

Viacheslav SHARYI,

Professor at the Department of Civil Service, Public Administration and
Political Science,

Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy,

Doctor of Sciences in Public Administration, Professor

ORCID: 0000–0002-5598–3505

(© SHARYI V., 2023)

THE ARCTIC: THE STRUGGLE FOR RESOURCES AND INFLUENCE IN THE REGION

Modern climate changes caused by the processes of global warming are clearly reflected in the geopolitical interests of various states of the world in relation to the Arctic region. Accordingly, the relevance of the study of this issue is caused by the formation in the last decade of a number of opportunities that may be open to a state that will establish its influence in the Arctic. This is due to a combination of economic and political advantages expressed in the extraordinary amount of resources that characterize this region, the development of rational sea routes, the satisfaction of commercial goals and even the protection of the sovereignty of coastal countries. Thus, the purpose of the work was to define the Arctic as a political arena, in particular, to reveal the interests and plans of various countries regarding its territory and resources. For this, the research used the method of analysis and synthesis, comparison, deduction, generalization, as well as historical. As a result, it was established that active climatic changes in the world cause the formation and development

of new economic opportunities in the Arctic. Accordingly, the role of this region was determined for such countries as Canada, Russia, United States of America, Norway, Denmark, Iceland, Sweden and Finland. It was possible to establish that their interests are to a greater extent caused by the desire to control the operation of the Northern Sea Route. In addition, the work described the advantages of the Arctic region, which describe the priority of establishing control over this territory by the relevant state. In particular, it is beneficial for the development of economic activity, the protection of the territories of coastal countries, it is characterized by a significant number of deposits of natural resources and other minerals, as well as wide transit opportunities. Thus, it was proved that it is appropriate to consider the Arctic as a socio-cultural, ethnic, socio-economic, geopolitical space around the North Pole, the resources of which provoke world states to compete with each other. The practical value of the work is revealed in the possibility of using its results for further scientific research, as well as educational material for those studying the Arctic and its role in international relations.

Key words: *climate change; Northern Sea Route; international conflicts; mineral deposits; strategic competition.*

В'ячеслав ШАРИЙ,
професор кафедри державної служби, публічного адміністрування та
політології,
Черкаський національний університет імені Богдана Хмельницького,
доктор наук з державного управління, професор
ORCID: 0000-0002-5598-3505
(© ШАРИЙ В., 2023)

АРКТИКА: БОРОТЬБА ЗА РЕСУРСИ ТА ВПЛИВ У РЕГІОНІ

Сучасні кліматичні зміни, спричинені процесами глобального потепління, чітко відбиваються на геополітичних інтересах різних держав світу щодо Арктичного регіону. Відповідно, актуальність дослідження цієї проблематики зумовлено формуванням в останнє десятиліття низки можливостей, які можуть бути відкриті для держави, що встановить свій вплив в Арктиці. Це пов'язано з поєднанням економічних і політичних переваг, що виражаються в надзвичайній кількості ресурсів, якими характеризується цей регіон, розвитку раціональних морських шляхів, задоволенні комерційних цілей і навіть захисті суверенітету прибережних країн. Таким чином, метою роботи було визначити Арктику як політичну арену, зокрема виявити інтереси та плани різних країн щодо її території та ресурсів. Для цього в дослідженні використовувався метод аналізу і синтезу, порівняння, дедукції, узагальнення, а також історичний. У результаті було встановлено, що активні кліматичні зміни у світі зумовлюють формування та розвиток нових економічних можливостей в Арктиці. Відповідно, визначено роль цього регіону для таких країн, як Канада, Росія, Сполучені Штати Америки, Норвегія, Данія, Ісландія, Швеція та Фінляндія. Удалося встановити, що їх інтереси більшою мірою зумовлені бажанням контролювати експлуатацію Північного морського шляху. Крім того, у роботі було описано переваги арктичного регіону, що характеризують пріоритетність встановлення контролю над цією територією відповідною державою. Зокрема, він вигідний для розвитку економічної діяльності, захисту територій прибережних країн, характеризується значною кількістю покладів природних ресурсів та інших корисних копалин, а також широкими транзитними можливостями. Таким чином,

доведено, що Арктику доцільно розглядати як соціокультурний, етнічний, соціально-економічний, геополітичний простір навколо Північного полюса, ресурси якого провокують світові держави до конкуренції між собою. Практична цінність роботи полягає в можливості використання її результатів для дальших наукових досліджень, а також як навчального матеріалу для тих, хто вивчає Арктику та її роль у міжнародних відносинах.

Ключові слова: *зміна клімату; Північний морський шлях; міжнародні конфлікти; родовища корисних копалин; стратегічна конкуренція.*

Problem statement. Special attention from the international community to the Arctic region since the beginning of the 21st century is due to a number of factors that are more related to the advantages of this territory. In particular, the Arctic is characterized by a large number of sources of natural resources that attract representatives of various countries from an economic point of view. In addition, modern scientists and practitioners began to pay special attention to the development of optimal sea routes, not only for the transportation of goods, but also for the satisfaction of tourist purposes. Accordingly, the relevance of the research is caused by the processes of global warming, the consequences of which are reflected more and more vividly on the ecological state of the planet. However, for countries planning to establish influence in the Arctic, this factor has both negative and positive aspects. In particular, the negative ones are expressed in the problems associated with a sharp change in the climate, which is characterized by the pollution of ecosystems, the melting of the ice sheet, and the increase in temperature on the planet. In turn, the positive ones are characterized by an increase in the level of accessibility to the depths of the

Arctic, as well as the properties of the waters, which become more passable for ships (Heininen, 2020).

Based on the above, it was noted that the problems of this study were revealed in the definition of the main resources, as well as other advantages characteristic of the Arctic territories, which cause rivalry between different countries. As a result, a geopolitical problem was formed, which is expressed in the peculiarities of relations between states regarding their activities in the Arctic. It was studied by many scientists, including ecologists, sociologists, political scientists, geographers, but their views are different, which as a result provokes disputes. This shows that the scientific doctrine has not yet proven an idea or a position that would clearly describe the interests of the Arctic states, and no priority approaches have been proposed to solve this acute international problem.

In particular, O.S. Stokke (2022) investigated this issue from the point of view of the causes of climate change on planet Earth, as well as their consequences in the Arctic. His work was largely based on the description of negative phenomena caused by the process of global warming and, accordingly, are reflected in the ecological state of the Arctic region, as well as its ecosystems. In addition, in her work, R. Pincus (2020) described the approaches due to which the peaceful coexistence of states in the Arctic is possible. The conclusions obtained by her allow to describe ways that would help to avoid the formation of international conflicts between states that want to establish their influence in this region. In turn, S. Kangasluoma and H. Lempinen (2022) reveal this problem in the context of the struggle for the resources of the region, in particular, it studies the historical foundations and events that were clearly reflected in this process.

It is important to note that she managed to allocate resources according to the interests of the Arctic countries and describe the approaches of each of them.

Also, it is necessary to pay attention to the conclusions reached by D. Depledge (2021) regarding the specifics of the policy and strategy of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in the Arctic region. In particular, he determined that the organization does not aim to establish complete control over the Arctic territories. However, its member countries express their interests in the context of the use of Arctic natural resources. In addition, attention should be paid to the results of the study by P. Graczyk and S.V. Rottem (2020), which relate to current problems of international legal regulation of the Arctic. In particular, he managed to define the principles and normative documents on the basis of which international cooperation is formed, as well as the interaction of the Arctic states in this territory. It is important that he proposed a qualitatively new approach to solving this problem, which consists in the creation of a special organization whose purpose would be based on monitoring the activities of the international community and specific countries in the Arctic.

Thus, the main goal of the work was to determine the current state, as well as prospects for the formation and development of peaceful international relations, the object of which are the resources and territories of the Arctic. For this, the following tasks were set in the study: to characterize the general features of the Arctic region; describe the impact of global warming processes on it; determine the list of states that aim to establish their influence on the Arctic territories; to investigate the general principles on which international cooperation in the Arctic is carried out; consider the peculiarities of the policies of the Arctic states and their interests; establish priority directions to avoid their future collision.

Materials and Methods. The analysis method was used when dividing the general question into several different elements. This approach was used for an in-depth study of the topic of the work, as well as definition of its object. In particular, the main geographical and legal properties of the Arctic were studied

in the study. In addition, on the basis of the analysis method, the goal of each of the states was determined, regarding the impact on this region and its future use. Also, the main international legal principles and norms were established, on the basis of which there is interaction and cooperation between countries claiming to establish control over the Arctic. In addition, the analysis method was used to study the provisions of a number of international and national documents related to the cooperation of states in the Arctic. Among them are the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (1982), Ottawa Declaration (1996), Illulissat Declaration (2008), Agreement on cooperation on aeronautical and maritime search and rescue in the Arctic (2011), Geneva Conventions on the Law of the Sea (1958).

The synthesis method, on the contrary, made it possible to consider the issue in unity, in particular to determine the general ideas and plans of the international community regarding the Arctic region. In addition, at his expense, characteristic features in the approaches that are common to each of the states were described. Thus, it made it possible to define the role of the Arctic for the whole world, not only in ecological, but also in economic contexts. The method of comparing leagues is the basis of the study of the main principles on the basis of which states compete with each other in the Arctic region. Also, its purpose was revealed during the establishment of common and distinctive features, in particular between their interests and plans. In addition, the method of comparison was applied in the course of determining the main advantages of the Arctic region for different states.

The deduction method was responsible for developing the logical structure of the work. In particular, at the beginning of the work, a general theoretical analysis of the Arctic, its main features and characteristics was carried out. Accordingly, the views and goals of different states regarding this region were studied further in the work, in particular, the features of cooperation

between them. This approach made it possible to consider the topic from general principles to specific ones, due to which it was possible to determine the dependence between the approaches of different countries. The historical method made it possible to determine the relations between states regarding the Arctic and its resources in different historical periods. The analysis in the work has been carried out since 1996, in particular, the creation of the Arctic Council to the present. The method of generalization was used to form conclusions in the work. This methodological tool made it possible to study the obtained results, highlight their main principles and note them in the results. His role was also revealed in the process of determining the priority directions for the continuation of this scientific research.

The scientific work was carried out in three stages. At the first, the general theoretical principles that describe the properties of the Arctic were studied. At this stage, the peculiarities of this region in the economic, geographic, resource, and political contexts were established. At the second stage, the attitude and interests of Canada, Russia, the United States of America (USA), Norway, Denmark, Iceland, Sweden and Finland regarding the Arctic region were characterized. Moreover, the plans of each of them were described, due to which, it was possible to establish the main fields of conflict between the Arctic states. At the second stage, a discussion was held, during which the author considered the positions and statements of other scientists regarding the Arctic factor in modern international relations. On the third, it was possible to determine the main ideas and positions that were described in the work and, accordingly, indicated them in the conclusions.

Presenting the main material. First of all, it is necessary to define what the Arctic region is, in particular, it is necessary to understand the zone of both land and sea, which is located to the north of the Arctic Circle. At the same time, it partially includes the territories of Eurasia and North America, the Arctic

Ocean, including islands, as well as parts of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans and adjacent to it. However, it was emphasized in the work that such a definition is not exhaustive and does not cover the entire territory of the Arctic. This is explained by the dynamic change in the world's climate, which leads to an increase in the temperature on the planet Earth, as well as the melting of glaciers, which in turn make up the territory of the Arctic region. It is worth noting that the term «Arctic» has a translation from the Greek language, in particular it means «bear» or «northern» (Who lives in..., 2020). Based on this, it was proved that this term refers to the northern polar region of the Earth. Thus, the structure of the Arctic Circle includes the northernmost territory of Alaska, the Chukchi Sea, as well as the waters north of Alaska, which are exclusive economic zones.

As for general data, the area of the Arctic is 21 million square meters km. At the same time, in 2022, record low indicators of the area of its ice cover were recorded, namely 14.88 million square meters km (Kachura, 2021). According to data from May 4, 2020, about 4 million people live in the entire Arctic, which in turn is only 0.05% of the entire population of the Earth (How many people..., 2020). As for the resources of the Arctic, they are characterized by huge volumes. In particular, the depths of this region contain about 12-13 billion tons of oil and 47.3 trillion cubic meters of gas. It is widely believed that these reserves make up 91% of the total volume of such minerals in the whole world. Another important energy resource is coal, the volume of which in the Arctic is estimated at 750 billion tons, including 559 billion tons of energy, and more than 81 billion tons of coconut (Gavrilova, 2017).

Turning to the analysis of the countries, the relations between which are determined by the peculiarities of interaction in the Arctic territory, it was noted that they are located north of the Arctic Circle. In particular, they include the USA (due to the territory of Alaska), Iceland, Canada, Norway, Russia, Finland,

Denmark (due to Greenland), Sweden. These states themselves are included in the list of Arctic states. However, only five of them have a mainland coast in the Arctic. This category includes the USA, Canada, Russia, Norway and Denmark, respectively, they are members of the Arctic Council. To determine the maritime space located in the sector from the land territory of the state to the North Pole, the length of the coastline of the countries listed above, as well as the main principles of the «sectoral theory», were used. The essence of the latter is revealed in the right of countries belonging to the category of coastal to the Arctic region to independently determine the borders of polar possessions in sectors. As for the normative consolidation of such a theory, it is not mentioned in international legal norms, in particular the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (1982), which in turn does not prohibit its use. The provisions of the above-mentioned document provide that the Arctic states have the opportunity to develop the subsoil, but only in the territories belonging to their exclusive economic zone, as well as the continental shelf.

However, it should be understood that the sovereignty of a specific interested state cannot be established over territories further from the continental shelf. This requirement is explained by the fact that the zone described above is the open sea, due to which all state entities have the opportunity to carry out free navigation, engage in fishing and conduct scientific expeditions on its territory. In addition, based on the norms of international law, the North Pole is not the property of a designated state. In particular, only the USA, Canada, Russia, Norway and Denmark have an exclusive economic zone that includes 200 nautical miles and is adjacent to their coasts (Väättänen and Zimmerbauer, 2020). Having analyzed the legal status of the Arctic, it was established that it is formed on the basis of the norms of international law, namely international treaties, as well as the norms of the national legislation of the Arctic states. At the moment, the status of exclusive maritime economic zones is gaining special

relevance, since some states have the right to expand them according to the geological features of the structure of the continental shelf. These countries include Norway, Russia, Canada and Denmark, as they ratified the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (1982) more than a decade ago. Attention was drawn to the fact that the USA has not yet ratified this document, which is why there is no right to such an initiative (Boylan, 2021).

In order to determine the features of international cooperation regarding the Arctic and its resources, the study considered the main elements that make this process possible. First of all, attention was focused on the Arctic Council, which was formed on September 19, 1996. Its essence lies in the resolution of various disputes arising between states in the Arctic region. The founding document of this Council is the Ottawa Declaration (1996). Thus, the Arctic Council includes: Canada, Finland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Russia, Iceland, USA, as they have territories within the Arctic. Moreover, its role and priority of activity is only increasing. Moreover, its role and priority of activity is only increasing. This is evidenced by the inclusion in the work of the Council of the leading countries of the world, in particular Germany, France, and China, in the context of observers. An important feature is the fact that indigenous peoples also participate in it as part of special organizations, such as the Aleutian International Association, the Athabaskan Arctic Council, the Gwich'in International Council, the Sami Council. The Arctic Council holds a two-year presidency, which alternates among its eight member states. In particular, from 2015 to 2017, the chair was held by the USA, respectively, in 2021 it was taken over by Russia (Serova et al., 2020).

In addition, attention was paid to the Illulissat Declaration (2008), which was developed and signed by Denmark, Norway, Canada, the USA and the Russian Federation in 2008, to join efforts and consider and solve problems in the Arctic region. This process was supposed to take place only at the expense

of peaceful negotiations, as well as support for cooperation in the most important spheres of international interaction. Describing the security sector of international relations within the Arctic, the project of Northern Defense Cooperation was noted. It includes the countries of Northern Europe, namely Denmark with the Faroe Islands and Greenland, Iceland, Sweden, Finland, and Norway. It was noted that it does not have the characteristics and properties of a military-political union, accordingly it is intended only as an element to deepen cooperation between the participating countries, as well as to avoid disputes between them. After analyzing the activities of the Arctic countries, it was proved that they expressed a special interest in this region in the period 2007-2021. This was manifested in the fact that all eight states, in particular the USA, Canada, Norway, Denmark, Russia, Iceland, Sweden and Finland, developed and approved their own national strategies in the Arctic region. Undoubtedly, each document had its own characteristics, which were expressed in the specific plans of a certain state. They also had common features, as the essence of such national strategies could be considered a response to contemporary societal challenges, namely climate change, geopolitical shifts in defined territories, increasing the priority of engaging in such activities in the Arctic as shipping and resource extraction.

While studying the USA's direct approaches to establishing influence and using resources in the Arctic territory, attention was focused on the fact that the beginning of this process was set on October 18, 1867. It was on this day that the Russian Empire sold Alaska to the USA, as a result of which the latter came under the jurisdiction of Washington. However, it was noted that the USA used this territory only for militarization during the Cold War, which indicated a lack of interest in Arctic resources at that time. A special role was played by the conclusion of the Geological Survey of the USA about the presence of high indicators of oil and gas in the Arctic region (Ferris, 2022). Based on this,

priority areas of work in the Arctic were described in the USA. In particular, the development of the region was envisaged in order to realize economic goals; access to the Northern transport routes; development and extraction of minerals; organization of scientific activities in cooperation with other states, due to data exchange. It was during the implementation of the directions listed above that one of the fields of conflict between the interests of the Arctic states took place. Accordingly, we are talking about Russia. This is explained by differences in the ideologies of these states, as well as approaches to regulating mutual relations. In particular, the formation of rigid «zones of influence» in which one state prevails over others is characteristic of Russia. This aspect definitely has a negative impact on the joint activities of the states in the Arctic, because it contradicts the main principles of international interaction, namely sovereign equality, unconditional compliance with international obligations, consideration of international disputes by peaceful means (Wegge, 2020).

Having characterized the peculiarities of Canada's activities in the Arctic, it was proved that it is quite active. This is explained by the fact that it was in Ottawa that the formation of the Arctic Council was initiated, in the form of an intergovernmental forum designed to implement the peaceful interaction of states in the Northern region. Canada's national policy regarding the Arctic region was revealed in such vectors as protection of the Canadian Arctic territory, provision of social and economic development, as well as protection of the natural resources of the Northern region. Representatives of this country paid considerable attention to improving the cultural and economic life of the local population of the Arctic. In its activities, Canada closely cooperated with the USA, in particular in the context of security and territorial protection, in response to the increase in military presence on the part of Russia. Canada is characterized by another area where its interests intersect with other states, Russia and Denmark (Sharapova et al., 2022). The object of their dispute is the

continental shelf, namely its division. Accordingly, the first application was submitted to the United Nations Commission for the purpose of extending Canada's northern border at the expense of the Lomonosov Ridge. At the same time, Russia defends the opinion that the Lomonosov ridge is a continuation of the Eurasian continent, and Denmark justifies the fact that it is a continuation of the island of Greenland.

Particular attention was also paid to Denmark's approaches, as it is the first country to begin full-scale scientific research on its own continental shelf. During her presidency of the Arctic Council, which took place from 2009 to 2011, she managed to develop the level of international cooperation in the Arctic, in particular through the adoption of the Agreement on cooperation on aeronautical and maritime search and rescue in the Arctic (2011). However, like the USA and Canada, Denmark is taking precautionary measures, in the form of an increase in Arctic defense spending in 2021, in response to Russia's increased military presence in these territories. As for Norway, its peculiarity is the consolidation of the Arctic status at the legislative level, namely in the document «Strategy of the Far North». Its provisions relate to the implementation of the national policy in the Arctic region, which is characterized on the one hand by prioritizing the preservation of the environment, and on the other hand by the formation and implementation of conditions favorable to Norway's oil and gas activities in the Barents Sea. The interests of this state intersected with the approaches of Russia, especially regarding the establishment of a maritime border in the Varanger Fjord, that is, in the Varyaz Bay. This conflict was resolved only in 2010, as a result of which the disputed territory was divided into two equal parts. A characteristic feature of the interaction between these two states was the conclusion of an agreement on the cancellation of the moratorium on oil and gas production in the territories that were divided between them (Rottem, 2020).

The peculiarities of the activities of Finland, Sweden and Iceland were also considered, as they are significantly different from the countries studied above. To a greater extent, this is due to the fact that, despite the fact that their territories are not adjacent to the Arctic Ocean, they border the Arctic Circle. Based on this statement, the listed countries cannot assert their rights and, accordingly, claim the territories that are economically beneficial. Their role in the development of the Arctic is extremely important. For example, although in Finland the national policy aims to use the economic potential of the Arctic region, at the same time its approaches are aimed at preserving and protecting the environment. In this context, special attention is paid to the areas of logistics, as well as infrastructure, including tourism. This is revealed in the fact that one of the main tasks of Finland is the formation of a railway connection, which will allow to establish access between the cities of Rovaniemi in Finland and Kirkenes in Norway. As a result of the development of such a connection, it is expected to create an opportunity to transport minerals, fish products, minerals, and natural resources contained in the Barents region. The priority is the development of the Northern Sea Route, due to which it would be possible to transport a large number of different goods.

As a result of studying the approaches of Sweden, it was established that it also officially belongs to the category of arctic countries, although its territory is not adjacent to the Arctic Ocean. Its main activity in the Arctic region is scientific and research in nature. This is explained by the fact that the most famous meteorological observations, as well as the study of snow and glaciers, take place at the Tarfala and Abiscu stations. The priority task of their national policy is to create a balance between the implementation of industrial activity in the Arctic and the protection of the unique environment. As for Iceland, it is an arctic country thanks to the island of Grímsey, which has a small territory inhabited by about 100 people. It is located in the Greenland Sea, it is this

property that determines Iceland's connection with the Arctic, since the Arctic Circle passes through this island. The interests of this country to a greater extent relate to the development of huge oil and gas deposits in the Icelandic Arctic, as well as the implementation of research activities in the northern region. Iceland's policy is not harsh or aggressive, as it does not make claims to other countries regarding the regulation of the Arctic region, and also actively promotes the development of trade and economic partnership in it.

The conducted analysis made it possible to establish that the interests of each of the Arctic countries intersect with each other. Of course, this provokes certain contradictions and misunderstandings. However, the conscious attitude of the representatives of different states to each other, as well as to the environment and the future of the planet, makes it possible to restrain their claims. The author believes that in order to avoid conflicts in the future, it would be advisable to clearly define the zones of influence of each of the Arctic states. This issue should be settled in such a way as not to ignore the interests of other non-Arctic countries, such as China, France, and Germany. This is possible only if the representatives of the countries conscientiously observe the norms of international law, as well as the main principles of international cooperation.

Discussion. M. Witt et al. (2021) in his study studied the struggle for the Arctic in the context of the implementation of international energy security. He managed to establish what energy resources are contained in this region and can be used in the future to provide both food and commercial purposes. He noted that the number of Arctic states will only increase due to the attractiveness of this region. This statement was justified by the advantageous geopolitical position of the Arctic, in particular its effective transport potential and even military-strategic advantages. All this leads to a significant increase in the attention and attractiveness of this region among different states, which as a

result can provoke conflicts between them. Including regarding energy resources, namely production and sale of oil, gas, coal (Auerswald, 2020).

Peculiarities of international legal regulation of the Arctic region were studied in their work by L. Heininen et al. (2020). They concluded that this process is based on universally recognized principles and norms established by international law. In their opinion, the main documents prevailing in international relations in the Arctic territories are the Geneva Conventions on the Law of the Sea (1958) and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (1982). In her work, the researcher managed to analyze doctrinal concepts not only in the field of international law, but also customary and contractual norms, including decisions of the UN International Court of Justice. It has been proven that the maritime territories of the Arctic region can be under the jurisdiction and state sovereignty of five coastal countries. It justifies the fact that the priority approach for the implementation of peaceful international cooperation in the Arctic is the conclusion of a special agreement between the Arctic states, namely Canada, Russia, the USA, Denmark, and Norway regarding their interests and joint responsibility among themselves.

Analysis of China's approaches to the Arctic region was carried out by M.T. Fravel et al. (2022). They noted that although this country does not belong to the Arctic category, it has interests in the territories and resources of the Arctic. They managed to establish that one of the main directions of China's activity is the development and provision of a new global trade route, which will definitely have a strong impact on its economy and the realization of its own interests. Unlike other states, China does not put forward plans for the militarization of the Arctic region, as it sees extremely high economic potential in these territories. The author also paid considerable attention to the extraction of resources, in particular energy resources, which are of interest to this state. However, this process is carried out by China indirectly, namely through

investments in such projects carried out by Russia, as it has the right to do so. The researcher substantiates the need for the active development of China's mutual relations with European states, since the success of the former in realizing its own interests depends significantly on the positions of the latter.

C. Holroyd (2020) paid special attention to the analysis of the interests of Asian states in Arctic resources. In her scientific work, she found that one of the main events for China, Japan and Korea was the acquisition of observer status in the Arctic Council in 2013. The approaches of the above-mentioned states are significantly different from the previous ones due to their geographical distance. Thus, the researcher managed to establish that Asian countries mostly adhere to the idea of globality of the Arctic and, accordingly, strive to give it the status of «world heritage». In this context, there are conflicts with the interests of the Arctic states, as they aim to divide the territories of the Arctic region and establish their own sovereignty over them. As for the direct national strategies characteristic of China, Japan and Korea, they contain three vectors, namely economic, environmental and political. The researcher managed to establish that the first lies in their desire to develop and use the energy resources of the Arctic region, as well as to create trans-Arctic sea routes, due to which it would be possible to significantly optimize the process of export and import of goods. Environmental interests are to a greater extent determined by climate change, which can have a sharp impact on the security situation in China, Korea, and Japan. It is because of this that they invest funds in projects aimed at protecting and restoring the environment, with the aim of slowing down the process of global warming. The author was able to identify their strategic interests, which relate to actively increasing the role of the Arctic in the international arena. Accordingly, such conditions provoke the desire of the Nearctic states to participate in the regulation of relations in these territories.

The approach of R.S. Naylor and C.A. Hunt (2021) to the study of the peculiarities of the struggle for the Arctic, particularly in the context of the tourism sphere, is special. They investigated the fact that the basis of the attractiveness of this region for tourists is definitely its geographical position, as well as special natural and climatic conditions. He reveals this issue from two points of view, namely positive and negative. The positive is reflected in the possibility of humanity to learn new territories related to the history of humanity in the past. The negative aspect is manifested in the likely detrimental effect of tourist routes to the Arctic. This is explained by the fact that the excessive activity of tourist vessels can cause drastic changes in the waters of the Arctic region, in particular their ecosystems. There is a possible negative impact on the ice sheet, where cruise liners are likely to dock. However, the researcher tries to model the priority, and most importantly, safe approaches to tourist activities for the environment. In particular, it is proposed to establish strict restrictions on such tourist routes, in particular the number of tourists, as well as their activities on land. It is extremely important to monitor the changes that will occur as a result of the implementation of tourism in the Arctic region, in order to respond in time and prevent the destruction of ecosystems.

Particular attention was paid to the work of M. Buse (2021), as it revealed the peculiarities of the Arctic policy of the European Union (EU). To a greater extent, they are determined by two directions, namely economic and environmental. Undoubtedly, the EU considers the Arctic as an important region with developed resource potential. This leads to the emergence of interest in the regulation of affairs in these territories. It is because of this that EU member states acquire the observer status of the Arctic Council, for example France, Germany, Italy, Poland, Spain. The Arctic attracts considerable attention of the European community due to dynamic changes in the environment. Accordingly, the glaciers of this region clearly reflect global warming, which causes an

increase in temperature and their melting. All this requires decisive action by the EU representatives. Thus, it can be established that the Arctic issue is on the agenda of the European Parliament. It can be resolved only through consensus with the Arctic states, as a result of which it is expected to control the ecological situation in the region, implement its sustainable development, support scientific research, and protect the interests of the indigenous population.

Based on the above analysis, it should be noted that the issue of international cooperation in the Arctic has a number of features due to the presence of a wide range of private interests among different states, in particular both Arctic and non-Arctic states. In this context, it is important to determine the priority directions that would avoid rivalry and conflicts in the Arctic region. This is explained by the fact that only in this case it is possible to establish and divide the interests of each of the states, as well as rationally approach their satisfaction, in order to avoid or slow down the harmful impact of human activity on the Arctic environment.

Conclusions. The work established that the Arctic currently attracts special attention of the international community. This is explained by the amount of resources contained in its depths and becoming more accessible due to the processes of global warming and the corresponding melting of the ice sheet. It was investigated that the desire to influence relations in the Arctic is put forward not only by the Arctic countries, which include Canada, Russia, the USA, Norway, Denmark, Iceland, Sweden and Finland, but also by European and Asian representatives. Of course, this only aggravates the situation regarding the distribution of the Arctic territories, as well as its resources between different states.

The field of conflict of interests of representatives of the international community regarding the regulation of the Arctic region was described in the study. In particular, the USA competes with Russia to a greater extent due to the

protection of its Arctic territories. In turn, Canada aims to expand its continental shelf, at the same time entering into conflict with Russia, which believes that the Lomonosov Ridge belongs to the Eurasian continent, as well as Denmark, which defends the idea that these territories are an extension of the island of Greenland. Norway's interests clashed with Russian interests during the distribution of its maritime borders. Iceland, Sweden and Finland, which do not have direct access to the Arctic Ocean, adhere to the principles of equality in their policy. In particular, their ideas do not conflict with the interests of other countries, as they are mostly of a research, i.e. scientific, nature. It should be noted that, in addition to the considered states, attention was paid to the fact that more and more European countries are receiving observer status in the Arctic Council. This trend indicates the priority of the Arctic region for the EU, both in economic, ecological and political contexts. Asian states, namely China, Korea, and Japan, also actively promote activities in the Arctic, with the aim of realizing their own tasks and interests in the future.

The conducted research shows the high economic potential of the Arctic. However, the author also pays special attention to the ecological component, which is definitely extremely important not only for the territories of this region, but also for the entire planet. Accordingly, states should cooperate not only to realize their common commercial goals, but also to protect the environment. In the following studies, it is worth analyzing effective methods of international interaction in the Arctic, taking into account the current conditions in society, which would make it impossible to form armed conflicts between countries regarding the impact on its territory.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Agreement on cooperation on aeronautical and maritime search and rescue in the Arctic. 2011. URL: <https://oaarchive.arctic-council.org/handle/11374/531>.

2. Auerswald D. P. Arctic narratives and geopolitical competition. In : *Handbook on Geopolitics and Security in the Arctic*. Cham : Springer, 2020. P. 251–271.
3. Boylan B. M. Increased maritime traffic in the Arctic : Implications for governance of Arctic Sea routes. *Marine Policy*. 2021. № 131. article number : 104566.
4. Buse M. The arctic region, European Union and climate change, as a global threat to security. *Bulletin of «Carol I» National Defence University*. 2021. № 10 (2). P. 64–68.
5. Depledge D. NATO and the Arctic : the need for a new approach. *The RUSI Journal*. 2021. № 165 (5). P. 80–90.
6. Ferris N. *The Enduring Threat to the Arts from Big Oil*. 2022. URL: <https://www.offshore-technology.com/sectors/the-enduring-threat-to-the-arctic-from-big-oil/>.
7. Fravel M. T., Lavelle K., Odgaard L. China engages the Arctic: a great power in a regime complex. *Asian Security*. 2022. № 18 (2). P. 138–158.
8. Gavrilova N. V. The role of the Arctic in the context of international energy security. *Actual Problems of Science and Exploration*. 2017. № 19. P. 141–143.
9. Geneva Conventions on the Law of the Sea. 1958. URL: <https://legal.un.org/avl/ha/gclos/gclos.html>.
10. Graczyk P., Rottem S. V. The Arctic Council : Soft actions, hard effects? In: *Routledge Handbook of Arctic Security*. London : Routledge, 2020. P. 221–233.
11. Heininen L. Overview of Arctic Policies and Strategies. *Arktika i Sever*. 2020. № 39. P. 195–202.

12. Heininen L., Everett K., Padrtova B., Reissell A. *Arctic policies and strategies – analysis, synthesis, and trends*. Laxenburg : International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, 2020.
13. Holroyd C. East Asia (Japan, South Korea and China) and the Arctic. In : *The Palgrave Handbook of Arctic Policy and Politics*. Cham : Springer, 2020. P. 319–332.
14. How many people live in the entire Arctic region. 2020. URL: <https://uk.myubi.tv/8627-how-many-people-live-in-the-entire-arctic-region>.
15. Ilulissat Declaration. 2008. URL: <https://arcticportal.org/images/stories/pdf/Ilulissat-declaration.pdf>.
16. Kachura M. Rains will replace snow in the Arctic in 2060. 2021. URL: <https://cutt.ly/z1chjc4>.
17. Kangasluoma S., Lempinen H. *Making of the Arctic dream-affective resources in the strategies of Arctic coastal states*. 2022. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2022.2091869>.
18. Naylor R. S., Hunt C. A. Tourism and livelihood sovereignty : a theoretical introduction and research agenda for arctic contexts. *Societies*. 2021. № 11 (3). article number : 105.
19. Ottawa Declaration. 1996. URL: <https://oaarchive.arctic-council.org/handle/11374/85>.
20. Pincus R. Three-way power dynamics in the Arctic. *Strategic Studies Quarterly*. 2020. № 14 (1). P. 40–63.
21. Rottem S. V. The Arctic Council : Between environmental protection and geopolitics. Singapore : Palgrave Pivot, 2020.
22. Serova N., Korchak E., Skufina T. The Arctic : strategic priorities of circumpolar countries. *Materials Science and Engineering*. 2020. № 753. article number : 072022.

23. Sharapova A., Seck S. L., MacLeod S. L., Koubrak O. Indigenous Rights and Interests in a Changing Arctic Ocean : Canadian and Russian Experiences and Challenges. *Arctic Review on Law and Politics*. 2022. № 13. P. 286–311.
24. Stokke O. S. Arctic Geopolitics, Climate Change, and Resilient Fisheries Management. *Ocean Yearbook Online*. 2022. № 36 (1). P. 440–474.
25. United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. 1982. URL: https://www.un.org/depts/los/convention_agreements/texts/unclos/unclos_e.pdf.
26. Väättänen V., Zimmerbauer K. Territory-network interplay in the co-constitution of the Arctic and «to-be» Arctic states. *Territory, Politics, Governance*. 2020. № 8 (3). P. 372–389.
27. Wegge N. Arctic Security Strategies and the North Atlantic States. *Arctic Review*. 2020. № 11. P. 360–382.
28. Who lives in the Arctic. 2020. URL: <https://kultura.poltava.ua/xto-zhive-v-arktici/>.
29. Witt M., Stefánsson H., Valfells A., Larsen J. N. Energy resources and electricity generation in Arctic areas. *Renewable Energy*. 2021. № 169. P. 144–156.

REFERENCES

1. Agreement on cooperation on aeronautical and maritime search and rescue in the Arctic. (2011). URL: <https://oaarchive.arctic-council.org/handle/11374/531> [in English]
2. Auerswald, D.P. (2020). Arctic narratives and geopolitical competition. In : *Handbook on Geopolitics and Security in the Arctic*, 251–271. Cham : Springer. [in English]

3. Boylan, B.M. (2021). Increased maritime traffic in the Arctic : Implications for governance of Arctic Sea routes. *Marine Policy*, 131, article number : 104566. [in English]
4. Buse, M. (2021). The arctic region, European Union and climate change, as a global threat to security. *Bulletin of «Carol I» National Defence University*, 10 (2), 64–68. [in English]
5. Depledge, D. (2021). NATO and the Arctic : the need for a new approach. *The RUSI Journal*, 165 (5), 80–90. [in English]
6. Ferris, N. (2022). *The Enduring Threat to the Arts from Big Oil*. URL: <https://www.offshore-technology.com/sectors/the-enduring-threat-to-the-arctic-from-big-oil/> [in English]
7. Fravel, M.T., Lavelle, K., Odgaard, L. (2022). China engages the Arctic: a great power in a regime complex. *Asian Security*, 18 (2), 138–158. [in English]
8. Gavrilova, N.V. (2017). The role of the Arctic in the context of international energy security. *Actual Problems of Science and Exploration*, 19, 141–143. [in English]
9. *Geneva Conventions on the Law of the Sea*. (1958). URL: <https://legal.un.org/avl/ha/gclos/gclos.html> [in English]
10. Graczyk, P., Rottem, S.V. (2020). The Arctic Council : Soft actions, hard effects? In: *Routledge Handbook of Arctic Security*, 221–233. London : Routledge. [in English]
11. Heininen, L. (2020). Overview of Arctic Policies and Strategies. *Arktika i Sever*, 39, 195–202. [in English]
12. Heininen, L., Everett, K., Padrtova, B., Reissell, A. (2020). *Arctic policies and strategies – analysis, synthesis, and trends*. Laxenburg : International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis. [in English]

13. Holroyd, C. (2020). East Asia (Japan, South Korea and China) and the Arctic. In : *The Palgrave Handbook of Arctic Policy and Politics*, 319–332. Cham : Springer. [in English]
14. *How many people live in the entire Arctic region.* (2020). URL: <https://uk.myubi.tv/8627-how-many-people-live-in-the-entire-arctic-region> [in English]
15. *Ilulissat Declaration.* (2008). URL: <https://arcticportal.org/images/stories/pdf/Ilulissat-declaration.pdf> [in English]
16. Kachura, M. (2021). *Rains will replace snow in the Arctic in 2060.* URL: <https://cutt.ly/z1chjc4> [in English]
17. Kangasluoma, S., Lempinen, H. (2022). *Making of the Arctic dream-affective resources in the strategies of Arctic coastal states.* DOI <https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2022.2091869> [in English]
18. Naylor, R. S., Hunt, C. A. (2021). Tourism and livelihood sovereignty : a theoretical introduction and research agenda for arctic contexts. *Societies*, 11 (3), article number : 105. [in English]
19. *Ottawa Declaration.* (1996). URL: <https://oaarchive.arctic-council.org/handle/11374/85> [in English]
20. Pincus, R. (2020). Three-way power dynamics in the Arctic. *Strategic Studies Quarterly*, 14 (1), 40–63. [in English]
21. Rottem, S.V. (2020). *The Arctic Council : Between environmental protection and geopolitics.* Singapore : Palgrave Pivot. [in English]
22. Serova, N., Korchak, E., Skufina, T. (2020). The Arctic : strategic priorities of circumpolar countries. *Materials Science and Engineering*, 753, article number : 072022. [in English]
23. Sharapova, A., Seck, S.L., MacLeod, S.L., Koubrak, O. (2022). *Indigenous Rights and Interests in a Changing Arctic Ocean : Canadian and*

Russian Experiences and Challenges. *Arctic Review on Law and Politics*, 13, 286–311. [in English]

24. Stokke, O.S. (2022). Arctic Geopolitics, Climate Change, and Resilient Fisheries Management. *Ocean Yearbook Online*, 36 (1), 440–474. [in English]

25. United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. (1982). URL: https://www.un.org/depts/los/convention_agreements/texts/unclos/unclos_e.pdf [in English]

26. Väättänen, V., Zimmerbauer, K. (2020). Territory-network interplay in the co-constitution of the Arctic and «to-be» Arctic states. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 8 (3), 372–389. [in English]

27. Wegge, N. (2020). Arctic Security Strategies and the North Atlantic States. *Arctic Review*, 11, 360–382. [in English]

28. *Who lives in the Arctic*. (2020). URL: <https://kultura.poltava.ua/xto-zhive-v-arktici> [in English]

29. Witt, M., Stefánsson, H., Valfells, A., Larsen, J.N. (2021). Energy resources and electricity generation in Arctic areas. *Renewable Energy*, 169, 144–156. [in English]

(Received on November 20, 2023)