fighting what is right, protecting Greenland's sovereignty is right. Therefore, vote for the motion. Thank you.

Chair: Okay. Thank you, the proposer. I think we'll now move to the vote.

An earlier speaker (Point of Order): Procedurally, there seems to be... there's a motion on the paper. It seems to be an ad hoc supplementation by our friends here. So I see there are actually two. It's not just one opposition. There's two. So I put it forward that the vote is on as the motion.

Chair: Yeah. Okay. Speaker. I will, I will restate the motion. I will restate the motion for everyone's benefit. This House would fight to ensure Greenland... Greenland's neutrality. Sorry, sovereignty. Okay, all those in favour of the motion. Those in the front... And all those against... Okay and abstentions... Oh, okay, by a vote of 10 to five, the motion is carried.

Analysis of the outcome powered by AI

Analysis of the debate

The debate regarding whether the House would fight to ensure Greenland's sovereignty centred on a hypothetical scenario in 2026 involving a US military annexation of the territory. The Proposition framed the intervention as a moral imperative and a strategic necessity to uphold

the integrity of NATO. They argued that the US action was an unjust war of aggression and that failing to defend a NATO member would signal the end of the alliance, thereby emboldening other global powers like Russia and China. A central pillar of their argument was the 'TACO' hypothesis—Trump Always Chickens Out—suggesting that a show of military strength would cause the US President to retreat rather than engage in a prolonged conflict.

The Opposition urged caution and pragmatism, warning that a 'hot war' between Western allies would be catastrophic for global stability and the global economy. They argued that European militaries lacked the capacity to fight the US and that the West should instead rely on economic sanctions, bond markets and diplomatic prevarication to wait out a one-term presidency.

Drivers of the result

The motion carried. The result was driven primarily by the Proposition's successful invocation of historical parallels regarding appeasement. Multiple speakers from the floor echoed the sentiment that dictators and bullies only respect strength, drawing direct comparisons to the failures of the 1930s. The argument that consistency is required in opposing imperialism—whether Russian, Chinese or American—resonated with the audience, overriding concerns about the practical difficulties of fighting the US military.

Furthermore, the Proposition effectively countered the fear of nuclear escalation by framing the potential conflict as a limited, defensive engagement that would provide the US President with a face-saving 'off-ramp' once resistance was encountered. The House ultimately determined that the long-term geopolitical cost of surrendering Greenland's sovereignty without a fight outweighed the immediate risks of military confrontation.