GECMUN XIII

BACKGROUND GUIDE

United Nations Security Council

Addressing emerging threats to international peace and security in the arctic region

SDG: 16: Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions, 13: Climate Action, 14: Life Below Water

Authored by Hahjin Kim, Yoonji Kim, Michaela Kang

March 5-6th, 2027

Last updated on October 17th, 2026

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Committee Introduction	3
Agenda Introduction	4
Letter from the Chairs	5
Key Terms	6
Historical Background	6
Current State of Affairs	8
Stances of Parties	9
Possible Solutions	10
Questions to Consider	11
Bibliography	12

Committee Introduction

The United Nations Security Council (UNSC) is one of the six principal organs of the United Nations and is a leading force for resolving any existing acts of aggression in the world. UNSC comprises a total of 15 member nations, five of which (China, France, Russia, United Kingdom, and the United States) are permanent members. Said members each hold a veto, a powerful tool that allows a member nation to seriously influence and occasionally stagnate decision making processes. Veto is an exclusive right that The remaining 10 spaces are occupied by nations voted through an electoral process.

The Security Council is largely responsible for identifying and determining threats to peace. This council often moderates international disputes between countries and recommends the best courses of action to settle conflicts through peaceful means that avoid triggering acts of aggression. If warranted, UNSC may even impose sanctions or authorize the use of force via the deployment of UN peacekeeping operations.

UNSC has been prominent in the global context of influence and its major successes including the 1990 coalition authorization and peacekeeping work to secure democratic elections in Namibia and Cambodia speak for the council's well established work. It is also the only committee able to release binding resolutions to its member nations within the UN body.

Agenda Introduction

One of the most important new security issues of the twenty-first century is the Arctic, which is undergoing unprecedented change. The region is warming almost four times faster than the rest of the world due to climate change, which is drastically changing the Arctic landscape and triggering significant sea ice loss. An estimated 13% of the world's undiscovered oil and 30% of its undiscovered natural gas are now accessible following the 13% per decade drop in Arctic summer sea ice extent since 1979. New economic opportunities have been brought about by these developments, but they have also increased military action, geopolitical rivalry, and worries about international security and environmental destruction.

Despite decades of international cooperation, the Arctic has become a more pressing security concern since the early 2000s as a result of increased ice melting brought on by climate change and growing strategic rivalry between major nations. At present, the world is affected by this issue, not only the eight Arctic countries. The Arctic region is of geopolitical, economic, and environmental significance to many nations, including major trading powers, energy importers, and observers. The world population is impacted by the effects of Arctic climate change, such as sea level rise and extreme weather events. Moreover, indigenous populations that rely on the Arctic ecosystem for their subsistence are also ones prone to direct harms.

The Arctic is a complex subject including resource competitions, freedom of navigation, environmental change, and global peace and security. As geopolitical rivalries, particularly Russia, the United States, Canada, Norway, and Denmark, intensify, the likelihood of territorial disputes increases. Thus, delegates are encouraged to examine how these interconnected issues threaten international stability and propose feasible solutions that strike a balance between state interests and the international community's shared responsibility to maintain peace and security.

Letter from the Chairs

Head Chair:

Welcome to the Security Council. My name is Hahjin Lily Kim and I will be serving as your Head Chair for this conference. I am also a junior at North London Collegiate School Jeju. I have been a part of this community for 6 years, and I sincerely hope that all of you have an enjoyable experience here at GECMUN, one that is hopefully challenging and rewarding. I look forward to seeing you engage in diplomatic collaboration and polishing that insight into creative solutions for this agenda, and all that you will bring to this committee. Best of luck delegates.

Deputy Chair:

Greetings, delegates, and welcome to the Security Council! My name is YoonJi Kim, and I am a sophomore at St. Johnsbury Academy Jeju. It is my honor to serve as your Deputy Chair for this conference. Having participated in Model United Nations for the past three years, I was able to grow both personally and academically. I hope this conference will be just as meaningful for each of you. I eagerly look forward to witnessing thoughtful debate and diplomacy, and I wish you all the very best of luck.

Associate Chair:

Hello, delegates! My name is Michaela Kang, a 9th grader from KISJ, and it is my honor to be serving as your associate chair for UNSC in GECMUN XIII. Although MUN may appear to be an intimidating activity to participate in, please note that it is an opportunity for you to take risks, meet new people, and have fun. I look forward to witnessing the passion you bring for debate as well as hearing about all the unique solutions you come up with. See you in March!

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact us via email!

Hahjin Lily Kim | Head Chair | hjkim28@pupils.nlcsjeju.kr
Yoonji Kim | Deputy Chair | s22290644@sjajeju.kr
Michaela Kang | Associate Chair | gykang30@kis.ac

Key Terms

Arctic Amplification

The phenomenon in which the Arctic region is warming at an increasingly fast rate–often described as two to four times faster–than the global mean recorded.

Arctic Militarization

The term Arctic militarization refers to the structural expansion of military infrastructure, troops, and offensive operation within the Arctic region(more specifically, the Arctic Circle). This process transforms a historically neutral ground of foundational scientific cooperation into a highly contested region.

The Arctic Five(A5)

The Arctic Five represents the sub-group of states with officially recognized coastlines along the Arctic Ocean: Canada, Denmark, Norway, Russia, and the United States. Currently, they hold the primary sovereign rights to access shipping lanes and continental shelves.

Global Commons Dispute

The legal tension between regional nations pertaining to sovereign rights and demanding open access to shipping lanes. Furthermore, it describes the geopolitical engagement over whether allowing open access to Arctic waterways should be treated as international waters or be under the jurisdiction of regional littoral states. This fuels discussion and heated debate among countries all around the world.

Icebreaker Diplomacy

Icebreaker diplomacy describes the strategic utilization of ice strengthened polar vessels aimed to enforce sovereignty, project national power, and secure dominance over trade lanes. They are also acknowledged as the ultimate currency of hard power in frozen waters such as the Arctic. Currently, Russia dominates this area with dozens of operational icebreakers, allowing the nation to escort ships and dictate terms along the Northern Sea Route.

Ilulissat Declaration

The Iluissat Declaration is a landmark treaty signed by the five coastal Arctic nations. In this declaration, the nations strictly blocked the creation of a new international treaty(ex. Antarctica Treaty). They collectively declared that the UNCLOS have enough power and capability to manage the region, firmly establishing their stance of exclusive control.

Svalbard Treaty

The Svalbard Treaty is a treaty granting Norway official sovereignty over the Svalbard archipelago, but also allowing other signatories equal scientific rights. The treaty is a crucial milestone in relation to the agenda. While Article 9 of the 1920 treaty prohibits the establishment of military fortifications in the region, the archipelago has become one of NATO and Russia's most crucial strategic passages.

Dual-Use Infrastructure

Infrastructure such as ports, airfields, and cables built with military funds for commercial and civilian purposes. While it possesses the technical capabilities to be rapidly repurposed during the case of a conflict, it also has many limitations. For example, labeling civilian transport as dual use may place the lives of civilians in danger as it becomes a legitimate military target during a crisis.

Grey Zone Warfare

Grey Zone Warfare describes the competitive interactions among state and non-state actors that fall between the two concepts of peace and war. In the context of the agenda, it would imply how adversaries use non-military means–such as cyberattacks–to project dominance and power over the Arctic without influencing a direct military response.

Security Dilemma

The Security Dilemma is a situation in which actions taken by a state to increase its own security makes other states view the action as aggressive, thus leading to an arms race. The ultimate message of the dilemma is as nations are forced to respond and engage in competition with these other nations, it causes an arms race where both sides end up less secure than before. When one nation reopens a polar airbase for the sole purpose of defensive patrols, neighboring Arctic states can view it as an offensive threat, triggering a cycle of competitive militarization that continues to destabilize and weaken the entire region.

Historical Background

The Arctic has remained a peculiar subject within the realm of international discourse, and in particular, regarding its security. Once defined primarily by its inaccessibility, it is now increasingly becoming known for the opposite. During the Cold War, the Arctic served as a strategic buffer between the United States and the Soviet Union, the land being acting as a host for radar systems, submarine patrol routes and all extensive military activity. The military treated the region as a flashpoint by proxy instead of an official, governed space. Hence, there was no binding legal work or contractual evidence that would be able to manage the Arctic as a distinct political entity, and thus during this period, it existed as an ambiguous piece of military property.

This status changed in 1996, with the establishment of the Arctic Council. This was a high intergovernmental organization forum comprising eight Arctic states (Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Russia, Sweden and the United States) alongside six other organizations representing Arctic Indigenous peoples as permanent members. The Council was designed specifically not to have authority over military power, directing their attention to far different matters including sustainable expansion and environment protection.

In 2008, the Ilulissiat Declaration was signed by five Arctic coastal states: Canada, Denmark, Norway, Russia, and the United States. This cooperation was meant to reaffirm that the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) would govern territorial parts and resource rights in the region, rejecting the suggestions for a new comprehensive legal regime. In spite of this redirection, the ambiguity of the land has been challenged. Most notably, in 2007, Russia’s planting of a titanium flag on the seabed of the North pole was met with great disapproval, but is now understood as a gesture attempting to symbolise the return of great power calculation.

Climate change has accelerated these marginal concerns to a more urgent status. The polar ice of the Northern Sea route and the Northwest passage have both been opened, exposing valuable resources such as oil reserves, rare earth minerals, and has drawn non Arctic states alongside existing committee members to challenge the longstanding peace. NATO's expansion in the Nordic region following Finland's and Sweden's accession has further militarized a space the Arctic Council was never equipped to govern, leaving the UNSC to solve an truly ambiguous territorial dispute.

Current State of Affairs

With growing issues of climate change, competition of natural resources, and growing military actions, the Arctic is rising as a major global matter. The Arctic was mainly perceived as a place for cooperation on scientific research and environment protection historically. However, the escalation of tensions in recent years deteriorated the security of the Arctic. Russia is a nation that currently executes the largest military presence in the Arctic region, expanding its infrastructure, military bases, and the development of the Northern Sea Route. In response, countries such as the US, Canada, and other NATO nations have drawn their attention to Arctic security and military readiness.

Several events have negatively affected the current situation in the Arctic. The Russia-Ukraine war has diminished cooperation between Russia and Western Arctic countries, which caused difficulties in diplomatic dialogues. Also, the accession of Finland and Sweden into NATO has affected the security balance in the region due to the growing influence of NATO near Russia in the Arctic area. Another concern is climate change, which has led to an increase in the struggle for resources due to the melting of ice, making new routes and resources more accessible.

There are a number of problems with the present strategy of Arctic security. There is no well-developed international security system aimed at preventing conflicts in the region. The Arctic Council promotes collaboration on the environment and science issues; however, it does not consider military disputes. Moreover, communication between countries has become more strained, which means that there is a high risk of miscommunication and unintentional conflicts. The lack of facilities required to react to emergencies and protect the environment in case of the growth of human activity in the region also exacerbates the situation.

The increased accessibility of the region led to the emergence of new challenges. Fears are rising that the region could become a potential battleground for major powers amid growing militarization. Competition for resources and sea-lanes has created disputes over sovereignty and access. Indigenous peoples' traditional way of life and natural habitats are under threat from climate change and industrial development. The rise in activity in the region has led to an increase in environmental hazards such as oil spills and thawing permafrost, worsening the status quo.

Stances of Parties

Albania

Albania is not an arctic state and possesses no territorial claims in the Arctic territory. However, the nation is a NATO member, and utilizes its position as a supporter of the rules-based international order. Its key interests involve the safeguarding of European and international security. Most of its invested interest into the Arctic's status is in the potential harms or changes that may occur toward shipping routes, natural resources, increased militarization and the ripple effect of nation by nation hostility onto geopolitical tensions.

Australia

In spite of not being one of the Arctic states, Australia carries a vested interest in the Arctic, in consideration to the factors of international security, environmental risks and its economic activity. The country considers that the climate-driven transformations occurring in the Arctic carry profound implications onto not just that sole region, but extend toward other areas. Particularly, through sea-level rise, changes in global weather patterns, and impacts on marine ecosystems. Australia's engagement with the matter mainly relies on the country's proficiency in polar science and governance, as well as other scientific approaches working to support the region.

Brazil

Brazil's perspective on the Arctic relies primarily on a scientific and environmental protection approach. Brazil possesses no territorial claim over the arctic, but it sees the Arctic's ice loss as an extreme environmental event that has directly contributed to rising sea levels and broader changes in the global climate system, creating a hazard for the international community. The country has continuously advocated that the existing economic opportunities should not overshadow the serious environmental consequences; a product of continued exploitation. The existing availability of gas, oil, or other valuable resources and minerals should not be represented as an opportunity, but rather be subverted from the main talking points, as per Brazil's environmentally prioritized stance. The country does hold some positive regard toward reasonable economic development, but believes all financial 'booms' should be reasonable and sufficient. Brazil has also previously stated that non-arctic states should be allowed to contribute to discussions concerning the Arctic's environmental consequences, in the name of international cooperation and efficient problem solving.

Canada

Canada considers the Arctic a fundamental component of its national security and identity. As one of the world's principal Arctic states, Canada is a firm advocate in maintaining territorial integrity as well as supporting the protection and monitoring of northern territories, all while maintaining relations with other Arctic states. Alongside the ever-changing ecosystem, one of Canada's main concerns remains Indigenous participation and rights, particularly, the interests of Inuit and other northern communities. Canada's large scale interest in maintaining both environmental and social standards exemplifies the nation's deep understanding of the current fragility of the Arctic and the measures required to accommodate it.

China

In consideration of the Arctic, China considers its security an utmost priority in order to ensure future scientific research and development can be conducted on the lands. China identifies itself as a "Near-Arctic State" and believes that non-Arctic nations should have the right to participate in Arctic affairs in accordance with international law. China supports maintaining peace and stability in the region through diplomatic negotiations, mutual respect, and adherence to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). The nation places particular importance on protecting its economic and scientific interests, including the development of the Polar Silk Road and the expansion of international shipping opportunities. While respectful of the jurisdiction of the Arctic States, China still strongly advocates for the collaboration of all willing international parties to help secure and maintain peace and stability in the region.

Denmark

Denmark's close relations with Greenland and the Faroe islands make the Arctic a major priority. As a NATO member, Denmark is a firm supporter of peaceful negotiations and believes all territorial disputes can be settled through channels under international law, keeping the Arctic's international dignity intact while doing so. The developments in the Arctic have a direct impact on Denmark, meaning that this nation has a strong incentive to ensure that the Arctic's changing environment and unearthing opportunities for new resources is handled with care. Tactics that the nation approves of include enhanced surveillance, maritime awareness, general defensive strategies, and most importantly: collaboration. To Denmark, cooperation is a strong component of this delicate process, using level-headedness to avoid turning the arctic into a military confrontation. Environmental protection is also wholly a Danish priority, meaning the sustainability of approved practices is an essential metric for the country, following greenlandic interests alongside that of indigenous ones.

Fiji

Fiji does not believe the status quo is a challenge separate to the Arctic, believing it to be the primary barometer of global climate change and may directly dictate the survivability of low lying Pacific islands. As a vulnerable island nation, Fiji contributes values that reflect that nature, showing concerns that Arctic ice loss will contribute to sea-level rise and that economic competition over the Arctic's resources must not undermine the more pressing environment and climate goals. Fiji believes it essential to put Arctic governance over increased militarization and the respective regional desires to extract and distribute newfound resources. Vulnerable communities, environmental culpability and the rights of indigenous communities are also among the concerns of Fiji's international considerations.

Finland

Finland considers the Arctics security as a personal responsibility, interconnected with the country's own national defense and environmental rights. Finland, both and Arctic and NATO member, uses its international leverage to support causes regarding effective cooperation, as a means to deescalate geopolitical tensions. The country is also a firm believer in the Arctic remaining under the jurisdiction of international law, rather than being adopted under a specific regional territory. Finland's approach relies mostly on strategizing, including research, sustainable development, and awareness. It also

opposes military action and political unionization directly, maintaining a firm stance rather than setting conditional terms for them.

French Republic

As a member of NATO and permanent member of UNSC, France is deeply involved in the agenda. The nation perceives the Arctic as a significant region for international security due to its strategic location, natural resources, and efficient shipping routes. Deeply concerned about Russia's growing military presence and increasing involvement of other major nations in the region, the country supports international law, UNCLOS, freedom of navigation, and stronger cooperation with allied nations. The country takes the stance that security should be balanced with environmental protection and scientific cooperation.

Germany

The agenda is seen by Germany as an inseparable part of the overall European security system. As stated in its 2024 Arctic Policy Guidelines, the country stresses the necessity of keeping peace and stability to preserve the rule-based international order. Germany is very concerned with the increase in Russia's military activities after the Ukrainian conflict and with competition in the Arctic region among countries. Supporting protection of critical infrastructure, freedom of navigation, and respect for international law, Germany strongly supports stronger NATO and European cooperation.

Iceland

Because of its unique geographic location, Iceland perceives the Arctic and North Atlantic as a very significant region for international cooperation and security. The fact worth mentioning is that even though Iceland is a country without any armed forces, it participates in NATO by means of cooperation. Regarding the agenda, the nation supports maintaining a strong system of cooperation between NATO member states and Arctic states while avoiding unnecessary militarization. Iceland prioritizes the Arctic's value for addressing climate change, ensuring maritime safety, and building emergency response capabilities.

Italy

Italy's 2026 Arctic policy focuses on international law, freedom of navigation, UNCLOS, and the protection of critical resources. The nation supports dealing with urgent security threats through NATO and European cooperation rather than building an independent Italian military presence in the Arctic region. Recognizing the importance of the region in terms of environmental protection, Italy is also concerned about the effects of climate change and the opening of new shipping and economic opportunities in the region. Italy also highly supports dialogue between Arctic and non-Arctic states for international cooperation and prevention of tensions from developing into larger conflicts.

Japan

As sea ice is melting and new shipping routes are being developed along with growing geopolitical competition among the major powers, Japan realizes that climate change is having a very significant impact on the Arctic region. On the other hand, Japan is giving due consideration to the growing

deployment of Russian troops in the Arctic along with China's involvement in the region. Japan's preference is towards more cooperation among the nations for keeping major shipping routes clear and reducing the tensions which can disrupt trade. As an observer of the Arctic Council, Japan would likely support a balanced approach that protects economic interests while avoiding confrontation.

Kenya

Even though Kenya has no direct territorial claims in the Arctic, developments in the region affect its long-term interests. Changes in the Arctic climate have caused a rise of sea levels and changes in weather patterns, which are especially important for coastal and developing countries such as Kenya. Kenya is interested in making sure that Arctic developments don't worsen existing environmental and economic problems in developing countries. The involvement of Kenya in the Security Council can enable other nations to ensure that the Arctic does not become another center of geopolitical rivalry in future while linking it with various issues like climate change and development.

Netherlands

Because of its position as a major maritime and trading country, the Netherlands has a growing interest in the Arctic. The nation is particularly concerned about the protection of undersea cables and other infrastructure that connects Europe and the wider world. As a member of NATO, the Netherlands is also likely to take Russia's military activity seriously, supporting close cooperation with European allies. Still, as the country itself is interested in the economic and environmental consequences of increased activity in the region, it would probably avoid solely presenting the Arctic as a military issue.

Norway

Norway can be considered as one of the countries with greatest interests in Arctic security. Having already seen increased military operations in the High North region, the country views the region as an important part of its national defense. The country advocates increased cooperation within NATO, improved monitoring, and increased security of important structures and shipping lanes. At the same time, Norway is also interested in Arctic region in terms of such fields as energy and fishing, so maintaining stability in the region is also very important to the country.

United States

The United States prioritizes defending homeland security and interests, recently heightened amid concerns regarding Russian militarization and Chinese dual use of the Arctic region. Seeing that the Arctic is a crucial region for global energy and geopolitics, rivalry between major powers has transformed the High North as an area of stiff competition. To combat this, the US has created a multitude of national strategies, one predominant example being the American Grand Strategy. This strategy highlights the US's stance of maintaining influence, strengthening alliances, and ensuring freedom of navigation to prevent a single power from dominating the Arctic.

United Kingdom

Despite the fact that the United Kingdom is not considered an Arctic state, the nation considers itself highly affiliated with the situation as they are "the nearest neighbour to the Arctic region". Thus, the UK is stepping up to protect the Arctic by doubling the number of troops stationed in Norway and

strengthening joint exercises with its NATO allies. Through this approach, the nation aims to defend the Arctic from newly arising threats and policy shifts. Furthermore, these actions also reinforce the country's leadership in the region while bolstering NATO's deterrence posture. Ultimately, the UK is heavily focused on safeguarding its homeland and allies against new challenges while maintaining peace.

Russia

The nation of Russia views the Arctic as a crucial national security zone and important location to maintain their power status in both trade and management. Russia believes that the militarization of the Arctic is a necessary defensive measure to protect its borders and has the rightful sovereignty to do so. The country remains a continuous advocate of accusing NATO of destabilizing the region through its own northern expansion, hardening its military stance. This defensive realism stance underlines that the country views the region as a non negotiable stronghold for a desired economic future which Russia believes is through domination.

South Korea

South Korea may not be a main actor in this agenda, with its geographical location from the Arctic being relatively far, but its interests are certainly clear. Despite how many countries are concerned with militarization, trade dominance, and militarization, Korea prioritizes a stable regulatory environment to be able to export resources and boost economic growth. Moreover, seeing that Korea has not pursued any direct military actions in the region, the nation should be focusing on present strategies that allow for economic shipping access and direct defense industrial contributions while still balancing its role as an Arctic Council observer.

South Africa

South Africa does not have an official stance or foreign policy that addresses Arctic militarization. Being a non Arctic nation, South Africa typically views the matter of Arctic security through the broader lenses of international law. The nation continues to be a firm UN advocate for the adherence to the Law of the Sea(UNCLOS) and for the prioritization of peaceful dispute resolution. Despite that South African policy discourse acknowledges that environmental shifts caused from ice melt could have consequences on the nation, it refrains from intervening in any geopolitical standoffs between Arctic countries.

Singapore

As an observer state to the Arctic Council, Singapore refrains from taking sides, maintaining a neutral stance. The country emphasizes the need for peaceful resolutions and strictly adhered to the UNCLOS for the purpose of open freedom of navigation. Despite that the nation doesn't disagree on governance or resource exploration, the nation emphasizes that such transactions happening in the Arctic must align with the UN's policies. Furthermore, Singapore encourages multilateral cooperation for scientific research and environmental protection rather than military escalation. By doing so, the nation hopes to safeguard its status as a global shipping hub while protecting and upholding maritime law.

Sweden

Sweden plays a crucial role in the Arctic that balances responsibility with an emphasis on domestic interests. The nation has stated that the new Arctic Strategy reflects a "serious security situation" that has to be resolved, and called for an increased international focus in the region. Through a multilateral approach of policies and international cooperation, Sweden aims to counteract Russian military

threats and influence in the arctic. Moreover, the nation views Russian conventional forces and hybrid operations as a direct threat to regional stability, emphasizing the need for the complete diplomatic and institutional isolation of such countries willing to compromise the diplomatic peace between nations.

Switzerland

As climate change continues to worsen, the Arctic is warming up four times as fast than the global average. Simultaneously, the Arctic is also becoming a strategic hotspot for trade, with melting ice unlocking new shipping routes and exposing vast reserves that are economically profitable. At such times, Switzerland believes that science diplomacy can serve as a 'bridge', highlighting how competing nations must recognize that they must find a way to cooperate when it comes to addressing common threats, in this case, climate change. Thus, Switzerland strongly opposes the militarization of the Arctic, advocating instead for the region to remain an area of strategic cooperation and environmental cooperation.

Türkiye

Unlike other competing Arctic powers, Türkiye prioritizes building a sustainable presence in the Arctic through the utilization of science diplomacy. The nation advocates for preserving and strengthening the Arctic Council while remaining open to discussing possible alternative structures in present frameworks that could find a way to secure Arctic governance. Furthermore, Turkiye also emphasizes the need for economic partnership for the Arctic to maintain an area of low geopolitical tension. As a non Arctic state to the Arctic Council, the nation continues to advocate for the Arctic to be a demilitarized zone governed by international law rather than exclusive military dominance.

Possible Solutions

Strengthening Diplomatic Cooperation in the Arctic

Rather than relying on the self, the international community could focus on multi-lateral cooperation to prevent territorial disputes and to promote further stability in the region. Encouraging peaceful negotiations over maritime disputes, offsetting territorial instincts through regular diplomatic dialogue with these new alliances reaffirm the vitality of international law. One example would be to work off of existing frameworks, such as the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), which would offer a legal basis for resolving maritime disputes. Overlapping maritime claims should be sufficiently addressed through the reinforcement of international law and strengthened cooperation in existing international institutions.

Environmental considerations and Climate protection

Stricter environmental regulations could be put in place to emphasise the severity of the environmental degradation that the Arctic state is enduring. Member states could utilize their platform and visibility to promote sustainable reduction practices, awareness, and scientific strategies to reduce the pollution in the shipping and distribution activity. Using their influence and presence in their respective international organizations would promote sustainable practices including reduction of pollution in shipping and distribution as well as scientific research. For instance, developed countries could also offer financial assistance to help protect the Arctic’s ecosystem for indigenous and vulnerable populations affected by environmental changes.

Questions to Consider

1. How can a nation balance the military infrastructure's expansion and fleets of ice sheets in the Arctic without triggering a regional arms race?
2. In what ways can a cooperative measure regarding critical mineral resources and fisheries be enforced without infringing on national sovereignty?
3. What diplomatic or security frameworks can a nation support to prevent regional military conflicts?
4. How can Arctic nations make sure that indigenous peoples get an active say in matters of regional security and environmental protection?
5. How could the countries balance out the advantages that they get from the increased availability of shipping lanes in the Arctic with the disadvantages they face due to environmental concerns and conflicting interests?

Bibliography

"Averting conflict can become Switzerland's role in Arctic science diplomacy." *Geneva Centre for Security Policy*, www.gcsp.ch/news/averting-conflict-can-become-switzerlands-role-arctic-science-diplomacy. Accessed 23 Aug. 2026.

Bennett, Mia. "South Korea's growing role in Arctic economic development." *Foreign Policy Association*, fpa.org/south-koreas-growing-role-in-arctic-economic-development/. Accessed 23 Aug. 2026.

Demirbaş, Kübra. "Türkiye's Arctic Strategy: From Science Diplomacy to Strategic Positioning." *Mintel World*, www.mintelworld.com/reports/turkiyes-arctic-strategy-from-science-diplomacy-to-strategic-positioning?lang=en. Accessed 23 Aug. 2026.

Hilde-Gunn Bye. "Sweden Sharpens Its Arctic Strategy." *High North News*, en.highnorthnews.com/politics/sweden-sharpens-its-arctic-strategy/1112909. Accessed 23 Aug. 2026.

Jonassen, Trine. "NATO's Military Leader: 'The Arctic in 2025 Is at a Crossroads.'" *High North News*, en.highnorthnews.com/politics/natos-military-leader-the-arctic-in-2025-is-at-a-crossroads/135176. Accessed 23 Aug. 2026.

Middleton, Alexandra. "Militarization of the Nordic Arctic: Demographic, Economic and Environmental Implications." *The Arctic Institute*, www.thearcticinstitute.org/militarization-nordic-arctic-demographic-economic-environmental-implications/. Accessed 23 Aug. 2026.

Ministry of Defence. "UK steps up defence of Arctic and High North from rising Russian threats." *GOV UK*,

www.gov.uk/government/news/uk-steps-up-defence-of-arctic-and-high-north-from-rising-russian-threats. Accessed 23 Aug. 2026.

Nadarajah, Hema. "How has Singapore been legitimising its presence in the Arctic?" *East Asia Forum*, eastasiaforum.org/2018/07/21/how-has-singapore-been-legitimising-its-presence-in-the-arctic/. Accessed 23 Aug. 2026.

Nesheiwat, Julia. "Why the Arctic matters to the United States." *Atlantic Council*, www.atlanticcouncil.org/dispatches/why-the-arctic-matters-to-the-united-states/. Accessed 23 Aug. 2026.

Adler, Katya. “Tensions Rise as China, Russia, US and Europe Scramble for Arctic.” *BBC*, 23 May 2025, https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/cjwqn7z02plo.

“Arctic Security.” *Site Name Seo*, 2026, https://www.nato.int/en/what-we-do/deterrence-and-defence/arctic-security.

Cooperazione, della. “The Arctic: Presentation of Italy’s Strategic Document on Arctic Engagement – Ministero Degli Affari Esteri E Della Cooperazione Internazionale.” *Esteri.It*, 2026, https://www.esteri.it/en/sala_stampa/archivionotizie/comunicati/2026/01/artico-domani-la-presentazione-del-documento-strategico-sullimpegno-italiano/.

Fellow, Kayla Mayo Research. “The Arctic Security Threat - Nato-Veterans.” *Nato-Veterans*, 16 June 2026, https://nato-veterans.org/the-arctic-security-threat/.

“Government of Iceland | National Security.” *Www.Government.Is*, https://www.government.is/topics/foreign-affairs/national-security/. Accessed 23 Aug. 2026.

Heggstad, Ingrid Sollid. “How Climate Change Amplifies Arctic Tensions, but Does Not Drive It.” *The Arctic Institute - Center for Circumpolar Security Studies*, 19 Feb.

2026, https://www.thearcticinstitute.org/climate-change-amplifies-arctic-tensions-drive/.

Helge Adrians, et al. “Germany as Arctic Security Actor.” *Stiftung Wissenschaft Und Politik (SWP)*, Apr. 2026, https://doi.org/10.18449/2026RP06.

Heron, Anthony. “A North Sea Defence Alliance: Challenges and Opportunities for the UK.” *Atlas Institute for International Affairs*, 27 Jan. 2025, https://atlasinstitute.org/a-north-sea-defence-alliance-challenges-and-opportunities-for-the-uk/.

Keil, Kathrin. “The Arctic: A New Region of Conflict? The Case of Oil and Gas.” *Cooperation and Conflict*, vol. 49, no. 2, June 2013, pp. 162–90, https://doi.org/10.1177/0010836713482555.

Malik, Ishfaq Hussain, and James D. Ford. “Understanding the Impacts of Arctic Climate Change Through the Lens of Political Ecology.” *WIREs Climate Change*, vol. 16, no. 1, Dec. 2024, https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.927.

Mar, Martínez, and Prieto. *Recibir BOLETÍN ELECTRÓNICO Visitar La WEB 98/2025 24 De Noviembre De 2025 Geopolitics and Power Relations in the Arctic Geopolitics and Power Relations in the Arctic*. https://www.defensa.gob.es/documents/2073105/2320887/geopolitica_y_artico_2025_dieeeo98_eng.pdf/6e8bc0d8-d076-990d-bbde-f69ed54469b4?t=1763453429856. Accessed 23 Aug. 2026.

Raspotnik, Andreas. “Beyond the Northern Sea Route: The Developmental State and Japanese Arctic Energy Policy.” *The Arctic Institute - Center for Circumpolar Security Studies*, 24 Mar. 2026, https://www.thearcticinstitute.org/beyond-northern-sea-route-developmental-state-japanese-arctic-energy-policy/.

"France's Strategic Role in NATO's Arctic Ambitions: A Non-Arctic Power's Perspective." *The Arctic Institute - Center for Circumpolar Security Studies*, 12 Nov. 2024, https://www.thearcticinstitute.org/frances-strategic-role-natos-arctic-ambitions-non-arctic-powers-perspective/.

Tandon, Ayesha. "The Arctic Has Warmed 'Nearly Four Times Faster' Than the Global Average - Carbon Brief." *Carbon Brief*, 11 Aug. 2022, https://www.carbonbrief.org/the-arctic-has-warmed-nearly-four-times-faster-than-the-global-average.

WWF. "Climate Change." *WWF Arctic*, WWF, 2023, https://www.arcticwwf.org/threats/climate-change/.

Sharp, Gregory. "From the Central Pacific to the Arctic" *High North News* , 23. Oct. 2019. https://en.highnorthnews.com/home/from-the-central-pacific-to-the-arctic/175168

Government of Canada. "Canada's Arctic Foreign Policy" *Gouvernment of Canada.* 26. Feb. 2026. https://international.canada.ca/en/global-affairs/corporate/reports/arctic-policy-2024?lang=eng&utm_

NATO. "Arctic Security" *Deference and Defense.* 24. July. 2026 https://www.nato.int/en/what-we-do/deterrence-and-defence/arctic-security?utm_

Colless, Laurel "In an age of geopolitics, who gets to decide the future of the North?" *Arctic Today. 3. Aug. 2026.* https://www.arctictoday.com/who-decides-the-future-of-the-arctic/