

Greenland Territorial Dispute Between Denmark and US and its Implications on Russia**Muhammad Asim¹**¹ Department of Political Science, University of Management and Technology, LahoreEmail: mehsudasim006@gmail.com**DOI: <https://doi.org/10.70670/sra.v3i2.823>****Abstract:**

The largest island in the world, as a result of favorable geostrategic positions, rich natural resources, and changing position regarding the territorial disputes, Greenland now lies on the frontlines of the Arctic geopolitics. This paper will look at the tantrums that have surrounded the relationship between Denmark, the United States and Greenland and in its consequences of the encounter to the relationship of Russia. The autonomy of Greenland is making it more independent since this was once a Danish colony. At the same time, the United States military, economic and geopolitical interest in Greenland has been noted to be increasing as seen in the ownership of Thule air base and earlier attempts at acquiring the island. These processes declare that Greenland has been transformed to a standby region to political power hub. In its quest to exercise its powers over Greenland, Denmark tries to balance its obligations to the NATO and its aspiration to have self-determination in the country. It also examines the manner in which the United States is efforts are underway towards beefing up its Arctic frontier as the great-power rivalry ratchets up. Conversely, Russia considers the spread of Western influence in Greenland as a threat towards its Arctic positioning strategy in areas that are associated with resource prosperity and dominantly rising sea lanes. The paper also argues that the effect of territorial future of Greenland as being integrated into Denmark or as gradually becoming less dependent, or more integrated and controlled by the United States would have a vast influence on the power play in the Arctic. This discussion indicates that, in the twenty-first century, the island became a chess board of the geopolitical game. The process of greenlandization is one of the factors as to why one should expect the changes in the spheres of authority, military orbits, and the international security system incorporating Russia and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in the Arctic.

Key Words: Greenland, Arctic Geopolitics, Greenland Territorial Sovereignty, Denmark-Greenland Relations, U.S. and Russian Policies, Polar Region, Great Power Competition

Introduction:

Greenland is the largest arctic island and a very important geographic spot in the emerging global geopolitical setting that lies between America and Europe. Geographically close to Canada and the United States, Greenland was politically under Denmark and symbolized strengths and sovereignty of Danes in North Atlantic. However, all that has changed recently because of changing power balances in the world and the rapidly increasing impacts of climate change to the territorial sovereign status of Greenland. To the big powers, especially the US and Russia, the island has found a mean heightened value of the all the natural resources in it, opening of the shipping lanes due to the melted ice as well as close vicinity to other strategic military and

economic centers of interest. Since its inclusion in the Kingdom of Denmark in 1953, Greenland has always been a Danish colony. Greenland is given very much autonomy since the Home Rule in Greenland of 1979 and the Self-Government Act of 2009, but issues such as foreign policy, defense, and monetary policy remain under the control of Denmark. This new political reality has raised a question whether Greenland can have full autonomy in all aspects that can greatly expand the international relationship of Greenland. Greenland is also a means of ensuring relevance of Denmark in Arctic politics as well as global politics besides being a colony of Denmark. Denmark is entitled to engage in strategic security talks and huge international meetings such as the Arctic Council since it holds its sovereignty to the Greenland. However, the US is primarily interested in Greenland because of its strategic and military significance. Seemingly as a result of both its strategic value towards the Cold War early-warning system, but also its role as a forward base in the military strategy of the Arctic region since the founding of Thule Air Base in the 1950s, Greenland is an important part of the U.S. defense architecture. Although Denmark turned down Trump's 2019 offer to purchase Greenland, the move highlighted the Washington administration's heightened interest in acquiring control of the territory. This interest stems from the fact that, as the United States' presence in the Arctic thwarts China's and Russia's objectives, the region is becoming into a territory resource and a site of geopolitical competition.

Nonetheless, the interest that the US has in Greenland has more to do with military and strategic value. Greenland is also an important part of U.S. defense architecture due to its utility to the Cold War early-warning system and continued utility as an Arctic forward base in the U.S. military strategy since the creation of Thule Air Base in the 1950s. Even though Denmark, in 2019 rejected the offer made by Trump to buy Greenland, this action revealed a growing interest in the Washington administration to gain control of the region. This consideration is motivated by the fact that, as the presence of the United States in the Arctic undermines the interests of China and Russia, the waters are turning into a territorial resource and a geopolitical field of contention. But a general and increasing interest in Greenland and the Arctic by the west at large has been interpreted by Russia as direct challenge to traditional dominance of the region. Development In upgrading its fleet in the arctic and re-opening former Soviet period bases, the Kremlin has invested heavily in the militarization of its northern periphery. Russia considers itself as a power to reckon with and it feels threatened by the growth of NATO or the increased number of Americans in its backyard because it has better shipping routes through Arctic which can be used by ships and because it is more economically stable than before. In turn, the changes to the status of Greenland may produce a diverse range of effects that follow, such as a further opening up to the United States, or, alternatively, desire to achieve formal independence: any of these changes could greatly affect the international stability estimates as well as Russian Arctic strategy. The development has made Greenland stop being a distant island with diminished powers in the international community. Three countries that have something to gain due to this geopolitical turning point are Russia, the United States and Denmark. In order to interpret the greater meaning of the sovereignty in the Arctic and military activities as well as the consequences of any major power conflict in the area it is important to know the history and existing conflict over Greenland borders.

Literature Review

Greenland is a nation that plays a vital role in the fast-changing arctic geopolitical map and hence the growing interest by scholars in the past several decades. Historically, Greenland has been a remote and isolated backwater whose status has radically changed given the global environmental change, exploitation of natural resources and power politics. The fact that it is geographically located between North America and Europe besides the fact that it is endowed with vast amounts

of unutilized natural resources have further concretized its description of being a battle field between the interests of Russia, the United States and Denmark. Over the international law, military strategy and post-colonial studies, there is diversity of scholars, through which they have shaped geopolitical importance of Greenland. The consequential literature is a substantive source that is used to comprehend the rising power of the island in the international arena. Greenland ownership and its broken character together with the Denmark relation occupies a big space within the literature. Political and constitutional evolution on the way to allowing Greenland more autonomy is traced by such historians as AckrEN (2011) and Gad (2013), especially following the enactment of the Self-Government Act in 2009 and the introduction of the Home Rule in 1979. Such legal wins are often seen as indicators to the eventual total sovereignty but the economic reliance of the island on the Danish subsidies take away the euphoria. As an example, Winther and Goldsmith (2019) state that although there have been certain political steps aimed toward becoming a nation, Greenland is still limited by the poor quality of the infrastructure and financial structure of the region so that, perhaps, a complete split between Greenland and Denmark is not possible in the nearest future. As the phenomenon of Greenlandic self-rule is regarded as the determining factor among the indigenous movement in the framework of the struggle to give its self-government after the European colonization, Nuttall (2008) and Wilson (2020) lay primary emphasis on the psychological and cultural dimensions of Greenlandic personality. These internal dynamics are coupled by the literature putting emphasis on Greenland contribution to the U.S. Arctic policy and its effect on being U.S. Denmark relationships. Ever since the cold war, the presence of the long standing American military establishment on the island has been the backbone of American defense policy with the Thule Air Base being its center of gravity. It has been established that Greenland is a key strategic facility in the missile warning and surveillance of the arctic region by the United States (Conley and Rohloff, 2015). More recent studies by Pincus and Ali (2016) indicate that the Americans are now more involved especially following the Trump administration controversial 2019 offer to acquire Greenland out of Denmark. The offer was outrightly refused, but the academic and policy circles were drawn once again to the geopolitical interest and tensions between economic interest and integrity of the territory. Olesen (2020), Heininen, and Exner-Pirot (2019) viewed the U.S. drift to Greenland involving the opening of a consulate in Nuuk and the provision of developmental aid as the effort to undermine Russian and Chinese influence in the Arctic. Denmark has been in a corner. Greenland is under the care of Denmark in the foreign policies, as well as defense since Denmark is the legal sovereign and the member of NATO; it should also listen to the rising Greenlandic demands of autonomy. It is a tough task to be in which places Denmark in a precarious situation since it is forced to promote American security concerns as the post-colonial neighbor to Greenland. Anxious but determined is the course that the 2011 Arctic Policy and the subsequent upgrading of the Danish defenses show to follow in the main agenda of the NATO and becoming a part of it. As its domestic leverage over the island declined, scholars have claimed that with its territorial sovereignty over Greenland, Denmark uses its leverage by representing relevant Arctic governing organizations on multi lateral entities. Albeit being less conspicuous, the stand that Russia has on Greenland does not diminish its relevance when it comes to Arctic geopolitics. Strategic importance of the region to the economical as well as national security of the country has prompted intellectuals in Russia, as well as critics in the West, to observe the increasing aggressiveness displayed by Moscow to ensure that it dominates the Arctic. Zysk (2008) and Klimenko (2019) have also reported that Russia is mobilizing substantial forces along the Russian Arctic frontier which include opening regions hitherto blocked during the Soviet era, deployment of new state of the art missile systems as well as mobilization of increased number icebreakers in its vessels. The reaction of increased US and NATO activity that takes place in Greenland or around the island is strong among the Russians as

the country does not question the sovereignty of the island. In the context of melting arctic ice which is revealing the arctic north, Russia considers the development of Greenland toward the West as containing it (Osthagen, 2020). This has been worsened by the possibility of Greenland providing NATO with a strategic platform of conducting operations to spy on Russian activities in the maritime waters and to claim ownership of the emerging arctic waterways. A second concept of academic discourse was the politics of the natural resources and the way they have transformed the environment. Emmerson (2010) and Keil (2014) among others have expressed hope that the rich uranium resources, rare earth mineral resources, as well as hydrocarbon reserves offshore of Greenland will transform the island in terms of its economy and foreign policy. The ice in the sea is melted rapidly and owing to the fact that the rate the issue of warming in the Arctic is much higher than the global warming, it makes access of harvesting commodities and navigating the sea more and more habitable. The shift leaves every one of the key countries and specifically US, which does not desire to see China or Russia in control of the greenlandic minerals that are profitable on long-term basis. Having the desire to remain to have some form of control over its own resources the administration of Greenland has attempted to exploit the international appetite to attract foreign investment in the meanwhile. The Arctic has become a region of great power, just as many academics have predicted, as the result of a confluence of the geopolitical piloting, resource availability, and climate change. Even more modish theorists such as Rahbek-Clemmensen Lanteigne (2020), which discuss on the impact of both environmental and strategic pressures that are making Arctic cooperation into Arctic confrontation, also show that the so-called Arctic race was among the initial theories that alerted on the phenomenon. In this respect, Greenland is a geopolitical hotspot, as well as a regionality pointer. The territorial issue of Greenland will hold a lot of weight as the Arctic moves towards being a more competitive area involving military and economic aspects as far as the position of each of the countries in the region is concerned. To draw a conclusion, the scholarly materials depict Greenland as a disputed territory that belongs to the geopolitical power play and an emerging self-governing territory. The activities in the island have attracted interests of the super powers of the world such as the US and Russia besides Denmark which has supervisory authority to the state. The problem of what will happen in Greenland to confirm, as a result, independence, more involving into the West, and strategic neutrality will soon turn into a key to the Arctic politics because of the accelerating rate of the climatic issue and the increasing world competition.

Research Questions

This essay discusses why the alteration of the territorial opportunity of Greenland and why it is of specific interest when examining the topic of arctic geopolitics. To discuss the strategic rationale and security implication on the example of Russia, the United States, and Denmark, the following study questions would be posted:

Q1. What has happened to the state of territorial relationships between Greenland and Denmark, between Greenland and independent statehood and how are the current political and legal relations constitutionally between Greenland and Denmark and Greenland and independent statehood?

Q 2. Which are the strategic concerns guiding the increasing United States participation in Greenland and in what ways do they interfere with the sovereign authority of Denmark and the need by Greenland to have independence?

Denmark's Position

Greenland is officially part of Denmark and this connection has been central to the Danish position and geopolitical strategy in the Arctic. Despite having had Home Rule since 1979 and Extended Self-Government since 2009, Denmark is in charge of Greenland as regards its foreign policy,

military, and security aspects. This plan can grant Denmark the potential to make a major difference in Arctic matters because of its connection with Greenland, which makes it gain access to the Arctic Council and personal input regarding the development of regions management systems. Given the fact that without Greenland Denmark cannot possibly sustain its existence running within the NATO and other world organizations and institutions, the country purports financial self-interest and national pride as the rationale behind the preservation of its unity with the island. Denmark and United States collaboration on matters of defense in Greenland has existed since World War II. This collaboration was enhanced in the course of the cold war where the two countries could establish the Thule Air Base. Denmark has usually not strictly objected the American military regime in the island in its entirety as an extension of the NATO anti-deterrence of the arctic, though at times accused by Greenlanders and even its own citizens, due to its security accord with America. Denmark has modernized the Danish defense policy during the past years and tied it with NATO ambitions, especially in the presence of Russian military man oeuvres in the High North. In its actual policy, Denmark has a fairly moderate, yet basically strong position towards Russia, which is almost the same as the western security doctrines. Denmark is worried about Russian militarism and believes that the geostrategic position of the island of Greenland is required in tracking the events that are occurring in the arctic despite its elevation on the importance of diplomatic cooperation in the arctic through Arctic Council. Denmark takes this position, thus making a compromise between its wish to retain sovereignty, encourage the independence of Greenland, as well as lay down first transatlantic security interests.

United States' Position

The US believes that Greenland is one of the most important tactical resources of the US Arctic and the world geosecurity system. It got involved in Greenland during World War II when it assumed the responsibility to defend the island against the invasion by the Nazis. The United States has since then been noted to have a prominent presence there mainly due to the presence of Thule Air Base in northwest Greenland as one amongst the location to monitor space and early warning ballistic missile creation. Since it is located geographically in such a manner it borders both North America and the Arctic frontier, this round the clock military presence shows just how essential green land would be to the American defense policy. The United States has in the past few years been manifesting much interest in Greenland due to increased competition in the Arctic. The fact that Denmark turned down the offer of the government of Trump, in 2019, to buy Greenland, is interpreted as a manifestation of geopolitical interest to them. U.S. seeks less visible means of assertion in Greenland since then, such as improvements of diplomatic relations, development assistance, and reception of its consulate in Nuuk in 2020. To uphold its Arctic policy, according to Washington, Greenland is a crucial area in stopping Russian militarization and reducing the Chinese investment in Arctic infrastructures and mining of its natural resources. The claims of China as near-Arctic have been of particular interest to the US along with its economic interests and the increasing military influences as well as ambitions of Russia in the Arctic. To maintain polar strategies and facilitate the freedom of passage, the United States needs to be in Greenland, which could turn into the center of arctic air, and sea related operations. The United States would like to strengthen its collaboration with Denmark and Greenland to make sure that this important piece of territory would not "lose" the Western security network but would promote the development of its domestic economy and independence with the focus on the American agenda.

Russia's Perspective:

As Russia maintains, one of the major changes in the Arctic is the rising strategic importance of Greenland, which is taking the form of twinning of the U.S. and Denmark countries. The high

level of interest of the Greenland location to Russia as part of the national security permits the country to extend the Western military and surveillance assets into the region despite the fact that the geographical territory of Greenland is not neighboring the Russian territory. Moscow says that the troop presence of the U.S. or NATO in the arctic including Greenland is simply a threat to its hegemony in the region so far. Another factor is the fact that Russia is employing its own comprehensive Arctic policy where its main focus is consolidating its northern border, opening up to the Arctic resources, and controlling the Northern Sea Route. Russia has engaged more patrols in the High North, reopened old soviet stations and installed advanced missiles in the past one decade. Experts and analysts concur that Russia considers the Arctic as a buffer zone and life-giving region, which is a very important aspect of national security. It is in this context that a stronger U.S. presence in Greenland will be viewed as a more comprehensive flanking strategy, which has the potential to put at risk Russia prospective northern sea-lines of communications and strategic deterrence options. Moreover, the growing autonomy or independence of Greenland concerns Russia even more when it results in the stronger affiliation to NATO or U.S. policies. Russian concerns are provoked by the fact that Greenland, where Washington is selected today as the most preferable location to expand its military facility, could become a location of a complex-level theatre of operations of intelligence, missile defence, or control over the navigation in the Arctic. Notably, Russia is becoming uneasy on the military front dated back to the accumulation of western forces in the arctic regardless of the efforts taken in the diplomatic field and inclusion in such platforms like the arctic council. Making the Russian Arctic calculus to be more militaristic is the report that Sputnik gives about how Greenland, which has become a very significant patch of land, is developing into a hostile player in the area. The island is no more an exotic component of the world, now it becomes a scene of the power game of a great power.

Theoretical Framework:

This paper applies the main theories in international relations realism which is the classical geopolitics and the securitization theory in order to identify the geographical relevance of Greenland to the triangle dynamics of Denmark, the United States and Russia. The frameworks may also be used as an extra set of lenses to interpret the effects of risks, space and power on the state behaviour in the Arctic. Realism is one of the bases of understanding the reason behind the actions of governments in the Arctic and is one of the most durable paradigms in international affairs. The basic assumption behind the realism approach is that states exist within anarchic world systems of political politics where it is of paramount importance to maximise power and merely to survive. This being the case, Greenland is not an autonomous region subjected to the Danish ownership; yet a geographical attraction which can be utilized in order to access the power to control any state that can successfully apply the manipulative impress on it. Although the Greenland forms part of the strategic defense command of the United States, especially to be able to detect missiles and be able to monitor the Beaufort Sea, the fact that Denmark still exercises its sovereign right over the territory has now made it to be relevant at the international and regional level in the context of global and regional politics. But it is also evident that Russia considers the growing pro- western orientation of Greenland as a threat to its own strategies and security-based military and economic aspirations in the arctic. The urge of governments to have greater share of influence in a region full of wealth both in resources and geopolitics is more realistic as far as the eagerness to win such battles is concerned. Realism is followed by classical geopolitics that is more preoccupied with the influence that geography has on the sphere of political power and strategic decision-making. The geographic position of Greenland is such that the country is located between North America and Europe, and direct access is to the Arctic Ocean; thus, having significant tactical weight. In the work of such theorists as Nicholas Spykman and Halford

Mackinder, the key areas of geography are the power systems that prevail globally. Through this, Greenland will be the spatial pivot of the Arctic and through which power could be projected to the North Atlantic and the circumpolar region. The significance of the island is enhanced by the fact that it is getting more and more accessible as the result of the climatic changes, including both the reserves of the natural resources which have not yet been explored as well as the possible exploitation of the routes of the Arctic Sea. The positioning of Greenland surely positions it as a major location in the country as it enables the United States to spy on the Russian plane and ships movement as well as transport soldiers to other parts of NATO across the northern coast. Concurrently, Russia considers western interest in Greenland to be its effort at experimenting with its sphere of influence and restriction of its mobility at arctic. Besides the spatial pre-ordination and material strengths, the securitization theory provides a constructivist measure to how a nation interprets as well as reacts to the perceived dangers. The securitization thesis, according to which the threat is posed as existential and, thus, just severe action, was created by the Copenhagen School. The national security approach, especially the one developed by the United States and Russia, has defined the changing geopolitical position of Greenland. Greenland is no longer seen as the land of Arctic protection as opposed to the land of a geographical neighbor and partner in the case of the US, at least as long as fears of Russian militarization and Chinese Investments exist. In the more tangible reactions against this securitized narrative are the enlargement of the US embassy in Nuuk and increase in the level of defense spending. Russia on the other hand perceives this increase in the Western presence as an attack on its century's old dominance in the Arctic. Further, the region has been turned into a more securitized region where the Western actions are labeled as hostile and used as a justification to expand the military forces. All these three theoretical positions of realism, geopolitics and securitization affect the behavior of Denmark, the United States and Russia towards Greenland. The issue of a zero-sum game in the Arctic race is conditional to the principle of realism; geopolitics makes it clear that the physical location of Greenland matters as well; and the theory of securitization shows how the trends observed abroad can be utilized by the advocates of the particular approaches on the one hand to justify their policies in the context of their respective home countries, and on the other hand to rationally explain them to the rest of the world. In combination, they present a comprehensive guideline in examining the territorial location of Greenland as a strategic factor that could be considered in the power tussle in the Arctic. It is based on such theoretical instruments that the importance and greatness of the island can be achieved in the context of international relations in the twenty-first century. Since the accessible Arctic is rising as a result of climate change, so is the geopolitical tussle.

Methodology:

With the help of a qualitative research design, based on a case-study analysis of territory and geopolitical connections held by Greenland toward the greater nation of Denmark, Russia, and the United States, the given report is composed. The case study method is especially suitable when exploring into the depth of the complex political condition so that the researcher can assess the diplomatic, strategic and historical aspects of Greenland changing position within the Arctic zone. The research strategy would entail the use of a primary and secondary source material mostly published on the internet. These are state government policy documents, strategic white paper, defense treatise, and general statements of certain Russian, the United States, and Denmark. Also, the broader institutional context is offered by publications and reports of the international organizations, like United Nations, NATO, and the Arctic Council. The major documents have been the Greenlandic self-government acts and policies, the Russian military theories, the U.S. Department of Defense Arctic strategies and the Danish Arctic Strategy. Academic sources, i.e., books and peer-reviewed journal articles were also utilized in the study, as were policy studies

carried out by other think tanks including the Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS), the Arctic Institute, and the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). The sources are also used to systematize the theoretical interpretation in addition to giving some of the theoretical inputs to allow comparative study of national interests and strategic behavior. The comparative analysis relies on the qualitative case-oriented approach and the historical example of Greenland is employed to indicate the way the three key players Russia, the United States and Denmark have developed the positioning of their strategies towards Greenland. The source triangulation helps the study locate patterns of state rhetoric, behavior, and state policy outcomes. Greenland is a unique and exemplary experience that can give an idea of more encompassing ideas such as the great power rivalry, the militarization of the Arctic, and the questions of sovereignty. To deduce the role that national interests play in this geopolitically sensitive and constantly evolving part of the world, the study shall not be exhaustive; it shall be interpretive.

Dissociation (incompatibilities or Divergences):

Despite the fact that security issues are shared by all 3 countries, Denmark, the United States, and Greenland, being the formal partners of NATO, nonetheless, retain quite different views, interests, and stakes in the question of ownership of the territory of Greenland and its redefinition of the area of strategic interests. The geopolitics of the region are unsustainable because of the increasing Russian suspicion of the Western cooperation over the Arctic that enhance division between the foes in the region, especially between Denmark and US. A major difference lies in the fact that U.S. was very aggressive in adopting its strategic position as opposed to Denmark sovereignty approach. Denmark has made an analysis of its sovereign responsibilities including finding a balance with regard to the Greenlandic autonomy, has officially embraced the autonomy of Greenland. The strategy in the Arctic envisions peaceful cooperation and sustainable development instead of focusing on an army buildup as the means to its power. United States, however, is most likely to use security in a more toothsome manner. Denmark likely does not see eye to eye with the high rate of armed forces and martial strategic approach as the U.S. plans to carry out its Arctic policy, but the presence of the U.S. in the Arctic is also rather warmly viewed, in particular the stationing of the Thule Air Base. The 2019 suggestion by the Trump administration to buy Greenland, ridiculed as a non-starter, set a shiver down the spine of the Danes in Copenhagen and revealed the Rubicon between the American view on exchange of territory and power and the more Danish outlook on sovereignty. The other layer of separation is evident in the fact that Greenland itself has several ambitions of attaining independency. The Greenland officials have been on many occasions eager to have full autonomy particularly where this enables them to have direct access to such giants as United States and China despite the fact that Denmark is very much insistent on continuing being part of the union. The US, in its turn, has been pursuing its interest in Greenland by establishing a consulate in Nuuk, providing Greenland with development aid, and concluding resource access agreements often before talking to Copenhagen. Although Denmark perceives these types of efforts positively as contributing to the development of Greenland, there exist issues that portray that the influence of Denmark is being diminished together with signs that they may eventually contribute to the speedy route to making Greenland independent in the long term. The triangle doing the creation of conflict in the alliance of Western Arctic consists of the Danish control, the Greenlandic control and the U.S. assertiveness. These events are largely affected by the fact that Russia feels to be strategically insecure. The increasing proximity between Greenland, Denmark and the United States is not considered by the Moscow leadership as an internal NATO affair but as a blatant attempt to surround Russia and thus to extend Western influence to the Arctic directly. Greenland has become more widely talked of in Russian authorities and the media as the western presence that is chipping away at Russian control and influence along the Northern Sea

Route. Consequently, the Russian military has quickly ventured into the Arctic with constructions of new infrastructure, additional naval strengths, and better surveillance systems on its northern coast. This is connected with the securitized perception of the Greenland of even the ostensibly non-threatening activities, including diplomatic and scientific cooperation, whose competitive intent is identified. It is easy to harmonize the current tension in the Arctic, basing on mistrust among countries and different expectations. The area that was initially marked by stability of lands and cooperation is turning into an alphabet of militarized rivalry. To a significant extent, the more aggressive policy can isolate the intentions of Denmark to choose stability and diplomacy due to the necessity of the U.S. to balance the influence of China and Russia. In the meantime, the desire to have more autonomy of Greenland, which is the need by all means is capable of being exploited by external powers to an extent where it will destabilize the balance of power in the area. Maladjustment is a threat to future tensions and escalation of conflicts, therefore, according to this concern, the United States is mainly interested in strategic positioning towards its opponents whereas Denmark aims to reconcile American interests and dominate the free Greenland country. Seeing herself getting encircled, Russia can either forestall or cause the Arctic airspace or maritime zone, and she is using the fact that Greenland is being increasingly close to the West as an excuse. In absence of effective Arctic discourse and trust-building mechanisms those opposing views can become fatal standings.

Dissociation (Conflict or Divergence) Conciliation (Solutions that can be Achieved / Mechanisms of Cooperation):

Geopolitical tensions in Greenland are also on the rise, but there are still opportunities of international collaboration and conciliation. Although Russia, United States, and Denmark have divergent strategic interests in the arctic, especially on the Greenland military and territorial value, the common grounds on the climate change, maritime safety and stability in the regions can provide the basis of cooperation. To reduce the level of competition and obstruct the subordination of national interest, we should first of all enhance the available diplomatic platforms, reconcile multilateral framework, and pursue realistic element-specific confidence-building measures. Russia and Denmark (through Greenland) are both permanent members of the Arctic Council that is one of the most productive venues of Arctic cooperation. The Council plays a significant role in enhancing scientific cooperation, environment protection, and sustainable development despite the fact that it is not directly linked to matters about security. This can be exploited so as to enable Denmark and Greenland to remain in communication with Russia despite even in times of increased geopolitical standoff. The fact that Greenland is a member of the Arctic Council working groups enables it to pursue its own interests without being forced in positions that demand it goes multilateral and take the initiative of reducing the feeling of being engulfed or left out by the others, especially Russia. In this case, confidence-building measures (CBMs), which have been delineated as including such activities as sharing information, military transparency and training exercises in response to search and rescue (SAR) or disaster response, might be an associated measure. In any of the regionally-based Arctic CBMs that the United States and Denmark are able to spearhead, Russia is to be invited as either a collaborator or observer of the non-war handles, the prime participation place serving as the Greenland. Other than decreasing the number of miscommunications, these will indicate that cooperation is appreciated without compromising the interest of national defense. Furthermore, the process of creating the Arctic Security Forces Roundtable (or the bilateral agreement on the communication through the existing military forces, like the Navy) will help prevent the mistakes performed by the sailors operating in the waterways in the Arctic or along Greenland. Most of these mechanisms have been shelved under the pressure of the tensions over Ukraine, but any little bit of these can be resuscitated to offer stability.

Denmark is in a position to carry out a diplomatic mission of establishing low level interaction between Russia and NATO interlocutors as the country is a less aggressive ally compared to the United States. Rules-based also implies that the governance in the Arctic proceeds under legal tools. One of them is the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). The United States, although including most of the conditions of UNCLOS is not the party. The two signatories Russia and Denmark have established their conflicting claims to the seabed of the Arctic including parts of Greenland on the UNCLOS processes. The amicable way of resolving the clash of claims and stop the issue to deteriorate further is to keep chatting one another on these legal grounds than on the favorable grounds. Lastly, scientific diplomacy, especially on the question of climate observation; glacier retreat; and degradation of permafrost, can further be explored as a means of trilateral cooperation. Greenland is perhaps one of the most conspicuous area globally where the issue of climate change is becoming a plague and this could serve as a neutral ground between Russian and Western scientific agencies where they can collaborate. Besides the creation of useful data, this union would create the network of humans with connections that the political campaigns could not cut. On balance, there is a chance of diplomatic appeasement in the arctic region despite the fact that the Greenland issue cannot be underestimated as a factor of growing and constant conflict. Denmark, the US and Russia may find solutions to their competing interests and retain the Arctic and Greenland as zones of opposition instead of conflict with the aid of multilateral forums, legal standards and technical collaboration.

References

- Ackrn, M. (2011). Greenlandic self-government and autonomy: Current issues and possibilities of developments. 231243, *Polar Record*, 47(243). 10.1017/S003224741000012X <https://doi.org>
- S.G Borgerson (2008). The Economic and Security Consequences of Global Warming -- Arctic meltdown: The economic and security implications of global warming, 63 77 in *Foreign Affairs*, 87, no. 2 (2008). 20032581 is the DOI.
- Rohloff, C. and Conley, H. A. (2015). New ice curtain in the Arctic is the target of Russia. CSIS refers to the Center of strategic and international studies. A new curtain of ice. *New Ice Curtain Analysis*: <https://www.csis>.
- C Emerson (2010). The Arctic history of the future. *Public Affairs*.
- U. P. Gad, (2013). Greenland is one of the up-and-coming post-Danish nationStates. *Conflict and Cooperation* 48 (2) 2 14-235. 10.1177/0010836713482814 is the DOI.
- Exner-Perot, and Heininen, L. (2019). Security and climate change: It is time to change paradigm. Chapter 1: In *Arctic Security in the Age of Climate Change* (ed. by H. Exner-Pirot and R. Huebert, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012, p. 114), the problem of Arctic security and climate change has been debated. U Calgary Press.
- K. Keil, (2014). Arctic: A brand new battleground? Gas and oil case, 10.1177/0010836713482555 *Cooperation and Conflict* 49 (2), 162 190
- Klimenko, E. Arctic geopolitics are changing (2019). SIPRI is an abbreviation of Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. The geopolitics of the new arctic: [www.sipri.org/commentary / topical- backgrounder/ 2019](http://www.sipri.org/commentary/topical-backgrounders/2019)
- Nuttall, M. (2008). Self-government in Greenland: to the world its first Inuit absorbed state? *Native American Affairs*, 3-4, 64-70.
- Olsen, M. R. (2020) Trilateral United States, Denmark and Greenland ties in the Arctic. *Danish foreign policy Trilateral relations Denmark United States-Greenland Review of Danish foreign policy*, 3, 5366.

- 2020, 2020. The coast guards in the arctic and ocean politics. DOI 10.23865/arctic. v11.2294, Arctic Law and Politics Review, 11, 122-145.
- Ali, S. H., and R. Pincus (2016). Are you ever in the Arctic? Frame theory and media coverage as the factors of Arctic discourse formation. 39(2), 83-97. 10.1080/1088937X.2016.1170004 Polar Geography
- Lantinga, M., and Rahbek-Clemmensen J. (2020). Historical lessons? Chinese Arctic and Greenlandic rare earth elements interaction. The Arctic yearbook 2020.
- R. C. Wilson (2020) Decolonization, postcolonialism and the future of Greenland. 10 (1). 98117. Polar Journal. 2020:10:10802154896X20201761750 <https://doi.org>
- K. Zysk (2008). Arctic strategy of Russia: Aims and limitations. Applications of imagination JFQ | 57 2 103110 The webpage <https://ndupress.ndu.edu>