Multiple Perspectives Utility Analysis

Analysis of U.S. foreign policy options in Greenland.

RINT - RENOVATIO IMPERII INTELLIGENCE

RENOVATIO IMPERII

Index

GEOPOLITICA IMPERII

1. Summary

Purpose and findings of the analysis
• Renovatio Imperii Intelligence (RINT) assessed, using the “Multiple Perspectives Utility Analysis” (MPUA) research methodology, the **cost-effectiveness of U.S. foreign policy options deemed available regarding the Greenland issue**; • This methodology requires that the set of options under analysis be evaluated, in distinct phases, by the analyst team, by stakeholders involved in the political process preceding the foreign-policy decision, and finally by the policy decision-maker themself (i.e., the President of the United States); • **The study identified two preference orders**: the first, grounded in cost-effectiveness evaluations, selected **“Militarization of Greenland”** (i.e., the model adopted during the Cold War) as the preferable option; the second, resulting from the relative utilities of the consulted political actors, indicated a propensity for the **“Purchase”** option (i.e., a bilateral transactional agreement between the United States and the Kingdom of Denmark aimed at obtaining sovereignty over Greenland).

2. Report (1/2)

Report
The analysis identified the "Militarization of Greenland" as the foreign policy option exhibiting the highest degree of cost-effectiveness for achieving national objectives in the Arctic region. Specifically, the analysis indicates that this foreign policy course would address priorities articulated by the current administration with respect to: (i) control of the Arctic region and its maritime routes; (ii) defensive reinforcement of the North American continent; and (iii) securing guarantees regarding exploitation of Greenland's natural resources. This solution would also entail a smaller deviation from the status quo than other options considered and could leverage the existing political-legal framework. This report was produced using an intelligence analysis methodology termed Multiple Perspectives Utility Analysis (MPUA). MPUA is commonly employed in the field of international-political research to identify the set of most cost-effective choices available to a state when confronting a strategic question. The methodology is characterized by the involvement of multiple stakeholders, each with specific interests, who are asked to express their assessments of the foreign policy options under consideration. Although this methodology has the advantage of reducing evaluative distortions during analysis, it cannot entirely eliminate the influence of certain cognitive biases. For example: (i) the analysis relied exclusively on publicly available sources; (ii) the assessments made may have been influenced by internal consensus dynamics within the analyst team; and (iii) the cultural background and professional provenance of the analysts may have conditioned their evaluations. The second- and third-ranked cost-effective foreign policy options are "Maintenance of the status quo" and "Purchase," respectively. The former is defined as retention of the current national posture in Greenland; the latter as acquisition of sovereignty over the territory through a bilateral transactional agreement with the Kingdom of Denmark. Other foreign policy options were judged to be less cost-effective, specifically: military annexation, annexation through referendum, conclusion of an association treaty, and adoption of a multilateral convention. Among the evaluation criteria discussed, those considered most relevant for assessing the aforementioned options were: (i) consequences at the international level; (ii) consistency with the national security strategy; and (iii) likelihood of success. *(continues)*

2. Report (2/2)

Report
(follows) The analysis also incorporated the perspectives of the Department of State, the Department of War, the intelligence services, and the national military-industrial complex. These actors were selected because of their influence on the decision-making process and their capacity to express operational preferences. It should be noted that, overall, these actors ranked the "Purchase" option as preferable to "Militarization," thereby diverging from the analysts' conclusions. Based on these actors' assessments, three scenarios were developed to represent different allocations of preferences by the policy decision-maker. The model displayed a moderate degree of variability: under each allocation of preferences, every foreign-policy option achieved first place in at least one scenario. However, in absolute terms the "Purchase" option received the highest degree of preference from the decision-maker. Ultimately, the study identified two orders of preference: the first, grounded in cost-effectiveness evaluations, selected "Militarization" as the response to the foreign-policy question at hand; the second, derived from the relative utilities of the consulted political actors, indicated a propensity for the "Purchase" option.

3. Methodology (1/13)

Introduction (1/2)

This analysis was conducted using the Multiple Perspectives Utility Analysis (MPUA) research methodology, which belongs to the family of strategic-intelligence methodologies.

MPUA is a research methodology employed within strategic intelligence, decision-support for policy makers, and foreign policy formulation. Despite its apparent conceptual simplicity, MPUA proves particularly effective in complex decision environments such as systemic crises or scenarios marked by emergent challenges where uncertainty and time pressure degrade analytic quality.

Strategic intelligence methodologies provide individuals, groups, and institutions with a broader and more structured understanding of facts, thereby facilitating decision processes and contributing to the mitigation of risks, threats, and informational ambiguity. MPUA addresses the need to formulate better-informed choices, to construct a decision-favourable environment and, at the strategic level, to retain the initiative vis-à-vis an adversary.

Concurrently, the methodology enforces rigorous scrutiny of the researcher's value and cognitive assumptions, enabling identification of cognitive biases, evaluative distortions, and epistemological limitations, and promoting the development of a coherent analytic framework.

Traditionally, MPUA is applied in international-relations contexts with predictive aims: the objective is to anticipate future developments in order to identify optimal solutions and efficient resource allocations. From this perspective, it addresses topics such as warfare, diplomacy, risk/return trade-offs, and systemic power dynamics. The involvement of multiple actors/stakeholders and therefore multiple perspectives permits the progressive narrowing of the set of options available to the final decision-maker. The intelligence analyst filters and processes raw information, converting it into operational courses of action, policy agendas, and strategic-military planning.

This study proposes the application of that methodology in the context of the increasing expression of interest by the United States and, in particular, by the current occupant of the White House, Donald J. Trump regarding the exercise of greater control over Greenland and the broader Arctic region.

(*continues*)

3. Methodology (2/13)

Introduction (2/2)

(*follows*)

The following provides a precise account of the steps followed by the analyst team of Renovatio Imperii Intelligence (RINT) in order to obtain the policy-making guidance presented in this report.

3. Methodology (3/13)

Phase I
The first phase of MPUA entails identification of seven distinct foreign-policy options aimed at achieving the political objective under consideration. From analysis of publicly available sources, that objective was construed as encompassing the following aims: • control of the Arctic region and its maritime routes; • acquisition of additional strategic depth; • exploitation of Greenland’s natural resources. The following foreign-policy options were identified: 1. **Purchase**: bilateral financial transaction (U.S. – Denmark/Greenland) aimed at obtaining sovereignty over Greenland. 2. **Military annexation**: aggression against Denmark via a military operation intended to annex Greenland. 3. **Annexation via referendum**: promotion of a separatist referendum in Greenland followed by conclusion of an annexation treaty. 4. **Maintenance of the status quo**: retention of the current configuration of U.S. engagement in Greenland. 5. **Multilateral convention**: promotion of a multilateral treaty between the United States and NATO allies to reorganize Greenland’s defence. 6. **Association treaty**: full (classical association treaty) or partial (Cypriot-style solution) transfer to the United States of Greenland’s foreign-policy and defence management. By partial transfer, for example, is meant a transfer of sovereignty limited to the geographic areas where military bases would be located. 7. **Militarization**: increase of U.S. military presence in Greenland at U.S. expense (Cold War model).

3. Methodology (4/13)

Phase II

The second phase involves pairwise comparison of each option against the remaining six. In the table below, "1" indicates that the option listed horizontally is considered preferable, while "0" indicates preference for the option listed vertically. Note that, at this phase, the pairwise comparisons of the identified options are intuitive and general in nature. Unlike the subsequent phases, the options are not compared on the basis of specific criteria.

Options	Purchase	Military annexation	Referendum	Status quo	Multilateral convention	Association treaty	Militarization	TOT
Purchase	*	0	0	0	1	1	0	
Military annexation	1	*	1	0	1	1	1	
Referendum	1	0	*	0	1	1	1	
Status quo	1	1	1	*	1	1	1	
Multilateral convention	0	0	0	0	*	1	1	
Association treaty	0	0	0	0	0	*	0	
Militarization	1	0	0	0	0	1	*	
TOT	4	1	2	0	4	6	4	21

As can be observed, the "Association treaty" option prevails over the others by a significant margin, collecting 6 preferences. "Purchase", "Militarization" and "Multilateral convention," by contrast, finish with the same score, each collecting a total of 4 preferences. The pairwise comparison of each option against all others based on an "intuitive" and "first-impression" logic favors the cautious yet effective solution of a treaty that delegates part of Greenland's sovereignty to the United States without attempting annexation. The first phase of an MPUA assessment, however, does not yield high-granularity information. Following this initial generic comparison of the foregoing options, it is possible to proceed to the subsequent phases, which constitute the core of the MPUA methodology.

3. Methodology (5/13)

Phase III
The third phase of MPUA requires identification of a set of seven evaluation criteria for the foreign-policy options. Parameter selection is central to the methodology because these criteria are used to “measure” the payoff of each foreign-policy option. It is important to emphasize that parameters must be chosen through a collective deliberation process (i.e., brainstorming), thereby avoiding arbitrary decisions that would risk confirming analysts’ cognitive biases. A criterion reflects a characteristic, aspect, or fundamental element of the type or category of options under comparison. The following criteria were identified: 1. **Economic cost**: the financial commitment required to adopt a given foreign policy option. 2. **Economic benefits**: the expected financial utility derived from adopting a given foreign policy option. 3. **Implementation complexity**: overall complexity (timing, logistics, legal, diplomatic, military, etc.) anticipated in executing a given foreign policy option. 4. **Consistency with grand strategy**: the extent to which the success of a given foreign-policy option advances the United States’ long-term objectives (preservation of global primacy, reduction of global commitments, reinforcement of North American security, transition toward a strategy of selective interventionism and/or offshore balancing). 5. **Likelihood of success**: the probability that a given foreign policy option will achieve its objectives. 6. **International consequences**: the political externalities generated by adoption of a given foreign-policy option. 7. **Domestic consensus**: the effects of adopting a given foreign policy option on public opinion.

3. Methodology (6/13)

Phase IV

The fourth phase requires analysts to perform pairwise comparisons among the selected criteria to intuitively assess the relative preferability of each. The three criteria receiving the highest number of preferences are then identified. This process mirrors the second phase but is applied to criteria rather than to options.

Evaluation criteria	Economic cost	Economic benefits	Complexity	Consistency with grand strategy	Likelihood of success	International consequences	Domestic consensus	TOT
Economic cost	*	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Economic benefits	0	*	1	1	1	1	1	
Complexity	0	0	*	1	0	1	0	
Consistency with grand strategy	0	0	0	*	0	1	0	
Likelihood of success	0	0	0	1	*	0	0	
International consequences	0	0	0	0	1	*	0	
Domestic consensus	0	0	1	1	1	1	*	
TOT	0	1	3	5	4	5	2	21

With a total of 5 points, the criteria “International consequences” and “Consistency with grand strategy” tied for first place in the pairwise comparison. “Likelihood of success,” which might have been expected to top the list, ranked second with a total of 4 points. This result is consistent with MPUA’s design: the method limits undue influence of the analyst’s personal judgment, thereby improving reliability.

It is then necessary to assign weights to the three highest-ranked criteria. Given a total of 14 points (the sum of the three criteria values), the weighting yields the following results:

- International consequences → 5/14 = 0.36
- Consistency with grand strategy → 5/14 = 0.36
- Likelihood of success → 4/14 = 0.29

3. Methodology (7/13)

Phase V (1/3)

The fifth phase constitutes the core of MPUA. It requires performing three separate pairwise comparisons of the seven options, each comparison conducted with reference to one of the three criteria selected in Phase IV. Thus, three distinct assessments are produced, each using one of the top three criteria as the evaluation parameter. Under the criterion "International consequences," the analysis assigns greater preference to options least likely to destabilize the international system. In this assessment, "Maintenance of the status quo" ranks first with a total of 6 points, indicating that continuity of the existing political arrangement is perceived as the choice with the least destabilizing international implications. "Militarization" and "Multilateral convention" follow in second and third place, respectively, with 5 and 4 total preferences.

Foreign policy options	Purchase	Military annexation	Referendum	Status quo	Multilateral convention	Association treaty	Militarization	TOT
Purchase	*	0	0	1	1	1	1	
Military annexation	1	*	1	1	1	1	1	
Referendum	1	0	*	1	1	1	1	
Status quo	0	0	0	*	0	0	0	
Multilateral convention	0	0	0	1	*	0	1	
Association treaty	0	0	0	1	1	*	1	
Militarization	0	0	0	1	0	0	*	
TOT	2	0	1	6	4	3	5	21

The three highest-ranked options are then weighted using the "International consequences" criterion value (0.36) from the previous phase:

- Maintenance of the status quo → 6 × 0.36 = 2.16
- Militarization → 5 × 0.36 = 1.80
- Multilateral convention → 4 × 0.36 = 1.44

3. Methodology (8/13)

Phase V (2/3)

Under the criterion "Consistency with grand strategy," the "Purchase" option ranks first with a total of 6 points, being judged the solution most aligned with a U.S. strategy aimed at increasing control over the island while avoiding the costs and risks associated with more coercive alternatives.
"Annexation via referendum" and "Military annexation" follow in second and third place, with 5 and 4 total preferences respectively. Both options imply a direct strengthening of political control over the island but differ significantly in terms of political sustainability and strategic costs in the international context.

Foreign policy options	Purchase	Military annexation	Referendum	Status quo	Multilateral convention	Association treaty	Militarization	
Purchase	*	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Military annexation	1	*	1	0	0	0	0	
Referendum	1	0	*	0	0	0	0	
Status quo	1	1	1	*	1	1	1	
Multilateral convention	1	1	1	0	*	1	1	
Association treaty	1	1	1	0	0	*	0	
Militarization	1	1	1	0	0	1	*	
TOT	6	4	5	0	1	3	2	21

The three highest-ranked options are then weighted using the "Consistency with grand strategy" criterion value (0.36) from the previous phase:

- Purchase → 6 × 0.36 = 2.16
- Annexation via referendum → 5 × 0.36 = 1.80
- Military annexation → 4 × 0.36 = 1.44

3. Methodology (9/13)

Phase V (3/3)

Under the criterion "Likelihood of success," the "Maintenance of the status quo" option ranks first with a total of 6 points, being the only option that entails no departure from the current political framework.

"Militarization" and "Military annexation" follow in second and third place, respectively, with 5 and 4 total preferences. Of these latter options, the former is the only one that would involve a substantive modification of the status quo, since "Militarization" would fall within the scope of existing bilateral arrangements: it would effectively constitute a U.S. return to the posture maintained in Greenland during the Cold War.

Foreign policy options	Purchase	Military annexation	Referendum	Status quo	Multilateral convention	Association treaty	Militarization	
Purchase	*	1	0	1	1	1	1	
Military annexation	0	*	0	1	0	0	1	
Referendum	1	1	*	1	1	1	1	
Status quo	0	0	0	*	0	0	0	
Multilateral convention	0	1	0	1	*	1	1	
Association treaty	0	1	0	1	0	*	1	
Militarization	0	0	0	1	0	0	*	
TOT	1	4	0	6	2	3	5	21

It is necessary to weight the three highest-ranked options using the "Likelihood of success" criterion value (0.29) from the previous phase:

- Maintenance of the status quo → 6 × 0.29 = 1.74
- Militarization → 5 × 0.29 = 1.45
- Military annexation → 4 × 0.29 = 1.16

3. Methodology (10/13)

Summary table of weighted scores for each option

Weighted score	International consequences	Consistency with grand strategy	Likelihood of success	TOT
Militarization	1,80	0,72	1,45	3,97
Maintenance of the status quo	2,16	0	1,74	3,90
Purchase	0,72	2,16	0,29	3,17
Association treaty	1,08	1,08	0,87	3,03
Military annexation	0	1,44	1,16	2,60
Multilateral convention	1,44	0,36	0,58	2,38
Annexation via referendum	0,36	1,80	0	2,16

3. Methodology (11/13)

Phase VI

The following phase most distinctly characterizes the MPUA analysis; the methodology itself is named for its use of "Multiple Perspectives." To incorporate viewpoints beyond those of the analyst team, the most relevant actors within the decision-making framework were selected. Renovatio Imperii Intelligence therefore postulated each examined actor's perspective and their relative utilities (including self-interested considerations) with respect to each presented foreign-policy option. Specifically, the perspectives analyzed were:

- **Department of State**: the entity responsible for planning U.S. foreign policy, currently led by Marco Rubio;
- **Department of War**: the entity responsible for command of the U.S. Armed Forces, currently led by Peter Hegseth;
- **Intelligence services**: the aggregate of U.S. intelligence agencies (CIA, NSA, etc.);
- **Military industry**: dominant U.S. corporate groups in the production of military technologies, weapon systems, and materiel (e.g., Lockheed Martin, RTX, Boeing Defense etc.).

3. Methodology (12/13)

Phase VI

Expected Value Success ("E.V. Success")	On a scale from 0 to 100, the value of the relative utility of the success of a given foreign-policy option for a given counterpart.
Probability of Success	On a scale from 0 to 1, the probability of success that a given counterpart assigns to a given foreign-policy option.
Expected Value Failure ("E.V. Failure")	On a scale from 0 to 100, the value of the relative utility of the failure of a given foreign-policy option for a given counterpart.
Probability of Failure	On a scale from 0 to 1, the probability of failure that a given counterpart assigns to a given foreign-policy option.

Department of State	E.V. Success	Prob. Success	E.V. Failure	Prob. Failure	Total E.V.
Militarization	40	0.45	30	0.55	34,5
Maintenance of the status quo	10	0.3	80	0.7	59
Purchase	90	0.8	10	0.2	74

Department of War	E.V. Success	Prob. Success	E.V. Failure	Prob. Failure	Total E.V.
Militarization	90	0.8	10	0.2	74
Maintenance of the status quo	20	0.4	10	0.6	14
Purchase	70	0.7	50	0.3	64

Intelligence services	E.V. Success	Prob. Success	E.V. Failure	Prob. Failure	Total E.V.
Militarization	70	0.7	20	0.3	55
Maintenance of the status quo	30	0.4	50	0.6	42
Purchase	80	0.8	30	0.2	70

Military industry	E.V. Success	Prob. Success	E.V. Failure	Prob. Failure	Total E.V.
Militarization	80	0.8	15	0.2	67
Maintenance of the status quo	30	0.2	70	0.8	62
Purchase	80	0.7	20	0.3	62

3. Methodology (13/13)

Phase VII

The final phase of the analysis consists of simulating the decision-making process of the President of the United States, as the ultimate decision-maker on foreign and national security policy. Based on the assessments and aggregated scores provided by the previously analyzed actors, the President is required to express his preference among the three presented options, assigning a score from 0 to 1 to each.

The simulation is structured into three distinct starting conditions reflecting different decision contexts:

- the **first** assumes preferences consistent with publicly available information (media, statements, etc.);
- the **second** considers a scenario marked by deterioration of dossiers deemed priorities (Middle Eastern crises, Ukraine, Indo-Pacific);
- the **third** introduces a valuation conditioned by political-consensus needs and diplomatic constraints.

Donald J. Trump	Peso	Total E.V.	Weighted E.V.
Militarization	0.3	230,5	69,15
Maintenance of the status quo	0.1	177	17,7
Purchase	0.6	270	172

Donald J. Trump	Peso	Total E.V.	Weighted E.V.
Militarization	0.3	230,5	69,15
Maintenance of the status quo	0.6	177	106,2
Purchase	0.1	270	27

Donald J. Trump	Peso	Total E.V.	Weighted E.V.
Militarization	0.5	230,5	115,25
Maintenance of the status quo	0.1	177	17,7
Purchase	0.4	270	108

To request a **consultation** on **geopolitical risk,** you can contact us at

info@renovatioimperii.org

Or through our official channels

@RenovatioImperiiOfficial

Renovatio Imperii

@renovatioITA

RENOVATIO IMPERII