

TERRITORIAL ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

DOI: 10.15838/ptd.2026.4.144.2

UDC 327(100) | LBC 66.4

© Balatsky E.V.

THE EXPANSIONIST POLICY OF D. TRUMP AND THE RESHAPING OF THE GLOBAL GEOPOLITICAL LANDSCAPE



EVGENY V. BALATSKY

Primakov National Research Institute of World Economy and International Relations
of the Russian Academy of Sciences (IMEMO)

Moscow, Russian Federation

e-mail: EVBalatsky@imemo.ru

ORCID: 0000-0002-3371-2229; ResearcherID: D-8752-2018

At present, the geopolitical landscape is being reshaped and state borders are being redrawn, which is giving rise to fundamentally new decisions by the political leadership of many countries. In the context of this problem, the article examines the possibility of the United States of America maintaining its geopolitical hegemony through the implementation of the Great Unification project, which envisages the accession of three new territories – Greenland, Canada, and Australia. The research shows that this project is virtually the only chance for the United States to restart the capital accumulation cycle within its existing jurisdiction. The paper demonstrates that such an unification would lead to a reconfiguration of the global natural resource market in favor of the United States, securing its undisputed leadership. The notion of a deal, constantly articulated by Trump in his political rhetoric, fits entirely within the historical traditions of the U.S. territorial expansion. A separate examination of the situation with Greenland, Canada, and Australia indicates that these territories have their own vulnerabilities and may therefore be interested in joining the United States, which makes the Great Unification project quite feasible. At the same time, the article emphasizes that the implementation of the said project would require the fulfillment of four conditions that are currently absent: reaching a final consensus among the U.S. political elites regarding the necessity of the Great Unification project; the shift of the U.S. authorities from a destructive to a constructive form of expansionist policy (from coercive methods to

For citation: Balatsky E.V. (2026). The expansionist policy of D. Trump and the reshaping of the global geopolitical landscape. *Problems of Territory's Development*, 30(4), 10–28. DOI: 10.15838/ptd.2026.4.144.2

constructive integration); the return of the country's political elites to civilized diplomacy, which entails taking into account the interests of others, conducting constructive negotiations, demonstrating respect for partners, and being ready to compromise; and Washington's possession of an appropriate conceptual document (plan) with a detailed strategy and tactics for the integration of new territories. The work notes that if these conditions are not met, periodic outbursts of interest among future White House occupants regarding the annexation of new territories will be observed, which will significantly contribute to the overall destabilization of the geopolitical situation. The merging of large territories into unified states may become the main factor of human development over the next 2–3 decades.

Great Unification project, United States of America, geopolitical hegemony, deal.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The article was prepared within the framework of the project of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Russian Federation for 2026 "Global and regional centers of Power in the emerging world order" (075-15-2024-551). The author expresses his gratitude to the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments. The author expresses special gratitude to V.A. Volkonsky for his valuable advice on improving the manuscript of the article.

Introduction: New policy in new conditions

The arrival of U.S. President Donald Trump on the global political stage marked the beginning of an entirely new phase of expansionism – one that entails redrawing established borders through the enlargement of U.S. territory. Suffice it to recall that Trump first floated the idea of annexing Greenland during his first presidential term, with his administration actively working on the plan, and in 2019 the head of the White House openly expressed interest in purchasing the island¹. America's interest is believed to have been triggered by China's attempt in 2018 to buy a local airport (Gricius, 2025). In 2020, Trump's White House aides and specialists from the U.S. Treasury Department examined the proposed purchase in greater detail and assessed the financial resources it would require. That same

year, according to Miles Taylor, a former official at the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, the U.S. President inquired about the possibility of exchanging Puerto Rico for Greenland; and in 2024, during his second term, he stated that it was "absolutely necessary" for the United States to acquire Greenland². In 2026, at the World Economic Forum in Davos, Donald Trump expressed his willingness to pay for the island, and according to the *Daily Mail*, he considered offering every resident of Greenland one million dollars if they voted for its accession to the United States³. Some time later, members of Trump's team began to speak out on the Greenland issue as well. For example, Elon Musk addressed the future U.S. ambassador to Denmark, Ken Howery, with the words: "Help America get Greenland!"⁴ All this attests to the seriousness of the global hegemon's claims to the world's largest island.

¹ NYP: Trump was interested in purchasing Greenland during his first term. RIA Novosti. Available at: <https://ria.ru/20241225/grenlandiya-1991119838.html?ysclid=mlfcym9oie690978651>

² Trump again declared that the United States needs to acquire Greenland. RIA Novosti. Available at: <https://ria.ru/20241223/trump-1990764727.html>

³ Daily Mail: Trump may offer Greenlanders \$1 million each for joining the United States. Kommersant. Available at: <https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/8364270>

⁴ The president is absolutely serious." Why did Donald Trump decide to annex Greenland and Canada to the United States, and how might it end? Lenta.ru. Available at: <https://lenta.ru/articles/2025/01/10/trump-the-new-coqueror/?ysclid=mlfd1i0v1v460994510>

Yet Trump's appetites were not confined to the northern island. Soon came announcements of the swift return of the Panama Canal to American ownership, as well as proposals for Canada and Mexico to join the United States. Even during his second inauguration, Trump pointedly referred to Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau as "Governor of the great state of Canada" and treated the country itself unconditionally as the 51st U.S. state. Moreover, according to Trump, he is doing this for the good of Canadians themselves: "Many Canadians want Canada to become the 51st state of the United States... I think it's a great idea. 51st state!"⁵.

No less significant is the creation, in 2021, of the AUKUS military partnership between Australia, the United States, and the United Kingdom. It gives Australia access to American nuclear submarine technology and, in effect, binds Canberra tightly to Washington's strategic course for decades to come (Laurenceson, 2025).

Yet even these moves do not exhaust the innovative imperatives of the Trump administration. The current year, 2026, has brought new forms of U.S. activism on the international stage. In January 2026, Venezuelan President Nicolás Maduro was abducted by U.S. intelligence services and is to face trial in an American court on charges of narco-terrorism, while his person has been replaced by the puppet figure of Delcy Rodríguez. The following month, the United States and Israel launched a joint operation to bomb Iran and eliminated a significant part

of the country's senior political leadership. Also in January 2026, the American president declared an oil blockade against Cuba, and in February he clarified that he planned to "blow up" the island nation, since its authorities are already "hanging by a thread"⁶.

These events are being actively discussed both in the media and in academic publications. Analysts' opinions range widely: some believe that Trump's rhetoric and its external chaos betray the absence of a coherent policy⁷, while others regard it as a natural element of strategy (Koretskaya, 2017; Alekseev, 2017). Some, however, take his promises very seriously⁸.

There is apparently an objective basis for the contradictory nature of Trump's policy, but the new vector he has set in international relations demands the closest attention. Two lines of Trump's expansionist policy have now emerged quite clearly – *a constructive one* and *a destructive one*. The first involves expanding U.S. borders through the formal incorporation of new territories (Canada, Greenland, etc.), while the second entails strengthening America's positions in various regions by bringing the governments of the relevant countries under control and overthrowing undesirable regimes (Cuba, Iran, Venezuela, etc.). Tellingly, the position of the U.S. authorities on these issues is announced openly, not hidden – which can be regarded as a new trend in the country's state governance. None of these changes is accidental, and the foreign policy imperatives that Trump articulates should not be dismissed as rhetorical bravado. Accordingly, the aim of this article is to examine the prerequisites and possibilities for Washington's implementation

⁵ The president is absolutely serious." Why did Donald Trump decide to annex Greenland and Canada to the United States, and how might it end? Lenta.ru. Available at: <https://lenta.ru/articles/2025/01/10/trump-the-new-coqueror/?yscl=mlfd1i0v1v460994510>

⁶ Will Cuba become "the next Iran": Trump's plans and prospects. Mail: news. Available at: <https://news.mail.ru/politics/70430869/>

⁷ Making it in 24 hours: Western press begins tallying Trump's chaotic "feats." Moskovsky Komsomolets. Available at: <https://www.mk.ru/politics/2026/04/23/uspets-za-24-chasa-zapadnaya-pressa-nachala-podschyot-khaotichnykh-podvigov-trampa.html>

⁸ I said so! The most scandalous statements by U.S. President Donald Trump. Ren.TV. Available at: <https://ren.tv/longread/1338500-ia-skazal-samy-skandalnye-zaiavleniya-prezidenta-ssha-donald-trampa>

of a new phase of foreign policy expansion, as well as the geopolitical configuration that may emerge as a result of such a policy.

To make the aim more concrete, let us consider three territories that could be united with the U.S.: Greenland, Canada, and Australia. For a constructive examination of this new geopolitical configuration, it makes sense to assess three problematic aspects: the expediency and justification of the planned expansion for the United States itself; the feasibility of the stated objectives; and the likelihood and conditions of such a large-scale transformation.

The Grand Unification project

Here and below, we shall refer to Trump's project under the conventional title of the "Grand Unification" (GU), which involves the accession to the United States of three territories: Canada, Australia, and Greenland. As noted above, Canada and Greenland have repeatedly been named in Trump's rhetoric as targets of geopolitical unification, while Australia, by virtue of its close military integration with the United States, already lies in the mainstream of such integrationist policy.

It may seem that Washington's geopolitical ambitions on this scale are entirely unfounded and even largely irrational. Yet, as will be shown below, this is not entirely the case. The idea of the GU project did not emerge by chance: it is fully in line with the policy of maintaining America's global hegemony. At the same time, one cannot fail to see in the project a shift to a fundamentally new political stance. Whereas the United States, as a global empire, previously contented itself with the shadow control of various territories around the world, the country's administration now seeks to legitimize its claims to strategically important stretches of land and ocean. This is not, of course, about abandoning shadow control in favor of an official unified jurisdiction; rather, the two strategic lines are now beginning to be pursued simultaneously.

Below, we examine the underlying logic of the GU project. To that end, we identify its geopolitical, geo-economic, and historical preconditions.

Geopolitical preconditions of the Grand Unification

Understanding the present position of the United States brings us to the concept of cycles of accumulation developed by Giovanni Arrighi. According to his classification, the United States is the hegemon of the fourth global cycle of capital accumulation, which is gradually being succeeded by a fifth, centered in China (Arrighi, 2006). The logic of succession of world capital centers (Genoa + Venice, the Netherlands, Great Britain, and the United States) leaves the old hegemon, the United States, almost no chance of holding on to its positions. The gradual displacement of American players from the world market by the Chinese serves as a vivid confirmation of this. At the same time, the outgoing hegemon never gives up its positions without a fight. In this connection, Trump's first presidential term involved an open attempt to *restart* the cycle of capital accumulation within the previous geographic jurisdiction and thereby preserve the privileged position of the United States (Balatsky, 2018). Trump is pursuing the same objective in his second presidential term, but his new strategy differs from the initial one.

Let me note at the outset an extremely important point made by Arrighi: "Every center of capital internalizes (takes on) the costs of providing certain functions – protecting its markets, producing goods, ensuring exchange operations, and its own reproduction" (Arrighi, 2009). In his view, this last function – reproduction – has not yet been mastered by any center. Moreover, the very possibility of "conserving" the world hegemon remains an open question. Trump, in effect, took it upon himself to ensure the *reproduction* of the world

capital center represented by the United States for an indefinitely long period. It cannot be ruled out that this was a utopian idea from the very outset, yet that does not diminish the efforts the American administration has made toward this end.

No less interesting is Arrighi's distinction between the *external* and *internal* territorialism of a world capital center. The former is aimed at expanding beyond the center, the latter at the market within the borders of the leading state (Arrighi, 2006). In this context, it is easy to see that Trump's first presidential term was directed at implementing internal territorialism by bringing high-tech production back to the United States and revitalizing the national economy. For various reasons, this policy failed. In his second term, Trump proclaimed a shift to external territorialism through the incorporation of additional territories into the United States. So far, this policy has likewise not been adequately realized, but the very fact that the Trump administration is searching for new paths and attempting two large-scale institutional experiments is symptomatic.

The foregoing demonstrates that Washington neither wishes nor is able to surrender its privileged position, and is therefore compelled to try every available means to maintain its dominance. The GU project fits squarely into this logic and, if successfully implemented, could at least temporarily prolong U.S. hegemony.

Geo-economic preconditions of the Grand Unification

Another war for the planet's natural resources is currently unfolding. In this respect, the United States, despite its natural wealth, needs additional resource inputs. Incorporating new territories offers a solution to this problem. At present, in terms of land area, the United States ranks behind not only Russia but also China, while China's population is 4.1 times larger than that of the current hegemon. The GU project could rectify this state of affairs. Calculations show that its implementation would make the "renewed" United States the world's absolute leader in territory, exceeding Russia by a factor of 1.7 and surpassing the combined territory of Russia and China by 7 percent (*Tab. 1*). Such an advantage is undoubtedly strategic, significantly improving America's chances of retaining hegemony.

The population increase that the GU project would bring to the United States is not particularly striking, but it cannot be ignored either. In the new configuration, China's population advantage would shrink from 4.1 to 3.4 times. Though not decisive, this demographic gain would give the United States an additional edge in defending its leading positions.

More important, the GU project would give the United States not merely an arithmetical advantage in territory but outright leadership in available natural resources. According to the portal *24/7 Wall St.*, Russia tops the ranking

Table 1. Territory and population of the world's largest countries (as of 2026)

Country	Territory, million km ²	Population, million people
Russia	17.260	146.2
United States	9.147	341.2
China	9.597	1404.9
GU project (USA + Canada + Australia + Greenland)	28.757	409.3
Compiled from: Countries of the world by area. Fandom. Available at: https://geography.fandom.com/ru/wiki/Страны_мира_по_размеру ; List of states and dependent territories by population. Wikipedia. Available at: https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Список_государств_и_зависимых_территорий_по_населению?ysclid=mpicvy1r4w873109473		

of the ten countries with the richest resource endowments by a wide margin (*Tab. 2*). The Grand Unification, however, would give the United States an absolute superiority over its main competitors. The GU bloc's natural resource reserves would exceed Russia's by almost 30 percent and would be nearly equal to those of Russia and China combined; with Greenland, which was not included in the calculations, this advantage would be even greater.

Beyond the general balance of forces shown in Tables 1 and 2, the GU project also promises other strategic geo-economic benefits. Above all, this concerns the coming redistribution of the Arctic and the Arctic Ocean shelf. The Arctic is melting, becoming more open to navigation and colonization, and the potential of its subsoil is estimated at hundreds of trillions of dollars. The northern countries are already contending for Arctic resources, and the GU project carries considerable weight in this struggle. At present, Russia claims roughly half of the Arctic, while the United States, through Alaska, claims only about

10 percent. The incorporation of Greenland alone would raise the U.S. presence in the Arctic region to one third, and together with Canada, the United States could lay claim to nearly half of the Arctic's riches⁹. Furthermore, according to the U.S. government, Greenland produces 43 of the 50 minerals classified as strategic and critical to the American economy. Gabriella Gricius points out that the United States is currently 100 percent dependent on imports for 12 critical minerals and 50 percent dependent on imports for another 29 elements; Greenland possesses many of these, which is why acquiring the island can be seen as a way of reducing the hegemon's dependence on imports from China¹⁰. The ongoing melting of glaciers also opens up additional opportunities for drilling oil and gas wells and extracting ore minerals. Global warming likewise creates new prospects for world shipping and trade, in which the United States is prepared to participate actively¹¹.

Nor should the military significance of Greenland be overlooked. During the Cold War, the island was already important to the

Table 2. Natural resource reserves by country, 2021

Country	Reserves, trillion USD	Relative to Russia, %
Russia	75.7	100.0
United States	45.0	59.4
Saudi Arabia	34.4	45.3
Canada	33.2	43.9
Iran	27.3	36.0
China	23.0	30.4
Brazil	21.8	28.9
Australia	19.9	26.3
Iraq	15.9	21.0
Venezuela	14.3	18.9
GU project (USA + Canada + Australia)	98.1	129.6
Compiled from: The world's most resource rich countries. 24/7 Wall St. Available at: https://247wallst.com/special-report/2012/04/18/the-worlds-most-resource-rich-countries/		

⁹ What is Trump really up to: Is the United States ready to go to war with its neighbors? Ferra.ru. Available at: <https://www.ferra.ru/review/techlife/trump-wants-greenland-and-canada.htm>

¹⁰ By stoking the Greenland debate, is the United States actually harming itself? Eurekalert! Available at: <https://www.eurekalert.org/news-releases/1113269>

¹¹ "If he annexes Canada, why can't we have the Baltics?": Has Trump begun an overseas expansion? BiznesOnline. Available at: <https://www.business-gazeta.ru/article/659409?ysclid=mlfe9r8uvh875465872>

United States as a key location for tracking ballistic missiles that could potentially reach the American homeland from the USSR. In a statement on January 14, 2026, Trump stressed that acquiring Greenland would be decisive for the “Golden Dome” – the proposed missile defense system that the United States wants to use to intercept missiles launched from space. The Greenland–Iceland–United Kingdom gap is also of central importance for maritime surveillance, since it blocks Russian submarines and naval forces from access to the North Atlantic¹².

As for Australia, its incorporation is important in the context of the global confrontation with China. The point is that recent decades have witnessed the active Sinicization of Australia: the Chinese community there is one of the largest in the world in per capita terms and the largest outside Asia. Mandarin Chinese is the second most widely spoken language in Australia¹³. If this process continues, the continent will, in the foreseeable future, turn into something of a Chinese province, with all the consequences that this entails. Some experts already speak openly of the prospect that “the Chinese will build a second China in Australia”, including by transferring part of their military potential there¹⁴. Clearly, such an expansion of China’s influence – and the emergence of a China + Australia bloc – would make any further U.S. struggle to retain hegemony impossible. This is why a silent contest for the continent is now unfolding between the two superpowers, the United States and China. Given these

circumstances, Washington must erect an official barrier to Australia’s further Sinicization.

The geo-economic aspects of the GU project considered above not only fit squarely into the logic of U.S. domination but render it almost devoid of alternatives. Otherwise, America will lack the resources needed to preserve its global privileges.

Historical preconditions of the Grand Unification

The U.S. took shape as a state in a highly distinctive manner, steadily enlarging itself through the acquisition of additional lands. Though the history of these purchases is well known, let us briefly recall its main milestones¹⁵:

1. 1803 (President Thomas Jefferson) – purchase of the Louisiana Territory from France, covering more than 2.1 million km², for 15 million dollars;
2. 1819 (President James Monroe) – purchase of Florida from Spain for 5.5 million dollars;
3. 1848 (President James K. Polk) – acquisition, following the Mexican–American War, of more than half of Mexico’s territory, 1.4 million km², for compensation of 15 million dollars;
4. 1854 (President Franklin Pierce) – purchase of 120,000 km² of territory from Mexico for 10 million dollars;
5. 1867 (President Andrew Johnson) – purchase of Alaska from Russia, an area of 1.7 million km², for 7.2 million dollars;
6. 1898 (President William McKinley) – acquisition of the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and Guam following the Spanish–American War

¹² By stoking the Greenland debate, is the United States actually harming itself? EurekAlert! Available at: <https://www.eurekalert.org/news-releases/1113269>

¹³ The Chinese diasporas of the United States and Canada and the “new” Chinese migration. Zapadnaya Rus. Available at: <https://zapadrus.su/rusmir/istf/132-konferentsii/2019.html>

¹⁴ Andrei Shkolnikov: “The Chinese will build a second China in Australia.” Novye izvestiya. Available at: https://newizv.ru/news/2023-03-04/andrey-shkolnikov-kitaytsy-budut-sozdavat-v-avstralii-vtoroy-kitay-399653?utm_source=sozero.livejournal.com&utm_medium=referral&utm_campaign=sozero.livejournal.com&utm_referrer=sozero.livejournal.com

¹⁵ “The president is absolutely serious”. Why did Donald Trump decide to annex Greenland and Canada to the United States, and how might it end? Lenta.ru. Available at: <https://lenta.ru/articles/2025/01/10/trump-the-new-coqueror/?yscl=id=mlfd1i0v1v460994510>

for 20 million dollars (in 1946 the Philippines gained independence; Puerto Rico and Guam remain unincorporated organized territories of the United States);

7. 1898 (President William McKinley) – annexation of the Hawaiian Islands (in 1893 Americans organized a coup d'état in Hawaii; in 1894 the puppet Republic of Hawaii was proclaimed and annexed four years later; in 1900 Hawaii became a self-governing territory, and in 1959 it was declared the fiftieth state of the United States);

8. 1903 (President Theodore Roosevelt) – acquisition of the Panama Canal Zone for 10 million dollars and the Guantánamo Bay base in Cuba for 3.4 thousand dollars (the Panama Canal was returned to Panamanian jurisdiction in 1999; Guantánamo remains under U.S. control);

9. 1917 (President Woodrow Wilson) – purchase of the Virgin Islands from Denmark for 25 million dollars (the Virgin Islands hold the status of an unincorporated organized territory of the United States).

As for Greenland, experts recall that the United States declared its intention to purchase the island in 1867, 1910, 1946, and 1955, and that President Trump raised the idea once again in 2019 and 2025¹⁶. In the 1860s, President Andrew Johnson, under whom Alaska was acquired, wanted to buy the island from Denmark, and in 1946 President Harry Truman even offered Copenhagen 100 million dollars for the transfer of Greenland to Washington¹⁷.

The United States also had its own designs on Canada. In 1775, during the American War of Independence, American revolutionaries

invaded Quebec but were defeated. Several unsuccessful attempts to seize the territory of present-day Canada were also made during the Anglo-American War of 1812–1815. Calls for the annexation of the British North American colonies continued during the Civil War of 1861–1865, and in 1867 the threat of American invasion became one of the reasons for the creation of the Dominion of Canada and the emergence of a new state. The American military command returned to the idea of invading its northern neighbors in the 1920s and 1930s, when it drafted War Plan Red for a possible armed conflict with the British Empire; although the document was hypothetical and never approved by Congress, the very fact that such an initiative emerged is symptomatic¹⁸.

All these facts make it abundantly clear that the United States has long maintained a stable tradition of territorial transactions to expand its borders, actively employing money, bribery of officials, and military force. American authorities have skillfully exploited historical moments when other states were weakened to strip them of territory. In many cases, money served as diplomatic cover for aggression. The incorporation of Mexican lands, for example, rested on Mexico's military defeat, but monetary compensation lent the deal a veneer of civilized legitimacy. The U.S. authorities also displayed strategic vision, prepared to stay the course long after the initial campaign. Much the same logic governed the Hawaiian Islands, which remained a self-governing territory for almost sixty years and were granted statehood only when nothing any longer stood in the way.

¹⁶ By stoking the Greenland debate, is the United States actually harming itself? EurekAlert! Available at: <https://www.eurekalert.org/news-releases/1113269>

¹⁷ Donald Trump's Western Hemisphere has become more active. Kommersant. Available at: <https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/7422780?ysclid=mlfdppz6a2864986830>

¹⁸ How realistic is Canada's accession to the United States? Trump proposes making the neighboring country the 51st state, and some Canadians are not opposed. RBC. Available at: <https://www.rbc.ru/politics/02/02/2025/679d15419a7947932cb1bfdd?ysclid=mlfdw19r6z878538247>

Combining the instruments at their disposal, the U.S. authorities are fully capable of carrying out another round of jurisdictional expansion. In this respect, Trump's policy by no means contradicts the American tradition; on the contrary, it fits squarely within it. As analysts note, Trump's initiatives are not his "personal invention" but a "new edition" of long-standing American interests (Myagkov, 2025). Even today, the United States can still offer the countries being absorbed certain inducements that would facilitate the peaceful entry of large territories into its fold. The gains from the GU project are likely to outweigh its costs.

But how feasible is the GU project? Let us consider this question separately for each territory.

The absorption of Greenland: *Pro et contra*

The United States' choice of Greenland as a target for incorporation is far from accidental. A number of circumstances, in one way or another, make this plan easier to implement. Let us enumerate them.

First, geographically speaking, Greenland is situated in North America, but by historical convention it belongs to Western Europe, being part of the Kingdom of Denmark (Myagkov, 2025). This fact may seem trivial, yet at a certain moment it could prove decisive and exert a tangible influence on political decisions. The logic of nature and planetary configuration favors Greenland's integration with North America rather than with Europe, and the United States can play on this, using geography to its own advantage. Pressure from the American establishment will only mount because of the island's strategic dimension: controlling Greenland makes it possible, in due course, to raise the question of ownership of and access to the hydrocarbon reserves on the Arctic shelf (Myagkov, 2025).

Second, Greenland has assumed an ambiguous position in its foreign policy. On the one hand, it seeks greater autonomy and separation from mainland Denmark and has been strengthening cooperation with Canada and the United States; on the other, it does not force the process because of its financial dependence on the central authorities (Belukhin, 2024). This creates the basis for a step-by-step absorption of Greenland by the United States. For example, as a first step, the island could gain full political autonomy thanks to economic assistance from the hegemon; as a second, it could obtain the status of a self-governing territory under U.S. patronage; as a third, it could become an unincorporated organized territory of the United States; and as a fourth, it could achieve full statehood. Washington has ample room to exploit Greenland's economic dependence.

Third, the island's geographical position is of military significance, enabling control over the entire polar Arctic zone and the transit routes passing through it (Myagkov, 2025). The United States currently operates 17 military bases in Greenland, which gives it unprecedented leverage for coercive pressure on the island's leadership. Bringing Greenland under U.S. jurisdiction would allow Washington to strengthen its military posture against Russia by controlling Arctic airspace and Russia's Arctic coastline. For the Russian Federation, this would constitute an additional challenge – and that very fact would itself impel the U.S. authorities to push ahead with the project.

Fourth, the island's resource wealth has independent significance and serves as a source of attraction for many countries. Deposits of precious metals (gold, silver, platinum) and rare stones (diamonds, rubies, and the unique stone tugtupite) have been discovered on the island. According to expert estimates, Greenland's oil reserves account for 13% of the

world's undiscovered reserves, and its natural gas reserves for 30%, with more than 80% of hydrocarbon resources lying on the island's shelf. U.S. strategic interest in Greenland is also linked to its abundant freshwater reserves: the total volume of Greenland's glaciers is about 2.85 million km³ of ice, equivalent to 10% of the world's freshwater reserves. The importance of water as a vital resource will only grow, and the United States simply cannot afford to relinquish control over such a market. These circumstances are compounded by global warming, which is especially pronounced in polar latitudes: the island's ice sheet is shrinking by nearly 245 billion tons annually due to melting, opening new prospects for the commercial exploitation of its subsoil (Myagkov, 2025).

Fifth, Greenland's natural resources are of fundamental importance for global competition. The deeper reason for U.S. interest in the island's natural wealth is believed to lie in its rich deposits of rare-earth metals: lithium, niobium, thorium, zirconium, tantalum, beryllium, yttrium, and others. Their total volume is estimated at 38.5 million tons, or about 30% of the world total, placing Greenland second in the world after China in terms of reserves (Myagkov, 2025). The significance of rare-earth metals stems from their growing use in various high-tech innovative industries – from advanced machine building and metallurgy to the nuclear and aerospace industries, the military-industrial complex, the production of electronic equipment and optical communication devices, chemical manufacturing, and household appliances. China is the leading supplier of rare-earth metals to the global and U.S. markets, accounting for up to 70%. This makes the United States dependent on China and

threatens future technological backwardness. Gaining control over Greenland's resources would allow the hegemon to reshape the high-tech market in its favor, ruling out passive contemplation of potential integration opportunities. Moreover, the United States has already taken steps to push China out of Greenland, though given the island's orientation toward external autonomy, this situation could change at any moment.

Sixth, Denmark is currently the weak link among the Nordic countries and is incapable of resisting U.S. pressure. The American administration no longer regards Denmark as a worthy ally in the Arctic zone, unlike, say, Norway. Analysts note that this is precisely what triggered the U.S. claims to Greenland, whereas Trump has never voiced any claims to Norway's Svalbard¹⁹ (Belukhin, 2025). Compared with Norway, Denmark suffers from excessive bureaucracy in all its decision-making, a lack of follow-through, and insufficient funding to meet its commitments. Under these conditions, Denmark has no political trump cards with which to defend its priority over Greenland.

Seventh, a great many contradictions and conflicts have accumulated between mainland Denmark and Greenland. There is no point in enumerating all the clashes between the two territories; let us cite just a few:

- the question of adequate political representation for Greenland in defending its interests in the Arctic, particularly within the Arctic Council;
- the Greenlanders' demands for more active participation in ensuring the island's security;
- the demand for equality between Danish and Greenlandic, and the central government's chronic inability to build

¹⁹ Belukhin N.E. (2025). The Greenland mirror of American interests. Russian International Affairs Council. Available at: <https://russiancouncil.ru/analytics-and-comments/analytics/nikita-belukhin-grenlandskoe-zerkalo-amerikanskikh-interesov/>

simultaneous-interpretation infrastructure (Belukhin, 2025);

– conflicts caused by the juvenile justice system: in 2022, based on testing of parents, 5.6% of children of Greenlandic origin were removed from their families and placed under guardianship, compared with 1% among Danes²⁰.

All this increases the chances that the United States will detach Greenland from Denmark. At the same time, the central government's response has been primarily humanitarian in nature, focused on Greenland's sustainable development, green energy, and support for indigenous peoples, while balancing external pressure and alliance commitments (Grinyaev, Zhuravel, 2025). Clearly, such a passive policy cannot stop the United States.

A few further points may be added to the picture.

First, English serves as the second (working) language among the Scandinavian population, and nearly everyone speaks it quite well. In this respect, moving into an English-speaking jurisdiction would be far less painful for Greenlanders than one might assume. The islanders are likely to have even fewer problems with English than with Danish.

Second, the mooted American payments of one million dollars per head to Greenland's residents are an extremely powerful argument. For a population of 55,600, this would represent a colossal leap in prosperity, whereas for the United States the required sum would equal just one percent of the 2025 federal budget revenues (5.24 trillion dollars)²¹. Such "buying off" of the population could tip the scales in favor of the island's voluntary accession to the United States.

Third, the United States has the means to resolve many of the long-standing and

vexing problems of Greenland's residents – for example, ensuring comprehensive internet coverage across the island. With equipment supplied by SpaceX, the quality of mobile communications for the islanders could be substantially improved.

The facts considered above indicate that the United States has every opportunity to incorporate Greenland. The only questions are how long this will take, at what cost, and in what form.

The absorption of Canada: *Pro et contra*

The second country to feature in Trump's rhetoric as a candidate for incorporation into the United States is Canada. Despite the seeming impossibility of this project, several circumstances work in its favor. Let us briefly consider some of them.

First, the United States and Canada have already achieved an unprecedented degree of political and economic integration. John McDougall, for example, rightly argues that Canada participates in the political agenda "by default" (McDougall, 2020). This entails the forced harmonization of Canadian and U.S. policies, which calls Canadian independence into question in many areas. Moreover, the existing dependence of the Canadian economy on that of the United States drives ever closer cooperation between the two countries (Filina, 2022).

Second, the United States and Canada have synchronized their collective security institutions and their regulation, and maintain extremely close cooperation in this area – intelligence sharing, border security, law enforcement, and counterterrorism. Experts emphasize that this synchronization

²⁰ Danish authorities took a newborn baby from a Greenlandic mother immediately after birth. Rossiyskaya Gazeta. Available at: https://rg.ru/2025/08/25/vlasti-danii-otobrali-mladenca-u-materi-grenlandki-srazu-posle-rodov.html?ysclid=mppu4hdtpv891236949&utm_referrer=https%3A%2F%2Fya.ru%2F

²¹ On the U.S. budget for fiscal year 2025: The deficit exceeded 25%. EurAsia Daily. Available at: <https://easaily.com/ru/news/2025/10/27/o-byudzhete-ssha-za-2025-y-finansovyy-god-deficit-sostavil-bolee-25>

rests on shared institutions, identity, and interests (Khlopov, 2022). Such a configuration of the collective security system can evolve in only one direction: deeper integration.

Third, the United States and Canada have developed exceptionally close scientific ties, which at present can hardly be severed and could, on the contrary, be further deepened. As an editorial in the authoritative journal *Science* puts it, the United States is Canada's principal scientific partner. According to the Canadian bibliometric database *Web of Science*, over the past five years 27% of all Canadian scientific publications were co-authored with American colleagues. Large-scale cooperation programs and joint research projects are also underway in such critical fields as the Great Lakes, the Arctic, space, healthcare, climate monitoring, artificial intelligence, subatomic physics, and data sharing (Quirion, 2025).

Fourth, Canadian public sentiment on possible integration into the United States cannot be described as unequivocal. According to a 2025 Ipsos poll, 30% of Canadians would vote for their country to join the United States if Washington guaranteed them American citizenship and the conversion of their savings into U.S. dollars; in the 18–34 age group, the figure reaches 43%. Notably, 21% of respondents believe that the unification of Canada and the United States into a single state is only a matter of time²².

Fifth, the unification of the two countries presents no language problem, since English is used in both. The presence of a French-speaking minority in Canada periodically makes itself felt but does not lead to sustained separatist sentiment.

All of this makes it abundantly clear that the preconditions for U.S.–Canadian unification exist, and the only question is how comfortable a particular model of integration would prove.

The absorption of Australia: *Pro et contra*

Although President Trump has never commented on Australia, it is precisely this country that is in urgent need of transformation and, perhaps, even integration with the United States. It is worth recalling that Huntington already classified Australia as a torn country (Huntington, 2024). This “rift” became most clearly apparent as far back as the early 1990s, when Australia's political leaders decided that their country should “redefine itself” – leave the West and become an Asian society. This stance took the form of the so-called Keating – Evans choice, a term introduced into scholarly discourse by Huntington and named after its architects: Paul Keating, then Prime Minister of Australia, and Gareth Evans, the foreign minister at the time. The choice entailed a policy course aimed at Australia's merger with Asia.

This historical curiosity shows that by the end of the 20th century the Australian population had already lost its sense of self-identification. Unsurprisingly, Australians with a distinctly Western mindset cannot assimilate into Asian culture overnight. As a result, the country found itself between Scylla and Charybdis: on the one hand, in Paul Keating's words, it remained “an outpost of the empire”; on the other, in Lee Kuan Yew's phrase, it had become “the new white trash of Asia” (Huntington, 2024). Over the past thirty years, Australia's internal split has only widened. The country's Asian orientation and China's successes have led to a partial erosion of the continent's loyalty to its strategic partner, the United States. Canberra believes that the era of U.S. primacy is over and the region has become

²² How realistic is Canada's accession to the United States? Trump proposes making the neighboring country the 51st state, and some Canadians are not opposed. RBC. Available at: <https://www.rbc.ru/politics/02/02/2025/679d15419a7947932cb1bfdd?ysclid=mlfdw19r6z878538247>

multipolar, with deeper economic integration with China contributing not only to domestic and regional prosperity but also to stability and security (Laurenceson, 2025).

There are currently no exact statistics on the number of ethnic Chinese in Australia. According to available data, by 2016 they numbered 1.2 million, corresponding to 5% of the country's population (Katkova, 2018). More recent estimates put the figure at 7% by 2026, while the share of all residents from Asian countries stands at 30%²³. Given that these are minimal estimates against the backdrop of the government's abandonment of the "White Australia" policy, the true scale of the continent's Sinicization could well be several times greater, making Australia's shift under China's patronage entirely realistic in the foreseeable future. Already today, the largest ethnic groups drawn into immigration-related conflict are Italians, Chinese, and Indians, all of which have experienced rapid population growth in recent years²⁴. These facts carry strategic risks for the United States, which will therefore be forced to respond to the emerging situation.

To better grasp the strategic gains from competing U.S. and Chinese unions with Australia, let us turn to *Table 3*.

Clearly, if the United States were to lose Australia and China were to seize the integration initiative, the hegemon's position would become truly precarious. A China + Australia union would be almost twice as large

as the United States in territory, 4.2 times larger in population, and roughly equal in natural resource endowments. If, on the other hand, the United States managed to absorb Australia, China would still outnumber the new union 3.8 times in population but would fall behind by factors of 1.8 and 2.8 in territory and resource reserves, respectively. The conclusion is simple: whoever succeeds in incorporating Australia – or drawing it firmly into their sphere of influence – will be the global leader in the decades ahead.

As for the realism of bringing the island continent into the United States, the facts reviewed above suggest that the project is by no means utopian. Several points stand out.

The first is psychological and cultural. Possessing a Western mindset, the Australian population has spent three decades unable to resolve its cultural identity. Situated far from the main centers of a weakening West, the country is being pulled ever deeper into the orbit of a rising Asia, above all China. Integration with the United States would put an end to this ambiguity. If accompanied by intensified mutual investment flows, the benefits for Australia would be plain, while contacts with Asia would not have to be severed.

The second is linguistic. The United States and Australia are both English-speaking countries, and their union would cause no cultural shock to either population.

Table 3. Parameters of the proposed territorial unions

Country	Territory, million km ²	Population, million people	Natural resource reserves, trillion USD
United States	9.1	341.2	45.0
China	9.6	1404.9	23.0
United States + Australia	16.8	368.4	64.0
China + Australia	17.3	1432.1	42.9
Compiled from data in Tables 1 and 2.			

²³ Behind the Poetic Words: The End of the Earth (Part II). Wen Wei Po. Available at: <https://www.wenweipo.com/a/202602/03/AP6981046ee4b04d7d56d187f3.html>

²⁴ Ibidem.

The third is military. Through membership in the AUKUS bloc, Australia has quietly become a nuclear-capable power. This turns the continent into America's forward base in the Southern Hemisphere, which under no circumstances can be ceded to China, its geopolitical rival.

The fourth is economic. Australia is an extremely peculiar geographical formation with a rather fragile ecology (Diamond, 2023). This necessitates a mass of mega-projects on the continent. Australia, for example, sets records in building giant desalination plants²⁵, undertakes large projects for the construction of airports, highways, and rail lines, including rail and road tunnels under the harbor with high-speed driverless trains²⁶. The country has become a leader in shale gas extraction and the LNG market (Pogosyan, 2020). It is also developing the marine sector as a growth driver by harnessing wave and tidal energy and building a "blue economy" on this basis (Sharygina, 2021). All of this creates a vast market for U.S. technology and investment.

The foregoing suggests that Washington has real opportunities to absorb Australia. The only question is how effectively and delicately this will be accomplished.

Discussion of results

A decade ago, the GU project would have been considered as pure fantasy. Yet amid the reshaping of the old world order, it now appears as perhaps the only worthy response the United States can offer to China's rise. According to IMF data, China's GDP first exceeded that of

the United States by 2.2% in 2016, and by 2025 the advantage of the Middle Kingdom had already reached 34.0%²⁷. This means that time is working in favor of the Asian power, and if current production trends persist, by 2035 China's GDP will exceed that of the United States by roughly 70% – an unacceptable lag for Washington.

The foregoing shows that the GU project is highly desirable for the United States, beneficial to the territories to be absorbed, and entirely feasible. In this connection, it is worth recalling that George Orwell, in his famous novel, depicted three totalitarian states: Eurasia, Eastasia, and Oceania. The composition of the latter is close to the GU project under consideration here²⁸: Oceania consists primarily of the United States, Canada, and Australia, while Greenland figures among the disputed territories over which the three powers are at war. This suggests that by the mid-20th century the global distribution of power on the planet was already clearly visible and predictable. Orwell's futurological forecast now appears to be taking on tangible contours.

At the same time, it is safe to say that the United States is today entirely unprepared to implement the GU project. Several conditions would first have to be met.

First, a *definitive consensus* must be reached between the official and deep state in the United States, as well as between Democrats and Republicans, on the necessity of the GU project. Trump's partial unveiling of the project indicates that a serious demand for such an initiative already exists within the American political establishment; however, the inconsistency of the U.S. president's position on the issue reveals

²⁵ The grand construction of desalination plants in Australia. Fishki.net. Available at: <https://fishki.net/3706461-grandioznaja-strojka-opresnitelnyh-zavodov-v-avstralii.html?ysclid=mpsblem4sv146446853>

²⁶ Australia's infrastructure boom: Can the country afford such expensive construction of transport and road facilities? Za rubezhom. Available at: <https://zarubejom.ru/articles/infrastrukturnyy-bum-avstralii/?ysclid=mpsbyritfc147504599>

²⁷ List of countries by past and projected GDP (PPP). Wikipedia. Available at: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_by_past_and_projected_GDP_\(PPP\)#cite_note-IMF_Data-1](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_by_past_and_projected_GDP_(PPP)#cite_note-IMF_Data-1)

²⁸ Orwell G. (2024). 1984. Moscow: Azbuka. 352 p.

the absence of unity among different influence groups. It cannot be ruled out that Trump's tenure will become a period of consolidation of the country's political elites around the GU project and of familiarizing the world with the idea, while its actual implementation will fall to subsequent administrations.

Second, the U.S. authorities must make a *definitive shift from destructive to constructive forms* of expansionist policy. The abduction of other countries' presidents (Venezuela), threats to their governments (Cuba and Panama), and the bombing of their territory (Iran) should give way to a drive to unite America's "genetic" allies and to build a model for their effective integration into the country's existing institutional configuration. Today, the United States is already perceived around the world as an aggressive state that feels bound by no obligations, a perception that makes it risky for other countries to enter into strategic alliances with it. Washington's practice of political blackmail and interference in the affairs of other states has already brought the world to the very brink of nuclear catastrophe. Under such conditions, large-scale peaceful integration initiatives are all but impossible to pursue.

Third, America's political elites must revive the art of diplomacy that they have effectively destroyed over recent decades. In that time, Washington has grown unaccustomed to taking other parties' interests into account and to conducting constructive negotiations, preferring instead to exert coercive pressure on its political counterparts. When integrating additional territories into its fold, the United States will be forced to reconcile its own claims with those of others, offer inducements to the countries being absorbed, demonstrate respect toward them, and make compromises. This will require a substantial overhaul of the country's foreign-policy machinery. For now, Trump's crude and provocative statements

work in the opposite direction: they provoke categorical rejection of accession to the United States among both the governments and the populations of the territories targeted for incorporation.

Fourth, the implementation of the GU project requires Washington to have an appropriate conceptual document – a plan – that would set out in detail the strategy and tactics of integrating new territories. It is already clear that the project will be phased and multistage. Greenland, for instance, should be integrated first, then Canada, and finally Australia; success in integrating one territory would serve as the basis for integrating the next. As noted above, the incorporation of Greenland itself would proceed through several steps: first, the island would gain independence from Denmark; then it would acquire the status of a self-governing territory under U.S. patronage; and after some time it would become an unincorporated organized territory of the United States, eventually attaining statehood. Canada and Australia, in all likelihood, would be integrated as sets of states corresponding to their existing historical territorial divisions. In parallel, currency issues, the synchronization of tax systems, and the like would also have to be addressed. No such program currently exists in the United States, although drafting one presents no fundamental difficulty and would not take long.

Fulfilling these conditions is by no means extraordinary; what is needed is simply the consent of America's political elites on the necessity of the GU project. If that consent is not forthcoming in the near future, we will witness cyclical bursts of activity by future occupants of the White House on incorporating new territories, followed by their fading away without any real achievements – yet such initiatives will markedly destabilize the geopolitical environment.

One further aspect of the problem should be noted. The scenarios of geopolitical reconfiguration examined above pursue an obvious goal: gaining control over all the resources directly linked to territories. Behind this goal, however, lies a deeper problem – the contest for technological leadership between China and the United States. The winner of this race will seize and hold primacy as the hegemonic country for many years to come, with all the consequences that entails. Already today, many technological projects of the two giant countries are running into shortages of natural resources. Competition for resources and advanced technologies is therefore merging into a single process, which is precisely why expansionist strategies have become so relevant for the United States. In this sense, for both China and the United States, renouncing the struggle for new territories is tantamount to renouncing the struggle for technological leadership. This confrontation is further exacerbated by the contest for global economies of scale, the attainment of which makes it possible to significantly raise the economic efficiency of a national economy – the key to a country's high competitiveness in the global geo-economic and geopolitical markets.

In conclusion, the value of the present study deserves mentioning. It can be assessed along two dimensions. On the one hand, the analysis is useful in clarifying the main parameters of a specific U.S. integration project. On the other, the very methodology of dissecting scenarios of global redistribution has universal resonance and can be extended to other similar projects. The proposed approach offers a starting point for the scenario-based forecasting of geopolitical and geo-economic development under conditions of high uncertainty and ongoing hybrid warfare. It rests on viewing the future as a set of possible scenarios (variants) of development, each then subjected to substantive analysis. The storyline

examined in this article – the integration of geopolitical space under U.S. auspices – may never materialize and may not become the defining variant of global development. However, the very practice of developing several such scenarios and assigning them probabilities could become a new, regularly employed method of global forecasting. In this sense, the approach presented here may mark the beginning of a useful practice of studying alternative paths and prospects of global economic development.

Conclusion

The article has examined the possibility of the United States preserving its geopolitical hegemony through the implementation of the Grand Unification project, which would involve incorporating three new territories: Greenland, Canada, and Australia. It shows that this project is effectively the only chance for the United States to restart the cycle of capital accumulation within its own jurisdiction. The study notes that such a union would reshape the global market for natural resources in America's favor, preserving its undisputed primacy. It also argues that the notion of a "deal" – constantly invoked in Trump's political rhetoric – fits squarely within the historical tradition of U.S. territorial expansion.

A separate examination of the situations of Greenland, Canada, and Australia shows that each of these territories has its own vulnerabilities and may therefore have reasons to be interested in joining the United States, making the Grand Unification project entirely feasible. At the same time, the article stresses that the implementation of this project requires four conditions that are not yet in place. First, a definitive consensus must be reached within America's political elites on the necessity of the GU project. Second, the U.S. authorities must shift from a destructive to a constructive form of

expansionist policy – from coercive methods to creative integration. Third, America’s political elites must return to civilized diplomacy, one that takes other parties’ interests into account, conducts constructive negotiations, demonstrates respect for partners, and shows a willingness to compromise. Fourth, Washington must have in place an appropriate conceptual

document – a plan – with a detailed strategy and tactics for integrating the new territories.

Should these conditions remain unmet, the world will witness a periodic flare-up and fading of interest among future White House administrations in annexing new territories. This will contribute significantly to the aggravation of the geopolitical situation.

REFERENCES

- Alekseev A.B. (2017). Constructing moral panic in political discourse. *Politicheskaya lingvistika*, 62(2), 55–64 (in Russian).
- Arrighi G. (2006). *Dolgi dvadtsatyi vek: Den'gi, vlast' i istoki nashego vremeni* [The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power, and the Origins of Our Time]. Moscow: Izdatel'skii dom "Territoriya budushchego".
- Arrighi G. (2009). Afterword to the second edition of The Long Twentieth Century. *Prognosis*, 1(17), 34–50 (in Russian).
- Balatsky E.V. (2018). The concept of capital accumulation cycles by J. Arrighi and its applications. *Terra Economicus*, 16(1), 37–55 (in Russian).
- Belukhin N.E. (2024). Is it closer to Washington than Brussels? Comparative analysis of the paradiplomacy of Greenland and the Faroe Islands. *Analiz i prognoz. IMEMO RAN*, 4, 57–72 (in Russian).
- Diamond J. (2023). *Kollaps. Pochemu odni obshchestva prikhodyat k protsvetaniyu, a drugie – k gibeli* [Collapse. How Societies Choose to Fail or Survive]. Moscow: AST.
- Filina A.D. (2022). Contradictions in the US-Canadian economic relations. *Sovremennaya nauka: aktual'nye problemy teorii i praktiki. Seriya: Ekonomika i pravo*, 4, 117–121 (in Russian).
- Gricius G. (2025). Constructing low tension: The role of experts and narratives in the case of Greenland. *The Nordic International Studies Association*, 60, 4, 647–674. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/00108367251364175>
- Grinyaev S.N., Zhuravel' V.P. (2025) The geopolitical transformation of the Arctic and Denmark's strategy in the context of global competition. *Obshchestvennye nauki i sovremennost'*, 5, 7–16 (in Russian).
- Huntington S.P. (2024). *Stolknovenie tsivilizatsii* [Clash of Civilizations]. Moscow: AST.
- Katkova E.Yu. (2018). The role of the Chinese Diaspora in shaping Australia's New immigration policy. *Vestnik RUDN. Seriya: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya*, 18(3), 642–655 (in Russian).
- Khlopov O.A. (2022). U.S.-Canadian security cooperation: The role of institutions and identity. *International Journal of Humanities and Natural Sciences*, 3-2(66), 81–88 (in Russian).
- Koretskaya O.V. (2017). Linguistic and stylistic features of Donald Trump's political rhetoric. *Prepodavatel' XX vek*, 2, 349–355 (in Russian).
- Laurenceson J. (2025). Ambiguous alignment: Australia navigating US–China rivalry in the postAUKUS era. *China International Strategy Review*, 7, 16–30.
- McDougall J. (2020). *Drifting Together: The Political Economy of Canada-US Integration*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Myagkov V.Yu. (2025). The “Greenland vector” of the U.S. geo-economic strategy. *Rossiiskii vneshne-ekonomicheskii vestnik*, 2, 61–68 (in Russian).
- Pogosyan A. (2020). Liquefied hopes: The Australian LNG market in terms of energy transition. *Energeticheskaya politika*, 154(12), 74–83 (in Russian).
- Quirion R. (2025). Uphold US-Canada science. *Science*, 387, 6739, 1127.
- Sharygina A.T. (2021). Prospects for the development of renewable ocean energy in Australia. *Uchenye zapiski Mezhdunarodnogo bankovskogo instituta*, 38(4), 124–143 (in Russian).

INFORMATION ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Evgeny V. Balatsky – Doctor of Sciences (Economics), Professor, Chief Researcher, Primakov National Research Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the Russian Academy of Sciences (IMEMO) (23, Profsoyuznaya Street, Moscow, 117997, Russian Federation; e-mail: EVBalatsky@imemo.ru)

Балацкий Е.В.

ЭКСПАНСИОНИСТСКАЯ ПОЛИТИКА Д. ТРАМПА И ПЕРЕФОРМАТИРОВАНИЕ ГЛОБАЛЬНОГО ГЕОПОЛИТИЧЕСКОГО ПРОСТРАНСТВА

В настоящее время началось перекраивание геополитического пространства и изменение границ государств, что продуцирует совершенно новые решения политического руководства многих стран. В контексте данной проблемы в статье рассмотрена возможность сохранения Соединенными Штатами Америки своей геополитической гегемонии за счет реализации проекта Великого Объединения, предполагающего присоединение к стране трех новых территорий – Гренландии, Канады и Австралии. Показано, что этот проект является фактически единственным шансом для США перезапустить цикл накопления капитала в рамках прежней юрисдикции. Продемонстрировано, что подобное объединение привело бы к переформатированию глобального рынка природных ресурсов в пользу США с сохранением их неоспоримого лидерства. Понятие сделки, постоянно артикулируемое Трампом в его политической риторике, полностью укладывается в исторические традиции Америки по расширению их территории. Отдельное рассмотрение ситуации с Гренландией, Канадой и Австралией свидетельствует, что эти территории имеют свои уязвимые места, следовательно могут быть заинтересованы во вхождении в состав США, что делает проект Великого Объединения вполне реализуемым. Вместе с тем подчеркивается, что реализация названного проекта потребует выполнения четырех условий, которые пока отсутствуют: достижение окончательного консенсуса в среде политических элит США в отношении необходимости проекта Великого Объединения; переход властей США от деструктивной к конструктивной форме экспансионистской политики (от силовых методов к созидательной интеграции); возвращение политических элит страны к цивилизованной дипломатии, предусматривающей учет чужих интересов, ведение конструктивных переговоров, демонстрацию уважения к партнерам, готовность идти на компромиссы; наличие у Вашингтона соответствующего концептуального документа (плана) с детально проработанными стратегией и тактикой интеграции новых территорий. Отмечается, что в случае невыполнения перечисленных условий будут наблюдаться периодические вспышки активизации и затухания интереса будущих хозяев Белого Дома в отношении присоединения новых территорий, которые внесут весомый вклад в общую дестабилизацию геополитической обстановки. Слияние больших территорий в единые государства может стать главным фактором развития человечества на ближайшие 2–3 десятилетия.

Проект Великого Объединения, США, геополитическая гегемония, сделка.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

- Алексеев А.Б. (2017). Конструирование моральной паники в политическом дискурсе // Политическая лингвистика. Т. 62. № 2. С. 55–64.
- Арриги Дж. (2006). Долгий двадцатый век: Деньги, власть и истоки нашего времени. Москва: Издательский дом «Территория будущего». 472 с.

- Арриги Дж. (2009). Послесловие ко второму изданию «Долгого двадцатого века» // Прогнозис. № 1 (17). С. 34–50.
- Балацкий Е.В. (2018). Концепция циклов накопления капитала Дж. Арриги и ее приложения // *Terra Economicus*. Т. 16. № 1. С. 37–55.
- Белухин Н.Е. (2024). Ближе к Вашингтону, чем Брюсселю? Сравнительный анализ парадипломатии Гренландии и Фарерских островов // Анализ и прогноз. ИМЭМО РАН. № 4. С. 57–72.
- Гриняев С.Н., Журавель В.П. (2025) Геополитическая трансформация Арктики и стратегия Дании в условиях глобальной конкуренции // *Общественные науки и современность*. № 5. С. 7–16.
- Даймонд Дж. (2023). Коллапс. Почему одни общества приходят к процветанию, а другие – к гибели. Москва: АСТ. 864 с.
- Каткова Е.Ю. (2018). Роль китайской диаспоры в формировании новой иммиграционной политики Австралии // Вестник РУДН. Серия: Международные отношения, Т. 18. № 3. С. 642–655.
- Корецкая О.В. (2017). Лингвостилистические особенности политической риторики Дональда Трампа // *Преподаватель XX век*. № 2. С. 349–355.
- Мягков В.Ю. (2025). «Гренландский вектор» геоэкономической стратегии США // *Российский внешне-экономический вестник*. № 2. С. 61–68.
- Погосян А. (2020). Сжиженные надежды: австралийский рынок СПГ в условиях энергоперехода // *Энергетическая политика*. Т. 154. № 12. С. 74–83.
- Филина А.Д. (2022). Противоречия в американо-канадских экономических отношениях // *Современная наука: актуальные проблемы теории и практики*. Серия: Экономика и право. № 4. С. 117–121.
- Хантингтон С.Ф. (2024). Столкновение цивилизаций. Москва: АСТ. 640 с.
- Хлопов О.А. (2022). Сотрудничество США и Канады в области безопасности: роль институтов и идентичности // *International Journal of Humanities and Natural Sciences*. Т. 3-2. № 66. С. 81–88.
- Шарыгина А.Т. (2021). Перспективы развития в Австралии возобновляемой энергии океана // *Ученые записки Международного банковского института*. Т. 38. № 4. С. 124–143.
- Gricius G. (2025). Constructing low tension: The role of experts and narratives in the case of Greenland. *The Nordic International Studies Association*, 60, 4, 647–674. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/00108367251364175>
- Laurenceson J. (2025). Ambiguous alignment: Australia navigating US–China rivalry in the post-AUKUS era. *China International Strategy Review*, 7, 16–30.
- McDougall J. (2020). *Drifting Together: The Political Economy of Canada-US Integration*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Quirion R. (2025). Uphold US-Canada science. *Science*, 387, 6739, 1127.

ИНФОРМАЦИЯ ОБ АВТОРЕ

Евгений Всеволодович Балацкий – доктор экономических наук, профессор, главный научный сотрудник, Национальный исследовательский институт мировой экономики и международных отношений (ИМЭМО) имени Е.М. Примакова Российской академии наук (Российская Федерация, 117997, г. Москва, ул. Профсоюзная, д. 23; e-mail: EVBalatsky@imemo.ru)