

Substantially Increasing U.S. Military Presence in the Arctic (Pros and Cons)

TABLE OF CONTENTS (ver. 1.23 = Final)

PRO SIDE	5
PRO: Opening New Trade Routes	5
S: According to... The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023	5
PRO: Increased Access to Resources	5
S: According to... The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023	5
PRO: Countering Re-Militarization from Russia/China	5
S: According to... The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023	5
PRO: Russia's Renewed Vigor to Militarize (the Arctic).....	5
S: According to... The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023	5
PRO: Countering Russian Military Expansion	5
S: According to... Georgetown Security Studies Review, November 11, 2022	5
PRO: Deterrence Against Chinese Military Deployment.....	6
S: According to... Georgetown Security Studies Review, November 11, 2022	6
PRO: Preventing Infrastructure Attacks	6
S: According to... Georgetown Security Studies Review, November 11, 2022	6
PRO: Protecting Allies from Drone Threats	6
S: According to... Georgetown Security Studies Review, November 11, 2022	6
PRO: Stopping Cyber Attacks on Infrastructure	6
S: According to... Georgetown Security Studies Review, November 11, 2022	6
PRO: Upgrading Cold-Weather Capabilities.....	7
S: According to... Georgetown Security Studies Review, November 11, 2022	7
PRO: Inadequacy of Early Warning Systems	7
S: According to... Georgetown Security Studies Review, November 11, 2022	7
PRO: Need for Upgraded Air Defense	7
S: According to... Georgetown Security Studies Review, November 11, 2022	7
PRO: Modernization of Early Warning Assets	7
S: According to... Georgetown Security Studies Review, November 11, 2022	7
PRO: Need for Permanent Air Defense	8
S: According to... Georgetown Security Studies Review, November 11, 2022	8
PRO: Infrastructure for Ground Forces.....	8
S: According to... Georgetown Security Studies Review, November 11, 2022	8
PRO: Layered Defensive Network	8
S: According to... Georgetown Security Studies Review, November 11, 2022	8
PRO: Warming Increases Piracy (ex. East Africa -> fewer fish = more pirates).....	9
S: According to... American Meteorological Society, April 27, 2023	9
PRO: Responding to "Part-Time" Pirates (or "Standby Piracy")	9
S: According to... American Meteorological Society, April 27, 2023	9
PRO: Protecting Against Security Threats	9
S: According to... India Quarterly, December 2021	9
PRO (Effectiveness): Generating Power Through Training (Navy)	9
According to... the Brookings Institution, May 2021	9
PRO (Security): Arctic Rebalancing is Needed.....	10
According to... the Brookings Institution, May 2021	10
PRO (Security): Regaining Arctic Dominance (Army).....	10
According to... the Brookings Institution, May 2021	10
PRO (Security): Crucial Detection, Tracking & Engagement (Air Force).....	10
According to... the Brookings Institution, May 2021	10
PRO (Security): Aggressive Russian Investment in Infrastructure	11
According to... the Brookings Institution, May 2021	11
PRO (Security): Navy Capabilities Will Be Effective	11
According to... the Brookings Institution, May 2021	11

Substantially Increasing U.S. Military Presence in the Arctic (Pros and Cons)

PRO: Russia & China Will Deny Access.....	11
S: According to... the American Security Project, December 10, 2021.....	11
PRO: Increased Access to Valuable Resources.....	11
S: According to... the American Security Project, December 10, 2021.....	11
PRO: Energy Independence for Impoverished Nations.....	11
S: According to... the American Security Project, December 10, 2021.....	11
PRO: China's Authority for Expansion is 'Questionable'.....	12
S: According to... the American Security Project, December 10, 2021.....	12
PRO: Russia's Expansion is 'Unlawful'.....	12
S: According to... the American Security Project, December 10, 2021.....	12
PRO: Lacking Security Along Trade Routes.....	12
S: According to... the American Security Project, December 10, 2021.....	12
PRO: Limited Presence Threatens Security (ex. Lacking Satellites).....	12
S: According to... the American Security Project, December 10, 2021.....	12
PRO: Limited Presence Threatens Security (ex. Ice Breakers).....	12
S: According to... the American Security Project, December 10, 2021.....	12
PRO: Funding Limits Threatens Military Bases.....	12
S: According to... the American Security Project, December 10, 2021.....	12
PRO: Arctic Investment Ensures Regional Security.....	12
S: According to... the American Security Project, December 10, 2021.....	12
PRO: Infrastructure Provides Better Security (& Economic Benefits).....	13
S: According to... the American Security Project, December 10, 2021.....	13
PRO: Improved Communication Vital to Success.....	13
S: According to... the American Security Project, December 10, 2021.....	13
PRO: Call for Declaration of Peace.....	13
S: According to... the American Security Project, December 10, 2021.....	13
PRO: Lack of Presence Increases Threats.....	13
S: According to... the American Security Project, December 10, 2021.....	13
PRO: Preventing Adversaries from Denying Access (to us and our allies).....	13
S: According to... the American Security Project, December 10, 2021.....	13
PRO: Risk of 'Resource' War is Disproven.....	13
S: According to... Polar Geography, February 28, 2021.....	13
PRO: Protecting Valuable Resources.....	14
S: According to... Milsat Magazine, March 2019.....	14
PRO: Communication is Critical to Success.....	14
S: According to... Milsat Magazine, March 2019.....	14
PRO: Overcoming Limitations Prevents Threats.....	14
S: According to... Milsat Magazine, March 2019.....	14
PRO: Providing Life-Saving Operations.....	14
S: According to... Milsat Magazine, March 2019.....	14
PRO: Training (& Technology) Prepares Military Forces.....	14
S: According to... Milsat Magazine, March 2019.....	14
PRO: Overcoming Communication Problems.....	15
S: According to... Milsat Magazine, March 2019.....	15
PRO: Reliable Communication Critical for Safety.....	15
S: According to... Milsat Magazine, March 2019.....	15
PRO: Improving UAV Capabilities (FYI: Unmanned Aerial Vehicles or Drones).....	15
S: According to... Milsat Magazine, March 2019.....	15
PRO: Protecting Immense Economic Interests.....	15
S: According to... Milsat Magazine, March 2019.....	15
PRO: Russia Militarism is 'Great Arctic Power'.....	15
MIT Securities Studies Program, October 29, 2020.....	15

Substantially Increasing U.S. Military Presence in the Arctic (Pros and Cons)

PRO: Essential Need for Science Infrastructure.....	16
S: According to... Atlantic Council, November 19, 2020	16
PRO: Dormant Diseases Endangers Global Health	16
S: According to... CNN News, March 8, 2023	16
PRO: Arctic Bioprospecting Helps with Medicines.....	16
S: According to... University of East Anglia, Oct 18, 2022	16
PRO: Russia Poses a Serious Threat (Problem Must Be Addressed!)	16
Prof. Katarzyna Zysk, of the Norwegian Institute for Defense Studies, DW News, August 28, 2023	16
PRO: Increasing Focus on Climate Change	16
S: According to... the Department of Defense, 2022	16
PRO: Responsible Operation w/o Harming Environment.....	16
S: According to... the United States Navy [Website], Last Accessed: October 2023.....	16
CON SIDE	17
CON: Reducing Competition Improves Security/Influence	17
S: According to... The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023.....	17
CON: Alternative Routes Readily Available (Arctic is Non-Essential).....	17
S: According to... The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023.....	17
CON: Missile Defense Protects Against Arctic Threats	17
S: According to... The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023.....	17
CON: Arctic Operations are Expensive/Difficult/Dangerous	17
S: According to... The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023.....	17
CON: Russia & China's Arctic Partnerships.....	17
S: According to... The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023.....	17
CON: Marginal Economic Incentives (Not Worth the Investment).....	18
S: According to... The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023.....	18
CON: Russia Not Prioritizing Environment/Indigenous Considerations	18
S: According to... The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023.....	18
CON: Lacking Economic Interests (Dangerous to Predict & Risks Conflict)	18
S: According to... The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023.....	18
CON: Russia Losing Arctic Resources	18
S: According to... The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023.....	18
CON: Strengthening Security Cooperation in Arctic	19
S: According to... The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023.....	19
CON: Nordic Partners Capable of Arctic Security.....	19
S: According to... The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023.....	19
CON: Avoiding Competition Strengthens Security.....	19
S: According to... The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023.....	19
CON: Militarization is Incredibly Costly (Cost Threatens Security).....	19
S: According to... The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023.....	19
CON: Resource Exploitation Still Cost Prohibitive.....	19
S: According to... The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023.....	19
CON: Global Markets Make Resources Available	20
S: According to... The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023.....	20
CON: Access to Rare Earth Minerals (ex. Sweden)	20
S: According to... The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023.....	20
CON: Humanitarian/Environmental Diplomatic Challenges (vs. Russia/China).....	20
S: According to... The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023.....	20
CON: [Trade-Off] Collective Defense Yields More Resources	20
S: According to... The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023.....	20
CON: Military Provocation by Russia.....	20
S: According to... Responsible Statecraft, August 29, 2022	20

Substantially Increasing U.S. Military Presence in the Arctic (Pros and Cons)

CON: Poor Use of Resources	21
S: According to... Responsible Statecraft, August 29, 2022	21
CON: Cooperation with Russia is Vital	21
S: According to... Responsible Statecraft, August 29, 2022	21
CON: Exacerbating Climate Change	21
S: According to... Responsible Statecraft, August 29, 2022	21
CON: Increased Emissions	21
S: According to... Responsible Statecraft, August 29, 2022	21
CON: Climate Change is Region's Largest Threat (more than war!).....	22
S: According to... Responsible Statecraft, August 29, 2022	22
CON: Cooperation on Climate is Paramount	22
S: According to... Responsible Statecraft, August 29, 2022	22
CON: Warming Reduces Piracy (ex. South China Sea → more fish = fewer pirates).....	22
S: According to... American Meteorological Society, April 27, 2023	22
CON: Extraordinary Challenges in Defense Operations.....	22
S: According to... the Brookings Institution, May 2021	22
CON: Arctic Defense Faces Serious Challenges.....	23
According to... the Brookings Institution, May 2021	23
CON (Security): Cooperation Avoids Russia-China Alliance	23
According to... the Brookings Institution, May 2021	23
CON: Lacking Technology/Knowledge to Extract Resources	23
S: According to... the American Security Project, December 10, 2021.....	23
CON: Geopolitical Tensions Rising in the Arctic	23
S: According to... PBS News, April 23, 2023	23
CON: Becoming Another “Area of Confrontation”	23
S: According to... the Norwegian Institute for Defense Studies, DW News, August 28, 2023	23
CON: Russia Will Feel Threatened	23
S: According to... the Norwegian Institute for Defense Studies, DW News, August 28, 2023	23
CON: Miscalculations Can Trigger Nuclear War.....	24
S: According to... Harlan Ullman, Senior Adviser at the Atlantic Council, The Hill, March 13, 2023	24
CON: Increased Tension Risks Nuclear War	24
S: According to... the William J Perry Project, Last Accessed: October 2023	24
CON: Miscalculations Far More Likely (& Dangerous)	24
S: According to... CBC News, February 18, 2018.....	24
CON: Cooperation (not Confrontation) is Key to Pursuing Science in the Arctic	24
S: According to... The Arctic Institute, March 14, 2023	24
CON: Restoring Cooperation is Critical to Addressing Climate Emergencies	24
S: According to... The Arctic Institute, March 28, 2023	24
PRO/CON: Four Pillars of the Arctic Strategy.....	24
S: According to... Georgetown Security Studies Review, November 11, 2022.....	24
PRO/CON:	24
S: According to... Arctic Yearbook, March 2023	24
REFERENCES	25

Substantially Increasing U.S. Military Presence in the Arctic (Pros and Cons)

PRO SIDE

PRO: Opening New Trade Routes

S: According to... *The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023*

<https://cimsec.org/why-the-us-is-losing-the-race-for-the-arctic-and-what-to-do-about-it/>

Q: It states...

Almost weekly there is another story insinuating that the US is losing the “race for the Arctic.” Those who support the claim that the US is losing this race often highlight that the Arctic ice is melting and that this environmental change is opening up potential trade routes and making natural resources more ripe for exploitation. Others then point out that Russia has increasingly re-militarized the Arctic and that China has also made inroads to establish itself in the region.

PRO: Increased Access to Resources

S: According to... *The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023*

<https://cimsec.org/why-the-us-is-losing-the-race-for-the-arctic-and-what-to-do-about-it/>

Q: It states...

Almost weekly there is another story insinuating that the US is losing the “race for the Arctic.” Those who support the claim that the US is losing this race often highlight that the Arctic ice is melting and that this environmental change is opening up potential trade routes and making natural resources more ripe for exploitation. Others then point out that Russia has increasingly re-militarized the Arctic and that China has also made inroads to establish itself in the region.

PRO: Countering Re-Militarization from Russia/China

S: According to... *The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023*

<https://cimsec.org/why-the-us-is-losing-the-race-for-the-arctic-and-what-to-do-about-it/>

Q: It states...

Almost weekly there is another story insinuating that the US is losing the “race for the Arctic.” Those who support the claim that the US is losing this race often highlight that the Arctic ice is melting and that this environmental change is opening up potential trade routes and making natural resources more ripe for exploitation. Others then point out that Russia has increasingly re-militarized the Arctic and that China has also made inroads to establish itself in the region.

PRO: Russia's Renewed Vigor to Militarize (the Arctic)

S: According to... *The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023*

<https://cimsec.org/why-the-us-is-losing-the-race-for-the-arctic-and-what-to-do-about-it/>

Q: It states...

As a result, since the disastrous Russo-Japanese War of 1905, and especially during WW I and WW II,* and the Cold War, Russia has militarized the Arctic. This is something that it has taken up with renewed vigor under Vladimir Putin's regime. Russia's militarization of the Arctic has especially occurred in two spots. The first one is the ice-free Barents Sea, which Russia has relied on to access the world's oceans so that it can better protect its territory and international interests from foreign threats, and the second one is under the Arctic ice cap where its nuclear submarines have an icy bastion that protects them from NATO forces.

PRO: Countering Russian Military Expansion

S: According to... *Georgetown Security Studies Review, November 11, 2022*

<https://georgetownsecuritystudiesreview.org/2022/11/11/combating-the-gray-zone-enhancing-americas-arctic-force-posture/>

Q: It states...

Russia's military expansion and Arctic territorial claims are well documented. Recently, the Russian military reopened 50 Soviet-era military installations and invested in a growing array of Arctic capabilities, including hypersonic cruise missiles and nuclear-powered undersea drones. Russia also maintains a robust air defense network along its northern coastline with a dedicated Northern Fleet and Arctic Brigade as part of its Arctic military command. Both forces serve to defend the Russian homeland and assist in securing Russia's economic resources. An enhanced military posture in the Arctic coincides with Russia's increased economic activity in the region that focuses on the Northern Sea Route as an increasingly profitable shipping lane. In addition to vast reserves of hydrocarbons, the Arctic could potentially possess up to \$1 trillion worth of rare earth metals and abundant fisheries. Access to natural resources and an enhanced military presence suggest that Russia could become increasingly assertive over its claims in the Arctic in the coming years, especially as the People's Republic of China (PRC) increasingly cooperates with Russia.

F: It states... Recently, the Russian military reopened 50 Soviet-era military installations and invested in a growing array of Arctic capabilities, including hypersonic cruise missiles and nuclear-powered undersea drones.

C: This means... by increasing U.S. military presence in the Arctic, we can counterbalance Russian military expansion and deter potential aggression, thereby enhancing global security and protecting tens of millions of lives.

Substantially Increasing U.S. Military Presence in the Arctic (Pros and Cons)

PRO: Deterrence Against Chinese Military Deployment

S: According to... *Georgetown Security Studies Review*, November 11, 2022

<https://georgetownsecuritystudiesreview.org/2022/11/11/combating-the-gray-zone-enhancing-americas-arctic-force-posture/>

Q: It states...

In addition to Russia, China continues to exert increasing regional influence. Despite being geographically removed, the PRC views the Arctic as a vital strategic frontier that will likely witness increasing military competition. Though its military efforts are modest, the People's Liberation Army Navy deployed naval vessels to the Arctic on two occasions, built an icebreaker, and considered producing nuclear-powered icebreakers. Economically, the PRC seeks to develop the Northern Sea Route as an alternative to other contentious maritime routes as it transports goods to Europe.

F: It states... Though its military efforts are modest, the People's Liberation Army Navy deployed naval vessels to the Arctic on two occasions, built an icebreaker, and considered producing nuclear-powered icebreakers.

C: This means... by increasing U.S. military presence in the Arctic, we can monitor and potentially deter Chinese naval activities, safeguarding key maritime routes and protecting the security of millions of lives dependent on these routes.

PRO: Preventing Infrastructure Attacks

S: According to... *Georgetown Security Studies Review*, November 11, 2022

<https://georgetownsecuritystudiesreview.org/2022/11/11/combating-the-gray-zone-enhancing-americas-arctic-force-posture/>

Q: It states...

Russia and China are likely to conduct gray zone operations in the Arctic because of its strategic importance and due to their demonstrated willingness to use all measures short of conflict to coerce other states. Europe is currently witnessing what a future gray zone operation in the Arctic may look like as it struggles to maintain gas supplies heading into the winter. On September 26, 2022, Sweden detected explosions and gas leaks emitting from the Nord Stream pipeline leading to Germany, suggesting sabotage that many attribute to Russia. In addition to Nord Stream, Norway has reported numerous drone sightings in October near its energy facilities. Russia also relies on cyber-attacks to target infrastructure, including the 2021 Colonial Pipeline attack in the United States. Recent infrastructure attacks offer a glimpse at how the Russians could behave in future Arctic standoffs as they seek to exert control while maintaining deniability.

F: It states... On September 26, 2022, Sweden detected explosions and gas leaks emitting from the Nord Stream pipeline leading to Germany, suggesting sabotage that many attribute to Russia.

C: This means... by increasing U.S. military presence in the Arctic, we can better secure critical infrastructure, such as pipelines, that are essential for energy security in Europe, thereby protecting the well-being of millions of lives.

PRO: Protecting Allies from Drone Threats

S: According to... *Georgetown Security Studies Review*, November 11, 2022

<https://georgetownsecuritystudiesreview.org/2022/11/11/combating-the-gray-zone-enhancing-americas-arctic-force-posture/>

Q: It states...

China's recent gray zone efforts received less publicity than Russia's, but the PRC is no stranger to using cyber attacks and non-attributable means to achieve political objectives. For example, the PRC uses its maritime militia to support its claims over the South China Sea by providing a constant presence while preventing states from attributing such actions to the Chinese government. In addition, China continues to use economic measures to coerce neighboring countries and may do so to secure future resources in the Arctic.

F: It states... Norway has reported numerous drone sightings in October near its energy facilities."

C: This means... by increasing U.S. military presence in the Arctic, we can assist in monitoring and intercepting unauthorized drone activities near critical infrastructure, making millions of lives safer by ensuring energy security.

PRO: Stopping Cyber Attacks on Infrastructure

S: According to... *Georgetown Security Studies Review*, November 11, 2022

<https://georgetownsecuritystudiesreview.org/2022/11/11/combating-the-gray-zone-enhancing-americas-arctic-force-posture/>

Q: It states...

China's recent gray zone efforts received less publicity than Russia's, but the PRC is no stranger to using cyber attacks and non-attributable means to achieve political objectives. For example, the PRC uses its maritime militia to support its claims over the South China Sea by providing a constant presence while preventing states from attributing such actions to the Chinese government. In addition, China continues to use economic measures to coerce neighboring countries and may do so to secure future resources in the Arctic.

F: It states... Russia also relies on cyber-attacks to target infrastructure, including the 2021 Colonial Pipeline attack in the United States.

C: This means... by increasing U.S. military presence in the Arctic, we can bolster cybersecurity measures for critical infrastructure, thereby safeguarding the energy supply and protecting tens of millions of lives.

Substantially Increasing U.S. Military Presence in the Arctic (Pros and Cons)

PRO: Upgrading Cold-Weather Capabilities

S: According to... *Georgetown Security Studies Review*, November 11, 2022

<https://georgetownsecuritystudiesreview.org/2022/11/11/combating-the-gray-zone-enhancing-americas-arctic-force-posture/>

Q: It states...

The White House and DOD strategies address the need to invest in upgraded cold-weather capabilities, the modernization of early warning systems, continued training enhancement, and further cooperation with allies. However, despite the increased focus on the Arctic, each strategy may miss an essential aspect of the impending competition. As territorial and economic claims expand in the region, how will the United States protect its infrastructure from "gray zone" attacks and the use of unmanned systems to exploit resource claims? Relying on early warning systems to detect and track airborne targets while Air Force assets intercept threats may prove inadequate, especially if the United States faces persistent threats from multiple adversaries employing manned and unmanned aircraft.

F: It states... The White House and DOD strategies address the need to invest in upgraded cold-weather capabilities.

C: This means... by increasing U.S. military presence in the Arctic, we can better adapt to the harsh environmental conditions, thereby enhancing operational effectiveness and protecting millions of lives.

PRO: Inadequacy of Early Warning Systems

S: According to... *Georgetown Security Studies Review*, November 11, 2022

<https://georgetownsecuritystudiesreview.org/2022/11/11/combating-the-gray-zone-enhancing-americas-arctic-force-posture/>

Q: It states...

The White House and DOD strategies address the need to invest in upgraded cold-weather capabilities, the modernization of early warning systems, continued training enhancement, and further cooperation with allies. However, despite the increased focus on the Arctic, each strategy may miss an essential aspect of the impending competition. As territorial and economic claims expand in the region, how will the United States protect its infrastructure from "gray zone" attacks and the use of unmanned systems to exploit resource claims? Relying on early warning systems to detect and track airborne targets while Air Force assets intercept threats may prove inadequate, especially if the United States faces persistent threats from multiple adversaries employing manned and unmanned aircraft.

F: It states... Relying on early warning systems to detect and track airborne targets... may prove inadequate..."

C: This means... by increasing U.S. military presence in the Arctic, we can supplement early warning systems with additional layers of defense, thereby safeguarding millions of lives from potential aerial threats.

PRO: Need for Upgraded Air Defense

S: According to... *Georgetown Security Studies Review*, November 11, 2022

<https://georgetownsecuritystudiesreview.org/2022/11/11/combating-the-gray-zone-enhancing-americas-arctic-force-posture/>

Q: It states...

Successfully defending American interests and the homeland from potential gray zone operations requires the United States to invest in upgraded Arctic air defense capabilities and the military infrastructure to rapidly deploy forces to remote locations.

F: It states... Successfully defending American interests... requires the United States to invest in upgraded Arctic air defense capabilities and the military infrastructure to rapidly deploy forces to remote locations.

C: This means... by increasing U.S. military presence in the Arctic, we can respond more swiftly to emerging threats, thereby enhancing the security of millions of lives.

PRO: Modernization of Early Warning Assets

S: According to... *Georgetown Security Studies Review*, November 11, 2022

<https://georgetownsecuritystudiesreview.org/2022/11/11/combating-the-gray-zone-enhancing-americas-arctic-force-posture/>

Q: It states...

The Arctic strategy provides the United States with a baseline from which it can build on homeland defense initiatives but fails to identify additional security measures required to provide for a layered defense. One of the strategic objectives of the Arctic strategy is to improve the understanding of the operating environment through the modernization of early warning assets to assist in tracking threats across domains. Replacing aging radar systems is vital, but the strategy fails to mention the deployment of air defense assets to the northern reaches of Alaska.

F: It states... One of the strategic objectives of the Arctic strategy is to improve the understanding of the operating environment through the modernization of early warning assets...

C: This means... by increasing U.S. military presence in the Arctic, we can modernize early warning systems to better track threats, thereby enhancing national security and protecting millions of lives.

Substantially Increasing U.S. Military Presence in the Arctic (Pros and Cons)

PRO: Need for Permanent Air Defense

S: According to... *Georgetown Security Studies Review*, November 11, 2022

<https://georgetownsecuritystudiesreview.org/2022/11/11/combating-the-gray-zone-enhancing-americas-arctic-force-posture/>

Q: It states...

The Army's Arctic strategy, "Regaining Arctic Dominance," notes that there is no current plan to implement permanent air defense assets in the vulnerable regions of Alaska. The Army plans to "examine the benefit of establishing Arctic Army Prepositioned Stocks sets," which will include ground-based air defense but not establishing a permanent presence. In March, Northern Command conducted its Arctic Edge 2022 exercise, which included air defense integration for the first time in recent decades. Though it was only a training exercise, soldiers learned valuable lessons on winterizing equipment and preparing for Arctic operations. Exercises such as Arctic Edge and the repositioning of equipment are an essential first step but responding to immediate threats will require a permanent air defense presence. Russia's recent drone usage around hydrocarbon facilities in Europe should provide a stark warning for what may come in the Arctic. Air Force F-22s will continue to play a crucial role in intercepting manned aircraft, but layering America's homeland defense with air defense systems can help protect key infrastructure in the far reaches. Rapid responses to potential aerial threats will require permanent air defense systems available to respond if Air Force assets are unavailable.

F: It states... The Army's Arctic strategy, 'Regaining Arctic Dominance,' notes that there is no current plan to implement permanent air defense assets in the vulnerable regions of Alaska.

C: This means... by increasing U.S. military presence in the Arctic, we can establish permanent air defense systems, thereby providing a more robust defense against aerial threats and protecting millions of lives.

PRO: Infrastructure for Ground Forces

S: According to... *Georgetown Security Studies Review*, November 11, 2022

<https://georgetownsecuritystudiesreview.org/2022/11/11/combating-the-gray-zone-enhancing-americas-arctic-force-posture/>

Q: It states...

Unfortunately, this recommendation is likely to be met with skepticism because of the number of requirements already facing U.S. forces, but recent European developments may prove it necessary. Due to Russian threats, Norway's deployment of ground forces to their oil and gas plants demonstrates the necessity of having the infrastructure to station, mobilize, and sustain ground forces in areas of interest. Ground forces stationed in southern Alaska or elsewhere will not provide timely support and may face difficulties accessing the region. Developing the infrastructure to station soldiers in the Arctic is costly and a potential drain of human resources, but it aligns with the National Defense Strategy's first priority of defending the homeland. In an article from August 2021, Noel Williams offered a potential solution by permanently stationing Marines in Alaska. By establishing a permanent presence in Alaska, the Marines could rotate forces through a northern installation and act as a quick reaction force for potential regional issues. A Marine deployment to the region would build upon previous training exercises in the Arctic and increase their interoperability with other Arctic nations such as Norway.

F: It states... Developing the infrastructure to station soldiers in the Arctic is costly and a potential drain of human resources, but it aligns with the National Defense Strategy's first priority of defending the homeland.

C: This means... by increasing U.S. military presence in the Arctic, we can establish the necessary infrastructure for ground forces, thereby enhancing our ability to defend critical areas and protecting millions of lives.

PRO: Layered Defensive Network

S: According to... *Georgetown Security Studies Review*, November 11, 2022

<https://georgetownsecuritystudiesreview.org/2022/11/11/combating-the-gray-zone-enhancing-americas-arctic-force-posture/>

Q: It states...

Recent strategy updates by the White House and the DOD aim to overcome the geographic limitations and experience gaps plaguing the United States in the Arctic. New initiatives and investments highlighted in these strategies will significantly increase America's ability to respond to an Arctic crisis, but the appropriate security posture demands increased investment. The potential for future gray zone activities in the Arctic requires the United States to assess which assets it needs in the Arctic. At the very least, the United States must consider establishing an integrated air defense network and a permanent ground presence in northern Alaska. By adding these vital elements, the United States can layer its defensive network, provide security for critical infrastructure, and rapidly respond to any crisis. A free and open Arctic will require an enhanced American military presence to ensure its competitors do not deny access to other Arctic states with legitimate claims.

F: It states... At the very least, the United States must consider establishing an integrated air defense network and a permanent ground presence in northern Alaska.

C: This means... by increasing U.S. military presence in the Arctic, we can create a layered defensive network, thereby providing a more comprehensive security umbrella and protecting millions of lives.

Substantially Increasing U.S. Military Presence in the Arctic (Pros and Cons)

PRO: Warming Increases Piracy (ex. East Africa -> fewer fish = more pirates)

S: According to... American Meteorological Society, April 27, 2023

<https://blog.ametsoc.org/2023/04/27/climate-change-is-driving-piracy-on-the-seas/>

Q: It states...

Climate change is an unseen force behind maritime piracy, with opposite impacts on two of the world's major pirate hotspots, according to a paper just published in the American Meteorological Society journal *Weather, Climate, and Society* (WCAS). The study, by Bo Jiang, PhD (University of Macau), and Gary LaFree, PhD (University of Maryland, College Park), examines 20 years' worth of data, demonstrating that years with warmer ocean temperatures see increased piracy off the coasts of East Africa, but decreased piracy in the South China Sea.

PRO: Responding to "Part-Time" Pirates (or "Standby Piracy")

S: According to... American Meteorological Society, April 27, 2023

<https://blog.ametsoc.org/2023/04/27/climate-change-is-driving-piracy-on-the-seas/>

Q: It states... People in areas prone to piracy often have names for this phenomenon. In Singapore, where Jiang grew up, fishermen who turn to piracy when fish production is low are called "standby pirates" or "part-time pirates." This is one of the first studies in criminology to quantitatively examine when these standby pirates are most likely to engage in illegal activities. To tease out the effects of climate from those of other factors, Jiang and LaFree carefully examined the potential effects of other factors—like the presence of private security guards on board, and the regional "misery index" of local economic stress. Holding all other variables constant, they still found a significant relationship between sea surface temperature and piracy.

PRO: Protecting Against Security Threats

S: According to... *India Quarterly*, December 2021

<https://doi.org/10.1177/09749284211047721>

[Sharma (2021). Bipandeep Sharma is a Research Analyst at Non-Traditional Security Centre at Manohar Parrikar Institute for Defence Studies and Analysis, New Delhi. He is also a doctoral candidate at Department of Political Science, Panjab University, Chandigarh (India). 'De-Securitisating the Arctic' in *Climate Change: An Indian Perspective*. *India Quarterly*, 77(4), December 2021, 622-641. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09749284211047721>]

Q: It states...

"...The Arctic states feel that if they did not uphold their military strength, the other powerful states may threaten their state's national interests in the region; whereas, if they did strengthen their own military capabilities in the Arctic, it might create a sense of insecurity in their immediate neighbours, thus compelling them to take similar enhanced security measures (Åtland, 2014). In practice, the circumpolar Arctic is witnessing a significant increase in militarisation in the form of expansion to military bases, developments in military infrastructure, increasing military exercises, deployment of sophisticated weapons, radars, surveillance equipment and so on (Jensen & Rottem, 2010; Nilsen, 2018; Sharp, 2011; Spohr et al, 2013, p. 34; Wang, 2013). Involved states' emerging documents, policy briefs, significant research papers and media reporting on the Arctic are becoming increasingly assertive on addressing these emerging issues (termed as security threats) through the language of 'security', where the emphasis is laid on protecting the state's interests through enhancing its hard traditional military measures in the region (Barnes, 2017; Boulègue, 2019; Danish Ministry of Defence, 2018; Department of the Navy, 2021; Devyatkin, 2019; Dittmann, 2009; Norwegian Government, 2017, p. 18). ..."

F: It states... Increased military presence can help to deter potential adversaries and maintain stability in the region. The Arctic is becoming increasingly important due to its strategic location and the abundance of resources, which has led to growing competition among Arctic states.

C: This means... By increasing its military presence, the US can signal its commitment to protecting its interests and those of its allies, due to deterring potential aggression and maintaining stability in the region.

PRO (Effectiveness): Generating Power Through Training (Navy)

According to... *the Brookings Institution*, May 2021

https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/FP_20210520_arctic_defense.pdf

Q: It states...

The Department of the Air Force is a key DOD player in the Arctic and its new strategy reflects this.²⁵ Crucially, the Air Force plays a lead role in homeland defense through its missions via the North Warning System which helps detect, track, and engage air and missile threats. The Air and Space forces provide land and space-based awareness in addition to rapid response options in the region through fighter and refueling aircraft. This makes the Arctic a key area to project combat-credible power into Eurasia. The department also runs an Arctic Weather Survival school and operates the only ski-equipped aircraft, LC-130, in the U.S. military's inventory. Gaining skills to operate in the environment is also key for generating combat power. The unique advantages of using airpower in the region meets the need to overcome the challenges inherent in such a vast area. In fact, the nation's largest airspace used for high-threat training is in Alaska.

Substantially Increasing U.S. Military Presence in the Arctic (Pros and Cons)

F: In other words... The U.S. Air Force' Arctic Weather Survival school provides vital training for the necessary skills to operate effectively in the arctic environment which is "key for generating combat power".

C: This means... Increasing our military presence, will be effective due to the expertise offered through superior military training and skill development.

PRO (Security): Arctic Rebalancing is Needed

According to... the Brookings Institution, May 2021

https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/FP_20210520_arctic_defense.pdf

Q: It states...

Arctic activity has largely focused on nuclear sub-surface power projection and deterrence in addition to scientific research during the Cold War and its immediate aftermath. But the decrease in year-round sea ice and sea ice thickness has global effects on weather systems and ecology, and will inevitably increase human activity due to the desire to exploit resources, engage in recreational activity, and increase commercial activity and shipping via two trans-Arctic routes. This makes the Arctic of growing strategic value, especially in the realm of security competition. Many Arctic states are developing Arctic critical infrastructure and establishing more robust Arctic military presence to some extent or another. Ongoing and foreseeable future increases in Russian and Chinese military activity will likely create a security dilemma whereby the United States, Canada, and the Nordic countries find themselves in need of reciprocation.

F: In other words...

As access to the arctic increases so will extracting resources, commerce, and tourism. Many countries such as Russia and China are developing critical infrastructure and a greater military presence. The US and its allies must do the same.

C: This means... If we increase our military presence, then millions of lives and millions of dollars in commerce will be better protected. Otherwise, our rivals will try to take the arctic for themselves.

PRO (Security): Regaining Arctic Dominance (Army)

According to... the Brookings Institution, May 2021

https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/FP_20210520_arctic_defense.pdf

Q: It states...

The Department of the Army's recently released Arctic strategy²⁴ focuses on regaining Arctic dominance by establishing an Army able to generate and project forces that are trained, equipped, and sustained to fight, win, and survive in extreme cold weather and high-altitude conditions. To achieve this, the Army plans to establish an operational two-star headquarters with uniquely trained and equipped combat brigades to increase the Army's cold-weather capabilities. The strategy also highlights the Army's need to improve the material readiness of Arctic-capable units to conduct extended operations in the Arctic region as well as the need to improve individual and collective training of forces to operate in the region. The Army also believes returning to the Arctic provides new opportunities to engage and train with allies and partners who also operate in extreme cold and high-altitude environments.

F: In other words... The Army is focusing on regaining Arctic dominance by establishing operational headquarters with combat brigades who will engage and train with allies to operate in extreme cold environments.

C: This means... By increasing our military presence, we also increase our military capabilities and this will deter aggressors and protect millions of lives.

PRO (Security): Crucial Detection, Tracking & Engagement (Air Force)

According to... the Brookings Institution, May 2021

https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/FP_20210520_arctic_defense.pdf

Q: It states...

The Department of the Air Force is a key DOD player in the Arctic and its new strategy reflects this.²⁵ Crucially, the Air Force plays a lead role in homeland defense through its missions via the North Warning System which helps detect, track, and engage air and missile threats. The Air and Space forces provide land and space-based awareness in addition to rapid response options in the region through fighter and refueling aircraft. This makes the Arctic a key area to project combat-credible power into Eurasia. The department also runs an Arctic Weather Survival school and operates the only ski-equipped aircraft, LC-130, in the U.S. military's inventory. Gaining skills to operate in the environment is also key for generating combat power. The unique advantages of using airpower in the region meets the need to overcome the challenges inherent in such a vast area. In fact, the nation's largest airspace used for high-threat training is in Alaska.

F: In other words... The arctic is a vast area and air force resources are crucial to help detect, track, and engage air and missile threats and allow for rapid response through both fighter and refueling aircraft making the Arctic a key area to project combat-credible power into Europe and Asia.

C: This means... If we increase our military presence, we protect millions of lives, by providing crucial support to a vital area of strategic importance.

Substantially Increasing U.S. Military Presence in the Arctic (Pros and Cons)

PRO (Security): Aggressive Russian Investment in Infrastructure

According to... the Brookings Institution, May 2021

https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/FP_20210520_arctic_defense.pdf

Q: It states...

Regardless of these challenges, both Russia and China claim strategic interests in the region. The Arctic is part of Russia's national identity. The 2014 Russian Military Doctrine states that the safeguarding of Russian interests in the region is a main task.⁷ Russia exercises commercial administrative control over the Northern Sea 2 Route⁸ by requiring transiting commercial vessels to pay for pilotage and icebreaking services and has claimed an estimated 80% of the oil and gas under the Arctic shelf.⁹ Further, Russia is aggressively investing in infrastructure and improving its Arctic military posture.¹⁰ In fact, the Russian military has recently upgraded its bases, reallocated more air and naval assets to the region, and increased the frequency of regional shows of force.¹¹

F: In other words... Russia is aggressively investing in infrastructure and its Arctic military, has recently upgraded its bases, and as reallocated more military assets to the region, and increased regional shows of force.

C: This means... If we increase our military presence, then we are protecting hundreds of millions of lives, because we need to counter Russia's expansion to bring stability.

PRO (Security): Navy Capabilities Will Be Effective

According to... the Brookings Institution, May 2021

https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/FP_20210520_arctic_defense.pdf

Q: It states...

The Department of the Navy released its strategic blueprint for the Arctic on January 5, 2021.²⁶ The blueprint outlined the challenges and opportunities resulting from a more accessible region in an era of increased great power competition. It also highlighted the need for enhanced naval presence by integrating specific Navy and Marine Corps capabilities, strengthening of cooperative partnerships with Arctic nations, and the building of a more capable Arctic naval force through modernization, training, and updated employment concepts. These objectives are intended to better defend the homeland, promote and preserve U.S. national interests in the region, and protect sea lines of communication.²⁷

F: In other words... challenges and opportunities - in an era of increased great power competition. It also highlighted the need for enhanced naval presence by integrating specific Navy and Marine Corps capabilities, strengthening of cooperative partnerships with Arctic nations, and the building of a more capable Arctic naval force through modernization, training, and updated employment concepts. U.S. national interests in the region, and protect sea lines of communication.²⁷

C: This means... Increasing our military presence, will be effective due to the expertise offered through superior

PRO: Russia & China Will Deny Access

S: According to... the American Security Project, December 10, 2021

<https://www.americansecurityproject.org/the-need-for-increased-u-s-presence-in-the-arctic/>

F: It states... Russia and China have already shown their intent to use Arctic passageways and their willingness to deny the U.S. access. Russia's militarization of its northern shores that face the Arctic Circle also presents security threats.

C: This means... An increased military presence in the Arctic could help the U.S. secure new shipping routes and access to natural resources by showing strength and deterring possible aggression toward us and our allies.

PRO: Increased Access to Valuable Resources

S: According to... the American Security Project, December 10, 2021

<https://www.americansecurityproject.org/the-need-for-increased-u-s-presence-in-the-arctic/>

F: It states... Resource availability is one of the many reasons why countries increase the involvement in the Arctic; the presence of rare earth mineral deposits.

C: This means... we need to increase the security and safety of the region to allow our companies and those of our allies to gain access to these precious resources.

PRO: Energy Independence for Impoverished Nations

S: According to... the American Security Project, December 10, 2021

<https://www.americansecurityproject.org/the-need-for-increased-u-s-presence-in-the-arctic/>

F: It states... Countries experiencing energy security issues, in central and eastern Europe, see access to Arctic resources as an opportunity to become more self-sufficient. Russia uses gas lines and other forms of energy as a bargaining chip to hold control over these countries.

C: This means... US military presence can help allies to escape from Russia's influence making millions of European people more secure and more financially stable.

Substantially Increasing U.S. Military Presence in the Arctic (Pros and Cons)

PRO: China's Authority for Expansion is 'Questionable'

S: According to... the American Security Project, December 10, 2021

<https://www.americansecurityproject.org/the-need-for-increased-u-s-presence-in-the-arctic/>

F: It states... China and Russia are the United States' main competitors in the Arctic. China has claimed that it is a "near-Arctic state," however, this designation is questionable considering the closest point to the Arctic circle in China is 811 nautical miles.

C: This means... we must increase our military presence to contain Chinese expansion in an area that is nearly 1,000 miles from their territory.

PRO: Russia's Expansion is 'Unlawful'

S: According to... the American Security Project, December 10, 2021

<https://www.americansecurityproject.org/the-need-for-increased-u-s-presence-in-the-arctic/>

F: It states... Russia has many ice breakers that can launch cruise missiles giving the U.S. less time to respond. In addition, Russia claims territory up to the north pole extending well beyond the shoreline outlined under international law (ex. Law of the Sea Treaty).

C: This means... we must increase our presence to contain unlawful Russian expansion in an area that is supposed to be international waters.

PRO: Lacking Security Along Trade Routes

S: According to... the American Security Project, December 10, 2021

<https://www.americansecurityproject.org/the-need-for-increased-u-s-presence-in-the-arctic/>

F: It states... Economic trade can create national security concerns due to the small number of U.S. ice breakers in the region and limited military presence, there are limited ways to protect the integrity of the shipping routes, which will continue to expand with the melting of the Arctic ice.

C: This means... we must increase our military presence with more ice breakers and more vessels that will protect hundreds of billions in trade and resources from security threats.

PRO: Limited Presence Threatens Security (ex. Lacking Satellites)

S: According to... the American Security Project, December 10, 2021

<https://www.americansecurityproject.org/the-need-for-increased-u-s-presence-in-the-arctic/>

F: It states... a small military presence with limited satellites providing information in the arctic makes it difficult for military installations and ships to navigate, communicate, and transfer data effectively. This lack of information interferes with military readiness and decreases national security.

C: This means... we must significantly increase our presence to improve the security and defense of millions of lives - we need more security!

PRO: Limited Presence Threatens Security (ex. Ice Breakers)

S: According to... the American Security Project, December 10, 2021

<https://www.americansecurityproject.org/the-need-for-increased-u-s-presence-in-the-arctic/>

F: It states... the U.S. does not have enough ice breakers in the region. Ice breakers should become more present in the Arctic and include appropriate weapons should the U.S. ever have to show force.

C: This means... we need to expand our fleet of ice breakers so we can secure a greater area and provide reliable escorts, and search and rescue operations to protect our interests and our allies in the region.

PRO: Funding Limits Threatens Military Bases

S: According to... the American Security Project, December 10, 2021

<https://www.americansecurityproject.org/the-need-for-increased-u-s-presence-in-the-arctic/>

F: It states... there is not enough military base funding in the region. This is needed to combat the challenges that come with the harsh climate conditions, which contribute to the instability of infrastructure and decreased military readiness.

C: This means... we need to invest in a stronger military presence in order to prevent security threats from harming millions of lives in the area.

PRO: Arctic Investment Ensures Regional Security

S: According to... the American Security Project, December 10, 2021

<https://www.americansecurityproject.org/the-need-for-increased-u-s-presence-in-the-arctic/>

F: It states... There is a need for better communications from satellites, a need for more ice breakers, and funding for military to prevent national security risks, however, once these shortcomings are addressed, the U.S. will be capable of enforcing its sovereignty in the region.

C: This means... with proper funding, equipment and infrastructure, the increased military presence will ensure the security and safety of our national security and economic interests in the region.

Substantially Increasing U.S. Military Presence in the Arctic (Pros and Cons)

PRO: Infrastructure Provides Better Security (& Economic Benefits)

S: According to... *the American Security Project, December 10, 2021*

<https://www.americansecurityproject.org/the-need-for-increased-u-s-presence-in-the-arctic/>

F: It states... there are currently no American deep ocean ports along Alaska's Arctic coast. Deep-water ports will allow ships to easily access, and transport resources needed to diversify Alaska's economy, provide better search, and rescue capabilities off the coast.

C: this means... Without increasing our presence, we will lack the necessary infrastructure to keep the Arctic secure.

PRO: Improved Communication Vital to Success

S: According to... *the American Security Project, December 10, 2021*

<https://www.americansecurityproject.org/the-need-for-increased-u-s-presence-in-the-arctic/>

F: It states... There is a need for increased bandwidth for communication and data sharing for the U.S. military to be effective in the Arctic.

C: This means... without increased military presence the current abilities will be lacking and our national security will be significantly at risk.

PRO: Call for Declaration of Peace

S: According to... *the American Security Project, December 10, 2021*

<https://www.americansecurityproject.org/the-need-for-increased-u-s-presence-in-the-arctic/>

F: It states... A need to declare the Arctic a zone of peace with the aspiration that this declaration would increase the amount of discussion between nations while increasing the number of countries at the table for discussion beyond those that are Arctic states.

C: This means... the US is unlikely to be seen as a hostile force if the security is seen as promoting the safe use of the Arctic and not some conquest of new territories.

PRO: Lack of Presence Increases Threats

S: According to... *the American Security Project, December 10, 2021*

<https://www.americansecurityproject.org/the-need-for-increased-u-s-presence-in-the-arctic/>

F: It states... The Arctic presents many national security threats for the U.S. who for too long has not been an active member in the region and needs to invest further in its military role and in its ability to ship goods through the region.

C: This means... If we do not increase our presence, we will lose influence, and our rivals will take advantage and create serious security risks.

PRO: Preventing Adversaries from Denying Access (to us and our allies)

S: According to... *the American Security Project, December 10, 2021*

<https://www.americansecurityproject.org/the-need-for-increased-u-s-presence-in-the-arctic/>

F: It states... Increasing military presence must be done so that adversaries do not prevent U.S. involvement in the region. The U.S. needs to have more of a leadership role to balance the importance of stewardship over competition in this fragile part of the world.

C: This means... by not increasing our military presence we would be giving up vital influence in the region leading to even more competition and as such even greater risks.

PRO: Risk of 'Resource' War is Disproven

S: According to... *Polar Geography, February 28, 2021*

<https://doi.org/10.1080/1088937X.2021.1881645>

Q: It states...

However, the idea of 'resource wars' in the North has been debunked (Dodds & Nuttall,2016; Østhagen,2018; Tamnes & Offerdal,2014). Arctic resources, such as hydrocarbons, minerals, and fisheries, are located in the exclusive economic zones (EEZs) or territories of the Arctic littoral states (Claes & Moe,2018; Łuszczuk et al.,2014). There is no territorial dispute of significance in the region; only the miniscule island of Hans Ø/Hans Island remains disputed as both Canada and Denmark (Greenland) claim it. While Canada and Denmark (Greenland) have a tentative final agreement on a boundary in the Lincoln Sea (Byers & Østhagen,2017; Global Affairs Canada,2018), the only unresolved maritime boundary dispute concerns Canada and the United States in the Beaufort Sea, and negotiations over how to delineate the extended continental shelves around the North Pole look likely to become, at worst, a diplomatic row.

F: it states... The resources in the Arctic that countries are interested in are already protected by treaties and territorial boundaries. The idea that countries will be willing to fight over such resources has already been disproven.

C: This means... the risk of war due to an increase of military presence is very low. Countries use military vessels to protect their interests and rescue ships at sea all the time without inviting a war with its neighbors (or rivals).

Substantially Increasing U.S. Military Presence in the Arctic (Pros and Cons)

PRO: Protecting Valuable Resources

S: According to... Milsat Magazine, March 2019

<http://www.milsatmagazine.com/story.php?number=776809094>

Q: It states...

The Arctic is rich with valuable oil, gas, metals, minerals, and fishery reserves. The Arctic seabed is estimated to contain approximately 15 percent of the world's remaining oil supply, 30 percent of the world's natural gas deposits, and 20 percent of its liquefied natural gas. Historically, the frozen tundra made it nearly impossible to mine these valuable resources, but the melting ice along with improved infrastructure technology has made mining a very feasible opportunity. Therefore, the United States is taking proactive steps to increase its military presence in the Arctic region to protect its interests.

PRO: Communication is Critical to Success

S: According to... Milsat Magazine, March 2019

<http://www.milsatmagazine.com/story.php?number=776809094>

Q: It states...

Expanding the military footprint in the Arctic is not an easy task. Warfighters require specialized training and communications are extremely difficult to maintain. With that said, secure communications are critical to mission success in the Arctic. Current radio frequency solutions are patchy and unreliable and data transmissions are limited. With a growing presence in the region, there is a need to communicate with voice, text, images, and video anywhere and at any time. Iridium Certus users will be able to securely connect warfighters deployed in the region to command-and-control centers anywhere on the planet because the terminals can maintain broadband connectivity in unpredictable environments on land, at sea and in the air.

PRO: Overcoming Limitations Prevents Threats

S: According to... Milsat Magazine, March 2019

<http://www.milsatmagazine.com/story.php?number=776809094>

Q: It states...

The U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) also plays an important role in the Arctic and the organization is taking steps to increase its presence and effectiveness. "Presence equals influence. If we don't have a presence there, our competitors will," USCG's Commandant, Admiral Karl L. Schultz, said at the Wilson Center in Washington DC. The USCG's activities in the Arctic are reliant on precise and ongoing maritime domain awareness, which is currently restricted by limited surveillance, monitoring, and information system capabilities. Without a strong domain awareness, USCG resources will face greater threats.

PRO: Providing Life-Saving Operations

S: According to... Milsat Magazine, March 2019

<http://www.milsatmagazine.com/story.php?number=776809094>

Q: It states...

Telemedicine, casualty evacuation and search and rescue (SAR) are also three areas where Iridium Certus connectivity would provide life-saving communications. When conditions deteriorate, telemedicine may be the only way to provide lifesaving health services in the region; however, a dependable connection is required. Although the number of SAR cases in the Arctic are relatively low, the increased presence in the region will likely lead to more emergency situations requiring such services.

PRO: Training (& Technology) Prepares Military Forces

S: According to... Milsat Magazine, March 2019

<http://www.milsatmagazine.com/story.php?number=776809094>

Q: It states...

U.S. forces have been increasing their presence in the Arctic over the last few years and are including special training to prepare for the brutal environment and potential future conflict. Iridium Certus will provide them with the connectivity required to safely perform intelligence surveillance and reconnaissance. Although the company is cooperating with other Arctic states, U.S. forces must continue to prepare for any eventualities. Part of the military strategy for the region is to increase military exercises. In March of 2018, more than 1,500 U.S. military personnel gathered in the Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex and Long-Range Radar System sites for the largest joint training exercise of 2018, the Arctic Edge. The exercise exposed areas where better processes could be implemented to improve operational successes.

Substantially Increasing U.S. Military Presence in the Arctic (Pros and Cons)

PRO: Overcoming Communication Problems

S: According to... Milsat Magazine, March 2019

<http://www.milsatmagazine.com/story.php?number=776809094>

Q: It states...

As the United States expands its military presence, it is finding that existing connectivity options are limited or inadequate for the harsh and austere Arctic environment. Fortunately, the newly launched Iridium NEXT constellation of satellites will provide a secure and reliable broadband connectivity for military personnel in the region.

PRO: Reliable Communication Critical for Safety

S: According to... Milsat Magazine, March 2019

<http://www.milsatmagazine.com/story.php?number=776809094>

Q: It states...

Everything is more difficult in the Arctic. Communicating in the harsh conditions could become a life and death situation and radio communications are often tricky when interacting with the ionosphere. Military personnel on patrol using radio frequencies spend most of their time listening to static while they are trying to find a clear signal. The Iridium network is unaffected by terrestrial conditions and will provide reliable mobile connectivity for military personnel on the move during training exercises and operations.

PRO: Improving UAV Capabilities (FYI: Unmanned Aerial Vehicles or Drones)

S: According to... Milsat Magazine, March 2019

<http://www.milsatmagazine.com/story.php?number=776809094>

Q: It states...

Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS) are being outfitted on the USCG's fleet of cutters and they can be used to identify maritime threats, such as ice, but only if they have reliable and secure communications connectivity. Iridium Certus can be used to improve domain awareness and communications for the U.S. Military by providing VoIP, IP data for text messaging/asset tracking through the use of the proprietary Iridium NEXT network of 66 cross-linked satellites residing in Low-Earth Orbit (LEO).

PRO: Protecting Immense Economic Interests

S: According to... Milsat Magazine, March 2019

<http://www.milsatmagazine.com/story.php?number=776809094>

Q: It states...

Secure military communications, such as Iridium Certus, will also help the United States' economic interests in the region. From drilling to transportation, the economic opportunities are immense. The United States has already issued exploratory drilling permits in the region, and transportation opportunities are also increasing, but navigating the ice is still dangerous and requires reliable communications and accurate domain awareness. There are three passages in the Arctic that could be used as possible trade routes, but one of them is controlled by Russia and another one is still considered too constrained by thick ice caps. The Northwest Passage, though, has become a more economically viable shipping route, creating more direct routes between North America, Europe, and Asia. The Northwest passage could cut thousands of miles from journeys that currently use the Panama or Suez canals. Control of these routes could create potential conflict and is yet another reason why the region needs a stronger United States military presence.

PRO: Russia Militarism is 'Great Arctic Power'

MIT Securities Studies Program, October 29, 2020

<https://ssp.mit.edu/events/2020/great-power-competition-in-the-arctic>

Q: It states...

Russia may not qualify as a Great Power on the global arena, but it is without doubt a "Great Arctic Power" – and seeks to uphold this status and to capitalize on it. There has been for the last 12 years a gradually-expanding discrepancy between two policy tracks: Developing international cooperation in the Arctic and building a position of military superiority in the Barents region. Presently, major setbacks on the first track and major advances on the second have distorted the balance between them and turned Russia's Arctic policy excessively (and unsustainably) militaristic. Even the grand design for modernizing the Northern Sea Route (Sevmorput) is centered on military protection, while the economic rationale suffers. The only external impact that constrains the militarization of Russia's Arctic policy comes, counter intuitive as it may seem, from China. The Arctic constitutes only a secondary avenue in the Belt & Road initiative, and investments are comparatively small, but they make a difference, particularly for the Sevmorput. What China doesn't want to see in this region is arms race and military tensions, which could hamper its gradual economic "foot-printing". Northern European states, while increasing their defense cooperation and relying on NATO activities, find it useful to increase ties with China, and in the escalating US-China competition, the Arctic could be an area of mutually beneficial interactions.

Substantially Increasing U.S. Military Presence in the Arctic (Pros and Cons)

PRO: Essential Need for Science Infrastructure

S: According to... Atlantic Council, November 19, 2020

<https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/new-atlanticist/how-critical-science-infrastructure-investments-help-put-arctic-security-challenges-on-ice/>

F: It states... Russia and China have both made significant investments in scientific research in the Arctic, yet the United States has not, and such infrastructure is considered essential for balancing with our rivals.

C: This means... if we increase our military presence, we also increase medical, technical, as well as other sciences in the region and make new discoveries possible.

PRO: Dormant Diseases Endangers Global Health

S: According to... CNN News, March 8, 2023

<https://www.cnn.com/2023/03/08/world/permafrost-virus-risk-climate-scn/index.html>

F: It states... Warmer temperatures in the Arctic are thawing the permafrost - a frozen layer of soil beneath the ground - exposing viruses that, after lying dormant for tens of thousands of years, could endanger animal and human health.

C: This means... we need to increase the security and safety for scientists to encourage them to travel to the Arctic and discover these dormant threats to create cures.

PRO: Arctic Bioprospecting Helps with Medicines

S: According to... University of East Anglia, Oct 18, 2022

<https://www.labmanager.com/new-dataset-reveals-biological-treasure-trove-of-arctic-ocean-29033>

F: It states... a center for polar and marine research supports bioprospecting to tackle the shortage of antibiotics and antiviral medication, as well as reveal evidence that might influence our understanding of the evolution of life on Earth.

C: This means... by providing greater security and safety for scientists we can get access to new life-saving discoveries improving the lives of millions of people.

PRO: Russia Poses a Serious Threat (Problem Must Be Addressed!)

Prof. Katarzyna Zysk, of the Norwegian Institute for Defense Studies, DW News, August 28, 2023

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BxqQqfDJ1Bc>

F: She states... There is still power in Russia's favor which is why NATO had to take steps to strengthen its presence in defense and deterrence in the region. Over the past decade Russia has added water, air, and land-based military units giving them more offensive and despite the losses in Ukraine, it is still a capable force, one that is still capable of conducting its core missions including posing a direct threat to NATO and this is a problem that must be addressed.

PRO: Increasing Focus on Climate Change

S: According to... the Department of Defense, 2022

<https://media.defense.gov/2022/Oct/06/2003092213/-1/-1/0/2022-DOD-CAP-PROGRESS-REPORT.PDF>

F: It states... The government has established the Arctic and Global Resilience to support the integration of global climate change considerations into strategies, policies, plans, and programs, as well as working closely with Allies and partners to build resilience to climate change.

C: This means... Increased military in the arctic will not worsen climate change nor will it significantly add to any pollution.

PRO: Responsible Operation w/o Harming Environment

S: According to... the United States Navy [Website], Last Accessed: October 2023

<https://www.navsea.navy.mil/Home/SUPSALV/Environmental/>

F: It states... The Navy is committed to operating in an environmentally responsible manner on land and at sea. Prevention is the Navy's first line of defense, with the goal of reducing the number of spills that occur.

C: This means... increasing the military in the arctic will not cause pollution from the ships as the Navy is working hard to prevent the kinds of spills that would cause serious damage.

Substantially Increasing U.S. Military Presence in the Arctic (Pros and Cons)

CON SIDE

CON: Reducing Competition Improves Security/Influence

S: According to... *The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023*

<https://cimsec.org/why-the-us-is-losing-the-race-for-the-arctic-and-what-to-do-about-it/>

Q: *It states...*

One key point these articles often make is the United States' relative lack of icebreakers compared to its competitors. What is missing from this conversation, however, is an explanation of why the US has fallen behind its competitors in the Arctic. This article fills in that gap by attempting to explain why the US is behaving as it does. It then argues that paradoxically falling behind in this regional competition may actually improve America's overall security and international influence when compared to Russia and China.

CON: Alternative Routes Readily Available (Arctic is Non-Essential)

S: According to... *The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023*

<https://cimsec.org/why-the-us-is-losing-the-race-for-the-arctic-and-what-to-do-about-it/>

Q: *It states...*

The US is relatively fortunate in its geography. It has large coastlines with natural harbors on both the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans. Its rivers largely flow southward to southern ports. It also shares borders with Mexico and Canada, two countries that do not threaten the US in a conventional sense. This geography serves to protect the US from foreign invasion and allows it to readily deploy military forces to foreign locales, without use of the Arctic.

CON: Missile Defense Protects Against Arctic Threats

S: According to... *The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023*

<https://cimsec.org/why-the-us-is-losing-the-race-for-the-arctic-and-what-to-do-about-it/>

Q: *It states...*

With the advent of intercontinental missiles and strategic bombers, the Arctic became more important to the US militarily during the Cold War. This pushed the US to erect now largely defunct early warning stations across northern Alaska, Greenland, and Canada. More recently, it established incipient missile defense systems in the Arctic to deal with increased threats emanating from Russia, China, and North Korea and improved its ability to monitor the region. However, these systems have never been designed to control the Arctic, but instead to protect America, and its NATO allies, from foreign military threats coming from, or through, the Arctic. This is an important distinction.

CON: Arctic Operations are Expensive/Difficult/Dangerous

S: According to... *The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023*

<https://cimsec.org/why-the-us-is-losing-the-race-for-the-arctic-and-what-to-do-about-it/>

Q: *It states...*

The US largely has a free-market economy with strong interest groups that challenge its willingness to expand its commercial footprint in the Arctic. This has overwhelmingly kept it from attempting to control the Arctic like Russia has done and China is increasingly attempting to do. It is important to look at the times when American commercial interests have focused on the Arctic to understand America's overall lack of interest in this region. The three times the US has been economically drawn to the Arctic were to exploit temporarily scarce resources. This occurred with whale oil and seal skins during the 18th and 19th century, gold at the end of the 19th century, and oil during the mid-twentieth century. These intense periods of economic interest in the Arctic resulted in America's purchase of Alaska from Russia in 1867 and the development of Alaska in the decades afterwards. Notably, however, it is expensive and difficult to operate in the Arctic. As Canadian Arctic expert, Michael Byers highlights, even as the Arctic ice slowly melts, the region remains in complete darkness for half of the year and melting ice is dangerously unpredictable. The Arctic is also austere and quite far from the largest population centers of the world. As such, the intermittent economic demands for the region's natural resources have relatively quickly resulted in substitutes being found for these goods in less austere places.

CON: Russia & China's Arctic Partnerships

S: According to... *The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023*

<https://cimsec.org/why-the-us-is-losing-the-race-for-the-arctic-and-what-to-do-about-it/>

Q: *It states...*

Like Russia, China's companies are largely nationalized and it also does not have the environmental or indigenous concerns in the Arctic that the US does. It has spent the last two decades increasing its manufacturing sector and its international trade ties. This has increased its needs for natural resources and trade routes, resulting in its plans to establish a "Polar Silk Road," under its greater Belt and Road Initiative, in order to link the Arctic to China's greater network of international trading posts and manufacturing centers. As Russia has lost access to Western markets and technology over the last two decades, it has increasingly turned towards an eager China to help it build out its Arctic economic footprint. As such, China also has more economic interests to defend in the Arctic than the US does.

Substantially Increasing U.S. Military Presence in the Arctic (Pros and Cons)

CON: Marginal Economic Incentives (Not Worth the Investment)

S: According to... *The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023*

<https://cimsec.org/why-the-us-is-losing-the-race-for-the-arctic-and-what-to-do-about-it/>

Q: *It states...*

All told, since the US has only marginal economic incentives to pursue the Arctic, it has not felt the need to develop harbors, settlements, transport infrastructure, or icebreakers to increase its footprint in the region. As such, it has relatively little capability to “conquer the region,” but also relatively little to defend in the region.

CON: Russia Not Prioritizing Environment/Indigenous Considerations

S: According to... *The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023*

<https://cimsec.org/why-the-us-is-losing-the-race-for-the-arctic-and-what-to-do-about-it/>

Q: *It states...*

This legacy continues today as Putin pushes and subsidizes Russia’s economic ministries and state-controlled corporations to extract more resources from the Arctic and to expand the infrastructure of the Northern Sea Route (with the numerous powerful icebreakers needed to navigate this waterway) to transport these resources to distant markets. Unlike American corporations, Russia’s economic pursuits in the Arctic are not concerned with environmental or indigenous considerations either. Furthermore, Russia’s extreme sacrifices in the Arctic have made developing and controlling it symbolic for its people and leadership. As such, Russia has much more to defend materially and ideationally in the Arctic than the US does. Even with these factors pushing Russia to conquer the Arctic, Russia’s regional ambitions have been challenged by fiscal, demographic, and environmental hurdles. Most recently, the war in Ukraine has forced it to curtail its ambitious Arctic railway and icebreaker projects and to mobilize and sacrifice a significant proportion of its Arctic troops for combat in Ukraine. Additionally, many of its Arctic cities have rapidly de-populated, and the Arctic melt has paradoxically threatened its existing Arctic infrastructure.

CON: Lacking Economic Interests (Dangerous to Predict & Risks Conflict)

S: According to... *The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023*

<https://cimsec.org/why-the-us-is-losing-the-race-for-the-arctic-and-what-to-do-about-it/>

Q: *It states...*

Subsequently, the only portions of Alaska that are significantly developed are in the sub-Arctic portion of the state, with the exception of the oil fields of Prudhoe Bay – which also appear to be winding down with the advent of fracking and renewable energy. Increasing environmental concerns (most of Alaska is situated in nationally owned wilderness preserves) and native groups’ claims prohibitively increase the price of resource extraction from most of Arctic Alaska even further. Many Americans believe the region should be left to nature and to indigenous groups. The US also does not have a great need to develop the sea routes in the Arctic to improve its international trade. It has a transnational road and railway system and easy access to maritime trade routes which are connected through the recently enlarged Suez Canal. These circumstances mean that the US has very little motivation to establish sea routes through the largely uninhabited, relatively shallow, and dangerously unpredictable Arctic Ocean. Finally, Russia’s aggression over the last two decades, and increasing pressure from environmentally-based NGOs, have pushed American-based companies even further away from Russia’s Arctic.

CON: Russia Losing Arctic Resources

S: According to... *The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023*

<https://cimsec.org/why-the-us-is-losing-the-race-for-the-arctic-and-what-to-do-about-it/>

Q: *It states...*

This legacy continues today as Putin pushes and subsidizes Russia’s economic ministries and state-controlled corporations to extract more resources from the Arctic and to expand the infrastructure of the Northern Sea Route (with the numerous powerful icebreakers needed to navigate this waterway) to transport these resources to distant markets. Unlike American corporations, Russia’s economic pursuits in the Arctic are not concerned with environmental or indigenous considerations either. Furthermore, Russia’s extreme sacrifices in the Arctic have made developing and controlling it symbolic for its people and leadership. As such, Russia has much more to defend materially and ideationally in the Arctic than the US does. Even with these factors pushing Russia to conquer the Arctic, Russia’s regional ambitions have been challenged by fiscal, demographic, and environmental hurdles. Most recently, the war in Ukraine has forced it to curtail its ambitious Arctic railway and icebreaker projects and to mobilize and sacrifice a significant proportion of its Arctic troops for combat in Ukraine. Additionally, many of its Arctic cities have rapidly de-populated, and the Arctic melt has paradoxically threatened its existing Arctic infrastructure.

Substantially Increasing U.S. Military Presence in the Arctic (Pros and Cons)

CON: Strengthening Security Cooperation in Arctic

S: According to... *The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023*

<https://cimsec.org/why-the-us-is-losing-the-race-for-the-arctic-and-what-to-do-about-it/>

Q: *It states...*

America's lack of interest in the region has paradoxically pushed the other Arctic states to increase their security ties with the US and to take on more security responsibilities for the region. Similar to World War II, when Iceland and Denmark invited the US to help protect their territory from foreign adversaries, Russia's aggression pushed Sweden and Finland to formally petition to join the US-dominated NATO. The inclusion of these states into the organization means that half of the Arctic will soon be administered by NATO member states.

CON: Nordic Partners Capable of Arctic Security

S: According to... *The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023*

<https://cimsec.org/why-the-us-is-losing-the-race-for-the-arctic-and-what-to-do-about-it/>

Q: *It states...*

Specifically, the Nordic states of Norway, Sweden and Finland have significant capabilities and economic stakes in the region that will make up for America's relative lack of willingness and ability to contain Russia's and China's ambitions in the region. These countries' capabilities will be further complemented by Denmark and Canada, and the other non-Arctic NATO states that have recently increased their defense spending to deal with Russian aggression. This collective defense in the Arctic will allow the US to better focus on domains like space, cyberspace, the Americas, and the Indo-Pacific, which are more important than the Arctic to America's most critical national interests.

CON: Avoiding Competition Strengthens Security

S: According to... *The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023*

<https://cimsec.org/why-the-us-is-losing-the-race-for-the-arctic-and-what-to-do-about-it/>

Q: *It states...*

Overall, the US should not ignore the Arctic, and it should put to rest the notion that this region is a unique zone of peace in an otherwise quite turbulent world. That being said, Americans should also not deem that losing the "race for the Arctic" will critically threaten America's larger national interests. By not attempting to compete head-to-head with Russia or China to "conquer" the region, the US has incurred some advantages against these competitors. As the US has been reminded again in Iraq and Afghanistan, and through its observation of Russia's disastrous invasion of Ukraine, conquering territory comes with significant costs that can weaken the material strength and ideational attractiveness of a country. This, in turn, weakens a country's ability to secure its most significant national interests. The US should continue to diplomatically, militarily, and economically challenge Russia's and China's actions in the Arctic on humanitarian and environmental grounds, but it also should identify that China's and Russia's actions in the Arctic come with high economic and soft power costs that may relatively benefit the US. Doing so will allow the US to increase its ability to collectively defend its interests in the Arctic with its allies and to prioritize its attention and resources on domains that are more important to it than the Arctic.

CON: Militarization is Incredibly Costly (Cost Threatens Security)

S: According to... *The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023*

<https://cimsec.org/why-the-us-is-losing-the-race-for-the-arctic-and-what-to-do-about-it/>

Q: *It states...*

As the US has been reminded again in Iraq and Afghanistan, and through its observation of Russia's disastrous invasion of Ukraine, conquering territory comes with significant costs that can weaken the material strength and ideational attractiveness of a country. This, in turn, weakens a country's ability to secure its most significant national interests. The US should continue to diplomatically, militarily, and economically challenge Russia's and China's actions in the Arctic on humanitarian and environmental grounds, but it also should identify that China's and Russia's actions in the Arctic come with high economic and soft power costs that may relatively benefit the US. Doing so will allow the US to increase its ability to collectively defend its interests in the Arctic with its allies and to prioritize its attention and resources on domains that are more important to it than the Arctic.

CON: Resource Exploitation Still Cost Prohibitive

S: According to... *The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023*

<https://cimsec.org/why-the-us-is-losing-the-race-for-the-arctic-and-what-to-do-about-it/>

Q: *It states...*

Economically speaking, the Arctic will likely remain a backwater for market-driven economies for the foreseeable future. The relatively high costs of extracting resources and transporting goods from the Arctic means the region is unlikely to become much more attractive for Western companies, even if the ice continues to retreat (which has slowed in recent years) and icebreakers improve, except in times when specific resources are in sharp demand or when there are long-term bottlenecks in other trade routes.

Substantially Increasing U.S. Military Presence in the Arctic (Pros and Cons)

CON: Global Markets Make Resources Available

S: According to... *The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023*

<https://cimsec.org/why-the-us-is-losing-the-race-for-the-arctic-and-what-to-do-about-it/>

Q: *It states...*

The resources that Russia and China extract from the Arctic will contribute to the overall global supply of these resources and decrease their overall price for American consumers. As such, Americans will gain many of the benefits of Russia's and China's efforts in the Arctic while Russia and China absorb the costs. In the case of scarce rare-earth minerals that have spiked in demand and are monopolized by China, it appears Sweden may fill this void for the US with its own Arctic resources, even as companies search for substitutes for these critical resources.

CON: Access to Rare Earth Minerals (ex. Sweden)

S: According to... *The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023*

<https://cimsec.org/why-the-us-is-losing-the-race-for-the-arctic-and-what-to-do-about-it/>

Q: *It states...*

The resources that Russia and China extract from the Arctic will contribute to the overall global supply of these resources and decrease their overall price for American consumers. As such, Americans will gain many of the benefits of Russia's and China's efforts in the Arctic while Russia and China absorb the costs. In the case of scarce rare-earth minerals that have spiked in demand and are monopolized by China, it appears Sweden may fill this void for the US with its own Arctic resources, even as companies search for substitutes for these critical resources.

CON: Humanitarian/Environmental Diplomatic Challenges (vs. Russia/China)

S: According to... *The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023*

<https://cimsec.org/why-the-us-is-losing-the-race-for-the-arctic-and-what-to-do-about-it/>

Q: *It states...*

As the US has been reminded again in Iraq and Afghanistan, and through its observation of Russia's disastrous invasion of Ukraine, conquering territory comes with significant costs that can weaken the material strength and ideational attractiveness of a country. This, in turn, weakens a country's ability to secure its most significant national interests. The US should continue to diplomatically, militarily, and economically challenge Russia's and China's actions in the Arctic on humanitarian and environmental grounds, but it also should identify that China's and Russia's actions in the Arctic come with high economic and soft power costs that may relatively benefit the US. Doing so will allow the US to increase its ability to collectively defend its interests in the Arctic with its allies and to prioritize its attention and resources on domains that are more important to it than the Arctic.

CON: [Trade-Off] Collective Defense Yields More Resources

S: According to... *The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023*

<https://cimsec.org/why-the-us-is-losing-the-race-for-the-arctic-and-what-to-do-about-it/>

Q: *It states...*

As the US has been reminded again in Iraq and Afghanistan, and through its observation of Russia's disastrous invasion of Ukraine, conquering territory comes with significant costs that can weaken the material strength and ideational attractiveness of a country. This, in turn, weakens a country's ability to secure its most significant national interests. The US should continue to diplomatically, militarily, and economically challenge Russia's and China's actions in the Arctic on humanitarian and environmental grounds, but it also should identify that China's and Russia's actions in the Arctic come with high economic and soft power costs that may relatively benefit the US. Doing so will allow the US to increase its ability to collectively defend its interests in the Arctic with its allies and to prioritize its attention and resources on domains that are more important to it than the Arctic.

CON: Military Provocation by Russia

S: According to... *Responsible Statecraft, August 29, 2022*

<https://responsiblestatecraft.org/2022/08/29/arctic-military-build-up-poses-new-geopolitical-and-climate-risks/>

Q: *It states...*

Experts warn that at a time when tensions between the United States and Russia are escalating and the threat from climate change increases, a military build-up in the Arctic comes with new geopolitical and environmental risks. Gabriella Gricius, a PhD. a student and political scientist who follows the Arctic, tells me that a U.S. build-up envisioned in the senate bill could fuel military competition with Russia. "There are certainly real consequences for the U.S.'s greater military presence in the Arctic," Gricius said. "It may very well be treated as a military provocation by Russia and may result in increased Russian military exercises."

F: *It states...* It may be seen by Russia as a military provocation resulting in an increase in military exercises and tension.

C: This means... by increasing U.S. military presence in the Arctic, we risk escalating tensions with Russia, thereby potentially destabilizing the region and putting millions of lives at risk.

Substantially Increasing U.S. Military Presence in the Arctic (Pros and Cons)

CON: Poor Use of Resources

S: According to... *Responsible Statecraft*, August 29, 2022

<https://responsiblestatecraft.org/2022/08/29/arctic-military-build-up-poses-new-geopolitical-and-climate-risks/>

Q: It states...

Dr. Neta Crawford, co-director of Brown University's Costs of War Project, sees the military's view towards competition and build-up in the Arctic as a poor use of resources. "We have a certain catastrophe on its way," Crawford said in an interview. "It's not a possible war. It's a certain catastrophe, and the resources that we put to mitigating the risks by reducing emissions and also by adaptation are much better spent, I think, in terms of saving lives and livelihoods."

F: It states... It's a certain catastrophe, and the resources that we put to mitigating the risks by reducing emissions and also by adaptation are much better spent, I think, in terms of saving lives and livelihoods.

C: This means... by increasing U.S. military presence in the Arctic, we divert resources from more pressing issues like climate change, thereby failing to address imminent threats that could affect millions of lives.

CON: Cooperation with Russia is Vital

S: According to... *Responsible Statecraft*, August 29, 2022

<https://responsiblestatecraft.org/2022/08/29/arctic-military-build-up-poses-new-geopolitical-and-climate-risks/>

Q: It states...

In the past the Arctic Council oversaw cooperation of various countries and Indigenous nations navigating the geopolitics and climate risks in the Arctic. Following Russia's invasion of Ukraine, the council suspended its activities. Gricius says that a lack of cooperation in the region is unsustainable. "The Russian Arctic makes up around 50 percent of the entire Arctic, meaning that it's not truly possible for Russia to be shut out of the Arctic in any real way," Gricius said. "U.S. policy then, I would think, is influenced by that fact: Russia cannot be removed from the Arctic and will continue to be a key stakeholder in the region."

F: It states...

C: This means...

CON: Exacerbating Climate Change

S: According to... *Responsible Statecraft*, August 29, 2022

<https://responsiblestatecraft.org/2022/08/29/arctic-military-build-up-poses-new-geopolitical-and-climate-risks/>

Q: It states...

Along with risking greater conflict between the United States and Russia, a U.S. military build-up in the Arctic threatens to exacerbate climate change. Though the Department of Defense and various branches of the U.S. military have recently released "climate adaptation" plans, the content focuses primarily on adapting operations, rather than accounting for and reducing emissions. In fact, the U.S. Navy published a climate adaptation plan in May this year that was scrutinized for mostly omitting any mention of its ships and planes, the two main sources of the U.S. military's pollution. However, much of the impact of military emissions remains unknown because of a loophole in the Paris Climate Agreement which exempts governments from reporting their military's emissions.

F: It states... A U.S. military build-up in the Arctic threatens to exacerbate climate change.

C: This means... by increasing U.S. military presence in the Arctic, we contribute to climate change, thereby exacerbating a global crisis that threatens millions of lives.

CON: Increased Emissions

S: According to... *Responsible Statecraft*, August 29, 2022

<https://responsiblestatecraft.org/2022/08/29/arctic-military-build-up-poses-new-geopolitical-and-climate-risks/>

Q: It states...

Despite the lack of available information, Dr. Crawford used what data is public to calculate U.S. military emissions for the Costs of War Project. According to her research on military emissions published in 2019, "the DOD is the world's largest institutional user of petroleum and correspondingly, the single largest institutional producer of greenhouse gasses (GHG) in the world." She explained that roughly 30 percent of the military's emissions come from "installation emissions," meaning the energy use of military bases and other installations. The other 70 percent comes from "operational emissions," or the energy use of all training, missions, transport, and other activities. "To boil it down, anything that involves transportation is an emitter of serious significance," Crawford said. With this context, increased military activities in the Arctic are likely to result in increased emissions if activities are not reduced elsewhere.

F: It states... Increased military activities in the Arctic are likely to result in increased emissions if activities are not reduced elsewhere.

C: This means... by increasing U.S. military presence in the Arctic, we increase greenhouse gas emissions, thereby contributing to climate change and putting millions of lives at risk.

Substantially Increasing U.S. Military Presence in the Arctic (Pros and Cons)

CON: Climate Change is Region's Largest Threat (more than war!)

S: According to... *Responsible Statecraft*, August 29, 2022

<https://responsiblestatecraft.org/2022/08/29/arctic-military-build-up-poses-new-geopolitical-and-climate-risks/>

Q: It states...

Crawford elaborated that aircraft in particular contribute to the 70 percent of operational emissions. This is notable given that the U.S. Air Force reportedly has the largest presence of any military branch in the Arctic. While the Arctic Commitment Act primarily focuses on military build-up and trade competition with Russia, Gricius and Crawford see a need for different priorities. "Despite the media frenzy about militarization and conflict in the Arctic, climate change is the largest and most pervasive threat to the region," Gricius said. She suggests that rather than being used to escalate conflict, climate change should be used as an opportunity for cooperation. "The U.S., in particular, should and can play an important role both in supporting local initiatives in Alaska on climate change and also bringing together cooperative initiatives between scientists, diplomats, and other actors in the region," Gricius said.

F: It states...

C: This means...

CON: Cooperation on Climate is Paramount

S: According to... *Responsible Statecraft*, August 29, 2022

<https://responsiblestatecraft.org/2022/08/29/arctic-military-build-up-poses-new-geopolitical-and-climate-risks/>

Q: It states...

"Despite the media frenzy about militarization and conflict in the Arctic, climate change is the largest and most pervasive threat to the region," Gricius said. She suggests that rather than being used to escalate conflict, climate change should be used as an opportunity for cooperation. "The U.S., in particular, should and can play an important role both in supporting local initiatives in Alaska on climate change and also bringing together cooperative initiatives between scientists, diplomats, and other actors in the region," Gricius said. Crawford laid out a worst-case scenario. "Let's say there's an accident or an incident that escalates," she said. "That's hardly helpful and may be disastrous, ultimately, if it escalates to significant use of force. But it's also the case that when we do that, the other guys increase their emissions. ... Climate change is a much more urgent, and ultimately existential threat compared to these short-term concerns about showing the flag."

F: It states... Let's say there's an accident or an incident that escalates. That's hardly helpful and may be disastrous, ultimately, if it escalates to significant use of force.

C: This means... by increasing U.S. military presence in the Arctic, we risk accidental escalation of force, thereby potentially leading to conflict that could endanger millions of lives.

CON: Warming Reduces Piracy (ex. South China Sea → more fish = fewer pirates)

S: According to... *American Meteorological Society*, April 27, 2023

<https://blog.ametsoc.org/2023/04/27/climate-change-is-driving-piracy-on-the-seas/>

Q: It states...

The reason is fish. South China Sea fisheries see better catches in warmer years, but in East Africa (bordering countries like Somalia), warmer temperatures have a negative effect on fisheries. This means lean times for fishing communities—which in turn means fishermen are more likely to take up piracy to supplement their income. "When there's less fish there's more piracy; when there's more fish there's less piracy," Jiang says. Damage to fish stocks lessened the time between successful pirate attacks, and increased the likelihood that any given attack would succeed. "[This is] like a natural experiment, because we are looking at two regions of the world that have opposite effects. And these two are the hotspots of piracy around the world."

F: It states...

C: This means...

CON: Extraordinary Challenges in Defense Operations

S: According to... *the Brookings Institution*, May 2021

https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/FP_20210520_arctic_defense.pdf

Q: It states...

The effects of climate change are reducing Arctic ice, which is leading to more access, exploration, economic exploitation, and perhaps eventually the attempted exclusion of those who are not present. And with presence, of course, comes influence.⁶ But, in the Arctic, it is extraordinarily challenging to sustain defense operations because of the inherently hostile environment, great distances, and lack of support infrastructure.

F: In other words... Maintaining defense operations in the Arctic is very difficult due to the harsh environment, long distances, and lack of support infrastructure.

C: This means...If we increase our military presence in the Arctic, then it will not be very effective due to the complex and formidable challenges we will face.

Substantially Increasing U.S. Military Presence in the Arctic (Pros and Cons)

CON: Arctic Defense Faces Serious Challenges

According to... the Brookings Institution, May 2021

https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/FP_20210520_arctic_defense.pdf

Q: It states...

The effects of climate change are reducing Arctic ice, which is leading to more access, exploration, economic exploitation, and perhaps eventually the attempted exclusion of those who are not present. And with presence, of course, comes influence.⁶ But, in the Arctic, it is extraordinarily challenging to sustain defense operations because of the inherently hostile environment, great distances, and lack of support infrastructure.

F: In other words... As the Arctic ice melts from climate change, more access and economic opportunities arise, but military defense is tough due to harsh environment, long distances, and a lack of infrastructure.

C: This means... If we increase the our military in the Arctic, it will not be very effective due to extreme difficulties from the harsh Arctic environment.

CON (Security): Cooperation Avoids Russia-China Alliance

According to... the Brookings Institution, May 2021

https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/FP_20210520_arctic_defense.pdf

Q: It states...

The United States, its partners, and allies should seek to deepen regional cooperation amongst themselves,¹⁸ and as appropriate, with both Russia and China, but they must also be mindful of actions that could serve to push Russia and China closer together. While the current conventional wisdom is that there is an upper boundary for Sino-Russian security collaboration and that as such, their partnership in the Arctic is unlikely for a whole host of reasons,¹⁹ the two recently publicized their intent for a near-future joint moon base, perhaps signaling a renewed tolerance to partner in areas once thought to be beyond their existing geopolitical relationship.²⁰

F: In other words... The US and its allies should deepen regional cooperation amongst themselves and with both Russia and China, being mindful of actions that could push Russia and China closer together.

C: This means... If we increase our military presence, then millions of lives are put at risk as regional security will be threatened and this will reduce cooperation push our rivals into working against us.

CON: Lacking Technology/Knowledge to Extract Resources

S: According to... the American Security Project, December 10, 2021

<https://www.americansecurityproject.org/the-need-for-increased-u-s-presence-in-the-arctic/>

F: It states... The problem for those seeking access to Arctic resources is the lack of technology and knowledge to extract them sustainably.

C: This means... We can lead these companies to the area and protect them, but this does not guarantee that the resources can be extracted in a profitable and sustainable way. We would waste billions of dollars on something that will not work effectively.

CON: Geopolitical Tensions Rising in the Arctic

S: According to... PBS News, April 23, 2023

<https://www.pbs.org/newshour/show/tensions-rise-as-nations-race-for-valuable-resources-in-the-arcticthe-arctic>

F: It states... In the Arctic, melting ice is raising geopolitical tensions, kickstarting a race for potentially priceless minerals, oil deposits and shipping routes.

C: This means... increasing our military presence will increase competition and tension, making the entire region more dangerous due to potential conflict over resources.

CON: Becoming Another "Area of Confrontation"

S: According to... the Norwegian Institute for Defense Studies, DW News, August 28, 2023

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BxqQqfDJ1Bc>

F: She states... the strongest parts of Russia's military are in the Arctic and the region plays a central role for Russia's military. This has to do with nuclear deterrence and potential conflict with NATO (and the U.S.). This has become another area of confrontation between Russia and the West with security importance set to increase even further.

C: This means... increasing our military will increase security reactions from Russia's military significantly increasing the risk of the kind of confrontation that could threaten billions of lives around the world.

CON: Russia Will Feel Threatened

S: According to... the Norwegian Institute for Defense Studies, DW News, August 28, 2023

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BxqQqfDJ1Bc>

F: She states... Russia has a very extensive threat perception in the region, and this is another confrontation area with the west. In addition to protecting its strategic submarines, which play a central role in Russia's nuclear deterrence, the northern fleet plays an important role to potentially threaten targets in NATO and Europe.

C: This means... Russia will see our military presence as a threat to its security, which increases the risk to all of Europe.

Substantially Increasing U.S. Military Presence in the Arctic (Pros and Cons)

CON: Miscalculations Can Trigger Nuclear War

S: According to... Harlan Ullman, Senior Adviser at the Atlantic Council, *The Hill*, March 13, 2023

<https://thehill.com/opinion/national-security/3895679-war-by-miscalculation-or-by-mistake/>

F: It states... Some scenarios would make some theories of how a thermonuclear war can start seeming mild and many can be miscalculations or misjudgments.

C: This means... all it takes is one miscalculation that could trigger a chain of events leading to a nuclear war.

CON: Increased Tension Risks Nuclear War

S: According to... the William J Perry Project, Last Accessed: October 2023

<https://www.wjperryproject.org/nuclear-miscalculation>

F: It states... What is nuclear miscalculation? Nuclear miscalculation refers to the risk that a state will mistakenly understand the intentions of another state and respond by launching a nuclear strike. The false belief that an attack is imminent causes a country to “miscalculate” the risk of full-scale war and escalate a conflict to the nuclear level. A miscalculation is more likely to occur in times of heightened tension between nations.

C: This means... when we increase tension in the Arctic with all those ships, planes, and drones - we significantly increase the risk of an accident or miscalculation that could trigger a war, which could lead to using nuclear weapons.

CON: Miscalculations Far More Likely (& Dangerous)

S: According to... CBC News, February 18, 2018

<https://www.cbc.ca/news/world/war-risk-blunder-1.4540790>

F: It states... Miscalculations, accidents, or human error with rising global instability and the complexity of ongoing conflicts, experts believe accidents and missteps are more likely and far more dangerous than they were in the past.

C: This means... when we increase tension in the arctic, we are also increasing the risk of the kind of miscalculation that could trigger a war.

CON: Cooperation (not Confrontation) is Key to Pursuing Science in the Arctic

S: According to... The Arctic Institute, March 14, 2023

<https://www.thearcticinstitute.org/conflict-collaboration-role-non-arctic-states-arctic-science-diplomacy/>

F: It states... Cooperation with Russia has become difficult due to the war in Ukraine, and science diplomacy may yet be an effective means of restoring constructive relationships within the region.

C: This means... when we significantly militarize the arctic, we are provoking Russia, a key player, whose cooperation we need in science and science diplomacy.

CON: Restoring Cooperation is Critical to Addressing Climate Emergencies

S: According to... The Arctic Institute, March 28, 2023

<https://www.thearcticinstitute.org/can-arctic-cooperation-restored/>

F: It states... there is limited room to restore cooperation, which is absolutely necessary to dealing with the climate emergency that threatens the whole world, cooperation in research to understand the changes unfolding in the region, in environmental protection, and in joint climate change adaptation and mitigation efforts remain an imperative.

C: This means... when we use our military in a way that Russia will see as provoking them, we are closing the door on ways that we can gain vital cooperation with them.

MISC (UNSORTED):

PRO/CON: Four Pillars of the Arctic Strategy

S: According to... Georgetown Security Studies Review, November 11, 2022

<https://georgetownsecuritystudiesreview.org/2022/11/11/combating-the-gray-zone-enhancing-americas-arctic-force-posture/>

Q: It states...

After almost a decade, the White House has released an updated 2022 version of the National Strategy for the Arctic Region. The document establishes four pillars for advancing America’s interests: security, climate change and environmental protection, sustainable economic development, and international cooperation and governance. Though the strategy focuses on transnational threats such as climate change, it emphasizes the danger Russia poses to Arctic security, considering its invasion of Ukraine and its increased Arctic military presence. The updated Arctic strategy complements strategies set forth by the Department of Defense (DOD) and each of the military services by highlighting the impact of climate change and the future role of strategic competition in the region.

PRO/CON:

S: According to... Arctic Yearbook, March 2023

<https://www.belfercenter.org/publication/return-strategic-arctic>

[Miller, Steven E., Director, International Security Program, Member of the Board, at Harvard's Belfer Center, “The Return of the Strategic Arctic.” Arctic Yearbook, March 2023]

Substantially Increasing U.S. Military Presence in the Arctic (Pros and Cons)

REFERENCES

Why the U.S. is Losing the Race for the Arctic and What to Do About It,

Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023

<https://cimsec.org/why-the-us-is-losing-the-race-for-the-arctic-and-what-to-do-about-it/>

Combating the Gray Zone: Enhancing America's Arctic Force Posture,

Georgetown Security Studies Review, November 11, 2022

<https://georgetownsecuritystudiesreview.org/2022/11/11/combating-the-gray-zone-enhancing-americas-arctic-force-posture/>

The Return of the Strategic Arctic,

Arctic Yearbook, March 2023

<https://www.belfercenter.org/publication/return-strategic-arctic>

[Miller, Steven E., Director, International Security Program, Member of the Board, at Harvard's Belfer Center, "The Return of the Strategic Arctic." Arctic Yearbook, March 2023]

Arctic military build-up poses new geopolitical and climate risks,

Responsible Statecraft, August 29, 2022

<https://responsiblestatecraft.org/2022/08/29/arctic-military-build-up-poses-new-geopolitical-and-climate-risks/>

Climate Change Is Driving Piracy on the Seas,

American Meteorological Society, The Front Page, April 27, 2023

<https://blog.ametsoc.org/2023/04/27/climate-change-is-driving-piracy-on-the-seas/>

U.S. Military Options to Enhance Arctic Defense,

Brookings Institution, May 2021

https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/FP_20210520_arctic_defense.pdf

'De-Securitizing the Arctic' in Climate Change: An Indian Perspective.

India Quarterly, 77(4), December 2021, 622-641.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/09749284211047721>

The Need for Increased U.S. Presence in the Arctic,

American Security Project, December 10, 2021

<https://www.americansecurityproject.org/the-need-for-increased-u-s-presence-in-the-arctic/>

The Arctic security region: misconceptions and contradictions,

Polar Geography, February 28, 2021

<https://doi.org/10.1080/1088937X.2021.1881645>

Arctic Comms for Warfighters: Connectivity required within a brutal environment and potential future conflict,

Dan Gager, Vice President, COMSAT, Inc., Milsat Magazine, March 2019

<http://www.milsatmagazine.com/story.php?number=776809094>

Great Power Competition in the Arctic

MIT Securities Studies Program, October 29, 2020

<https://ssp.mit.edu/events/2020/great-power-competition-in-the-arctic>

How critical science infrastructure investments help put Arctic security challenges on ice,

Atlantic Council, November 19, 2020

<https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/new-atlanticist/how-critical-science-infrastructure-investments-help-put-arctic-security-challenges-on-ice/>

Scientists have revived a 'zombie' virus that spent 48,500 years frozen in permafrost,

CNN News, March 8, 2023

<https://www.cnn.com/2023/03/08/world/permafrost-virus-risk-climate-scn/index.html>

New Dataset Reveals Biological 'Treasure Trove' of Arctic Ocean,

University of East Anglia, Oct 18, 2022

<https://www.labmanager.com/new-dataset-reveals-biological-treasure-trove-of-arctic-ocean-29033>

How critical science infrastructure investments help put Arctic security challenges on ice,

Atlantic Council, November 19, 2020

<https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/new-atlanticist/how-critical-science-infrastructure-investments-help-put-arctic-security-challenges-on-ice/>

Substantially Increasing U.S. Military Presence in the Arctic (Pros and Cons)

REFERENCES (Continued...)

Tensions rise as nations race for valuable resources in the Arctic

PBS Newshour, April 23, 2023

<https://www.pbs.org/newshour/show/tensions-rise-as-nations-race-for-valuable-resources-in-the-arctic>

Geopolitical tensions between NATO and Russia increase in the Arctic,

DW News, August 28, 2023 [11 min]

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BxgQqfDJ1Bc>

Expert = Prof. Katarzyna Zysk, International Relations, Norwegian Institute for Defense Studies

War by miscalculation or by mistake?,

Harlan Ullman, Senior Adviser at the Atlantic Council, The Hill, March 13, 2023

<https://thehill.com/opinion/national-security/3895679-war-by-miscalculation-or-by-mistake/>

Nuclear Miscalculation,

William J Perry Project, Last Accessed: October 2023

<https://www.wjperryproject.org/nuclear-miscalculation>

What could start the next war? 'Accident, miscalculation, blunder',

CBC News, February 18, 2018

<https://www.cbc.ca/news/world/war-risk-blunder-1.4540790>

Climate Adaptation Plan 2022 Progress Report,

Department of Defense, 2022

<https://media.defense.gov/2022/Oct/06/2003092213/-1/-1/0/2022-DOD-CAP-PROGRESS-REPORT.PDF>

00C25 ENVIRONMENTAL - BACKGROUND

United States Navy, Last Accessed: October 2023

<https://www.navsea.navy.mil/Home/SUPSALV/Environmental/>

Conflict or Collaboration? The Role of Non-Arctic States in Arctic Science Diplomacy

The Arctic Institute, March 14, 2023

<https://www.thearcticinstitute.org/conflict-collaboration-role-non-arctic-states-arctic-science-diplomacy/>

Can Arctic Cooperation be Restored?

The Arctic Institute, March 28, 2023

<https://www.thearcticinstitute.org/can-arctic-cooperation-restored/>