

Greenland, yes. Canada, no.

By Roger L Simon

Vice President JD Vance's speech from Greenland was reassuring.

His brief reluctance during the Signalgate kerfuffle about acting against the Houthis had been concerning because significant action against the terror organization should have been taken years ago.



The first Trump administration had listed the Houthis as a Foreign Terrorist Organization (FTO) and a Specially Designated Global Terrorist Group (SDGT) for disrupting international

shipping. Almost immediately on taking office, the Biden administration unlisted them on allegedly humanitarian grounds. Much later they reconsidered and listed the Houthis again as a Specially Designated Global Terrorist Group (SDGT) by itself.

I know. Confusing. What's not confusing is the Houthis continue their behavior, taking on whatever shipping they can and lobbing their erratic missiles willy-nilly at Israel almost daily, desperate to hit something, anything.

What happens if one of those missiles slips through and slams into the Temple Mount, which is as likely as anything else, bringing down the Al-Aqsa Mosque, the Dome of the Rock and the Western Wall and everybody—Arab and Jew—in the vicinity?

WWIII? The Houthis don't seem to care.

Back to the subject had at hand – Greenland and Canada.

As we know, President Trump has made considerable noise about annexing both.

A negotiating stance? One could say more or less.

Greenland, as my headline indicates, is the better case, not necessarily for complete annexation but for something that subsumes the world's biggest island under full US military control.

This has created tension with our NATO ally whose capital was made famous in the song that begins "[Wonderful.. wonderful...](#)" (It is a pretty nice place.)

Speaking from a US base on the island, Vance accused Denmark of underinvesting in Greenland and therefore threatening the island's security.

"Our message to Denmark is very simple. You have not done a good job by the people of Greenland," he said.

What really is going on is not so much the role of Denmark, a small country with nowhere near the military might to defend against global powers, but the growing role of China and Russia in the North Atlantic and the Arctic itself. These waters and the nearby lands have become necessary to defend against missiles far more accurate and lethal than anything any country has yet to confront in war and for which the polar route is often the most direct.

China and Russia have also been building up their navel fleets

accordingly.

This is the military realignment of a future that is already happening and must be taken seriously. Denmark itself, pride aside, must realize the US is better equipped to handle these dangerous adversaries than they are. In fact, yielding to whatever degree necessary—there are numerous solutions— is wise for them and the entire West—yet so far they have been obstinate (egged on, no doubt, by their EU friends).

In his speech, Vance insisted that tribal Greenlanders would have self-determination, but declined to rule out military force in the pursuit of US hegemony over the island. He did acknowledge, however, that things are on hold, at least temporarily, to see what the Greenlanders themselves will decide about separation from Denmark.

My suspicion is that something will be worked out relatively soon between Greenland, Denmark and the USA.

One (of many) reasons I have for saying so is that just today President Trump seemed to have made the [beginnings of peace](#) with Canada's new prime minister Mark Carney, Trump did not call him "Governor" (of a 51st state) nor did Carney, who previously had plenty of bad things to say about our president, engage in this kind of talk. Tariff negotiations—they happen surprisingly fast— are apparently underway involving our commerce secretary Howard Lutnick as well.

As far as the 51st state salvo is concerned, I'm hoping that was just a negotiating tactic (I suspect it was) because the last thing America needs is Canada as a state. Trump himself was a bit evasive when he was asked on March 21 by Fox's Peter Doocy if the president feared the possibility of a state of Canada becoming being perpetually Democrat..

It would be, even more than California—but that's the least of it. Canada is on its way to being Europe or. if possible,

worse. Let's say Europe without the great architecture, paintings and food. Who would need it? (We have plenty of mountains of our own.)

Canada's open door policy on immigration, like Europe's, exacerbated in the name of multiculturalism by former PM Justin Trudeau— is turning the country into something a far cry from the friendly mounties on their horses of our childhoods.

The multi in multicultural didn't turn out to be so multi. The majority of their immigrants are from countries governed in essence by sharia law, in other words immigrants who have little interest in and no intention of assimilating. They want to change Canada's culture to theirs.

Europe is dealing with this every day now and, with the exception[tion of a handful Eastern European countries, not having much success.

Will Canada? More likely it will become a country filled with Ilhan Omars.

Keep the door shut, Mr. President.

First published in [American Refugees](#)