



International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation.

Institutional Authority in Trump's Speech on Greenland: A Critical Discourse analysis

Qasim Abbas Dhayef¹, Saif Hakim Fedhil^{2*}

¹⁻² College of Education for Humanities, University of Babylon, Iraq

Corresponding Author: Saif Hakim Fedhil

Article Info

ISSN (Online): 2582-7138

Impact Factor (RSIF): 8.04

Volume: 07

Issue: 02

Received: 16-01-2026

Accepted: 12-02-2026

Published: 09-03-2026

Page No: 108-114

Abstract

This study examines how institutional authority is constructed rhetorically in Donald Trump's speech on Greenland using Fairclough's three-dimensional model to analyze discourse. The analysis examines textual attributes, rhetorical strategies, and broader social practices to demonstrate that power is actively exercised and not simply derived from a presidential position. Linguistically, authority is built through securitization vocabulary, strong style, pronouns alignment, and hierarchical agency patterns that position the United States as an indispensable protector. A discourse that promotes legitimacy through historical mandate, technological superiority, a regional framework, and distorting the legitimacy of alternative institutions. The results also show how personal voice merges with institutional representation, centralizing executive leadership while maintaining formal legitimacy. Study highlights how geopolitical discourse serves as a site for performing and expanding institutional power.

Keywords: Institutional authority, Critical Discourse Analysis, Securitization, Presidential rhetoric and Geopolitical discourse

1. Introduction

Political speeches are also significant arenas of power and legitimacy construction and performance. Not only do they offer policies or opinions, they also fulfill institutional functions and replicate relations of domination across language. In the eyes of critical discourse analysis (CDA), discourse is regarded as a kind of social activity which is both conditioned and conditioning the social structures (Fairclough, 1992) [6]. In this respect political power is not confined to constitutions, laws and formal institutions. It is also put in place by language. The language used to make authority appear natural and legitimate allows use of pronouns, modalities, evaluation and presupposition. As explained by Fairclough (1989) [5], power in discourse works by shaping the situation of interaction (p. 46). Thus, the study of political discourses can enable a researcher to study the ways in which power is constructed, reinforced, and normalized using language.

In literature on political discourse, there has been a wide scope of research on the area of ideology, persuasion, populism, and rhetorical strategies (van Dyck, 1998). Nevertheless, little has been done to address the particular language to build institutional power more so in global geopolitical practices. Personal power is different than institutional authority. It addresses the legitimacy exercise based on the existence of clear roles, legal framework, and the government. The notion of legal logical authority formulated by Weber (1978) [10] comes in handy in this respect. According to Weber, such power is based on the notion that the rules are just and that power is to be capable of dictating what to be done to other people. People must repeat this power over and over again when they are discussing politics. That is why power is not something that you possess; it can be created and destroyed using words.

The remarks made by Donald Trump regarding Greenland can be included into this larger thesis and support the hypothesis that institutional power is a matter of a good talk. Trump talked about Greenland in his speech in the World Economic Forum in Davos on January 21, 2026, and made some bold claims to authority. He said that the United States was the only country which could afford to seize Greenland, that it was a core national security interest, that it was regionally aligned with North America by noting, This is our land and that the matter was related to the security of the association and also added that he would not employ force.

In line with this, the present study will not analyze the speech by Trump about Greenland as independent or even divisive utterances, but as a rhetorical location where the institutional power is constructed with the help of words. This involves the authority of the presidency, authority of the state and authority in defining sovereignty, protection and ownership as technical security considerations as opposed to multifaceted political and legal considerations. Despite the fact that the discourse on critical discourse (CDS) studies have explored the field of political discourse, power has been discussed as one of the background cases. The assumption made in most instances is that the President of the Council is the President and therefore one can assume that the power has already been given. Nevertheless, it is this assumption that created the gap, that is how institutional authority is created, reinforced, justified and absorbed via discourse, particularly when policy discourse concerns issues upon which there is no consensus, such as sovereignty and acquisition of territory. Thus, the proposed research is focused on analyzing the construction of institutional authority in the speech delivered by Trump in Davos about Greenland. To fulfil this purpose, the research questions to be answered in this study are:

1. In what way is the institutional power constructed linguistically in the speech of Trump in Davos on Greenland?
2. Which rhetoric strategies were employed in Trump speech at Davos about Greenland to defend the power of the state and the president?

2. Critical Discourse Analysis.

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) studies the relationships between language, power and social inequality. It originates in so many places. Fairclough (2015)^[7] also maintains that discourse is not merely a mirror of social reality but also an essential element of social reality; discourse is shaped and shaped by social structure (pp. 23). In this sense, political talk is not only concerned with the description of political action, but it participates in the construction of legitimacy, authority and consent.

In the same vein, van Dijk (2008)^[9] says that discourse is a core issue in reproduction of dominance. The elite can use discourse in the form of ministries, institutional heads, and media figures like presidents and they can use this position to manipulate social thoughts and perceptions. Therefore power is exercised both by coercion, as well as, through the symbolic control of meaning. In his book *The Discursive-Historical Approach (DHA)*, Wodak (2015)^[11] develops this concept. According to him, the politics of the present tend to invoke the past and historical accounts, communal memory and allusion to the past through intertextual appeal in order to justify the present. When the leaders discuss the history, the security threats or the fate of the country, these people are not only telling people what to think, they are also making people have the means through which to grasp some political standpoints.

Collectively, these scholars give the conceptual framework on how institutional power is used linguistically. Power is not expected to be an asocial entity; it is a rhetorical undertaking, which is reinforced and even contradicted.

2.1. The Three-Dimensional Model of Fairclough

The three-dimensional model by Fairclough is one of the most effective analytical frameworks in the studies of critical discourses. It is proposed that discourse is to be discussed at

three levels at the same time that are three related: the text, the discursive practice and the social practice (Fairclough, 2015, pp. 9–10)^[7]. This model allows researchers to procedurally transition to broad ideological structures out of frail linguistic structures.

Vocabulary, grammar, coherence, orientation, and rhetorical devices are the textual areas of focus in study. The two instances of non-neutral language include: fundamental national security interests and our territory. These involve cultural concepts that determine the way people perceive things. As Fairclough (2015)^[7] notes, the vocabulary we employ tends to depict the social values and our perception of power. Such words as should, will and must serve to affirm power as actions should or will take place.

On the discursive practice level, the research examined the writing, sharing and reading processes in literature works. The institutionalized presidential speech is presented to the country and world communities and broadcast via the worldwide media systems. This dispersion makes them more ideologically prominent. Fairclough (2015) states that the rhetorical practice implies both textual and rhetorical overlaps, which means that speech relies on the already existing discourses, including security, alliance, and sovereignty to acquire greater legitimacy. Whenever Trump mentions national security or the consensus of the region, he triggers wider circles of geopolitics discourse known to the masses.

Last, discourse is tied to larger social structures and power relations at the level of social practice. In this instance, the discussion examines reversal or restructuring of linguistic fraternities of geopolitical leading positions. According to Fairclough (2015)^[7] discourse recreates and alters the social structures (pp. 87-89). In the case of Greenland, the references which mention safety or regional compatibility can be explained within the wider scope of the U.S. Strategic positioning and the criterion of international hegemony.

The Fairclough model can be used to examine institutional power in the case of the Trump speech on Greenland, because the power is not confined to grammar or rhetoric, however; it would be applicable to all three dimensions simultaneously.

2.2. Political Discourse Authority of an Institution.

Max Weber (1978)^[10] defines power as a legitimate domination. The freedom of being followed by a given group of people is known as power. In this case, institutional authority is based on an existent legal stance and not on individual attributes. The rational legal authority as envisioned by Weber views the institutional authority as power that is exercised by use of official positions, bureaucratic systems and the use of formal rules. People look to the position and not to the individual that temporarily holds the position to obtain legitimacy.

According to Bourdieu (1991)^[2], linguistic power is based on symbolic capital, which is received through institutional recognition. The words of the president are efficient as they support the legitimacy of the position. Nonetheless, it needs to exercise this legitimacy by way of discourse. The effectiveness of power is only possible when it is perceived and accepted by the people. Likewise, Fairclough (2015)^[7] believes that authority tends to be stylish and evaluative (p. 132). In cases where statements are minimized as needed, imperative or morally warranted, it makes them less likely to disagree. An example is that the idea of national security used to justify actions based on national security may put forward

actions as protection as opposed to aggression. By so doing, it seems that the attitude of the speaker is to blame and morally-founded.

According to Chartres-Black (2011), metaphor is very persuasive in political rhetoric. Leaders are considered to be nation protectors in metaphors regarding protection, power, and defense. It is the security metaphors that make people feel that they must take action immediately and make extreme actions appear to be the only solution to dealing with danger. Moreover, according to Baird (2000), political talk tends to reduce complicated geopolitical problems to straight forward contrasts, like, security versus threat, power versus vulnerability, responsibility versus neglect. Though these simplifications bring clarity and easy-to-use feel, it tends to be ambiguous and out of depth.

The pronouns are an important linguistic characteristic. It is seen through the use of the main pronoun we which gives the feeling of homogenization and unity and the pronoun they which characterizes the outgroup (Van Dijk, 2008, p. 75)^[9]. This uniqueness facilitates unity in the group and the credibility of the leadership.

Additionally, personal and institutional identity tends to be combined in presidential rhetoric. Leaders can even represent or even personify the nation. The combination of identities by doing this strengthens power since political positions are associated with the national pride, dignity and the collective interest. That is why the study of presidential speech will help to see how institutional power is constructed, utilized, and normalized in society with the help of language.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research method

This paper uses a qualitative and interpretive research design since it deals with the meaning-making, ideological construction and linguistic strategies in a particular socio-political setting. The discourse analysis can be used through qualitative research, as a study that examines patterns of representation, implicit assumptions, and power hidden within the language, instead of utilizing a quantitative approach by employing the numerical method of measurement (Durney, 2007, p. 38). It is aimed at knowing how to construct power by means of discourse in order not to quantify any linguistic features.

3.2. Data Collection

The research information is premised on a speech given by Donald Trump at the World Economic Forum 2026 held at Davos, Switzerland. This speech was chosen because it puts Greenland within a larger political and economic context and discusses it as a global and strategic issue. This international conglomerate simplifies the process of examining how institutional power is constructed and fortified on a supreme level on the globe. The text of the speech was taken on the official site of the World Economic Forum.

3.3. Model of analysis

The paradigm of analysis adopted is Fairclough three-dimensional model of discourse analysis which contains: (text analysis, discursive practice, social practice) The rationale of using this model is that it enables a shift in the subtle structures of linguistic analysis to the grand scale of social understanding.

3.3.1. Textual Level

On the textual level, the analysis is carried out concerning linguistic characteristics like modalism and use of pronouns which express how the speakers place themselves in relation to power and authority (Fairclough (1992)^[6]). As an example, the high-certainty verbs that are stereotyped (he will, he should) can reflect the power of the institution.

3.3.2. Discursive Practice

Discursive practice entails the study of discourse in relation to institutional and legitimate roles by reference between text and identification. Fairclough (1992)^[6] stated that discursive practice connects both the production and consumption of texts, as well as institutional structures (p. 78).

3.3.3. Social Practice

On this level, it is the interpretation of the discourse regarding the larger geopolitical and institutional contexts. That is, the result of text must be connected to other social systems.

4. Data analysis

This paper is an analysis of the complete text of the Davos speech by Trump on Greenland. The analysis takes the perspective of the three-dimensional framework that analyses discourse in the context of text, rhetorical practice, and social practice.

4.1. Textual Level Analysis

The textual focus shows that even though institutional authority in the rhetoric about Greenland by Trump is supported by direct mention of the constitution, lexical choice, methodology, evaluative condensation, pronouns alignment, metaphorical structure, or agency distribution all contribute to the development of institutional power. The fragile linguistic construct always places the United States and by proxy, the presidency as a need, capable and core to the security order in the world.

4.2. Lexical Field

There are three lexical domains which govern the discourse throughout the discourse:

4.2.1. Security and Threat

Trump in his speech constantly refer to such terms as: national security, international security, basic national interest of security, strategic, threat, motive, safe, protect, risks, weapons, missiles, and nuclear.

This rhetorical repetition creates a certain rhetorical setting. Safety language is not a periphery, it forms the entire argument. When Greenland is put in the category of the main interest of national security, it can be discussed as a subsidiary diplomatic, cultural, or economical problem. The conversation does not allow room to interpret more because it emphasizes existential need. Further, a doubling up of national and international security increases the applicability. Greenland is at once a home front and stability in the whole world. This dual stance makes it more relevant and increases the validity of the American involvement.

4.2.2. Territorial Logic and Spatial Centrality

Greenland is often spoken about with the help of spatial words: "on the North end of America" "at the very center of

the middle" "between the United States, Russia and China" and our hemisphere.

Strategic interest is stamped by spatial signs. The discourse redefines the geopolitical ambition as a geographical imperative by focusing on the idea of proximity in the continents and the hemisphere doctrine. One phrase is of special interest the term this is our region. The possessive conscience incorporates symbolically even when the rhetorical conscience is framed. The semantic emphasis on the middle, the border and the hemisphere convert geography into a tactical fate. What this means is commitment is created by the site in itself.

4.2.3. Lexicon Hierarchical/ Capability.

The hierarchy is made in a systematic way by the discourse using comparative expressions: No nation... With the exception of the United States, "the United States alone" is "much more than people think he is" and "We have never been stronger than that. Simultaneously, Denmark and NATO get the label of lawless: "completely incapable" "spend less than 1 per cent" "are treated very unfairly" "we give too much, we get too little. This lexical difference creates a duality: U.S. strength/allied weakness. Comparative superiority represents institutional power.

4.3. Modality

The importance of modalities is very essential in the construction of institutional authority.

4.3.1. Epistemic Certainty

Such phrases as: The truth is..., No one can argue about it. , Everybody knows that now. and "It was a rigged election." Removing intellectual receptiveness. These forms transform the demands into indisputable facts. Discourse encourages the executive decisiveness by eliminating stereotyped hedging. Reiteration of unconditional propositions (e.g. the election was rigged) substitution of argument with declarative certainty. The issue of power is enhanced by trust rather than evidence.

4.3.2. Deontic Obligation

Comments like: It is the responsibility of all NATO allies to... "We need it..." "You need a strong border..." Make the speaker play a role of an institutional rules explainer. The commitment is regarded as an external and objective system but through the voice of the president. The argument that the United States was involuntary in World War II is also constructive that the move is compulsory and not voluntary. Necessity kills the charge of expansion.

4.3.3. Temporal Inevitability

Urgency is strengthened by time forms: The stakes are even higher than ever, more necessity than devotion. The past is depicted to be safer than the present. This time-based upsurge is a reason why policy should be re-evaluated. What was not required before is now in need.

4.4. Pronoun Alignment

Pronouns serve as institutionalization processes.

4.4.1. Fusion of "I" and "We"

The Speech tends to shift between personal and institutional expressions: I have done more... We are a great power, You would not have NATO, It had not to deal with me. The

oscillation of I and we eliminates the line between the personal leadership and prerogative. President Trump becomes a symbol of collective rights and at the same time, he is a representative of collective rights. This combination of power made it stronger. It appears that personal intervention is needed to help with institutional continuity.

4.4.2. Collective Identity Development.

The authority of the U.S. is spread way beyond the domestic boundaries, with the use of our country and the world. According to the speaker, the US is a guarantor in the world. The fact that the word you is more general in its rules of governance (You need strong boundaries...). This recommendation transcends the national scenario, and implies institutional universality.

4.4.3. Externalization by the use of They.

Dissidents and critics are habitually called them: Denmark, Russia, China, the media, political opponents. The they tend to be imprecise and this broadens the boundaries of hostility. Such ambiguity adds more cohesion to institutions through the external variation.

4.5. Evaluative Language

The discourse of tramps is full of extremities: enormous, gigantic, big, terrible, very crooked, huge, great, repetition (e.g. terrible, tremendous) increases the emotional appeal. Escalation associates with danger and might. Complimentary assessment softens aggressive statements: "Very great respect to Denmark" Love its people these polite forms cushion hierarchical spillover and keep power at the same time.

4.5.1. Metaphor

There are much more informal metaphors: a big, beautiful piece of snow, apple in his eye, to pull the trigger, to go back to the drawing table. Informality customs lessen the institutionalization between the speaker and the audience. Simultaneously, informality is not a weakness of power, The metaphor of Greenland as an ice cube depoliticalizes the region, depriving it of social and political identity. Become a strategic target.

4.5.2. Transitivity and Agency Hierarchy.

This decentralization of the agencies provides the United States with a steady advantage.

United States: "Conquered, defended, secured bases, defended, created, enhanced, negotiated and fortified NATO.

Denmark: I have fallen, I was not able, I spent too little.

Greenland: "Secured, Developed, Defended.

The grammatical form includes Greenland as a subject, and Denmark as an inadequate guardian. The United States is the sole viable actor. This line of the phrase, only the United States can protect, has a monopoly of the agency.

The analysis of discursive practices will be conducted based on the analysis described in

4.5.3. Discursive Practice Analysis.

On the discursive level of analysis, the linguistic form is transcended to analyze how discourses produce institutional authority in terms of narrative positioning, textual clues, identity performance, legitimacy strategies, and institutional relationships that are transformed. Although the textual level exposes the manner in which authority is linguistically

encoded, the level of rhetorical practice discloses the manner in which that authority is socially organized, circulated and obeyed.

The institutional power has been constructed in the discourse using five primary rhetorical processes, including historical command, enfranchising strategic need, delegitimizing institutions, distributing institutional persistence, and normalizing regional conquest. The two strategies contribute towards the overall performance of the executive component in the international geopolitical environment.

5. Historical Authorization

The best example of using rhetoric is to mention the World War II as a story that makes things credible. Citations of the early surrender of Denmark, the American intervention, and the liberation of Greenland are some of the examples of historical influence. The speech created a picture of sacrifice by stating that the United States fought on behalf of Denmark and saved Greenland. This is what makes America look more like a guardian than an aggressor. This method instills a feeling of moral accountability, i.e. that the contributions of the past are the pathways to the present behavior and the subsequent one is possible. Simultaneously, historical accounts create institutional stability and development with time. It does not depict the intervention of World War II as a distinct phenomenon, but as a pattern of continuing responsibility and the theory of we should have preserved eliminates the image of postwar diplomacy as a strategic mistake. Further, when it is said that modern stakes are more than ever, historical protection is becoming a current imperative. By this temporal condensation the discourse gives the renewed interaction, not as an expansion but as a heritage, and displays power as a narrative inheritance, not a new one.

6. Strategic Necessity and Securitization.

The discourse displaces Greenland within a planned set of strategies, as opposed to a non-essential preference in politics. The land is situated inside a defensive peripheral discourse wherein the hemisphere serves as an institutional perimeter and which needs vigilant protection, by indicating that the threats are kept out of our hemisphere, This framework is effective in transforming the position of Greenland as a foreign territory to a defensive extension. Meanwhile, the emphasis on the location of Greenland as being in the middle between the United States, Russia, and China leaves a strategic interest due to its introduction to geography as an objective justification. Implicit logic understands that a post gives rise to duty and obligation, in its turn, authorizes power.

In addition to that, Trump directly dismisses economic motivation by dismissing the arguments of rare earth minerals or resources. The letter cleanses the claim down to a security necessity by putting off-material or profitable interest the proposal. This dismissal of economic reasoning strengthens institutional legitimacy, in which acquisition is not a quest to grow but a state of protection. Through this, it is possible to make security the sole acceptable reason and thus makes Greenland seem a strategic and not a discretionary goal.

7. Alternative Institutions are delegitimized.

Institutional power is equally reinforced by undermining other rival institutions, as well as by positive claims.

Denmark is being depicted as a historical dependent entity and now neglected. Cash is quantitative by mentioning less than 1 percent on defense. This numerical structure improves the credibility, and it produces an institutional vacuum. Even phrases of high respect can be called diplomatic reprieve, rather than this is acceptance of equality. The action is thus replaced by personality in terms of institutional authority.

8. Institutional Continuity Personality.

One of the main characteristics of rhetorical practice is the distribution of institutional stability. The words like you would not have NATO without me, the war would never have begun, and we have never been stronger put the executive leadership in the position of not just being influential but structural without which the world would not have been a better place. The institutional silent and geopolitical system can be regarded as a direct impact of a presidential act. This implies that allies, threat mechanisms and global order cannot operate independently, but they depend on the leadership conditions. In this framework, the idea of institutional continuity is revised as predetermined by a presence of the executive, as opposed to it being incorporated into the framework of permanent bureaucracies or multilateral systems.

This individualization operates in the form of centralization, causal attribution and identity integration. The presence of institutional structures, e.g. NATO and diplomatic efforts, is presented as something that needs presidential activation and correction and, therefore, makes them seem less autonomous. World occurrences are then narratively associated with the existence or lack of leadership and transform power into a defensive and constant energy. Meanwhile, the merging of the individual and the institutional in the form of me and we also dissolve the lines between an individual and the institution, making the presidency the voice and institutional success the personal one. Collectively, these strategies entrench power on executive personality and re-establish institutional continuity as an element of individual leadership.

9. Technological Superiority as Legitimation

Achieving the step forward and talking about the losing system of the opponent is the cognitive discourse. This technology has created a chain of command with the U.S. being the best regarding the effectiveness of utilizing technology and tactics. Accounts of enemy systems which subvert or support the visuals of American superiority and the impotence of the enemy. The rhetoric introduces an element of strategy secrecy and ambiguity with references to the weapons that no one has ever heard about. Secrecy results in power: the knowledge is not explicit, but it has not been completely revealed, and it is a sign of having secret information at hand and increases credibility of the executive. This conversation founded on managed revelation strengthens the impression of a leader as knowledgeable, ready, and hi-tech. To be technologically on the move in this case is not merely being robust in the battle. This places more importance on bigger regional and coalition demands. In case the United States possesses the strongest defensive and offensive forces, then it is even reasonable and even mandatory that it takes the initiative of incursion into the protection of Greenland, the stabilization of NATO, and confronting the loss of the world. One of the main components of institutional power is strategic immunity.

10. Social Practice Analysis

The discourse is explained at the social practice level within a broader framework of geopolitical relations, institutional forms of power, and ingrained historical dogma(s). In the above parts, institutional authority has been demonstrated to be constructed linguistically and discursively. The next level looks at the interaction between these structures and actual political structures: the system of alliances, sovereignty norms, executive power, Arctic geopolitics, institutions of democracy, and power structures in the world.

Discourse exists and works to reform four of the principal macrostructures in the Arctic, namely; geopolitical competition, burden-sharing between Alliance and NATO legitimacy, executive, and institutional centralization, sovereignty, regional takeover, and the international norms. These structures put within the frame of the ways of institutional power expansion, distribution, and normalization.

10.1. Geopolitical Competition in the Arctic

The United States, Russia and China also form a larger geopolitical contest to which Greenland belongs. Through their recurring discussion on how they are positioned between these forces, they are placing themselves in newly emerging polar security system. Due to the strategic access, positions of military, surveillance routes, missile defense systems and others, the Arctic is getting increasingly important. The speech describes Greenland as a secure location to be in this cut-throat world. The speaker creates the story of vulnerability by referring to him as unprotected and occupying an important strategic spot. Weakness is no reason not to intervene.

At the macro level, this corresponds to a wider process of securitization of the Arctic. Greenland is no longer regarded as another territory of the Kingdom of Denmark. Rather, it is considered to be one of the main arguments in the fight between the great powers. Institutional power in this manner is placed in a global context, which is typified by the cultivation of armies and strategic rivalry. These structural tensions are mirrored and enhanced in the discourse.

10.2. Hemispheric Strategy

The fact that the phrase changing threats to enter our world is repeated puts Greenland into the category of the popular western doctrine of security. This concept holds that the world is a wall which should be guarded against the outside forces. This sentence symbolically incorporates Greenland into the discussion of the safety of the whole world by making it apparent that it is a part of North America. The action does not the sovereignty change, and it simply transforms the identity of Greenland, which hitherto was an external partner, into a figurative internal border.

At the social practice level, this is a redefined re-conceptualization concerning the sphere of influence. It puts the hemisphere in the context of a safe zone under the U.S. Mandate. This local fantasy supports the world order of hierarchy. Thus, the institutional power is not national only but also regional. The presidency is pegged as the protector of the stability of the hemisphere.

10.3. U.S. -Denmark Asymmetry Tension.

Denmark is described as having been historically rescued and today being forgotten. Although the speeches convey great respect, it is also clear that Denmark is incompetent. On the

macro social level, this constructs the story of asymmetric dependence. Denmark is one of the beneficiaries of the U.S. security.

The implicit implication of the proposal that the restoration of Greenland at the end of the Second World War could be a mistake undermines postwar sovereignty arrangements. The post-purchase recommendation renders the principles of sovereignty even more unstable. However, the discussion does not explicitly state that there is no sovereignty. It rather alters the meaning of sovereignty to have performance on security. In the event that Denmark fails to provide a good job in ensuring the protection of Greenland, then the U.S. intervention is right. In turn, the performance criteria is used to extend institutional authority as opposed to legal claims.

10.4. Security Superiority and Technological Hierarchy

The account on high end weapons and collapsed rogue administration puts the United States in the technological stratification. The most significant components of the global power structure on the broad level are modernization of the military and competing on a strategic level. The rhetoric uses this framework to demonstrate that the U.S. dominance is exemplified and continues. Technological superiority supports the needs of the region. The rule of the United States is, in essence, justified in case it has skills that no other country possesses. That is, power is dependent on the skill as well as the law.

10.5. Habituation to Expansion and Growth.

The fact that regional acquisitions are normalized is part of the larger trends in the development of the country. This discussion locates Greenland in a history of geopolitical transformation by relying upon precedents of past acquisitions, as well as European colonial experiences. Expansion into regions becomes a thing of the past, as opposed to being normal and extraordinary. On the social practice level, that is the conflict of modern standards of sovereignty and historic expansionist heritage.

11. Discussion

The findings of this paper indicate that the institutional authority that the speeches of Trump about Greenland focus on is not just highlighted by the formal references to the presidency, but also rhetorically adopted by the multi-layered combination of securitization, historical narrative, technological supremacy, regional framing and the executive allocation. Power is manifested as something that is being acted upon and not simply owned. The rhetoric allows merging security assertions, historic rights, and strategic need in a systematic way, creating one unified narrative where presidential leadership appears indivisible.

The key finding is associated with the legitimization process of securitization in terms of institutional power. Inevitably, people refer to Greenland as a core national interest in security. This turns the issue which might have been political into a serious security issue. The terming of the region as a regional and global security problem constrains the kinds of reaction that can occur. This justifies the American intervention as something that is necessary. Security language is thus used as an effective tool of legitimacy making the executive a reaction to structural threats as opposed to political desires.

The discussion also shows that there exists institutional power that is very entrenched in the historical story. Talking

of World War II, you establish a moral system that the present rewards the past in terms of the loss that was incurred. This article describes why and how the US defended Denmark and Greenland earlier and how that connects to what we are required to accomplish today. When you consider that perhaps it was a bad strategic decision in the war, because Greenland was given back to its original country, then it alters the way that you think about sovereignty deals as ones that are rooted in history and can be altered on the basis of what is currently happening in the world.

The issue of sharing official power is quite significant. With the help of the speech, the line between the presidency as an institution and the president as a person is also even more blurred. The see-sawing between the individual leadership and the collective one and the argument that the stability of the NATO or the stability of the world is in the hands of the president is a combination of the personal and the collective, and the assertion that institutional continuity is the core focus of the executive presence is central to the argument. Power is thereby distributed without the loss of institutional legitimacy, on the contrary, the presidency is incarnated in the person of the leader.

This was a takeover with talks in the American institutions on election integrity and citizen fidelity, and the politics among them. The assertions enlarged the powers of the president to domestic peacekeeping and international security by making allegations of election fraud to be related to international violence. Simultaneously, NATO is being redefined as an imbalanced coalition whereby the United States is the one at the receiving end, which further supports the argument that executive power is needed to bring about equilibrium. Territorial acquisition is institutionalized through the history and with this, normative opposition diminishes and expansion becomes embedded in a larger geopolitical tradition.

Combined, the findings indicate that the institutional power of this speech is constructed via an intersection of the need to have security, to possess a historical legitimacy, technological control, and executive centrality. The image of power is presented as logical, unavoidable, and gained throughout the history, where emotional and personal pressure is involved. In other words, Greenland is not only a local issue but also a location where politicians discuss the way they can use, protect, and expand governmental authority. The study shows that institutional power is becoming more based on strategic narrative efficacy but not exclusively on the basis of formal authority in the modern world discourse.

12. Conclusions

The paper concludes that the speech of Trump about Greenland gives an impression of institutional authority with the usage of strong language, strong style, and hierarchical patterns of agency. Greenland is perceived to be a threat to national as well as international security. This is not a political option, it is a strategic necessity. Presidential claims are made in high-certainty terms and are marked by expressions and indicators of commitment, as something undermotivated and undebatable. Moreover, the United States is always an active participant, and Greenland appears as an organism that needs protection. These types of linguistic selections introduce institutional power as a logical,

essential, and inherently fitting executive leadership. Historical references, technological superiority and comparison with weaker institutions are used to increase the legitimacy of presidential power and the state. The history of historical protection establishes a paradigm of morality between the past and future requirements, and the emphasis on military potential strengthens the notion that the leadership is right due to capability. Simultaneously, by alternating between personal and institutionalization, Trump uses both personal voice and institutional representation, portraying himself as a leader and a state itself. This way, the authority becomes institutional but personal as well and thus the executive power is perceived as something legitimate and even essential.

References

1. Beard A. *The language of politics*. London: Routledge; 2000.
2. Bourdieu P. *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press; 1991.
3. Charteris-Black J. *Politicians and rhetoric: the persuasive power of metaphor*. 2nd ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan; 2011.
4. Dörnyei Z. *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2007.
5. Fairclough N. *Language and power*. London: Longman; 1989.
6. Fairclough N. *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press; 1992.
7. Fairclough N. *Language and power*. 3rd ed. Abingdon: Routledge; 2015.
8. van Dijk TA. *Ideology: a multidisciplinary approach*. London: Sage; 1998.
9. van Dijk TA. *Discourse and power*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan; 2008.
10. Weber M. *Economy and society: an outline of interpretive sociology*. Roth G, Wittich C, editors. Berkeley (CA): University of California Press; 1978.
11. Wodak R. *The politics of fear: what right-wing populist discourses mean*. London: Sage; 2015

How to Cite This Article

Dhayef QA, Fedhil SH. Institutional authority in Trump's speech on Greenland: A critical discourse analysis. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation*. 2026;7(2):108–114.

Creative Commons (CC) License

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial Share Alike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.