

Tectonic Evolution of the Circum-Arctic

Victoria PEASE

Department of Geological Sciences, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden

✉ vicky.pease@geo.su.se

The Eocene to recent opening along the modern Gakkel spreading ridge is fairly well understood, but there is little consensus on Arctic reconstructions for Cretaceous and older events. Most workers agree that the Canada Basin opened (at least in part) as the result of rifting initiated c. 135 Ma; this age is inferred from pre- to syn-rift sedimentation on the conjugate margins, now the margins of Arctic Alaska and Arctic Canada (Houseknecht and Connors 2016; Hutchinson et al. 2023), and is supported by a shared syn-rift depositional history (Hutchinson et al. 2023). However, 1) the actual age of Canada Basin seafloor remains unknown, i.e. the age of sea-floor spreading after the on-set of rifting, and 2) as ages for the High Arctic large igneous province (HALIP) become more refined, the relationship between Canada Basin opening and the HALIP becomes central to basin opening scenarios (Dockman et al. 2018). Both of these issues are further complicated by the disparate geological timescales in common use today (Malinverno et al. 2012; Ogg 2020).

Gravity and magnetic (aeromagnetic and ship-borne) data record what is interpreted as a fossil spreading ridge in the Canada Basin with inferred ages of 142 Ma (maximum) to 120 Ma (minimum) (Grantz et al. 2011; Chian et al. 2016; Døssing et al. 2020). This time frame overlaps with the Cretaceous Normal Superchron, thus restricting magnetic reversals in the Canada Basin to pre- or post-date the long Cretaceous quiet period. Differences between magnetic anomaly timescales allow Canada Basin magnetic anomalies to be pre-120 Ma or post-83 Ma (Malinverno et al. 2012) or pre-130 Ma or post-124 Ma (Ogg 2020). Recent age data from the High-Arctic Large Igneous Province (HALIP) apparently record three main pulses of magmatism at c. 125 Ma, 95 Ma, and 80 Ma which lies within this critical window of time, and is used to invoke extension-driven plume magmatism (Hadlari 2024), rather than the conventional view that plumes facilitate extension. Clearly, more work remains to be done in order to resolve some of these arguments that the HALIP post-dates extension. Without agreement on the magnetic polarity timescale, the timing of tectonic events remain problematic.

References

- Chian, D., H.R. Jackson, D.R. Hutchinson, J.W. Shimeld, G.N. Oakey, N. Lebedeva-Ivanova, Q. Li, R.W. Saltus, and D.C. Mosher (2016), Distribution of crustal types in Canada Basin, Arctic Ocean, *Tectonophysics* **691**, Part A, 8–30, DOI: 10.1016/j.tecto.2016.01.038.
- Dockman, D.M., D.G. Pearson, L.M. Heaman, S.A. Gibson, and C. Sarkar (2018), Timing and origin of magmatism in the Sverdrup Basin, Northern Canada – Implications for lithospheric evolution in the High Arctic Large Igneous Province (HALIP), *Tectonophysics* **742–743**, 50–65, DOI: 10.1016/j.tecto.2018.05.010.
- Døssing, A., C. Gaina, H.R. Jackson, and O.B. Andersen (2020), Cretaceous ocean formation in the High Arctic, *Earth Planet. Sc. Lett.* **551**, 116552, DOI: 10.1016/j.epsl.2020.116552.
- Grantz, A., P.E. Hart, and V.A. Childers (2011), Geology and tectonic development of the Amerasia and Canada Basins, Arctic Ocean, *Geol. Soc. Mem.* **35**, 771–799, DOI: 10.1144/m35.50.
- Hadlari, T. (2024), Rift to post-rift tectonostratigraphy of the Sverdrup Basin in relation to onset of the High Arctic Large Igneous Province (HALIP) in the Early Cretaceous, Arctic Canada, *Geochem. Geophys. Geosyst.* **25**, 7, e2023GC011411, DOI: 10.1029/2023GC011411.
- Houseknecht, D.W., and C.D. Connors (2016), Pre-Mississippian tectonic affinity across the Canada Basin–Arctic margins of Alaska and Canada, *Geology* **44**, 7, 507–510, DOI: 10.1130/G37862.1.
- Hutchinson, D.R., D.W. Houseknecht, and D.C. Mosher (2023), Canada Basin Tectono-Sedimentary Element, Arctic Ocean, *Geol. Soc. Mem.* **57**, 1, M57–2022, DOI: 10.1144/M57-2022-49.
- Malinverno, A., J. Hildebrandt, M. Tominaga, and J.E.T. Channell (2012), M-sequence geomagnetic polarity time scale (MHTC12) that steadies global spreading rates and incorporates astrochronology constraints, *J. Geophys. Res.: Solid Earth* **117**, B6, DOI: 10.1029/2012JB009260.
- Ogg, J.G. (2020), Geomagnetic polarity time scale. **In:** *Geologic Time Scale 2020*, Vol. 1, Elsevier, 159–192, DOI: 10.1016/B978-0-12-824360-2.00005-X.

Received 4 February 2025

Accepted 5 February 2025