Journal of Liberty and International Affairs · Volume 12 · Number 2 · 2026 · eISSN 1857-9760
Published online by the Institute for Research and European Studies at www.e-jlia.com

Copyright © 2026 The author/s
This work is licensed under the CC BY 4.0 license
(*) Corresponding author
Peer review method: Double-blind
Research article
DOI: https://doi.org/10.47305/jlia.2026.2198
Received: 15.09.2025 • Accepted after revision: 16.06.2026 • Published: 20.06.2026
Pages: 40-61

Economic Viability of Arctic Maritime Routes: Trade Opportunities and Geopolitical Implications

Riva Panchal[1*]

[1]Pandit Deendayal Energy University, Gandhinagar, India ✉ riva.pphd21@sls.pdpu.ac.in

Abstract
This study analyzes the economic viability of Arctic maritime routes, with particular attention to the Northern Sea Route (NSR) and the Northwest Passage (NWP). Although shrinking sea ice has fueled expectations that these passages could reduce Europe–Asia shipping distances by as much as 30 percent, their real significance for global trade remains uncertain. Drawing on qualitative analysis of shipping data, policy documents, and academic literature, the study evaluates distance savings, cargo volumes, cost structures, and governance challenges. The findings indicate that the NSR has achieved only limited commercial use, while the NWP has attracted virtually no sustained commercial traffic. Overall, the article argues that Arctic routes are unlikely to reshape global trade in the near term. Instead, they may operate as niche, complementary corridors under specific economic, environmental, and political conditions.

Keywords
Arctic Maritime Routes; Northern Sea Route; Northwest Passage; Global Trade; Shipping Economics; Climate Change; International Affairs

INTRODUCTION

The retreat of Arctic sea ice attributed to climate change has renewed interest in the region as a prospective frontier for global shipping. The Northern Sea Route (NSR) along Russia's northern coastline and the Northwest Passage (NWP) through the Canadian Arctic Archipelago are often characterized as transformative alternatives to the Suez Canal and the Panama Canal, offering shorter transit distances between Europe, North America, and Asia. For example, a voyage from London to Tokyo via the NWP is nearly 7,000 km shorter than the equivalent journey through the Panama Canal. These potential time and fuel savings have prompted questions about the capacity of Arctic routes to reshape global trade flows and supply chains.

However, distance savings alone do not determine commercial viability. Shipping companies also depend on cost predictability, seasonal reliability, insurance conditions, infrastructure, legal clarity, and cargo suitability. Discourse on Arctic shipping has been dominated by geopolitical and security concerns, often overshadowing systematic evaluations of economic viability. Much of the existing literature focuses on strategic competition among major powers, such as Russian control over the NSR, Canadian sovereignty claims over the NWP, and China's interest in the Polar Silk Road. At the same time, relatively few studies assess the commercial practicality of these routes for the shipping industry. This has resulted in a persistent gap between the theoretical opportunities of Arctic navigation and its practical limitations.

This study addresses that gap by analyzing the economic viability of the NSR and NWP within the context of global trade. The central research question asks under what conditions the NSR and NWP can be considered economically viable alternatives to established maritime routes. Drawing on trade data, policy reports, and scholarly research, the article contributes to international relations scholarship by framing Arctic shipping not merely as a logistical issue but as a matter of international political economy, maritime governance, and strategic competition in an emerging global commons. The analysis contends that while the NSR and NWP may create niche trade opportunities, particularly for energy and bulk cargo, they are unlikely to transform global trade unless economic reliability is underpinned by cooperative governance and political stability.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Recent scholarship on Arctic maritime routes has focused on two main dimensions: economic viability and governance frameworks. On the economic side, much of the literature recognizes the distance and time savings associated with the Northern Sea Route (NSR) and Northwest Passage (NWP). One influential study by Bekkers et al. (2017) projects that by 2030, if the NSR becomes reliably navigable during summer months, approximately 2–5% of annual Asia–Europe trade volume could shift to Arctic corridors. This would represent a meaningful rerouting of goods, with potential benefits for selected ports and shipping operators, and could reduce transport costs between East Asia and Northern Europe by 20–30 percent.

However, other studies emphasize that these savings are partly offset by additional costs, including icebreaker escorts, ice-class vessel requirements, and higher insurance premiums, all of which reduce commercial attractiveness (Faury, Alix, and Montier, 2021). The prevailing consensus is that while Arctic shipping may offer niche opportunities, particularly for bulk commodities and energy transport, container shipping, which depends heavily on reliability, frequency, and scale, is unlikely to shift significantly northward in the near future (Dalaklis, Drewniak, and Schröder-Hinrichs, 2018).

Alongside economic considerations, the literature highlights infrastructure and governance limitations as major constraints on viability. Sparse port infrastructure, limited search-and-rescue capacity, and insufficient hydrographic mapping continue to constrain safe and predictable operations (Humpert and Raspotnik, 2012). Since 2017, the International Maritime Organization's Polar Code has introduced mandatory design and training standards for vessels operating in polar waters, yet scholars note that enforcement remains uneven and does not resolve broader economic and jurisdictional disputes (Engtrø, 2022). Legal ambiguity persists: Russia applies a permitting regime over the NSR, while Canada asserts sovereignty over the NWP as internal waters, positions contested by several maritime powers (Solski, 2021). These overlapping claims, combined with fragile infrastructure, reinforce uncertainty for commercial operators assessing Arctic routes.

In sum, the literature converges on three key points: Arctic routes offer shorter distances but not consistently lower costs, their use remains seasonal and largely niche, and governance and infrastructure deficits significantly limit broader adoption. This study builds on these findings by placing economic viability at the center of analysis, while treating strategic and geopolitical considerations as an important but secondary context.

CC BY

METHODOLOGY AND ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

This study employs a qualitative comparative analysis to assess the economic viability and strategic implications of Arctic maritime trade routes, with particular focus on the Northern Sea Route (NSR) and the Northwest Passage (NWP). The approach compares these Arctic corridors with established global shipping routes, notably those via the Suez Canal and the Panama Canal. The aim is not to develop a predictive cost model, but to evaluate the conditions under which Arctic routes may become commercially credible and strategically relevant within global trade networks. For this study, economic viability is defined as a route's capacity to deliver commercially meaningful advantages when distance and transit-time savings are weighed against operational costs, seasonal accessibility, insurance premiums, icebreaker requirements, infrastructure availability, cargo suitability, environmental risks, and governance uncertainty. This definition moves beyond a narrow focus on geographic distance and captures the broader economic and institutional factors shaping shipping decisions.

The analysis is structured around six indicators. First, it considers distance and transit-time advantages, as these are the most frequently cited benefits of Arctic navigation. Second, it examines current utilization and cargo throughput to distinguish theoretical potential from actual commercial uptake. Third, it assesses seasonality and ice conditions, which directly affect reliability and scheduling certainty. Fourth, it evaluates operational costs, including ice-class vessel requirements, insurance premiums, and icebreaker escort fees. Fifth, it analyzes infrastructure and support capacity, including port availability, search-and-rescue coverage, hydrographic charting, and emergency response systems. Sixth, it examines legal and governance conditions, including regulatory frameworks, sovereignty claims, and institutional arrangements that shape route predictability.

The study draws on secondary sources, including peer-reviewed academic literature, policy reports, shipping data, Arctic Council and Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME) documents, and key international legal instruments such as the International Maritime Organization (IMO) Polar Code and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). Sources were selected based on relevance, credibility, and recency, with emphasis on materials published within the past decade. At the same time, older works are included where they remain foundational to debates on Arctic shipping economics, maritime law, and international relations. A qualitative approach is appropriate because the future commercial role of Arctic maritime routes cannot be adequately captured through distance or cost metrics alone. Their viability is shaped by interacting economic, legal, infrastructural, environmental, and strategic factors. Several of these, including governance uncertainty, sovereignty disputes, environmental reputational risk, and geopolitical competition, require interpretive analysis rather than purely quantitative measurement. Accordingly, the study integrates empirical comparison with international relations perspectives to explain how economic opportunity interacts with state behavior, institutional capacity, and maritime governance.

No human participants were involved in this research. The study relies exclusively on publicly available secondary materials and does not require ethical clearance involving human subjects.

CC BY

ECONOMIC VIABILITY OF THE NORTHERN SEA ROUTE AND THE NORTHWEST PASSAGE

Claims about the commercial promise of Arctic maritime routes must be assessed against their actual operational record. The Northern Sea Route (NSR) and the Northwest Passage (NWP) offer clear geographic advantages, but their current use remains uneven, seasonal, and highly cargo-specific.

Recent data suggests that Arctic shipping activity has increased, albeit from a relatively low baseline. The Arctic Council reports that between 2013 and 2023, the number of unique vessels operating within the Polar Code area rose by approximately 37 percent, while total nautical miles sailed in the region more than doubled. This trend indicates that the Arctic is no longer a purely hypothetical or marginal maritime space within global shipping systems.

However, this growth has not translated into broad-based commercial integration. Activity remains concentrated in bulk carriers, general cargo vessels, fishing fleets, and tankers, rather than regular container liner services. Overall, the evidence suggests that while Arctic routes are becoming increasingly relevant for specific commodities and regional supply chains, they have not yet developed into general-purpose alternatives to established global shipping corridors.

Distance and Transit-Time Advantages in Arctic Routes

The primary commercial attraction of Arctic maritime routes lies in their potential to shorten voyages between major economic regions. As shown in Table 1, selected Asia–Europe routes via the Northern Sea Route (NSR) may reduce sailing distances by approximately 11 to 37 percent compared to the Suez Canal route (Trans.info, 2023).

Table 1: Selected Asia–Europe Shipping Distances via the Suez Canal Route and the Northern Sea Route (NSR), with Modelled Distance Savings (Source: Li et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2024)

Origin–Destination (Asia–Europe)	Distance via Suez Canal (nautical miles)	Distance via NSR (nautical miles)	Distance Reduction via NSR
Yokohama (Japan) – Rotterdam (Netherlands)	11,133	7,010	~37% shorter
Busan (South Korea) – Rotterdam (Netherlands)	10,744	7,667	~29% shorter
Shanghai (China) – Rotterdam (Netherlands)	10,577	8,046	~24% shorter
Hong Kong (China) – Rotterdam (Netherlands)	9,701	8,594	~11% shorter

These reductions are commercially significant because fuel consumption, crew time, and vessel operating costs are partly distance-dependent. In theory, an operator could complete more round-trip voyages per year on the NSR than via the Suez Canal, potentially increasing fleet productivity and revenue. Time-sensitive cargoes, such as high-value goods and perishable

CC BY

products, are particularly sensitive to transit duration, since shorter voyages can improve supply chain speed and reliability and may command higher freight rates in global markets.

Similarly, the Northwest Passage (NWP) offers meaningful savings on selected routes, although its distance advantage is generally less pronounced than that of the NSR. For example, modelling studies show that a voyage from London to Tokyo via the NWP would cover roughly 16,000 km, compared to about 23,000 km via the Panama Canal, yielding a reduction of nearly 7,000 km (approximately 30%) under favorable ice conditions (Tiller et al., 2022). Routes connecting Northeast Asia to the U.S. East Coast or Western Europe to the North Pacific could yield comparable savings. In principle, any reduction of several thousand kilometers translates into lower fuel consumption and shorter transit times, thereby improving operational efficiency on a per-voyage basis.

However, these geographic advantages do not automatically translate into commercial viability. The extent to which Arctic routes can influence global trade depends on whether distance savings can be converted into reliable, predictable, and cost-effective maritime services. This is why the economic question cannot be separated from broader issues of infrastructure, regulation, environmental risk, and political governance.

Current Utilization and Cargo Throughput

Despite these theoretical advantages, actual traffic remains modest. For example, while nearly 19,000 ships transited the Suez Canal in 2020, the number of full end-to-end transits of the Northern Sea Route (NSR) remains far lower; only 85 complete transits were recorded in 2021 and 43 in 2022 (Arctic Council 2024; Sander et al. 2025). Most NSR voyages to date have been destinational rather than continuous intercontinental transits. In other words, vessels primarily service natural resource projects in the Russian Arctic, transporting oil, gas, and minerals, or supply remote Arctic communities, rather than operating as regular container shipping links between Asia and Europe (Gunnarsson, 2021).

Even though total NSR cargo volumes have increased into the tens of millions of tons, reaching a record 36.3 million tons in 2023 (Rosatom, 2024), this remains small compared to established global corridors. For context, the Suez Canal handles on the order of 1.4 billion tons of cargo annually, more than thirty times the NSR's throughput, highlighting that the NSR currently represents only a marginal share of global maritime trade (Helwa and Al-Riffai, 2025).

The Northwest Passage (NWP) exhibits even more limited utilization. According to the Scott Polar Research Institute, 91 complete transits through the NWP had been recorded by the end of 2024, of which only 47 involved commercial cargo (SPRI, 2024). Between 2020 and 2024, there were 117 full Atlantic-to-Pacific transits, but only 39 were commercial vessels (Barnes 2025). Routine liner shipping remains largely absent, with most voyages characterized as experimental, seasonal, or one-off transits rather than sustained container services. Indeed, up until the late 2010s, no regular cargo service had been established through the NWP, with activity limited to isolated voyages and exploratory passages (SPRI, 2024).

The NSR, while more active, is still dominated by regional and resource-based shipping. Russian-flagged and Chinese-flagged vessels account for most traffic, primarily transporting Arctic hydrocarbons and minerals to Asian and European markets (Tianming and Erokhin, 2019). Major Western container lines have so far refrained from regular deployment on either the NSR

CC BY

or NWP for intercontinental trade, meaning that initiatives such as the "Polar Silk Road" remain aspirational rather than fully realized within global shipping networks (Zreik and Derendiaeva, 2025).

This traffic profile has clear implications for international relations. Arctic shipping does not yet function as a neutral global commons route comparable to the Suez or Panama Canals. Instead, current usage patterns reinforce the central argument of this article: Arctic routes may carry strategic significance even before achieving widespread commercial centrality.

Seasonal Navigability and Ice Constraints

Seasonality is the central operational constraint preventing Arctic routes from functioning like established global maritime corridors. Unlike the Suez Canal and the Panama Canal, which operate year-round, the Northern Sea Route (NSR) and Northwest Passage (NWP) remain dependent on ice conditions, weather variability, and limited navigational windows. This unpredictability significantly weakens their commercial appeal, particularly for container shipping, which relies on fixed schedules and reliable delivery cycles.

The NSR's shipping season typically spans late summer and early autumn, often roughly July to October for open-water vessels, depending on annual ice conditions (Gunnarsson, 2021). Its reliability is further constrained by interannual variability: for example, following a peak of 85 full transits in 2021, only 43 were recorded in 2022, reflecting both harsher ice conditions and geopolitical factors (Friskilä, 2023). Sudden weather changes or early freeze-up events have also led to vessels becoming unexpectedly trapped in recent years, underscoring the operational risks associated with Arctic navigation (Hine, 2021).

The Northwest Passage faces even more severe constraints. The Canadian Arctic Archipelago contains multiyear sea ice, thick, persistent ice formations that survive multiple summers, which can block or severely restrict navigation even during peak summer months (Howell et al., 2022). Its geography further complicates transit: narrow and shallow straits limit vessel draught in some routes to under 10 meters, while unpredictable icebergs and recurring ice choke points add additional navigational hazards (Arctic Council / PAME, 2021). At present, the NWP is generally navigable for only a few weeks in late August or early September for conventional vessels, and even this window is not guaranteed annually (Howell et al., 2022). Although climate projections suggest that warming trends may extend these navigable periods, for instance, the NSR could be open for roughly two to three months and the NWP for one to two months per year by mid-century under average conditions (Chen et al., 2021), the Arctic routes remain highly seasonal in the present system. This seasonality severely limits their viability for scheduled liner services, as weekly or predictable container shipping cannot be reliably maintained year-round. It also introduces significant opportunity costs, since vessels and fleets cannot be continuously deployed on Arctic routes.

As a result, Arctic voyage planning requires strict temporal coordination, with ships needing to enter and exit the region within narrow operational windows before seasonal freeze-up. This adds complexity to logistics, scheduling, and risk management, further constraining the economic competitiveness of Arctic maritime corridors.

CC BY

Operational Costs and Requirements

Beyond navigation timing, Arctic routes impose a set of unique operational costs that significantly reduce their commercial attractiveness. Vessels intending to use the NSR or NWP generally require ice-strengthened or Polar Class construction to withstand ice conditions. These specialized designs increase capital expenditures through reinforced hulls and structural modifications, and they may also reduce cargo capacity for a given vessel size. In addition, operating in even light ice can raise fuel consumption, further increasing voyage costs.

In the case of the Northern Sea Route (NSR), an additional direct cost stems from Russia's requirement for icebreaker escort services. Foreign or non-icebreaking vessels must hire nuclear or diesel icebreaker assistance when transiting Russian Arctic waters. Depending on ice conditions and vessel specifications, these escort fees typically range from approximately $100,000 to $300,000 per voyage and can exceed $400,000 in more challenging conditions, substantially eroding any cost savings from shorter distances (Theocharis et al., 2019). Insurance premiums for Arctic transits are also significantly higher than for equivalent voyages via the Suez Canal or the Panama Canal. Estimates suggest Arctic insurance costs can be around 0.5% of hull value and, in many cases, 20% to 100% higher than those associated with conventional routes, depending on ice severity and vessel experience (Brownlee, 2024).

Furthermore, compliance with the International Maritime Organization's Polar Code (effective 2017) introduces additional operational constraints. These include mandatory polar-specific equipment, enhanced crew training, restrictions on speed, and detailed emergency response planning requirements. While intended to improve safety, these regulations also increase compliance costs and reduce operational flexibility ("Polar Code - Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition", 2024). Taken together, these factors mean that Arctic voyages often carry higher fixed and variable costs per trip than equivalent Suez or Panama routes, partially or fully offsetting distance-related savings.

The Northwest Passage (NWP) presents a somewhat different cost structure. Although Canada does not operate a formal icebreaker escort pricing system comparable to Russia's, the route suffers from limited infrastructure and sparse operational support. Its narrow and shallow channels constrain vessel size, reducing economies of scale in shipping operations. Smaller vessels or partially loaded ships increase per-unit transport costs, making the NWP less competitive for containerized and high-volume trade flows.

Infrastructure and Support Gaps

Modern global shipping depends on a dense network of ports, refueling stations, repair facilities, and search-and-rescue services, elements that are largely limited or absent in the Arctic. Along the Northern Sea Route (NSR), the Russian Federation has invested in selected infrastructure nodes, including ports, energy terminals, navigation systems, and an expanded icebreaker fleet. Strategic hubs such as Murmansk, Arkhangelsk, Sabetta, and Pevek have improved operational capacity along parts of the route. However, large segments of the NSR remain sparsely serviced, with limited repair, bunkering, and emergency response infrastructure. Search-and-rescue capacity is a particular constraint given the vast distances, harsh climatic

CC BY

conditions, and slow response times in remote Arctic waters (Dalaklis, Drewniak, and Schröder-Hinrichs, 2018).

The Northwest Passage (NWP) is even less developed. Aside from small Inuit community ports and a few modest resupply harbors in Nunavut and the Northwest Territories, there is minimal infrastructure capable of supporting large-scale commercial shipping (Barnes 2025). This lack of support systems not only increases operational risk and insurance costs but also requires vessels to carry additional contingency fuel, provisions, and equipment, thereby reducing net efficiency gains from shorter routes.

In effect, the Arctic maritime region currently lacks the integrated logistical backbone that underpins conventional global shipping corridors. Substantial investment would be required to bring Arctic routes closer to the functional standards of established maritime systems. Until such developments occur, most shipping companies are likely to treat Arctic passages as niche or special-case routes rather than routine trade arteries. This reinforces the broader argument that Arctic shipping viability depends as much on governance, infrastructure investment, and institutional capacity as it does on geographic advantage.

Environmental and Reputational Concerns

Environmental risk has become an important economic variable in Arctic shipping, as reputational and regulatory costs increasingly shape corporate route selection. The Arctic is an ecologically fragile region, where oil spills, black carbon emissions, underwater noise, and ecosystem disruption could produce long-term and potentially irreversible impacts. These risks heighten regulatory scrutiny and can discourage commercial operators even when Arctic routes appear economically advantageous on paper.

The reputational dimension is particularly significant for major shipping firms and global retailers. In 2022, several leading international shipping companies pledged not to use Arctic sea routes, explicitly citing environmental concerns and the need to avoid contributing to damage in sensitive polar ecosystems ("Companies Pledge to Keep Their Shipments out of the Arctic - Ocean Conservancy", 2022). Such commitments illustrate that route choice is shaped not only by distance and cost considerations but also by corporate social responsibility, public perception, and environmental governance pressures.

These factors do not suggest that Arctic shipping will remain static or cease to develop. Rather, they indicate that its future trajectory will depend on a broader set of conditions than conventional cost–benefit analysis alone can capture. Environmental risk reinforces the central argument that Arctic maritime viability is embedded in international governance frameworks, regulatory norms, and questions of political legitimacy. While the Northern Sea Route (NSR) and Northwest Passage (NWP) may continue to offer selective trade opportunities, their broader commercial adoption will depend on the extent to which economic incentives can be aligned with safety standards, environmental sustainability, and institutional trust.

CC BY

AN ECONOMIC AND STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT OF ARCTIC SHIPPING ROUTES

Building on the empirical realities outlined above, this section assesses the implications of Arctic maritime routes for global trade, maritime governance, and international relations.

Economic Viability and Cost-Benefit Dynamics

The economic viability of Arctic shipping is determined by a complex cost–benefit balance. While tangible savings in distance, transit time, and fuel consumption are evident, these must be weighed against a range of additional operational costs and uncertainties. Financial analyses generally suggest that, in most cases, these savings either do not fully offset added expenses or do so only marginally.

Cost modeling studies support this cautious conclusion. For example, Liu and Kronbak (2010) find that the Northern Sea Route (NSR) can be economically viable during ice-free summer months, but primarily under conditions of high fuel prices and narrowly defined operational parameters. When bunker fuel prices are elevated, the fuel savings associated with shorter Arctic transits translate into substantial cost reductions, improving the likelihood of profitability. Conversely, when fuel prices are low, the economic advantage diminishes, and the conventional route via the Suez Canal often remains more cost-effective despite longer distances.

Vessel characteristics also play a critical role. Larger ships generate greater absolute fuel savings from reduced distances. However, the NSR is not yet suitable for the largest ultra-large container vessels due to draft limitations and ice constraints. In addition, fixed costs such as icebreaker escort fees and insurance premiums disproportionately affect smaller shipments or single-voyage operators. As a result, economies of scale are more difficult to achieve under current Arctic shipping conditions, limiting the competitiveness of these routes in global liner trade.

Recent comparative research suggests that the NSR may still be economically viable under specific conditions, particularly for energy exports, bulk commodities, and project cargo linked to Arctic resource development. These cargo types are less dependent on strict liner schedules and can accommodate seasonal variability more easily than containerized consumer goods (Faury et al., 2021). Energy commodities provide the clearest example: Russian Arctic crude oil and liquefied natural gas (LNG) are already transported via the NSR to Asian and European markets (Hedlund, 2024). These flows are economically rational because production occurs within the Arctic region, making the NSR the natural export corridor, and because such cargoes can be shipped using ice-strengthened tankers and carriers. Moreover, bulk commodities such as iron ore, coal, timber, and project cargo for mining and energy infrastructure have also been tested on a limited seasonal basis.

The Northwest Passage (NWP), by contrast, presents an even more constrained economic proposition. Its cost–benefit profile is generally unfavorable, aligning with long-standing assessments that characterize it as a symbolic or contingency route rather than a mainstream commercial corridor. This distinction is particularly relevant in the context of global trade resilience. Disruptions such as the blockage of the Suez Canal by the Ever Given in 2021, as well as recurring geopolitical tensions in chokepoint regions such as the Strait of Hormuz,

CC BY

highlight the vulnerability of global supply chains to maritime bottlenecks. While Arctic routes cannot currently serve as large-scale substitutes for established canals, they may gain relevance as seasonal or niche alternatives for selected cargo categories if improvements occur in safety, insurance conditions, and governance frameworks.

From an international political economy perspective, Arctic routes therefore represent more than a simple extension of global shipping networks. Route choice is shaped not only by price signals but also by institutional conditions, including regulatory clarity, insurability of risk, emergency response capacity, and broader political stability. Governance thus becomes an integral component of the economic calculation underlying Arctic maritime viability.

Infrastructure and Investment Needs

Infrastructure investment is not merely a commercial requirement; it is also a mechanism through which states shape access, influence, and control over Arctic maritime space. Russia's investments in ports, energy terminals, icebreakers, hydrographic surveys, navigation systems, and emergency response infrastructure have made the Northern Sea Route (NSR) more operationally viable than the Northwest Passage (NWP). However, this development has also increased the route's dependence on the Russian regulatory authority and state-controlled service provision.

This creates a dual policy challenge. On one hand, infrastructure investment reduces practical barriers to Arctic shipping by improving navigational safety, search-and-rescue capacity, and route reliability. On the other hand, when such infrastructure is concentrated under a single coastal state, commercial access may become exposed to political discretion and regulatory uncertainty. The NSR therefore raises a broader governance question for global trade: can a maritime corridor function as a credible international trade route if its infrastructure, permitting system, icebreaker services, and operational rules are largely controlled by one state?

The Northwest Passage presents the inverse situation. Canada and the United States have not developed the NWP as a high-volume commercial shipping corridor. Canadian Arctic policy has historically prioritized sovereignty enforcement, community resupply, environmental protection, and search-and-rescue capabilities rather than large-scale transit infrastructure. As a result, despite its theoretical distance advantages, the NWP remains less commercially attractive due to limited operational support and infrastructure underdevelopment.

For international institutions, this infrastructure gap has important governance implications. The International Maritime Organization (IMO) can establish safety and environmental standards through instruments such as the Polar Code. However, it does not build ports, operate icebreakers, or directly manage search-and-rescue systems, nor does it resolve questions of route access. The Arctic Council has contributed to cooperation on search and rescue, environmental protection, and sustainable development, but it is not a treaty-making body for binding maritime regulation and does not function as a governing authority over commercial shipping lanes.

Consequently, the future of Arctic shipping depends on coordination between national infrastructure strategies and international institutional frameworks. Without such coordination, Arctic routes are likely to develop unevenly: the NSR may evolve into a state-managed corridor

CC BY

with structured access conditions, while the NWP may remain a legally contested and commercially limited passage with constrained global integration.

Regulatory and Legal Factors

The international legal status of the Northern Sea Route (NSR) and Northwest Passage (NWP) also casts a shadow over their long-term economic prospects. The NSR lies largely within Russia's exclusive economic zone and partly within its territorial sea, and Russia asserts extensive regulatory authority over transit, including requirements for advance permission and the use of icebreaker escort services for many foreign vessels. While this regime has so far been accepted de facto by shipping companies, largely because operators comply in order to obtain access, it nonetheless introduces a degree of regulatory uncertainty. In periods of geopolitical tension between Russia and Western states, this dependence on discretionary access may discourage commercial operators, insurers, and cargo owners from relying on the route.

The Northwest Passage presents an even more contested legal situation. Canada claims that the various waterways of the NWP constitute internal waters, granting it full sovereignty and the right to regulate or restrict transit. By contrast, the United States and several other maritime powers view the passage as an international strait, subject to transit passage rights under customary international law (Bartenstein, Dremliuga, and Prisekina, 2022). This unresolved dispute leaves the NWP without a universally accepted legal framework governing navigation, creating uncertainty over applicable rules, enforcement authority, and liability in the event of incidents.

This legal ambiguity directly implicates the principle of freedom of navigation. If Canada's interpretation prevails, coastal-state control over Arctic passages would be strengthened. If the international strait interpretation gains wider acceptance, navigational rights for foreign vessels would be reinforced. For commercial shipping, however, the key issue is not only doctrinal but practical: the absence of consensus creates uncertainty about regulatory obligations and legal risk exposure.

This concern becomes more acute as Arctic waters become increasingly accessible due to changing ice conditions. If traffic increases without corresponding legal clarity, disputes over transit rights could become more frequent and commercially consequential. Shipping companies considering the NWP must therefore assess not only physical risks such as ice and infrastructure gaps, but also the possibility that voyages could become politically or legally contested. In this sense, freedom of navigation is not merely a legal doctrine but a practical component of commercial risk assessment.

The International Maritime Organization (IMO) Polar Code establishes mandatory safety and environmental standards for vessels operating in polar waters, but it does not resolve sovereignty disputes, determine the legal status of the NWP, regulate Russia's broader NSR access regime, or provide a comprehensive economic governance framework for Arctic shipping. It therefore improves safety but does not eliminate legal uncertainty.

The Arctic Council also plays a supporting role, particularly in promoting cooperation on environmental protection, scientific research, search-and-rescue coordination, and policy dialogue. However, it is not a treaty-based regulatory authority for commercial shipping, nor does it operate with enforcement powers comparable to canal authorities such as those

CC BY

governing the Suez Canal or the Panama Canal. Its consensus-based structure and non-binding mandate limit its capacity to resolve disputes over navigation rights, sanctions regimes, or commercial access rules.

As a result, the legal status of Arctic routes transforms maritime commerce into a question of broader international order. Some scholars have proposed that more formalized governance arrangements, potentially modeled on canal authorities or developed through Arctic Council–based agreements, could enhance predictability and increase confidence among global shipping firms (Gao and Guo, 2025). However, at present, the governance regime remains fragmented, with coastal states applying divergent legal and regulatory approaches. This fragmentation adds a further layer of strategic and institutional risk on top of purely economic considerations, reinforcing the view that Arctic shipping viability is inseparable from questions of international governance.

Strategic and Geopolitical Implications

Although the article's primary focus is economic viability, it is important to recognize that the development, or non-development, of Arctic shipping routes takes place within a broader strategic context. The findings suggest that economic advantages alone have not triggered a large-scale shift toward Arctic navigation; in fact, geopolitical dynamics sometimes outweigh market-based considerations. Russia's substantial investment in Northern Sea Route (NSR) infrastructure and its expanding military presence can be interpreted as an effort to secure control over a strategically important emerging trade artery and the natural resources along it. Control of the NSR could generate both economic gains (such as transit fees and influence over energy transport routes) and strategic leverage. In this sense, Russia's approach reflects a classic cost–benefit calculation framed in terms of power and influence (Rumer, Sokolsky, and Stronski, 2021).

China, despite lacking Arctic territory, has identified itself as a "Near-Arctic State" and has incorporated Arctic shipping corridors into its Belt and Road Initiative under the label "Polar Silk Road" (Doshi, Dale-Huang, and Zhang, 2021). This reflects Beijing's strategic interest in diversifying trade routes, reducing dependence on vulnerable chokepoints such as the Suez Canal and the Strait of Malacca, and potentially establishing faster maritime links to Europe. These strategic motivations have translated into increased engagement with the NSR, including partnerships between Chinese and Russian shipping firms and experimental winter voyages supported by icebreaker escorts (Yang, 2025).

Western countries, by contrast, have generally emphasized environmental risks and security concerns. The United States, in particular, frames unrestricted Arctic navigation as both a strategic issue, due to concerns about rival powers expanding their presence in the region, and an environmental one. NATO exercises in the High North and increased U.S. Coast Guard patrols in Arctic waters in 2019 signaled that Western governments are preparing to safeguard their interests as Arctic shipping activity grows (U.S. Department of Defense, 2019).

This is where the policy relevance becomes clear. Geopolitical competition may encourage investment in Arctic infrastructure, but it can also undermine the trust and predictability required for commercial shipping. Shipping companies are unlikely to depend heavily on routes that may be disrupted by sanctions, military tensions, regulatory retaliation, or

CC BY

contested transit rights. As a result, strategic rivalry can simultaneously accelerate Arctic development while limiting its long-term commercial viability.

From Economic Viability to Strategic Governance

Synthesizing the evidence on economic viability and international relations, Arctic maritime routes present a nuanced picture of conditional opportunity. The material benefits of routes such as the Northern Sea Route (NSR) and, to a lesser extent, the Northwest Passage (NWP), are evident. These advantages point to the potential emergence of a "Polar Silk Road," which could improve global supply chain efficiency and resilience by offering alternatives to traditional maritime chokepoints (Zreik and Derendiaeva, 2025). Even a modest diversion of Asia–Europe cargo flows through the NSR during the summer navigation season could reduce congestion in the Suez Canal and provide shippers with additional flexibility during periods of disruption. Strategically, the development of new routes could also encourage cooperation, as Arctic littoral and maritime states may establish shared standards, search-and-rescue agreements, and potentially even a broader polar navigation governance mechanism. In such a scenario, the Arctic could evolve into a zone of institutionalized collaboration. This optimistic outlook aligns with liberal institutionalist perspectives, which argue that growing economic interdependence can foster cooperation and reduce the likelihood of conflict. Over time, the NSR and NWP could be governed through multilateral frameworks ensuring freedom of navigation and environmental protection, comparable in certain respects to the governance regimes of the Suez and Panama Canals. Such arrangements would lower entry barriers, standardize operational costs, and reduce uncertainty for shipping firms, thereby further enhancing economic viability.

Conversely, the risks and constraints identified in this analysis temper these optimistic projections. The prospect of an Arctic shipping transformation remains highly conditional, depending on variables such as the pace of climate change, advances in ice-navigation technology, and the policy decisions of key stakeholders. If warming trends slow or stabilize, persistent thick ice could continue to limit navigation windows and sustain high operational costs. Moreover, high-profile accidents or environmental disasters in the Arctic could significantly erode public and political support, potentially leading to stricter regulations or even moratoria that would restrict route usage regardless of theoretical economic advantages. From a geopolitical standpoint, intensifying great-power competition in the Arctic could undermine the cooperative governance structures required for reliable commercial shipping. Security narratives are increasingly shaped by zero-sum thinking, with states viewing control of Arctic sea lanes as a strategic asset (Wegge, 2025). Russia's military buildup and its framing of the NSR as a sovereign economic lifeline, alongside NATO's increased attention to Arctic maritime security, suggest a growing potential for strategic friction. In such a context, heightened militarization or contested sovereignty could discourage commercial carriers, as shipping decisions depend heavily on stability and predictability. Thus, economic incentives alone are insufficient to determine outcomes; the long-term viability of the NSR and NWP will be shaped equally by geopolitical relations and governance structures. Even if year-round navigation becomes physically feasible later in the century, actual usage will depend on whether the Arctic is governed cooperatively or defined by rivalry and security tensions.

CC BY

From an international relations theoretical perspective, these dynamics can be interpreted through competing analytical lenses. A realist perspective emphasizes power and competition, suggesting that as Arctic routes become more accessible, states will seek to control them or restrict rivals' access, potentially transforming the NSR and NWP into future geopolitical chokepoints. Elements of this dynamic are already visible: cooperation between Russia and China on the NSR could evolve into a quasi-duopolistic arrangement in Arctic shipping, prompting countermeasures from Western states such as freedom of navigation operations and expanded investment in ice-capable fleets (Pechko, 2025). Such a trajectory could resemble historical struggles over strategic waterways, leading to segmented spheres of influence and constraining the broader economic potential of Arctic routes. In contrast, a liberal institutionalist perspective argues that states share a mutual interest in maintaining an open and stable Arctic, given the high costs of conflict and the collective benefits of an emerging maritime corridor. From this viewpoint, strengthening cooperative mechanisms, such as revitalizing the Arctic Council's role in shipping governance or expanding International Maritime Organization frameworks beyond the Polar Code (Chen and Cheng, 2025), could provide a foundation for stable development. If such institutional pathways are pursued, coordinated infrastructure investment and clearer regulatory regimes could balance coastal state interests with navigational freedoms, thereby reducing uncertainty, distributing costs, and increasing confidence among commercial shippers in the safety and reliability of Arctic routes.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of the Northern Sea Route (NSR) and the Northwest Passage (NWP) demonstrates that, while these Arctic corridors offer substantial reductions in distance and transit time, their economic viability remains conditional rather than absolute. Rather than displacing established routes such as the Suez or Panama Canals, Arctic passages are more likely to function as complementary and specialized alternatives, serving niche market segments and helping to alleviate periodic bottlenecks in global supply chains. The coming decades will be decisive in determining whether economic pragmatism and enlightened self-interest among states can transform the Arctic into a zone of sustainable commerce, or whether long-standing patterns of geopolitical rivalry will persist in this emerging maritime domain. At present, this analysis concludes that the economic viability of the NSR and NWP is real but constrained under current conditions. These routes are economically feasible only in specific circumstances and for select stakeholders, with widespread adoption limited by the factors outlined above.

Economic viability is not static and could improve through investments in infrastructure, more accurate ice forecasting, advanced ice-class vessel technology, reliable search-and-rescue capacity, and more effective cooperative governance mechanisms. At the same time, the strategic implications are substantial, acting both as a constraint and a catalyst. Without careful coordination, geopolitical competition could undermine the Arctic's commercial potential. At the same time, the shared need for stability underscores that no single actor can independently ensure the functioning of a trans-Arctic shipping system.

The future of Arctic shipping will depend on whether governance evolves along cooperative or competitive lines. If Arctic states treat the region as a shared maritime space, supported by harmonized standards, environmental protections, coordinated search-and-rescue

CC BY

systems, and predictable access regimes, these routes may assume a modest but meaningful role in global trade. Conversely, if the region becomes fragmented by sovereignty disputes, militarization, sanctions regimes, and competing spheres of influence, commercial operators are likely to remain cautious regardless of the theoretical distance savings. Only by addressing both the economic and strategic dimensions simultaneously, investing in physical infrastructure alongside "soft" institutional frameworks, can Arctic maritime routes develop into a viable component of the 21st-century global trade system.

In conclusion, the NSR and NWP are best understood as conditional trade opportunities with significant strategic implications. While they are unlikely to transform global commerce in the near term, they may still reshape selected trade flows and influence broader debates on maritime access, supply chain resilience, and global governance. Their broader significance lies in the intersection of commerce and power, as the Arctic increasingly emerges not merely as a new shipping corridor, but as a testing ground for whether climate-driven economic opportunities can be governed cooperatively or whether they will intensify competition within an emerging global commons.

CC BY

CONTRIBUTOR

The author contributed solely to the intellectual discourse that forms the foundation of this article, as well as its writing and editing, and assumes full responsibility for its content and interpretation.

COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL STANDARDS

Acknowledgments:
The author gratefully acknowledges the guidance and support of PhD supervisor Dr. Sitakanta Mishra, whose scholarly insights and constructive feedback significantly contributed to the development of this research. The author also thanks the reviewers and editorial team of the *Journal of Liberty and International Affairs* for their valuable comments, which helped improve the clarity, structure, and overall academic quality of the manuscript.

Funding:
Not applicable.

AI Declaration:
The author acknowledges the use of artificial intelligence tools, specifically Grammarly and Microsoft Copilot, to assist in translating and improving the clarity and quality of the English language in this manuscript. These tools were used exclusively for language refinement and did not contribute to the conceptualization, analysis, or development of the scientific content. The author retains full responsibility for the originality, accuracy, validity, and integrity of the manuscript.

Statement of Human Rights:
This article does not contain any studies with human participants performed by any of the authors.

Statement on the Welfare of Animals:
This article does not contain any studies with animals performed by any authors.

Informed Consent:
Not applicable.

Disclosure statement:
No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author/s.

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

Neutrality Statement on Jurisdictional Claims and Institutional Affiliations:

The publisher and the journal remain neutral regarding jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Language Quality and Author Responsibility Policy:

The publisher and the journal use AI-assistive tools to enhance the language quality of accepted articles. These tools help refine grammar, clarity, and readability while preserving the integrity of the original text. However, authors retain full responsibility for the accuracy and content of their work.

Disclaimer on External Links:

The publisher and the journal cannot be held responsible for the content of external websites or any broken or missing links within the article. Authors are solely responsible for ensuring the accuracy and functionality of all hyperlinks at the time of submission.

REFERENCES

1. Arctic Council / PAME. 2021. "Shipping in the Northwest Passage: Comparing 2013–2019." https://oaarchive.arctic-council.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/a87a9cf4-5e14-4a93-b483-6e703eb54e9c/content.
2. Barnes, Justin. 2025. "Explainer: The Northwest Passage's Shipping Potential, Legal Status, and What's at Stake." Edited by Elizabeth Hanlon. *The Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs*. July 28, 2025. https://www.belfercenter.org/research-analysis/explainer-northwest-passages-shipping-potential-legal-status-and-whats-stake.
3. Bartenstein, Kristin, Roman Dremliuga, and Natalia Prisekina. 2022. "Regulation of Arctic Shipping in Canada and Russia." *Arctic Review on Law and Politics* 13 (June): 338. https://doi.org/10.23865/arctic.v13.3229.
4. Bekkers, Eddy, Joseph F. Francois, and Hugo Rojas-Romagosa. 2018. "Melting Ice Caps and the Economic Impact of Opening the Northern Sea Route." *The Economic Journal* 128 (610): 1095–1127. https://doi.org/10.1111/ecoj.12460.
5. Boylan, Brandon M. 2021. "Increased Maritime Traffic in the Arctic: Implications for Governance of Arctic Sea Routes." *Marine Policy* 131 (September). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2021.104566.
6. Brownlee, Genevieve. 2024. "Cold Calculations: Economic Prospects for Arctic Shipping Routes." *Middlebury Institute of International Studies*. https://www.middlebury.edu/institute/sites/default/files/2024-07/cold-calculations-arctic-shipping-routes_miis_ited-working-paper_june2024.pdf.
7. Chen, Jinlei, Shichang Kang, Wentao Du, Junming Guo, Min Xu, Yulan Zhang, Xinyue Zhong, Wei Zhang, and Jizu Chen. 2021. "Perspectives on Future Sea Ice and Navigability in the Arctic." *The Cryosphere* 15 (12): 5473–82. https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-15-5473-2021.
8. Chen, Yitong, and Kaiyue Cheng. 2025. "Decarbonizing Arctic Shipping: Governance Pathways and Future Directions." *Frontiers in Marine Science* 12 (February). https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2025.1489091.
9. "Companies Pledge to Keep Their Shipments out of the Arctic." 2022. *Ocean Conservancy*. June 30, 2022. https://oceanconservancy.org/news/statement-companies-pledge-keep-shipments-arctic/.
10. Dalaklis, Dimitrios, Megan L. Drewniak, and Jens-Uwe Schröder-Hinrichs. 2018. "Shipping Operations Support in the 'High North': Examining Availability of Icebreakers along the Northern Sea Route." *WMU Journal of Maritime Affairs* 17 (2): 129–47. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13437-018-0142-7.
11. Doshi, Rush, Alexis Dale-Huang, and Gaoqi Zhang. 2021. "Northern Expedition: China's Arctic Activities and Ambitions." *Brookings*. https://www.brookings.edu/articles/northern-expedition-chinas-arctic-activities-and-ambitions/.
12. Drewniak, Megan, Dimitrios Dalaklis, Anastasia Christodoulou, and Rebecca Sheehan. 2021. "Ice-Breaking Fleets of the United States and Canada: Assessing the Current State of Affairs and Future Plans." *Sustainability* 13 (2): 703. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13020703.

CC BY

13. Engtrø, Espen. 2022. "A Discussion on the Implementation of the Polar Code and the STCW Convention's Training Requirements for Ice Navigation in Polar Waters." *Journal of Transportation Security* 15 (1–2): 41–67. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12198-021-00241-7.
14. Faury, Olivier, Yann Alix, and Nicolas Montier. 2021. "From the USSR to the Polar Silk Road: The Rise of the Strategic Russian Arctic Port Range." *Post-Communist Economies* 33 (7): 842–61. https://doi.org/10.1080/14631377.2020.1867428.
15. Friskilä, Øyvind. 2023. "NSR Shipping Activities in 2022." *Centre for High North Logistics*. https://chnl.no/research/reports-reports/nsr-shipping-activities-in-2022/.
16. Gao, Fei, and Peiqing Guo. 2025. "Unique Risks and Evolving Trends in Arctic Governance: A Forward-Looking Analysis Based on Policies and Practices." *European Journal of Futures Research* 13 (5). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40309-025-00250-y.
17. Gao Tianming and Vasilii Erokhin. 2019. "China-Russia Collaboration in Shipping and Marine Engineering as One of the Key Factors of Secure Navigation along the NSR." *Arctic Yearbook 2019*. https://arcticyearbook.com/images/yearbook/2019/Scholarly-Papers/20_AY2019_Gao_Erokhin.pdf.
18. Gunnarsson, Björn. 2021a. "Recent Ship Traffic and Developing Shipping Trends on the Northern Sea Route—Policy Implications for Future Arctic Shipping." *Marine Policy* 124 (February): 104369. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2020.104369.
19. Gunnarsson, Björn. 2021b. "Ten Years of International Shipping on the Northern Sea Route: Trends and Challenges." *Arctic Review on Law and Politics* 12 (February): 4–30. https://arcticreview.no/index.php/arctic/article/view/2614/5113.
20. Hancock, Lorin. n.d. "Six Ways Loss of Arctic Ice Impacts Everyone." *World Wildlife Fund*. https://www.worldwildlife.org/pages/six-ways-loss-of-arctic-ice-impacts-everyone.
21. Hedlund, Stefan. 2024. "Russia's Lifeline via the Northern Sea Route GIS Reports." *GIS Reports*. August 21, 2024. https://www.gisreportsonline.com/r/northern-sea-route-russia-asia-sanction/.
22. Helwa, Racha, and Perrihan Al-Riffai. 2025. "A Lifeline under Threat: Why the Suez Canal's Security Matters for the World." *Atlantic Council*. March 20, 2025. https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/in-depth-research-reports/issue-brief/a-lifeline-under-threat-why-the-suez-canals-security-matters-for-the-world/.
23. Hermann, Roberto Rivas, Ning Lin, Julien Lebel, and Alina Kovalenko. 2022. "Arctic Transshipment Hub Planning along the Northern Sea Route: A Systematic Literature Review and Policy Implications of Arctic Port Infrastructure." *Marine Policy* 145 (November): 105275. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2022.105275.
24. Hine, Lucy. 2021. "Vessels Struggle in Ice as Winter Comes 'Early' to Northern Sea Route." *TradeWinds*. November 25, 2021. https://www.tradewindsnews.com/bulkers/vessels-struggle-in-ice-as-winter-comes-early-to-northern-sea-route/2-1-1106211.
25. "How Viable Is Arctic Shipping?" 2024. *The Economist*. January 18, 2024. https://www.economist.com/the-economist-explains/2024/01/18/how-viable-is-arctic-shipping.
26. Howell, Stephen E. L., David G. Babb, Jack C. Landy, and Mike Brady. 2022. "Multiyear Sea Ice Conditions in the Northwest Passage: 1968–2020." *Atmosphere-Ocean* 61 (2): 202–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/07055900.2022.2136061.

27. Humpert, Malte, and Andreas Raspotnik. 2012a. "The Future of Arctic Shipping along the Transpolar Sea Route." Arctic Yearbook. https://arcticyearbook.com/images/yearbook/2012/Scholarly_Papers/14.Humpert_and_Raspotnik.pdf.
28. Humpert, Malte, and Andreas Raspotnik. 2012b. "The Future of Arctic Shipping." *The Arctic Institute*. https://www.thearcticinstitute.org/future-arctic-shipping/.
29. Jakub Solski, Jan. 2021. "Northern Sea Route Permit Scheme: Does Article 234 of UNCLOS Allow Prior Authorization?" *Ocean Yearbook* 35 (1): 443–72.
30. Li, Zhiyuan, Li Ding, Luofeng Huang, Jonas W. Ringsberg, Hui Gong, Nicolas Fournier, and Zhenju Chuang. 2023. "Cost–Benefit Analysis of a Trans-Arctic Alternative Route to the Suez Canal." *Journal of Marine Science and Engineering* 11 (4): 711. https://doi.org/10.3390/jmse11040711.
31. Liu, Miaojia, and Jacob Kronbak. 2010. "The Potential Economic Viability of Using the Northern Sea Route (NSR) as an Alternative Route between Asia and Europe." *Journal of Transport Geography* 18 (3): 434–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2009.08.004.
32. "Northwest and Northeast Passages?" 2025. *Discovering the Arctic*. May 13, 2025. https://discoveringthearctic.org.uk/governance/arctic-circumpolar-governance/northwest-northeast-passages/.
33. "Northwest Passage Transits to End of the 2024 Navigation Season." 2024. Cambridge: Scott Polar Research Institute.
34. Pechko, Kiel. 2025. "Rising Tensions and Shifting Strategies: The Evolving Dynamics of US Grand Strategy in the Arctic." *The Arctic Institute*. January 7, 2025. https://www.thearcticinstitute.org/rising-tensions-shifting-strategies-evolving-dynamics-us-grand-strategy-arctic/.
35. "Polar Code." 2024. *Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition*. February 14, 2024. https://www.asoc.org/learn/polar-code/.
36. Rosatom. 2024. "Historical Record of the Northern Sea Route: The Cargo Carriage Volume in 2023 Exceeded 36.254 Mln. Tons." January 11, 2024. https://www.rosatom.ru/en/press-centre/news/historical-record-of-the-northern-sea-route-the-cargo-carriage-volume-in-2023-exceeded-36-254-mln-to/.
37. Rumer, Eugene, Richard Sokolsky, and Paul Stronski. 2021. "Russia in the Arctic—a Critical Examination." *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*. March 29, 2021. https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2021/03/russia-in-the-arctica-critical-examination?lang=en.
38. Sander, Gunnar, and Eirik Mikkelsen. 2025. "Arctic Shipping 2013–2022: The Traffic Has Grown, with Big Variation between Regions, Seasons and Ship Types." *Polar Research* 44 (August). https://doi.org/10.33265/polar.v44.10978.
39. Sheehan, Rebecca, Dimitrios Dalaklis, Anastasia Christodoulou, Megan Drewniak, Peter Raneri, and Angelos Dalaklis. 2021. "The Northwest Passage in the Arctic: A Brief Assessment of the Relevant Marine Transportation System and Current Availability of Search and Rescue Services." *Logistics* 5 (2): 23. https://doi.org/10.3390/logistics5020023.
40. Theocharis, Dimitrios, Vasco Sanchez Rodrigues, Stephen Pettit, and Jane Haider. 2019. "Feasibility of the Northern Sea Route: The Role of Distance, Fuel Prices, Ice Breaking Fees and Ship Size for the Product Tanker Market." *Transportation Research Part E:*

Logistics and Transportation Review 129 (September): 111–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tre.2019.07.003.

41. Tiller, Stephen J., Adam P. Rhindress, Ibrahim O. Oguntola, M. Ali Ülkü, Kent A. Williams, and Binod Sundararajan. 2022. "Exploring the Impact of Climate Change on Arctic Shipping through the Lenses of Quadruple Bottom Line and Sustainable Development Goals." *Sustainability* 14 (4): 2193. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14042193.
42. U.S. Department of Defense. 2019. "Department of Defense Arctic Strategy." June 2019. https://media.defense.gov/2019/jun/06/2002141657/-1/-1/1/2019-dod-arctic-strategy.pdf.
43. Wegge, Njord. 2025. "The Arctic as an Arena for Strategic Competition." *Journal of Advanced Military Studies*. https://doi.org/10.21140/mcuj.2025SI002.
44. Yang, Carol. 2025. "How China Is Driving a Surge in Shipping Traffic along Arctic Sea Routes." *South China Morning Post*. June 13, 2025. https://www.scmp.com/economy/china-economy/article/3314324/how-china-driving-surge-shipping-traffic-along-arctic-sea-routes.
45. Zhao, Pengjun, Yunlin Li, and Yu Zhang. 2024. "Ships Are Projected to Navigate Whole Year-Round along the Northern Sea Route by 2100." *Communications Earth & Environment* 5 (1). https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-024-01557-7.
46. Zreik, Mohamad, and Olga Derendiaeva. 2025. "The Polar Silk Road: China's Strategic Engagement and Its Implications for Arctic Governance." *Polar Geography*, March, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/1088937x.2025.2477000.