

Is Scotland on Trump's list?

<https://www.taxresearch.org.uk/Blog/2026/01/05/is-scotland-on-trumps-list/>

Published: January 12, 2026, 8:32 pm

Nearly a year ago, [I published this video](#):

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qv2tDISzVkk&si=DtBURdx0HZipf-zN>

Using words that now seem prescient given what is happening in Venezuela and the threat to Greenland, [which is being widely acknowledged](#), I said:

In the world we now live in, the crazy is possible, and I'm suggesting that we need to prepare for it.

My argument was that Donald Trump's behaviour at the time signalled an expansionist mindset that was not merely rhetorical. Having already, at that time, floated the idea of absorbing Canada as a US state, threatened Panama over the canal zone, and pressured Denmark over Greenland, Trump was obviously already willing to treat sovereign territories as assets to be acquired. The concern was that once such demands began, they would escalate rather than stop.

Nothing suggests that anything I said was wrong: I did not have Venezuela on the list, that was all.

I then argued that from this perspective, Scotland could plausibly enter Trump's sights. Trump has a personal fixation with Scotland, claims ancestral ties, owns golf courses there, and views the country as familiar territory. More importantly, Scotland has significant strategic and economic value in a climate-stressed world: vast renewable energy potential, abundant clean water, and a central role in future European energy security. These assets align with Trump's interest in Greenland's mineral wealth as the ice recedes.

Scotland also hosts the UK's nuclear submarine base at Faslane. An independent

Scotland might challenge that arrangement, and Trump could seek to remove the uncertainty by asserting US control under the guise of security.

The most disturbing element was the risk of political complicity. In a scenario in which a Farage-led UK government faced an economic crisis, I suggested that Westminster might be willing to trade Scotland's sovereignty for financial support. I remain of that opinion.

However extreme that sounded, the core warning was that in a world of volatile politics, previously unthinkable outcomes can no longer be ruled out, and Scotland must be alert to that risk.

Does that warning still stand? I think it does. The chance is low, I admit, but just thinking about the possibility is important.

That is firstly because it draws attention to the UK Government's wholly inadequate response to what is happening, where it is claiming that it needs to see Trump's legal justification for the action he has taken before taking a view on it, when it is glaringly obvious that he is in breach of international law and the UN Charter, which, as permanent Security Council members, we are meant to uphold. Our prevarication is dangerous and could have consequences; in other words, it matters.

Secondly, this demands that we consider what it would be like if what is currently UK territory were under threat and how we would feel then. Little would concentrate the mind more than that, when right now it seems that ministers have only one intention, which is to deflect attention from what Trump is doing.

Thirdly, by changing the perspective, we gain a view of this country that is usually found almost impossible to comprehend, because it can be argued that it has been so long since we suffered occupation and external control. Even if such a takeover is unlikely, to think about the risk is relevant because it demands we form a view on Trump, on our government, on what the UK is, what defence means, and what we think Scotland is, from wherever we are on the independence issue.

What troubles me right now is the utter incoherence of Labour on what is happening.

Ask what would happen if Scotland were at risk, and they either respond by saying "don't be daft", except that the risk is not so remote that this is an appropriate reaction, or they have to address the issue. The question is worth asking, then. And I want to know their answer, because it is based on such scenario analysis that the government creates policy. So, what do they think?

Comments

When commenting, please take note of this blog's comment policy, [which is available here](#). Contravening this policy will result in comments being deleted before or after initial publication at the editor's sole discretion and without explanation being required or offered.