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Abstract
The IPCC report from 2013 predicts radical temperature changes in the world the coming years, with a melting ice cap in the Arctic as consequence. According to geological research made by institutes and scholars from the Arctic states the Arctic is likely to hold the last remaining oil and gas resources of the world. The melting ice cap opens up for resource exploitation and for new naval transportation routes between Asia and Europe and North America. There is a debate over what geopolitical implications these natural resources and the new transportation routes will get for the surrounding Arctic states since the existing international regulations in some areas are inadequate. This debate is divided into two camps; one side argues that the Arctic states will act cooperatively when exploiting the resources and navigating the new transportation routes, while the other side predicts violent and conflictive state behavior. The objective of this study is to analyze existing and potential conflicts in the Arctic through the perspective of leading international relations theories in order to make projections of potential Arctic developments. As analytical tool the study applies a conflict analysis framework to structure and categorize both the findings and the analytical chapter. In this qualitative and abductive study the data has been collected through mainly official state and private documents and text analysis of these documents have been used as method. The study concludes that a combination of both cooperation and competition is likely to occur in the Arctic in future, but cooperation will be the first alternative of choice for states rather than conflict.
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1. Introduction

This chapter describes the basic contents and reasoning needed for the making of this study.

1.1 Research problem

During recent years the world has faced many consequences of global warming with meltdown of glaciers, raised sea levels, drought and water shortage among others. The Arctic Ocean is also being affected by the warming and it is predicted that within a few years there will no longer be an ice crust covering the entire sea but open waters will be a reality during parts of the year in parts of the ocean. According to the latest climate report from IPCC the ice crust on the Arctic is currently decreasing at a rate of 3.5-4.1% during the winter and 9.4-13.6% in summer (IPCC, 2013). The report states that by the end of the 21st century the reduction of ice will range from 43% to 94% in September and in February from 8% to 34%. But “A projection of when the arctic will be completely ice free in September in the 21st century cannot be made with confidence for the other scenarios” according to (IPCC, 2013, p. 17). However, given the numbers from the report is it very clear that during parts of the year areas of the Arctic will be ice free in the near future leading to potential disputes between the involved states, NGO:s, IGO:s, MNC:s and other actors engaged or interested in resource extraction. The Arctic is in contrast to Antarctica consisting of ice and water with no underlying landmass. Hence the melting ice crust opens up not only for resource extraction but also for new naval transportation routes. It is predicted that sea lanes through the Arctic would severely shorten shipping time between Asia and Europe. The emerging possibility of resource extraction and naval transportation in the Arctic raises the question of which country or countries that shall be in control of these activities. The scenario with new emerging sea routes could be related to the opening of the Panama Canal in year 1914 and the Suez Canal in year 1869 which dramatically shortened sea transportations. Suddenly it was possible to enter the Pacific and the Red Sea directly without being forced to pass Cape Horn in South America or the Cape of Good Hope in South Africa. However, both the Panama and the Suez Canal are artificial and where being planned and initiated by certain states while the Arctic open waters will become a reality without state influence. The Suez Canal was a reason for conflict¹ in 1956 when Egypt aimed to nationalize the waters and a war arose against France, Great Britain and Israel. A similar conflict happened with the Panama between Panama and the United States (Yao, 2012) and (Morewood, 2006, pp. 38-42). Even though the Arctic

¹ Conflict can in a wide definition be seen as clashes of interests where actors use conflictive behavior against each other to attain their incompatible goals. Conflict demands at least two parties and the intensity can be either violent or non-violent. (Wallensteen, 2007, pp. 8-15)
consist of a much larger area than the canals there is perhaps based upon these historical prejudices a risk that tensions might arise since the Arctic states do find these waters interesting for transportation.

The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea is the main agreement between states that regulates naval activities in the Arctic and the rest of the world. However the convention is not suited perfectly for newly accessible waters such as in the Arctic and the convention is as a consequence interpreted in various ways depending on what definition states chooses to use. The lack of a given definition of internal and international waters in the Arctic creates a risk for dispute concerning the control of navigation routes and resources since the Arctic states in certain areas have overlapping territorial claims (Jarashow, 2006, p. 1593).

The remarkable change of reduced ice crust is something that has never been experienced before. For all times in human history the Arctic has been covered by ice and hence not much attention has been put in the inner areas of the region with the exception of Inuit’s and polar scientists. These recently changed conditions will affect human activities in matters of transport and resource extraction, but weak, or even lacking, international regulations make the outcome more uncertain. Whether the international relations in the Arctic will turn out competitive or cooperative depends on the behavior and acts among the involved Arctic states. However the region has in its external areas faced conflicts before and there are currently a number of unresolved conflicts where states (Arctic and non-Arctic) disagree upon fishing- and hunting rights as well as border demarcation. These conflicts have been relatively latent but may resurface as new conflicts potentially arise.

The literature on the topic can be quite critical and pessimistic by predicting conflicts and by pointing out aggressive behavior from the involved actors, mainly referring to the Arctic riparian states (Russia, USA, Canada, Denmark, and Norway) but also oil, gas and mining companies (Borgerson, 2008, pp. 63-77). The literature can also on the contrary be more positively oriented in terms of pointing out the cooperation that is undergoing in the Arctic within the Arctic Council or through bi-lateral state agreements (Brosnan, 2011, pp. 173-210). In a general attempt to structure the existing literature one can argue that there are two distinct camps where one belief in a more conflictive future situation in the Arctic while the other favors the belief of a rather cooperative development. Much of the literature is produced by academics from countries that are involved in the Arctic and tends therefore to be biased and supportive of their own state. In general the Nordic and the North American
literature for example share a common attitude in portraying Russia (to various degrees) as a rough Arctic actor which does not always act in accordance with what is considered as customary international relations behavior. However literature deriving from non-riparian states such as Sweden, Finland or the EU seems to be less hostile towards Russia and believes in cooperation between the Arctic states (Kefferputs, 2010, p. 2). A further discussion over literature and authors will follow later in the study.

Until recently the Arctic has not been an issue in international relations due to its harsh climate and inaccessible location and much of the literature is as a consequence rather newly written. The literature tends to be rather biased and predicts either a more conflictive or a more cooperative arctic development which will be elaborated in the literature discussion. An interesting point of departure would therefore be to analyze the struggle for natural resources, navigation control and territorial claims in the Arctic from different theoretical perspectives in order to point out what alternative developments the region currently seems to undergo and how the development potentially could be projected. By applying more than one theoretical perspective, in contrast to the majority of the literature, this study will offer a broader understanding to potential conflicts in the Arctic as well as alternative future projections.

1.2 Relevance
For policy makers it is crucial to be presented scientific material that is unbiased. However, current literature comes mainly from countries that are directly involved in Arctic relations and tends to be favoring the country of the author’s origin. In order to avoid the risk of being biased this study seeks to present projections of the High North that are based upon more than only one theoretical framework. The study will contribute to the debate through the making of theoretical exercises that will point out various potential future developments. Since the literature concerning the Arctic is far from conciliated the use of more than one theory will enable the study to benefit and draw conclusions from a wider perspective.

This study is also relevant due to the new conditions in an, until recently, desolate and inaccessible area. The Arctic is a region located between some of the world’s richest and most developed countries and the outbreak of a conflict would affect millions of people globally. A study that contributes to this debate by offering alternative future projections is therefore of high importance for policy makers to make decisions that favors a cooperative Arctic development. Another factor that makes the study relevant is that the Arctic state’s claims in the region must be presented to the UN Commission on the limits of
the continental shelf (CLCS) by latest ten years after the signing of UNCLOS. These submissions create a risk for international disagreements and for the majority of the Arctic states the submissions have to be presented within the upcoming 2-3 years. Many of these claims tend to be overlapping and so far only Norway has submitted their claims with CLCS approval (Commission on the limits of the continental shelf, 2013). Due to its recent climate and geopolitical changes the public knowledge about the conflict potential in the Arctic is rather limited which reinforces the need for further academic studies on the topic. A study that seeks to offer alternative future projections and explanations of causes and behavior to disputes in the High North is needed in order to hopefully increase public awareness, further understanding and to enable the making of political decisions that favors a peaceful Arctic development.

1.3 Purpose
The objective of this study is to analyze Arctic relations from the perspective of Realism, Liberalism and Structuralism in order to make projections of the potential future developments in the High North.

1.4 Research questions
The first two questions will be objectively and descriptively answered in the findings chapter, while the third will be analytically answered in the analysis chapter through the use of international relations theories.

1. Who are the actors and what are their interests in the Arctic region?
2. What are the acts and causes generating conflicts in the High North?
3. How do the leading IR-theories interpret Arctic relations and the potential future developments in the Arctic region?

1.5 Methodological design
This is an abductive and qualitative desk study which will collect data through the method of document analysis. The study will not apply any surveys or interviews and nor will it receive any experiences from the field. This validates the use of document analysis in order to transform written text in documents to data for analysis. Data material will mainly derive from official state documents from the Arctic states and private documents as well as mass media outputs with English, French or Scandinavian languages.
1.6 Theoretical Design
In this study the basic foundation of the classic theories of international relations; realism, liberalism and structuralism will be applied in order to analyze the findings of the case and to make future predictions. Based upon these three theories an analytical framework will be made within the study in order to structure the findings chapter and the analysis chapter.

1.7 Structure of the thesis
This study will be divided into nine chapters. The first is an introduction chapter which presents the research problem and relevance of this study. Further it presents purpose, research questions and the methodological and theoretical design. Finally the first chapter delimits and limits the study.

The second chapter is the method chapter which gives a comprehensive discussion concerning the method used in the study. In the second chapter a literature debate will also be included.

The third chapter discusses the theories of realism, liberalism and structuralism that will function as theoretical frameworks within the analysis chapter in this study. This chapter also presents a conflict analysis framework that is based upon the theories. This analytical framework offers certain categories that are to be used while structuring the thesis.

The fourth chapter serves as a background chapter that introduces the reader to historical events and international agreements that are important for the understanding of the findings chapter.

The fifth chapter presents the findings of this study. In the findings chapter the Arctic case will be presented objectively through the conflict analysis framework. In this chapter the various actors, interests, causes and behavior will be examined as well as the Arctic states official strategies in the region. The last part of the findings chapter presents the Arctic conflicts, both old and potentially new ones.

In the sixth chapter the Arctic relations will be analyzed through the perspective of the leading international relations theories; realism, liberalism and structuralism. The analytical chapter will also use the conflict analysis framework in order to structure the analysis. By the use of these theories future predictions of the development of the Arctic relations will be made.

Hence, the first two research questions are intended to be answered objectively in the findings chapter while the third research question will be answered separately in the
analytical chapter through the use of the theories.

The study will in its seventh chapter bring the conclusions drawn from the findings- and analytical chapter together and seek to offer its own geopolitical future predictions of the Arctic. The eight and very last chapter is presenting the references of the study.

1.8 Limitations and delimitations:
In an interpretative qualitative study it is almost impossible to separate the researcher’s historical context from the research. The data material needed for the research derives mainly from western sources leading to a potential misinterpretation of the Russian Federation and its actions in the Arctic. There exists Russian literature but due to lingual barriers the study will not be able to include those that are not written in English. The study is limited to primarily secondary sources which demand an awareness of the potential subjective nature of the authors. Also primary sources such as official state strategies may be misleading.

This study will serve as a desk study. A desk study limits the researcher in personal experiences of the culture and nature in the focused area of the study but allows the researcher to get insight through documents which are normally relatively easy to access and implies no costs. The study is delimited to include the most classic IR-theories such as realism, liberalism and structuralism in order to analyze the case. An inclusion of further theories would demand a larger amount of time to accomplish.
2. Methodological Framework
This chapter gives a comprehensive discussion of the method used for this study.

Qualitative research is a research strategy that often is employed in order to answer questions of why and how of human behavior, opinions and activities. The aim is to create an understanding of the social world by examining the interpretations of the world by its participants (Bryman, 2004, pp. 266-269). This kind of information is harder to get through more quantitative methods of data collection (Creswell, 2007, p. 259). Within this study the collection of data will primarily be focused on official documents from states and official documents deriving from private sources such as researchers, companies and organizations. In order to get information concerning recent activities and developments mass media outputs will also be interpreted and serve as data material in this study.

Data material deriving from official state documents can be seen as authentic and comprehensive for the researcher. However state documents might still be biased, in fact that can very well be the reason for why they are of interest to study and interpret, because of the biases they reveal. Therefore the researcher needs to be cautious if attempting to consider the documents as true descriptions of reality. The same reasoning applies to official documents deriving from private sources since people who write documents are equally likely to be biased. Documents cannot be regarded as giving objective opinions to, in this case, state affairs. As a consequence each document needs to be examined and interrogated in a context and in comparison with other data. The use of mass media outputs as data material raises the issue of authenticity and credibility. However, just as with state and private official documents it is the uncovering of inaccuracy that can be in the core of interest for the researcher (Bryman, 2004, p. 390).

While analyzing documents there are three approaches within the qualitative research method: qualitative content analysis, semiotic analysis, and hermeneutic analysis and the first approach will be applied in this study. In a qualitative content analysis the researcher generates certain categories that will guide the collection of data in the various documents interpreted. In this case the analytical framework of conflict analysis in international relations offers certain categories that are to be applied throughout the study (Johnson, 1995, pp. 244-245). The categories of actors, interests, causes, attitudes, behavior and conflict outcome will be applied in order to interpret the data in the findings chapter and for analyzing the findings in the analysis chapter.
This research will be of an abductive nature which is a method used to construct descriptions and explanations of society based on behavior and activities made by actors. Abduction refers to a social scientific description of the social life as it is described by the actors themselves. In abductive reasoning there are two stages in the process of research: the first describes the activities and the meanings of them and the second creates categories and concepts that can serve as a base for the understanding and explanation of a certain problem or phenomenon. Abduction as a method is closely related to interpretivism since it is used to discover why actors behave and act in a certain way by detecting tactics, meanings and interests. In abductive studies the researcher has no preconceived ideas that will be tested through research but rather tries to apply many hypotheses in order to understand what the cause to a certain act is. Abductive methods can be applicable while trying to answer questions of why actors act in a certain way and observation thereby becomes crucial to reach an understanding and a hypothesis. (Lewis Beck, 2004).

2.1 Literature debate
As has been mentioned earlier the debate over the melting ice and its consequences in the Arctic has created two camps of opinions and in the literature there seems to be no consensus over the potential future development in the High North. The uncertainty of the Arctic has also made authors formerly belonging to one side of the camp change opinions over time. The following North American, European, Russian and Nordic authors are some examples of researchers possessing acknowledged insight in Arctic relations, which are of importance for the making of this study. Borgerson (2008), Zysk and Konyshev are researchers that predict that competition will be more apparent in the Arctic than cooperation. Borgerson (2013), Kefferputz and Brosnan are researchers that instead predict a cooperative Arctic development.

Scott Borgerson, member at the American council of foreign affairs and senior fellow at the Institute for global maritime studies, published in 2008 an article “Arctic Meltdown” in the journal of Foreign Affairs. In this article he discussed the political implications of a changing Arctic with melting ices and he predicted an armed conflict in the region. He argued that the lack of strong international regulations and the richness in natural resources would create conflict among the Arctic states (Borgerson, 2008, pp. 63-77). Borgerson has in many forums been a strong advocator for increased US influence in the Arctic which he deemed necessary to stabilize the region and avoid conflict. Still he saw armed conflict as nearly unavoidable. However, in year 2013 Borgerson published a new
article “The coming Arctic Boom” in the journal of Foreign Affairs with a different opinion. In this he still recognizes the risks of the changing conditions in the Arctic but he points out the many steps made towards cooperation. He highlights the US ratification of the Ilulissat Declaration which aims to regulate peaceful settlements for Arctic claims, and so does the new directives given in UNCLOS. Borgerson admits in this recent article that he was among them predicting conflictive future in the Arctic. His changed opinion comes from what he sees as good Arctic governance due to fiscally balanced surrounding states that has developed a strive for profit rather than territorial conflicts (Borgerson, 2013, pp. 2-7).

Roderick Kefferputz, political advisor to the EU Committee on Foreign Affairs and member at the Centre for European Policy studies, shares the viewpoint that the Arctic states are increasingly focusing on cooperation. Kefferputz argues that too much critique is labeled against Russia and the western media and policy community criticize Russian Arctic policy to a degree that is not accurate. According to Kefferputz foreign governments, media and experts tend to focus only on Russian military maneuvers which they deem belligerent and fails to see the finer nuances and intricacies of Russian Arctic interests. Instead Kefferputz argues that the Russian policy is much more complex and does not differ largely to the ones of the Nordics and Canadian Arctic policies, rather Russia together with the Arctic states shows great cooperative behavior. As examples of Russian cooperative behavior he raises the fact that Russia contrary to the United States has signed UNCLOS and that they submitted their Arctic territorial claims legally to CLCS, steps that favors a cooperative Arctic development according to Kefferputz (Kefferputs, 2010, pp. 1-4).

Katarzyna Zysk is senior fellow at the Norwegian Institute for defense studies and she agrees with both Borgerson (2013) and Kefferputz (2010) upon the development of a more cooperative rhetoric in Arctic relations the latest years. However Zysk labels more skepticism towards Russia than Kefferputz and she does not believe that the changed Russian rhetoric is accurate; rather it is just a game. According to Zysk’s article “Russia’s Arctic strategy: Ambitions and Constraints” Russia has indeed changed their rhetoric and attitude in Arctic relations to become more of a cooperative nature. However Zysk argues that the rhetoric is misleading and fake. She does not believe that the real intentions of increased Russian military presence in the High North would be the defense of terrorism at sea and to combat smuggling, which is stated in Russia’s Arctic Policy strategy document. Instead she argues that Russia is determined to set clear that the Russian Federation is the most dominant actor in the Arctic and political, economic and military means will be applied in order to
achieve this dominance, no matter what their diplomatic rhetoric looks like. Conflicts are therefore likely to come. Zysk argues like Kefferputz that Russia legally submitted their territorial claims to CLCS; however their submission was rejected by the Commission. According to Zysk this will therefore only imply that Russia continues with their Arctic activities without an international support, which is possible with a strong military presence. Hence Zysk argues that the Arctic relations officially seem cooperative but that they in fact risk turning out more conflictive and violent. (Zysk, 2010, pp. 106-109).

Valery Konyshev, professor at St. Petersburg University and one of the monthly authors in the Russian Politics and Law Journal argues in his article “The Arctic at the crossroads of geopolitical interests” from 2012 that there is and will continue to be a militarization of the Arctic with a focus on competition rather than cooperation (Konyshev, 2012, pp. 35-39). However, Konyshev labels contrary to Zysk critics against the United States’ Arctic policies as reason for the conflictive relations in the Arctic rather than against Russia. According to Konyshev United States refuses to ratify UNCLOS and sees the Arctic Council as a non-important forum merely for discussions over environmental issues since USA is the riparian state with the smallest Arctic territory and thereby legally less influential. By opposing giving the council power to make binding decisions the United States preserves their freedom to act in the Arctic Konyshev argues. The US Arctic freedom will according to Konyshev be preserved by increasing economic and military activities in the region. In Konyshevs article he also raises the issue of an increased NATO engagement in the High North. According to Konyshev NATO has declared a new priority that is the global competition over resources and since 2008 the alliance has substantially increased its Arctic activities in order to consolidate its grip over the region. He argues that even nonaligned states such as Sweden and Finland now engages in NATO Arctic maneuvers which brings those states closer to the alliance with likely future membership (Konyshev, 2012, pp. 40-41). The combination of increased US interest in the Arctic and increased NATO military maneuvers aimed directly against Russia shows that there is a militarization going on in the Arctic with high risks for conflict as consequence Konyshev argues.

Ian Brosnan, professor in Ocean development and international law at Cornell University, argues in his article “Cooperation or conflict in a changing Arctic?” from 2011 that there is much more evidence for a cooperative future in the Arctic than what many are predicting (Brosnan, 2011, p. 202). The reason for why this has not been seen and understood by the public masses is because it has not yet become salient. The incentives to cooperate in
certain areas have not materialized but are likely to do so since the common theme in the strategies of the coastal states are cooperation. However, Brosnan points out that it is more likely that the cooperation will be bilateral rather than multilateral and he condemns the idea of a common Arctic Treaty that will regulate all Arctic activities. Brosnan sees conflict as a future Arctic possibility depending on states policies which are stated in their strategies, which is why he holds cooperation as more likely. Cooperation between the riparian states are already ongoing in many ways such as observation and rescue networking and Brosnan believes that the cooperative alternatives in resource development are more profitable for the states than conflict (Brosnan, 2011, p. 203).
3. Theoretical framework

This chapter will discuss the theories that are to be used as frameworks in this study.

The most dominant and widely used theories applied while analyzing international relations are realism, liberalism and structuralism and these will here be explained for. Focus will be put on the perspective of international relations within the theories. Below realism, liberalism and structuralism will be described, followed by a discussion of why to apply these theories in this study.

3.1 Realism

The realist theory is one of the dominant theories within the field of international relations and its center of analysis is power. According to realists the states are the actors that possess the greatest power and therefore focus is mainly directed on them within the theory. In fact, states are by realists seen as the only actor existing; other actors exist only on the will of states. In realism analysis of international politics other actors such as international organizations, NGO:s and multinational corporations are relatively rarely examined since they are considered to have no power. The combination of states and power as main focus of the realists leads them to consider the international arena as purely anarchic. Since there is no international authority the international arena is characterized by anarchy with a so called self-help system where states seek to take advantage of each other (Hall, 2009, p. 35). The survival of the states depends on their alliances and their strong power in terms of economics and military. Hence, the states hold a basic skepticism to progress in international politics and the conviction is that conflicts in the end get resolved by war. (Jackson, 2003, p. 68).

Within foreign policy the aim is to project and protect the interest of the state in world politics. The most important actors in world politics are the greatest powers and international relations are by realist understood as a struggle between these for power and security (Dunne, 2007, p. 55).

The normative core of realism is national security and state survival and the state as such is seen to be essential for the good of its citizens by guaranteeing security and welfare. International agreements are provisional and depending on the willingness of the states that sign them. All states will in case of a conflict with their own self-interest abandon international obligations. Conventions, customs, rules, laws and other agreements should be considered as expedient arrangements that will be of second priority if interfering with national interests (Jackson, 2003, pp. 68-70).
Each attempt by a state to enhance its own security tends to be seen as a security threat to other states. This is by realists called the security dilemma of international relations and it can only be avoided if states manage to create a scenario with balance of power. When states count each other as equally strong and powerful they will avoid war (Hall, 2009, p. 39). The balance of power creates a polarity between states which is fundamental to analyze for realists in order to detect whether the trend is towards war or peace. (Dunne, 2007, pp. 75-80).

3.2 Liberalism
The liberal perspective on international relations is built on the assumption that all individuals and states are rational actors that share a capability to regulate their relation to others in a world that is characterized by mutual interdependence. Peace, freedom and prosperity can be achieved through cooperation for the common good and the process of modernization and strive for progress leads to an increased international cooperation between states. The theory argues contrary to realism that also other actors than merely states matter in international relations. International organizations, NGO:s and transnational corporations as well as others can affect world politics (Dunne, 2007, pp. 90-91).

According to liberalists the state is pluralistic and their acts are a consequence of the concurrence and behavior among domestic interest groups. A state’s internal structure is affecting how they act in their foreign policy. A common perception among liberalists is for example that democratic states are less eager to go to war than their autocratic counterparts. States that are governed by a population that protects and preserves human freedom and rights are to be seen as peaceful. In other words democratic states are peaceful since war and violence is not generally accepted and legitimate in a democracy. War is seen as something more than pure costs and is considered illegitimate in other cases than of self-defense since it is violating the individual’s right to life and self-determination. In order for a democratic state to go to war it is necessary to get support from its people. However, democratic states are still prepared to go to war and they do so. The reason for this could according to liberalists be that the democratic states seek to impose democratic values and to free the people populating the autocratic states or war is used as self-defense. Nevertheless, the relative historical absence of conflicts between democratic states serves as a good support for the theory. Another liberalist explanation to the absence of war is that a democratic state to a larger extent favors free trade and open relations with the world. Interdependence and international institutions between states is crucial to maintain peace. The global interdependence implies that humans and states are mutually dependent on each other for their survival, development and prosperity which is
why states always will gain from cooperation. Instead of seeing the world as a zero-sum game as the realists the liberalists advocates a plus-sum game with good chances for prosperity and progress for all parts. International institutions are needed in order to counteract the suspicion states have against each other which can lead to short term advantages instead of long term cooperation. (Jackson, 2003, pp. 109-120). A final explanation to the democratic peace is according to liberalism their focus on absolute gains instead of relative gains. Absolute gain stating “As long as we do well it does not matter if others do even better” instead of a relative gain stating “we will do our best, but the number one priority is that the others don’t get ahead of us” (Jackson, 2003, p. 129). If all states focus on absolute gains they will know that none will get attacked by the other since all parts gains from cooperation. This is also one of the reasons for why democratic states to a larger extent have been the founders of inter-state cooperation systems (Ericson, 2009, p. 65).

3.3 Structuralism
The theoretical paradigm of structuralism is a critical theory that includes a variety of theories originally based on Marxism. Marxism as such is more of a societal and philosophical theory than a theory dealing with international politics. However many theories concerning international relations has developed with Marxism as base.

All politics, national and international, is about a class struggle and the state is a tool for the ruling class to dominate the lower classes. A state is not neutral since policies are affected by the internal class struggles and which class that gains power (Bjereld, 2009, pp. 69-71). The international capitalistic system has developed into an imperialistic system where resources from the poor areas of the world are brought to the capitalists in the rich part of the world. Differences in living standard between rich and poor will be maintained until the capitalistic system has been abandoned. War is by structuralists explained as a strive for rich countries to maximize profits and to keep their privileged situation by fighting against those who try to overthrow the system. War can be taking place between capitalist states, which was the case during the First World War where states tried to enhance their position against other rich rivals. Or wars can be fought between capitalistic and socialistic states like in Korea or the Cold War between USA and USSR.

Lenin developed in 1917 a theory about imperialism which argues that capitalism has reached its final phase when it turns into imperialism. Since all capitalists strive to maximize their profit, bigger and more powerful capitalists will eventually destroy the smaller leading to
monopoly capitalism where the market is divided between the most influential cartels. In this scenario financial and ruling capitalists together create oligarchies with absolute power over the economic development. In order for the capitalists in such financial oligarchy’s to maximize their profits they need to conquer new markets, which are found in the developing world. The aim for profit will lead capitalistic states to war, against poorer states or between themselves (Jackson, 2003, pp. 184-193).

Inspired by the theories of imperialism is the dependency theory which during the 60s and 70s received an international breakthrough. The theory seeks to explain underdevelopment of the third world as a consequence of the dependency as certain countries in the periphery have on capitalistic industrial countries in the core center of the world. The capitalists in the core countries have allied themselves with the ruling class in the periphery such as land owners and local capitalists in order to exploit the resources in the area. That will hinder a development of the periphery. (Hettne, 1995) (Dunne, 2007, pp. 149-156).

3.4 Theories to apply
In order to analyze the case with the High North and its recent development both realism and liberalism are very suitable to use as theoretical frameworks. They are the dominating classical international relations theories and they can provide explanations and projections regarding actions, actors and causes. The explanations offered by realism and liberalism are also distinctly different which makes it easier for analyzers to see which alternative outcomes there are in certain specific cases where the theories have been used. Therefore these two theories are obvious choices that will be applied in this study. However it is less clear whether structuralism can be used in an effective manner.

Structuralism sure is a dominating classic theory used within international relations and other fields. However its focus on rich vs. poor, core vs. periphery and north vs. south does not really apply perfectly in this case where the High North is consisting of neighboring advanced and developed states. In those areas where structuralism recognizes not only exploitative factors such as for example rich capitalistic state wars the realism theory can just as well be applied with their explanation of war. The fact that the states surrounding the Arctic Ocean in a global comparison are the world’s wealthiest does not favor the use of the dependency theory or the general idea of richer exploiting the poorer. Although it is in order to make a comprehensive study still crucial to apply all of the three most dominating IR-theories that exists. Structuralism theories will therefore be necessary to use and will serve as a base in this study. However, the reader and researchers must be aware that the analytical
result deriving from realism and structuralism risk being similar to each other, but for different reasons and by different actors. The Arctic case with both ongoing and potential future conflicts will be analyzed through classic realist, liberalist and structuralist frameworks.
### 3.5 Analytical Framework

The main arguments within realism, liberalism and structuralism on international conflict will be summarized into a conflict analysis framework that will be used throughout the whole study. The categories from the framework will serve as structure in the findings chapter while both categories and the arguments of the theories will be applied in the analysis chapter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Realism</th>
<th>Liberalism</th>
<th>Structuralism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actors</strong></td>
<td>States are seen as the main actors with the only real power. However states can function through for example international organizations in order to solve conflicts. Other actors exist if states are gaining from their existence.</td>
<td>Together states, IGO: s, NGO: s, MNC: s, rebels and individuals among others form the primary actors (in direct relation with conflict), the stakeholders (that gain from conflict) and the third actors (which are mediators that help primary actors to cooperate).</td>
<td>The core states and the poorer exploited periphery are seen as primary actors. The stakeholders in conflict are seen as capitalist corporations and people that exploit poorer and less powerful people. Core states dominate the international institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actors interests</strong></td>
<td>States are interested in the pursuit of power, in economic, political or military terms.</td>
<td>Varies from state preferences in a range of peace, progress, wealth, justice and to impose democratic values.</td>
<td>Capitalist core states seek to maximize profits and to maintain their privileges. Richer states aim to exploit the poorer states.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Causes to conflict</strong></td>
<td>Conflicts arise as a consequence of clashing national interests between states and when there is no balance of power.</td>
<td>Conflict is not natural and arises when there is no free market and little interdependence. Undemocratic states go to war.</td>
<td>Conflict is a struggle between capitalists and the proletariat. It is a struggle between capitalist states that seeks to create an imperial oligarchy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict Attitude</strong></td>
<td>The international arena is anarchic where the strongest states survive. State relations are an egoistic zero-sum game.</td>
<td>Relations between states are a plus-sum game which should focus on absolute gain instead of relative gain.</td>
<td>The capitalist system must be abandoned since it is exploitative. War is a result of rich countries trying to maximize their profits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict Behavior</strong></td>
<td>States develop alliances and military power, often with war as consequence. They seek balance of power and tend to ignore existing co-operation.</td>
<td>Democratic states are cooperative and peace oriented. Cooperation and compromises are reached through a free market (interdependence).</td>
<td>War is used as tool by capitalists to conquer new markets and to bring resources from the poorer to the richer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict outcome</strong></td>
<td>Conflicts can be resolved by reaching a balance of power between states. War will be the result if states reach no balance of power.</td>
<td>States can through cooperation resolve conflicts. A free market and interdependence keeps states from conflict. International institutions enable a peaceful world order.</td>
<td>Conflicts are resolved by reaching social equality. Only on the initiative of people an equal distribution of resources can be reached.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Background

This chapter gives the information needed for the understanding of the findings in the study.

4.1 History

Human engagement in the Arctic has historically been relatively rare by three reasons. First of all the characteristics of the region such as permafrost, glaciations and extreme temperatures have limited human activities. Furthermore the region is situated far from the centers of human civilization. Second, all attempts to settle the area in order to use it either for military or economic reasons have been limited by technological advancement and costs which has been put in relation to potential gains. Third, it was not until the 19th century as states showed any interest in the Arctic since it mentally had been a non-existing region and only small discovery and research expeditions had been initiated (Chrastansky, 2012, p. 113).

In the beginning of the 20th century the core center of the Arctic were not being discovered but the areas close to the Arctic Circle were getting attention. This was leading to for example disputes concerning Svalbard between Norway, the Netherlands and Great Britain over fishing and hunting rights. This dispute lead to the Svalbard Treaty in 1920 which was signed by originally 14 states (39 states today), including all the members of the Arctic Council, China, Japan and the larger European states. It aimed to regulate fishing, hunting and mining and allowed equal rights to the surrounding waters. But it also gave Norway the sovereignty of the Svalbard archipelago. Today this treaty is a reason for dispute since Norway claim that the treaty signing states do not longer have the right to the maritime areas within the 200 nautical miles zone of archipelago. (Churchill, 2010, pp. 551-554).

During the Cold War the Arctic became interesting for military reasons and aviation, submarines and missiles represented a militarization of the region at that time due to the fact that Arctic was and still is the shortest connection line between the continents of Asia, Europe and North America. However, during the Cold War the region was not seen as anything more than a strategic important area for submarines and bombers (Wezeman, 2012, p. 7)

In 1996 the Ottawa declaration were signed by the Arctic states USA, Russia, Canada, Sweden, Norway, Finland, Denmark and Iceland and by that the Arctic Council were created. (Arctic Council, 2013).

---

2 For a definition of the Arctic see Appendix 1
4.2 UNCLOS
The leading international treaty on maritime rights in the world is the UN convention on the law of the sea (UNCLOS) from 1982 that came into force in 1994 when 60 nations had signed the treaty. With this treaty the amount of waters that countries can claim as internal were extended to 200 nautical miles (370 km). The consequence of this adjustment was that formerly international straits became internal and a necessity to provide the international community with transit passage arose. If a strait links oceans or Exclusive economic zones (EEZ) the UNCLOS allows international vessels to navigate former international straits that became territorial with the treaty. However, despite creations of transit passages and detailed description of what rights ships has through internal straits the UNCLOS have not offered a complete definition of what constitutes internal straits and which straits used for international navigation that carries the right of transit passage which opens up for various definitions. As a result the Northwest Passage in the Arctic is a reason for dispute between Canada and USA which will be elaborated later in this study (Jarashow, 2006, p. 1609).

The UNCLOS allows states to make claims of the waters that are within 200 nautical miles from the state border. However, in the Arctic case the coastal states are according to article 76 in the convention allowed to extend their sovereign rights up to 350 nautical miles from their coast if they are able to prove that the underwater ridges on the Arctic seafloor is an extension of the continental shelf of the country. The United States have not ratified the UNCLOS convention and thereby they cannot according to international customary law make any territorial claims in the Arctic. As a complementary treaty Canada and USA have signed the Arctic Cooperation Agreement from 1988 that regulates the bilateral cooperation between the two states. However, the issue of the Northwest Passage and which country that possesses the shipping rights remain unresolved.
5. Findings
This chapter is structured in accordance with the analytical framework of this study and will present the results that the study has found.

5.1 Actors
By applying the analysis framework it can be found that there is a wide range of actors present and engaged in different fields of the Arctic. Depending on which theory used the actors can be said to be states, IGO: s, NGO: s, MNC: s, companies, universities, tourists and the 4 million people inhabiting the area.

States
There are five states considered as Arctic coastal states; Russia, Canada, United States, Norway and Denmark and they are referred to as the A5. However Sweden, Finland and Iceland are included as Arctic states since parts of their territory is situated within the Arctic Circle. Together these states form the eight permanent members of the Arctic council (A8). (Arctic Council, 2013). The A5 states are regardless of theory to be seen as the most dominating actors in Arctic relations. They are the states that border the waters of the Arctic Ocean and they are they only states that legally can make territorial claims in the region according to the UN CLCS.

Among the A5 states Russia is the state which currently possesses the greatest means of power in the region. Russia’s territory borders nearly half of the Arctic Ocean, the country has the largest majority of ice breaking vessels in the world and also the world’s biggest population living within the Arctic boundary. Further Russia is the state that so far has been most active in terms of economic activities in the Arctic. United States is despite its economic and military power in world politics the smallest state actor in the Arctic among the A5. USA possesses the smallest territory bordering the Arctic (through Alaska) and in total USA only has one state controlled ice breaking vessel active in the Arctic. (Wezeman, 2012, p. 7). In comparison Sweden, being an Arctic state without bordering the Arctic Ocean, has 8 state controlled ice breaking vessels, whereof one is active in the Arctic Ocean (Sjöfartsverket, 2013).

Canada is next to Russia the state with the largest Arctic landmass, population and amount of ice breaking vessels and is naturally the second most influential state actor in the Arctic besides Russia. The Canadian Arctic landmass consists of thousands of islands with both frozen and open waters in between.
Denmark get access to the Arctic through Greenland and the Faroe Islands and does through these islands in total have an Arctic population of 100 000. Greenland is the world’s biggest island which is a self-autonomous part of Denmark. Norway borders the Arctic Ocean in the north and through Svalbard and the Norwegian maritime areas in the Arctic is 1 500 000 km2, which corresponds to the size of France, Germany and Spain together. Around 470 000 Norwegians live within the Arctic boundaries, a tenth of Norway’s population (Arctic Council, 2011). The Nordic countries except Iceland does since 1961 share a cooperative fleet of ice breakers which are being used in Nordic waters and which are also contracted to Arctic ice breaking expeditions (Udenrigesministeriet, 2000, p. Art. 6).

Further states engaged in the High North are despite their geographical location China, South Korea and Japan which all seeks influence in the Arctic through for example ice breaking expeditions, even though they are not bordering the area. (Reuters, 2012). Additional states which are engaged in the Arctic but to a lower degree than the A8 is the Arctic Council observer state members; France, Germany, the Netherlands, Poland, Spain, United Kingdom, India, Singapore, Italy, China, South Korea and Japan (Arctic Council, 2013).

**Intergovernmental Organizations**

Intergovernmental organizations such as the United Nations and the Arctic Council are actors that functions regulative for the states involved in the region. The United Nations involvement is performed through their organs and international conventions such as the UNCLOS, which will be examined later. However the Arctic Council is by the A8 seen as the main intergovernmental body dealing with Arctic issues (Brosnan, 2011, pp. 173-210).

**The Arctic Council (IGO)**

The council is a high-level intergovernmental forum which aims to provide means for cooperation, coordination and interaction between the Arctic states with involvement of indigenous communities and other Arctic inhabitants on common Arctic issues. The council has besides its state members six permanent organizational members. The Arctic council functions as an arena not only for its permanent members but also for all of the council observers.
Besides the permanent and observer states and the permanent NGO members there are nine intergovernmental and inter-parliamentary organizations given the status of observer in the Arctic Council:

- The international federation of red cross and red crescent societies (IFRC),
- International union for the conservation of nature (IUCN),
- Nordic Council of ministers (NCM), Nordic Environment Finance corporation (NEFCO), North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission (NAMMCO),
- Standing Committee of the Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region (SCPAR),
- United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UN-ECE),
- United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP). (Arctic Council, 2013)

**North Atlantic Treaty Organization (IGO)**

Since four out of the five coastal Arctic states are NATO members the alliance cannot ignore the region and its development. However within NATO there are different views upon the level of engagement the alliance should have were Norway favors a strong role and Canada on the contrary favors a very small NATO influence in the Arctic. At the moment the alliance is performing air and maritime surveillance and keeps a unit ready for natural disaster response. NATO performs military exercises every year in the High North with Norway and Sweden as main host countries (NATO, 2012, p. 1).

**European Union (IGO)**

The European Union has today three and with a potential Icelandic membership four state members that are among the eight permanent members in the Arctic Council. Together with the observer states in the Arctic Council the EU has nine states that are somehow active in the Arctic. As a union the EU has presented its own Arctic Strategy and the Commission has stated that further focus on the Arctic-EU relations should be developed. The EU has applied for being a member in the Arctic Council but the submission has so far not been approved (European Union External Action, 2013, p. 1).

**Non-governmental organizations**

There is a huge amount of various NGO:s active in the arctic that seeks to preserve wildlife, environment or indigenous people’s rights. The Arctic NGO Forum is an organization that
aims to coordinate different NGOs on one platform in order to strengthen their positions and enhance their chances to get access to policy makers. The European Commission Directorate General for the Environment together with UNEP is providing funding for the Arctic NGO Forum. Among Arctic NGO Forum’s partners one finds: Greenpeace, WWF, International Polar Foundation, Indigenous peoples secretariat, Arctic North, Alternatives North, Alaska Wilderness League, Bellona Foundation, Circumpolar Conservation Forum, Earth Justice, Friends of the earth, Northern Forum, Oceana, Pacific Foundation, University of the Arctic, Wetlands International (Arctic NGO Forum, 2013).

However it is only WWF among the Arctic Forum members that has been granted observer status in the Arctic Council. In the council there are currently eleven Non-governmental organizations given the role as observers:

- Advisory Committee on Protection of the Seas (ACOPS)
- Arctic Cultural Gateway
- Association of world reindeer herders (AWRH)
- Circumpolar conservation union (CCU)
- International Arctic science committee (IASC)
- International Arctic social science association (IASSA)
- International union for circumpolar health (IUCH)
- International work group for indigenous affairs (IWGIA)
- Northern Forum (NF)
- University of the Arctic (UArctic)
- World Wide Fund for nature –global Arctic program (WWF). (Arctic Council, 2013)

Companies

There is a large amount of enterprises that are or seeks to become engaged in the Arctic. There are shipping and transport companies such as the Danish Maersk, Russian Rosatomflot, Norwegian Artic Shipping AS and the Canadian North Eastern Arctic Shipping (NEAS) that represents the dominating shipping companies. But besides these there are more additional shipping companies that deals with fishing, tourism and cargo transport in the Arctic. Among privately owned firms there are larger multinational corporations within the mining, oil and gas industry such as Shell (Anglo-Dutch), Statoil (Norwegian), Gazprom (Russian), Rosneft (Russian), Panarctic Oils Ltd (Canadian), Chevron (Canadian), Atlantic Richfield Company
5.2 Interests

The Arctic is considered to be very rich in resources and geologists are today doing research about how much there is under the melting ice cap and to what extent they are accessible for man. The resources in the Arctic that are of interest for the actors consists of mainly natural resources such as oil, gas, minerals and fish but also the possibility for new naval transportation routes (Lindholt, 2007, pp. 31-36). However, figuring out the interests of states in the Arctic is a risky business due to the uncertainty in the sources giving that information. The states as such do not clearly reveal what their interests are and the data in this study henceforth comes mainly from secondary sources, whose sources in turn can be questioned. But by extracting and analyzing the official Arctic state strategies, which will be presented later in the study, a researcher might detect certain areas of potential interests together with other officially claimed interests.

Oil and gas

The first discoveries of oil in the Arctic surroundings were made by Russia in 1961 with the Tazovskoye oil field and by the United States in Alaska with the Prudhoe Bay Field in 1967. Since then around 61 large oil and gas fields have been discovered whereof 43 are placed in Russia, 11 in Canada, 6 in Alaska and 1 in Norway (Ernst&Young, 2013, pp. 2-14).

The US geological survey together with Norwegian Statoil Hydro released in 2008 the first widespread report on Arctic oil and gas resources. In this report 25 out of 33 Arctic sedimentary provinces were held as likely to contain oil and gas deposits larger than 50 million barrels. The report concluded that within the entire Arctic there are likely more than 90 million barrels of oil and 1.669 trillion cubic feet of gas and 84% of it is expected to be found offshore in the sea. These numbers of oil and gas deposits would correspond to approximately one fourth of the remaining undiscovered oil and gas resources in the world (USGS: United States geological survey, 2008, pp. 1-4).

The Russian state controlled Oil Company Gazprom already today has approximately 113 trillion cubic feet of gas in production in their part of the Barents Sea. The Russian ministry of natural resources estimates that the territory claimed by Russia in the Arctic might contain as much as 586 billion barrels of oil. As a comparison Saudi Arabia’s current oil reserves (that are internationally acknowledged) amount approximately 280 billion
barrels. The Russian calculations widely exceed the estimations made by the USA and Norway (Borgerson, 2008, pp. 63-77). No matter which figures that are correct there is so far no doubt that there are large amounts of oil and gas in the Arctic.

**Minerals**

Besides oil and gas the Arctic is rich in various minerals. However, due to the large amount of existing minerals in the Arctic only the major will be brought up. The arctic current percent share of minerals is the following: Coal 2.1%, Iron 2.3%, Nickel 10.6%, Cobalt 11%, Chromite 4.2%, Tungsten 9.2%, Zinc 7.8%, Palladium 40%, Copper 3.8%, Gold 3.2%, Silver 3.6%, Platinum 15%, gem-diamonds 26%, industrial diamonds 23.3%. (Lindholt, 2007, pp. 31-36)

Russia extracts the largest amount of these minerals but the other Arctic states also have specific extractive importance. Sweden corresponds to three quarters of the iron production for example. Due to the shrinking ice cap it is expected that further minerals might become accessible for industry and increase the Arctic share of global mineral providing. The Kola Peninsula, the Taymyr Peninsula, the Kara Sea and the East Siberian Sea are locations with high estimated numbers of minerals that seems to increase. Currently drilling is undergoing by Russia on the Kola Peninsula close to the Norwegian border. (Russian Academy of Science, 2007).

**Fisheries**

When it comes to fishing the Arctic is divided into four marine ecosystems: the North-East Atlantic (the Barents Sea and the Norwegian Sea), the Central North Atlantic (the waters surrounding Iceland, Greenland and the Faroe Islands), North-Eastern Canadian waters (Newfoundland and the Labrador area) and the Northeast Pacific (Bering Sea). The total catch of wild fish in these four areas amounts 7.6 million tons which corresponds to approximately 10% of the world’s total catch. The catch of shrimps and crabs equalizes around 5.3% of the total catch in the world and fish farming of trout and salmon 7.7%. Commercial fishing in the Arctic is of recent origin starting in the 1950s in the North Pacific, due to technical barriers and climate conditions. However it is expected that the warming of waters and shrinking ice cap will make the ecosystems richer in species leading to an increase in commercial fishing. The increase in catch has been seen already in the fishery of sardines and anchovy which have increased with 25% in a decade and the catch of codfish and herring today makes up 65% of the total catch in the world (Lindholt, 2007, p. 34).
Sea routes and transportation

The Arctic is in contrast to Antarctica consisting of ice and water with no underlying landmass. Besides pure resources there are henceforth interests in Arctic transportation possibilities due to the melting ice cap. By now there are two major sea-lanes in focus. The Northwest Passage (NWP) and the Northeast Passage (NEP); which are expected to shorten contemporary oceanic transit times to a large degree (Konyshev, 2012, pp. 35-41). If for example the NEP would be fully navigable it would shorten the transportation time for trade vessels between Rotterdam and Yokohama from today’s 11 500 nautical miles through the Suez canal to less than 6 500 nautical miles, equalizing a saving of more than 40% in transport. The NWP on the other hand would shorten the route between Rotterdam and Seattle with 2000 nautical miles, equalizing a 25% shorter transportation time. For those ships that are too big for transportation through Panama and Suez such as the Danish Maersk the savings would be even greater since they no longer would have to sail around the Cape of Good Hope or Cape Horn (Borgerson, 2008, pp. 1-7).

Official strategies by the Arctic riparian states

The Arctic 5 states have presented official Arctic strategy documents stating their interests in the Arctic and their plans for the region in future. Within these strategy documents certain categories of interests can be extracted as common interests among the A5-states such as scientific research, environmental protection, resource exploitation, security, sovereignty assertion and social-economic development in the Arctic. However, a critical analysis of the strategies and the interests mentioned could lead to the conclusion that rather small focus will be put on scientific research and environmental protection in comparison to what efforts there will be made and are made in the area of for example resource extraction. Although, all the interests tend to get equal attention in the strategies.

State strategies tend to lean towards the category of behavior, however the strategies are also revealing certain interests and therefore it will be presented in this chapter as interest rather than as behavior. The interests presented in the strategies will be examined country wise below.
Russia’s Arctic strategy

In Russia’s “Strategy towards the Arctic until 2020 and beyond” from 2008 the interests of the country is clearly formulated. The main Russian objective in the Arctic is to integrate military, environment, economics, social and political aspects in a multidimensional way. This means that “soft” and “hard” policy aspects shall be co-existing. It is stated in the document that the aim of the strategy is to transform the Arctic region into a future resource base for Russia and that it should be done through increased investment, protection of Russian borders and safeguarding of Russian territory. “All kinds of activities in the northern regions are in the highest degree connected to providing of national security” and the strategy propose steps towards “actively counter strengthening of military infrastructure and enlargement of military activities” (Zysk, 2010, pp. 104-108). The strategy also highlights the importance of ensuring environmental safety, science promotion and the contribution to international stability.

The strategy is built upon five central pillars:

1. Social and economic development with focus on resource extraction and an increased use of the Northeastern Sea route;
2. State border protection and military security;
3. Protection of the environment that includes preservation of the Arctic and control over human impacts on the environment;
4. Scientific research concerning climate change, exploitation of resources and impacts on social issues;
5. Foreign relations that includes the establishment and maintenance of bilateral agreements and determining the limits of the continental shelf beyond the 200 nautical miles zone. (Brosnan, 2011, p. 180).

Based upon these pillars one could critically argue that soft interests such as social issues, protection of the environment and scientific research will achieve less focus by the Russian government in comparison to hard interest such as state border protection and the focus on resource extraction. But of course one cannot and should not rule out the possibility that Russia will accomplish to give equal attention on social issues as on economic, despite of what is written in the strategy.
Norway’s Arctic strategy

According to the Norwegian Arctic Strategy the High North is seen as the most important strategic priority area the coming years. The main political priority in the Arctic in the strategy document is stated to be exercising of authority in the High North. Increased presence of armed forces, police and prosecuting authorities is seen to be vital for maintaining stability, security and crisis management in the area. In order to exercise Norwegian sovereignty and Norway’s role in resource management it is crucial with the presence of the Norwegian Armed Forces. Special focus is directed towards Svalbard and its surrounding waters. Besides military activities the Norwegian Strategy document is very cooperative in its nature and attention is put on the relations with Russia with whom Norway have conflicting interests (Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2006, pp. 10-20). The Norwegian strategy is built upon 8 major pillars:

1. Foreign policy with focus on the environment, energy, regional forums and the Norwegian Armed forces;
2. Increasing the knowledge in climate, marine, polar and petroleum research;
3. The situation of the indigenous population;
4. Cultural exchange between the people inhabiting the Arctic;
5. Management and effective use of marine resources;
6. Petroleum activities;
7. Naval transportation;
8. Developing business in the Arctic. (Brosnan, 2011, p. 180)

Four out of these eight pillars focuses on economic interests and four focuses on soft aspects. However one can question how strong the Norwegian state interest are in the 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th pillars if these for instance would be threatening the interests of petroleum, naval and military activities.

Denmark’s Arctic strategy

In Denmark’s strategy for the Arctic 2011-2020 directives for security and sovereignty in the Arctic are presented. An Arctic military commando is created together with Denmark, Greenland and the Faroe islands that shall be able to protect sovereignty claims and surveillance in the Arctic. The military units shall be able to make risk analysis of the expected increased traffic and activity in the area. Closer cooperation with other Arctic
partner states is advocated in the strategy document in order to protect and maintain good relations between the coastal states (Udenrigsministeriet, 2010, pp. 19-21). The Danish strategy is built upon 11 major pillars:

1. Danish home rule;
2. Claiming sovereignty with physical presence and shelf mapping;
3. Nordic and Arctic cooperation;
4. The rights and protection of indigenous people;
5. Developments in the energy and mineral sector;
6. Protecting and using natural resources in a sustainable way;
7. Focus on environmental issues with global warming and pollution at the core center;
8. Research upon the impact of climate change and pollution;
9. Development of shipping infrastructure;
10. Increased commerce and industry;
11. Cultural cooperation. (Brosnan, 2011, p. 180)

Once again a critical analysis of these pillars could rule out those priorities that does not directly relate to economic interests. Cultural cooperation, focus on the environment and pollution and the rights of indigenous people could be seen as in reality less important for the Danish state than the interests in developing the Arctic shipping and energy sector.

**Canada’s Arctic strategy**

In Canada’s Arctic Strategy “Our North, Our Heritage, Our Future” it is stated that the geopolitical interest of the Arctic region has become greater than ever and the Canadian nation is therefore aiming to launch an ambitious northern agenda (Government of Canada, 2009, pp. 8-10). The Canadian strategy is built upon 5 major pillars:

1. Exercising Canadian Arctic sovereignty through physical presence and by mapping the continental shelf in order to extend the continental margin;
2. Protecting the environment through scientific research;
3. Increase and promote social and economic development by exploiting resources and perform infrastructure developments;
4. Improving and developing a northern governance;
5. Foreign policy shall focus on bilateral projects with Arctic partners and improve the status of the Arctic Council (Brosnan, 2011, p. 180).
The first and the third pillar represents most likely the dominating Canadian interests in the Arctic while for example the protection of the environment through scientific research could be seen as of less importance for the Canadian state.

**United States Arctic Policy**

In the United States Arctic policy document from 2009 it is stated that the US has “broad and fundamental national security interests in the Arctic region”. In the document it is said that the US shall take all actions necessary to establish the outer limits of the continental shelf, but besides that no direct claims of territories are made.

However, both the Northwest Passage and the Northeast Passage are seen as international waters used for U.S and world navigation and the freedom of those seas are considered top national priority. The United States seeks to preserve the rights and duties related to navigation in the Arctic and will aim to increase their ability exercising those rights, throughout the world, including the Arctic straits (National Security Presidential Directive , 2009, pp. 3-5).

Since the United States is not part of the UNCLOS convention their interests in the Arctic is not as dominant as for their Arctic neighbors. The United States have not presented an official strategy document as the rest of the A5 but instead a minor policy document with 6 areas of interest.

1. Arctic and national homeland security;
2. International governance;
3. An extension of the continental shelf and boundary issues;
4. Scientific cooperation;
5. Economic and energy focus;

Compared to the other A5 states the United States is more unclear with stating their interests and how they will achieve them considering that they have not produced a strategy document (only a policy document) nor possess all the necessary means to exercise power in the Arctic, such as ice breaking vessels. Anyhow USA could still be said to possess greater interests in economic and energy areas rather than a focus on safeguarding living maritime resources and environmental protection.
5.3 Existing disputes and potential sources of conflict

Formerly unregulated waters in the arctic such as the Barents Sea “Loophole”, the Norwegian Sea “Banana Hole” and the areas beyond the arctic states’ EEZ in the North Pole has become reason for dispute with climate change, technological advancement and the legitimate changes of EEZ giving state’s sovereignty beyond 200 nautical miles (Chrastansky, 2012, p. 125). In combination with newly arising risks for disputes as consequence of the emerging sea-lanes there are also older territorial disputes where states currently seeks control over natural resources in waters claimed as internal territorial waters.

With both the Northeastern Passage and the Northwestern Passage there are unresolved statuses upon the straits within these sea-lanes. The NEP and the NWP are consisting of a series of routes between islands which raises the question of whether these routes are to be considered as internal or international. The NWP is located mainly within Canadian waters and the NEP is located mainly within Russian waters but there are various opinions on to what extent these states actually can regulate naval transport on these sea-lanes since states defines and interpret the straits differently. The lack of agreement between the Arctic states arise when trying to define whether the sea-lanes passes through areas that are internal waters between islands and mainland, territorial waters within 12 nautical miles, contiguous waters within 24 nautical miles or if the lanes are part of states exclusive economic zones within 200 nautical miles. Furthermore, due to UNCLOS a state’s sovereign rights might be extended to 350 nautical miles from the coast if the underwater ridges are proven to be extensions from the continental shelf of a country (United Nations convention on the law of the sea, 1994) and (Chrastansky, 2012, pp. 120-125). In the UNCLOS it is stated that within ten years from the signing of the convention a state must present relevant geological data to CLCS in order to prove potential territorial or naval claims in the Arctic. Both old and newly emerged territorial and naval claims will be regulated through CLCS. The Arctic states are therefore at this moment in the process of presenting territorial claims with geological data that will support their submissions. The A5 states are the only states that legally can claim territory in the Arctic Ocean (Commission on the limits of the continental shelf, 2013).

The non-Arctic states do not possess the international legal right to claim territory in the Arctic, but it does not keep them from getting involved in the region. Chinese ice-breaking vessels are for example on a general basis navigating through the Arctic naval passages. Since China lacks legal possibility to make Arctic claims in terms of territory they
are cooperating with Iceland by establishing and funding a port infrastructure in the northern parts of Iceland in order to get access to the High North transport potentials. South Korea has also for instance built a floating oil drilling unit in the Norwegian Goliat oilfield in the Barents Sea (Reuters, 2012). Despite this the fact remains that the only states able to claim territory in the Arctic Ocean are the A5.

5.4 Behavior triggering conflict

Russia

Russia became the first state to officially claim areas of the Arctic in 2001 when they presented evidence that the Lomonosov Ridge (that stretches from Siberia to North America) was an extension of the Siberian continental Shelf to CLCS. The Russian claim would extend the country’s EEZ all the way up to the North Pole and by this 45% of the Arctic would become Russian. However CLCS postponed their definite decision and suggested Russia to complete their submission with further accurate geological data (Commission on the limits of the continental shelf, 2013). So far Russia’s claims have not been approved by CLCS.

Russia is among the Arctic states the most prominent actor in the Arctic considering their economic, military and demographic capabilities in the area. Not to forget is Russia’s 20,000 km Arctic borders that are the largest among the Arctic states. Since 2008 new military formations have been established in Murmansk and Archangelsk together with a new Arctic brigade and an Arctic Spetsnaz (military Special Forces). The Cold War military airbase on the Siberian island Kotelny is being reopened and a new navy base is established with modern military ice-breaking vessels. In Russia’s official Arctic strategy it is explained that these military formations have been established in order to combat terrorism at sea, smuggling and illegal migration (Kefferputs, 2010, p. 10) and (Staalesen, 2013, p. 1).

In 2007 Russia planted their flag on the Arctic seafloor of the North Pole as a lead of their claims of the Lomonosov Ridge. This was not positively met by the Arctic States, especially Canada and Denmark since they also claims the ridge as part of their continental shelf (Lovett, 2007).

Norway

In 2006 Norway presented their submission to CLCS claiming an area that in total encompass 235,000 km2 in the so called Arctic Banana Hole and the Loophole. The CLCS approved the Norwegian claims. But in the former area contesting claims have been made by Iceland and
Denmark/Greenland and in the latter Russia is claiming the waters. (Norweigian Petroleum Directorate, 2006). The claims are dominated by a dispute with Russia and bi-lateral negotiations between the countries are therefore undergoing regarding the status of the Loophole close to Svalbard.

Norway, as being a NATO member arranged in March 2012 “Cold Response”, the largest Arctic military maneuver since the Cold War with more than 16 000 troops and the objective of the exercise was to improve operations in high intensity wars and terrorist threats (Forsvarsmakten, 2013). According to SIPRI Norway’s policy is still strongly focused on Russia but has shifted to potential conflicting interests in the Arctic area with other actors (Wezeman, 2012, p. 7).

**Denmark**

Denmark needs to present their Arctic claims to CLCS the latest by year 2014. The Geological Survey of Denmark and Greenland seek to prove that the continental shelf from Greenland reaches to the North Pole on a distance of 380 nautical miles. If this claim would become approved by CLCS parts of the by Russia claimed Lomonosov Ridge becomes Danish. The Danish claims are also contesting with Canada in terms of the North West Passage and its navigation control. Hans Island is an uninhabited rocky island of 1.3 km area placed in the Kennedy Channel between Canadian Ellesmere Island and Greenland’s Northwestern coast that is claimed by both Canada and Denmark in order to control the navigation through the passage. Since 1980 Canada and Denmark have been taking turns in “occupying” the island and neither the territory nor the surrounding waters are defined in terms of sovereignty. (Jarashow, 2006, p. 1593).
Hans Island in the Kennedy Channel is a small island that is crucial for navigation control in the North Western Passage. (Picture from maps.google.com).

Canada

Canada is next to Russia the country with the largest amount of Arctic landmass and is the second most influential state actor in terms of military, economic and demographic resources in the Arctic. In 2008 Canada presented their claims in the Arctic to the International Geological Congress in Oslo and provided evidence that the Lomonosov Ridge is a natural extinction of the North American continent through the Ellesmere Island. This claim does directly contest Russian submissions but favors the interests of Denmark which also seeks to prove that the ridge is an extension from North America (but through Greenland). Further the Canadian federal government issues seabed mapping of the Arctic in order to extend the Canadian continent shelf in the areas of the Grand Banks and the Flemish Cap. With these claims Canada would encompass another 1.75 million square kilometers in the Arctic beyond the current 200 nautical miles limit (Loukacheva, 2009, p. 87).

Furthermore there is a dispute among Canada and the United States in the Beaufort Sea between Yukon and Alaska were Canada claims the area to be within the Canadian maritime boundary. The United States is together with Russia and Denmark opposing the Canadian claim of the Northwest Passage which by the United States is seen as international waters and not as internal (Loukacheva, 2009, p. 87). In 2009 the Canadian House of Commons renamed the Northwest Passage to the Canadian Northwest Passage to mark their stance upon the passage being internal waters of Canada (Pettersen, 2009, p. 1).
The Canadian government announces in their strategy document that they will strengthen Canadian presence in the Arctic by establishing a new army training center in Resolute Bay, expanding the military reserve force Canadian Rangers, providing military presence and surveillance and building a new military base on the northern part of the Ellesmere Island. Further investments are made in the coast guard fleet with 8 new armed ice-breaking vessels in order to patrol the Northwest Passage. In 2001 Canada established new regulations “Canada Shipping Act” where all vessels entering Canadian Arctic waters (claimed by Canada) became forced to report to the Canadian Coast Guard (Government of Canada, 2009, pp. 8-10).

**United States**

United States is despite the country’s seize economically and military the weakest state actor in the Arctic. As an example the country in total only possess one ice-breaking vessel and this one is considerable old in comparison to other Arctic state’s naval capacities. United States is also the Arctic 5 state with least landmass bordering the Arctic Ocean. Through Alaska the United States borders the Arctic Ocean but due to internal political disagreements the UNCLOS have not been ratified by the US and therefore they are not legally able to submit any claims to CLCS (Chrastansky, 2012, p. 126). Since the Georg W Bush administration the incentive from the American governments has been to ratify the UNCLOS convention, but the senate rather sees that the US operates independently in the Arctic. The senate argues that the US Navy together with international customary law is enough to secure US interests in the Arctic. The sole US icebreaker is placed in the Arctic in order to gather geological data that can be used for legally making claims in the Arctic in case of a changed decision in the US senate. As of by now, the United States is placed in a group of 7 remaining states that have not yet ratified the UNCLOS (Borgerson, 2008, pp. 63-77).

**5.5 Arctic conflicts**

Three categories of conflicts can be identified in the Arctic if including territorial border conflicts and by combining the interests in the Arctic that are stated in the A5: s official strategy documents with the claims submitted or in the process of submission to the CLCS. The conflicts detected concerns (1) border demarcation, (2) control over straits and sea lanes and (3) continental shelf demarcation. The first category consists of conflicts that have been ongoing for several decades, the second are recent potential conflicts arising as consequence
of the changed climate conditions and the third is a result of the UNCLOS convention. (Chrastansky, 2012, p. 117)

**Conflicts concerning border demarcation**

In this first category there are five ongoing and unresolved border demarcation conflicts:

1. The Russian Federation versus the United States concerning the border in the Bering Sea, in this case the countries have overlapping EEZs and fishery regulations. This conflict where about to be resolved in 1990 when a bilateral agreement where presented and signed by the United States. However the Russian Duma has chosen not to sign the agreement and therefore it never came into force.

2. The United States versus Canada concerning the border in the Beaufort Sea. In this case USA argues that the border that covers an area of 22 600 km has not been defined and the USA possess the right to resource extraction of seafood, oil and gas. However, Canada refers to an agreement between Great Britain and Russia from 1825 when Alaska was still Russian which defined the border between Alaska and Yukon. The agreement demarcated the border by using the term “as far as frozen ocean” which today becomes open for discussion considering that the ocean is no longer frozen. Due to this conflict no production or resource extraction is yet taking place in the disputed area.

3. Canada versus Denmark concerning Hans Island in the Kennedy Channel where the parties cannot agree upon the ownership of the island. Hans Island is a 1.3 km large rock with no inhabitants or resources. However it possesses a strategic importance for transport through the channel and the surrounding waters is said to be rich in oil. No agreement has so far been reached.

4. The Russian Federation versus Norway concerning the border in the Barents Sea. Norway claims and area of 176 000 km2 in the Barents Sea based upon a median approach that is not applied by Russia which therefore do not approve the Norwegian claims. The waters in the Barents Sea are compared to the northern parts of the Arctic Ocean more accessible for industry which makes resource extraction likely and oil, gas and fishery are of interest. Through the Gray Zone agreement from 1978 fisheries is regulated between Norway and Russia but the conflict over the border is still ongoing.
5. Norway versus Russia and the signing states of the Svalbard treaty concerning the status of Svalbard. In 1920 a multilateral agreement assigned Spitsbergen (Svalbard), the Bear Island and the minor islands between these two major islands to Norway with full sovereignty. However the agreement established the right for the 14 originally signatory states\(^3\) to equal use of natural resources in the area. By the time of the signing it mainly meant fishing and hunting but today’s situation offers different resources. The convention made it illegal to establish military bases and the use of the islands for military purposes but both Norwegian and Russian armed forces are patrolling the area. Norway do not recognizes the original treaty rights and claims total sovereignty over the islands. Russia in turn is the only state still claiming the rights of the Svalbard Treaty (Churchill, 2010, pp. 554-557). (Brosnan, 2011, pp. 173-210), (Chrastansky, 2012, pp. 117-123)

**Conflicts over straits and sea lanes**

The second group of conflicts concerns the control over the several straits within the Northeastern and the Northwestern passages. The waters of these sea lanes borders Canadian and Russian territory but whether these two states possess the right to control naval activities is interpreted differently. Canada sees their sea lane as being part of internal waters while USA among other states sees the NWP as waters only within Canadian EEZ where state jurisdiction is limited. Canada seeks to achieve maximum control over the Northwestern passage while other state’s favors freedom of navigation. In the case of the Northeastern passage the route mainly passes within Russian EEZ and not as internal waters. However Russia still provide for the rules and instructions for those passing through the NWP.

The graphics below shows the two major sea lanes currently used for navigation. Each lane consists of many alternative routes between various straits. It is expected that with melting ice even shorter alternative routes through the center of the Arctic Ocean will become possible (Borgerson, 2008, pp. 63-77).

\(^3\) The signing states of the Svalbard treaty were France, Great Britain, India, Japan, USSR/Russia, USA, Sweden, Denmark, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa.
Continental shelf conflicts

The most recent group of conflict in the Arctic developed as a result of changes in the UNCLOS convention. In the Arctic Ocean the waters beyond the territorial waters have been considered as international and part of the common human heritage. However technological advancements and changed climate conditions have made states interested in these waters and claims of sovereignty has been presented as a result. In order to regulate the activities in the Arctic Ocean and to avoid overlapping claims by states changes were made in the UNCLOS. These reforms expanded state’s EEZ further than the 200 national maritime borders and became based upon the continental shelf instead. As long as state’s can prove the outer limit of their continental shelf they can make claims in the ocean (United Nations convention on the law of the sea, 1994). However these proofs tend to be overlapping. Overlapping claims have been made by Canada, Russia and Denmark concerning the Lomonosov Ridge and by Norway, Denmark and Russia concerning the “Banana Hole” and the Arctic Loophole (Jarashow, 2006, pp. 1603-1609).
6. Analysis

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze the findings in this study from the perspective of the theories realism, liberalism and structuralism. The categories from the study’s conflict analysis framework will be applied for each theoretical part of the chapter.

6.1 Arctic relations from the perspective of realism

Actors

From a realist perspective it is only states that possess any real power and the five riparian Arctic states are the ones having the main attributes to influence and control the Arctic. The study has found that Russia possesses the largest amount of military personal deployed in the Arctic, the largest Arctic territory, largest Arctic population and that their Arctic fleet is bigger than the others combined. Among the A5 states the realists would therefore consider Russia as the state with the strongest attributes of power to protect and expand their Arctic interests.

The United States can in this case according to realism be seen as the least influential state among the A5 considering that they possess the smallest Arctic territory, one ice breaking vessel and in general are less engaged in Arctic issues. In this way the United States is less influential than Norway and Denmark. However, USA is among the western A5 states the only one with access to nuclear weapons. Therefore a realist would claim that in terms of balance of power USA is despite its lacking capabilities in other Arctic matters the only state that balances Russia in the Arctic. China does neither border the Arctic nor the Arctic Ocean but in terms of instruments of power a realist would see them as a future actor to count on. However, a realist would say, they are currently far behind their Arctic 5 counterparts and these will not without struggle open up for further states’ Arctic engagement.

Despite the existence of IGO: s and NGO: s and other non-state actors in the Arctic a realist would not consider them having any true power to influence Arctic policies. The UNCLOS, the Arctic Council or CLCS among others just exist since states somehow finds that they might gain from their existence in certain scenarios. A realist would argue that their very existence depends on the good will of the states and might disappear or become non-functioning if states so decide. Hence, in realists reasoning it is possible that certain institutions and non-state actors are contributing to the interests of certain states, while other states might find the institutions as useless and the states can therefore choose to ignore them.
**Interests**

According to realism national security and state survival is a highly definite interest in the Arctic. The states that get access to the Arctic resources will strengthen their general capabilities in national and international relations. A realist would argue that the number one Arctic interest for the A5 is to pursue power by increasing their economic activities in the region such as oil drilling, gas exploitation and naval transportation. In this case also structuralists and liberalists could be said to agree but their interests would be for different reasons.

However, in realism theory, to get access to these resources without risking armed conflict it is also in the interest of the A5 states not to disturb the balance of power and aggravate each other or the international community. That would be the reason for why the interests of these states officially are focused on environmental protection, cultural exchange and the safeguarding of maritime life. While in fact those are not the interests of the states a realist would argue, but rather excuses used to avoid public focus on heavy industries that could disturb such economic activities. Furthermore, realists would see the interests in combatting terrorism and the interests in rescue surveillance as simple reasons that enable the A5 to deploy armed units in the region. A realist would claim that those units in fact are used for the defense of the economic interests of the states and not primarily for rescue operations.

**Causes**

According to realism conflicts arise as a consequence of clashing interests which in the Arctic becomes more evident due to the melting ice cap. Realists would argue that the United Nations and the Arctic Council fails to provide a strong authority that gives clear directions to the involved states and as result the anarchic system allows the states to act upon their own will. Further realists would argue that states put themselves and their interests first, which is why states interpret existing agreements concerning border demarcation differently. The revised article in UNCLOS that allows states to expand their territory up to 350 nautical miles has increased the speed in which states are getting engaged in the Arctic. For a realist it would be obvious that the changes in UNCLOS were initiated by, and made for, the A5 states in order for them to expand their respective territories in the Arctic. For a structuralist however it would be seen as something that was made by the core states in order to be able to exploit the resources of the Arctic, while a liberalist would see it as proof for how cooperatively the states are solving their territorial conflicts.
Despite non-functioning international institutions according to realists, a realist find reasons for why armed conflicts have not yet become an imminent fact in the Arctic. The states surrounding the Arctic are all developed and economically strong and therefore the region has currently a balance of power. Through the military power of the United States and through the alliance NATO, the states Denmark, Norway and Canada manages to balance the otherwise in Arctic matters military stronger counterpart Russia. A realist would see this western military alliance as the reason for why Russia increases their military spending. Both realists and structuralists would argue that the consequence of this polarity is that the Arctic has seen an increased militarization where Russia and the NATO A5 seek to balance each other with increased military activities on each side. A realist sees such developments as something potentially causing conflict through for example preemptive attacks.

**Behavior**

A realist would argue that the A5 are trying to consolidate their balance of power by establishing new military formations in the Arctic. However the realists would also say that this current balance has not kept the states from acting in such a way that their interests are easily understood by other states. A realist would argue that when Russia planted their flag on the Arctic seafloor they sent a clear signal to their counterparts that they considered the Arctic as Russian. Planting a flag is nothing illegal but still very effective in portraying the interests without causing conflict. Canada can be said to have done the same thing according to realists when they renamed the Northwestern Passage to the Canadian Northwest Passage, stating clearly to the United States that navigation on the western parts of the Arctic will be done through Canadian supervision. The fact that Canada and Denmark take turns in conquering Hans Island with military troops reveals to realists that the states are both eager to portray what they want to achieve but also eager not to disturb the balance of power they have with Russia, which a realist would argue, a war between Canada and Denmark implies. A liberalist on the other hand, would see all these acts as something that is proving that states prefer not to use conflictive behavior.

Furthermore realists would argue that the A5 behavior in the Arctic reveals how little the states care about international regulations. Russia submitted their territorial claims to CLCS but were rejected and prompted to deliver better scientific evidence for their claims. Still this has not hindered Russia from continuing making reality of these claims where 45% of the Arctic becomes Russian. A realist would argue that nothing can stop Russia from doing and claiming what they want since there is no central authority capable of it. A structuralist
would agree but through emphasizing that Russia is imperialistic and seeks to create an oligarchy.

The lack of respect for international regulations applies not only to Russia according to realists, but also to the United States, which has chosen not to sign UNCLOS and therefore operates outside of the international legal system. In fact, Canada should have submitted their Arctic claims to CLCS in 2013 but have not done so. Still they are operating in the Arctic and treat the Northwestern Passage as Canadian. According to realist theory the states both can and will, regardless of their potential signing of UNCLOS or submission of claims to CLCS, continue with their Arctic activities such as seabed mapping, military patrolling and oil drilling. These agreements simply do not influence the states according to realists.

**Outcome**

If states choose to become more competitive rather than cooperative in the region a realist would argue that the United Nations, the Arctic Council and other existing international institutions will fail to prevent the outbreak of an armed conflict. The only way that a realist sees peace prevailing in the Arctic is if the current balance of power remains. However, realists would argue, if the trend of the melting ice crust continues and the core center of the Arctic turn navigable it will be difficult for Russia and Canada to control these new waters without increased military support. If China continues to develop its position as the world’s new superpower it is also very likely that their Arctic interests and activities will increase, in navigation for example, which according to realists will lead to even more strained relations in the region.

The pressure on each state in providing security and welfare to their citizens will according to realists be gradually increasing due to fewer natural resources elsewhere in the world in future. Considering that oil and gas are not unlimited resources the access to these will globally be steadily decreasing, making the world more and more focused on Arctic resource exploitation. Realists see the current polarity were the western A5 states unite against Russia as possible to prevail if the states gain from this cooperation. However, realists could say that China might become a better cooperation alternative to the Nordics than Canada and USA. Denmark and Norway might offer Arctic territory while China in exchange can offer security and defense against Russia or North America. Or realists would condemn such a development since China perhaps will choose not to engage further in the Arctic with risk for conflicts in an area they are not familiar with. This is impossible to predict but in
accordance with realist theory it is important to know that the alliances might change over time due to new security demands of the states.

If the United States does not speed up their Arctic engagement there will according to realism be no Arctic state that can balance Russia’s military and nuclear weapons capabilities. Russia will therefore most likely dominate major parts of the Arctic a realist would argue, and at least half of the area will become Russian, regardless of what CLCS approves or not. In future it is through both realist and structuralist thinking likely that the Arctic will face resource wars, armed conflicts over border demarcation and armed conflicts over navigation control. A realist would argue that the Russian Federation currently represents the state that is likely to win such battles.

6.2 Arctic relations from the perspective of liberalism

Actors

According to liberalists there are contrary to the realists a wide range of actors in the Arctic, but the level in which they can influence the region varies. The primary actors are the A5 states but a liberalist would argue that their international policies are affected by stakeholders such as the companies engaged in resource exploitation or navigation. Further a liberalist would say that since all the Arctic states except Russia are democratic there are currently also a number of NGO: s that influences areas of environmental protection, wildlife and the rights of indigenous people. According to liberalism theory this is a result of the open democratic climate in Canada, Sweden, Finland, Norway, Denmark and the United States which allows and favors such forces to influence state policies.

The fact that there are states and several NGO: s and companies active in the Arctic makes the relations more complex a liberalist would say, since these actors not necessarily have the same objectives. Certain stakeholders such as Gazprom and Rosneft do gain economically if Russia were to expand their Arctic territory and get access to further oil and gas resources, which make it likely that these companies influence Russian policies. Liberalists would argue that the same applies to the other A5 states with their national oil, gas or mining companies such as Norway with Statoil or Canada with Panarctic Oil. However, there is at the same time pressure from NGO: s such as Greenpeace or WWF in the safeguarding of for example the environment. A liberalist would claim that the democratic Arctic states experience this pressure from interest groups to a larger extent than Russia. A structuralist on the other hand would consider the oil and gas stakeholders as capitalists that
together with the imperialistic states are exploiting the Arctic, while the NGO: s are being suppressed by these capitalists. For a realist none of these would have any influence.

According to liberalists it has due to the many actors engaged in the region been necessary to establish institutions that function as regulative bodies maintaining order and cooperation for both states and NGO: s in the Arctic. Liberalists would see UNCLOS as an international legal framework that regulates state activities in the Arctic and the CLCS as the natural cooperative choice for the A5 to get approval for their territorial claims. The Arctic Council is according to liberalists a crucial institution for Arctic cooperation since it coordinates the A8 with observatory states, IGO: s and NGO: s. A liberalist would argue that the UN and the Arctic Council are strong mediators that prevent conflicts in the Arctic.

**Interests**

A liberalist would say that the interests among the A5 as being primary actors are very complex. They all share a strive for wealth and progress, which according to liberalism is achieved through cooperation. A liberalist would argue that the interests of the A5 is to get access to the rich natural resources of the Arctic and in order to trade they also seek for new navigation possibilities. In accordance with liberalist theory the A5 seeks to be progressive and increase the wealth of their states and populations which is why they also need to maintain peace. Therefore a liberalist would argue that it is in the interests of the A5 to respect the existing regulations and the directives given in UNCLOS and in the Arctic Council. Liberalists could find proof for the state willingness to do so in their behavior and state strategies. Each Arctic state highlights in their strategies the importance of cooperation and the maintenance of agreements. The strategies therefore prove for a liberalist that the states values environmental protection, climate change issues and indigenous peoples’ rights equally much as resource exploitation. Hence, a liberalist would argue that the interests in the Arctic are portrayed through the Arctic states, with its very complexity being a result of the several groups of people, companies and organizations that influence the making of state policies. Realists and structuralists would naturally consider these conclusions as false and point out that the state strategies only are serving as propaganda and does not reveal the real interests.

However a liberalist could say that the degree in which the states see other values and interests than resource exploitation varies from state to state. The population in the United States is less engaged in Arctic issues due to the fact that a majority of them lives far away
from the Arctic. As a result the US senate has not signed UNCLOS and US industries can easier act in the region without getting as much negative public attention domestically as their Nordic counterparts does. In Russia the Arctic is closely connected to Russian identity among the population, but the political climate is undemocratic which according to liberalists leads to restrictions for groups that favor social and environmental issues. Nevertheless Russian and U.S policies are according to liberalists influenced by the global community and their Arctic neighbors, which make all Arctic states interested in a functioning relation between resource exploitation, climate change, safeguarding of nature, progress and cooperation. According to liberalists conflicts in the Arctic is not in the interest of any actor. Both structuralists and realists would agree upon this but they would still see conflict as rather unavoidable.

**Causes**

Conflict is according to liberalism not natural and arises when there is a small or non-existing interdependence. The A5 states however, are strongly connected both politically and economically and liberalists could argue that Russia, as being the only undemocratic Arctic state, is kept from violent behavior due to their crucial trading relations with Europe and North America. Liberalists would see that even though there are risks for tensions in the Arctic the states have so far dealt with it in a cooperative manner through for example the creation of CLCS. Liberalist claims that the choice of war instead of cooperation is extremely costly, also in the Arctic. A liberalist would argue that even though the existing territorial conflicts over border demarcation have not been solved they have not either developed into armed conflicts. Instead they have remained latent making it possible to continue trading and cooperate.

According to liberalism democratic states avoid in the longest to go to war. That would for a liberalist be the reason for why Canada and Denmark have not ended up in war over the sovereignty conflict on Hans Island. According to liberalists the conflicts over border demarcation that have been present in the region have been dealt with in a cooperative manner through bilateral agreements. Liberalists would raise the example of USA and Canada which have not ended up in armed conflict over the Northwest Passage but instead have constructed a bilateral Arctic cooperation agreement that regulates their shipping.

The fact that Russia is an undemocratic state and thereby the only risk for war according to liberalism is balanced by the other states that are democratic. A liberalist would contrary to realists argue that the democratic states among the A5 are having an attitude of absolute gain.
rather than a relative gain. As long as they do well in the Arctic they do not care if Russia does better. Russia can therefore with a liberalist perspective continue to be the dominating Arctic actor as long as the others still achieve wealth and progress, regardless of the Russian success.

**Behavior**

A liberalist would argue that the behavior among the Arctic states is very cooperative in its nature. To avoid the risks for potential conflicts in future the states are making sure to establish and subordinate themselves to institutions and agreements such as UNCLOS and CLCS. The fact that Russia has submitted their territorial claims to CLCS proves to liberalists that they are willing to act in accordance with the rules given by the international legal system that were established by the democratic Arctic states. The submissions to CLCS can by realists be seen as reasons for conflict since they might be overlapping, or they can for liberalists be seen as cooperative steps taken in accordance with international law. According to liberalists the purpose of CLCS is that the states shall be able to deal with their overlapping claims. Further a liberalist would argue that the establishments of the Arctic Council, UNCLOS and CLCS have removed potential suspicion that the A5 might have had against each other. State claims are through these institutions being reported and presented publically for each one of the Arctic states and enables the international community to give their approval. Such cooperative measures constrain conflictive behavior according to liberalists while they according to realists are useless if the situation gets more conflictive.

However, the fact remains that each one of the A5 states are establishing new military formations and performs military maneuvers in the Arctic that are creating risks for armed conflicts. Nonetheless, a liberalist could argue that the states are using symbolic behavior instead of war to portray their interests or disapproval of other state behavior. When CLCS postponed Russia’s submission of Arctic claims realists are arguing that Russia will take control of the Lomonosov Ridge by force. But instead liberalists sees Russia’s act of planting their flag on the seafloor as a peaceful act that shows what Russia consider as theirs without using arms. Realists would say that when Canada and Denmark are taking turns in putting their flag on Hans Island it is conflictive behavior while liberalists could see it as the contrary since no rifles ever are fired and that democratic states in the longest seek to avoid conflict.
According to liberalists the states seek to satisfy many interest groups within their borders which is why the states act through a wide agenda. They are both allowing industries to exploit resources in the Arctic and making sure to highlight the need for environmental protection. To reach progress and wealth according to liberalism the states need resources, public acceptance and cooperation, which Arctic relations currently are portraying to a liberalist. In fact, a liberalist could argue that Arctic military formations might be in accordance with domestic public pressure of increased safety which could be why the democratic states are increasing their military.

**Outcome**

The ice will continue to melt and the new conditions will according to a liberalist test the institutions and their capability to remain order and peace. But liberalists would claim that the new Arctic conditions also are promising for the surrounding states and their economies. Especially since they will get access to new profitable resources and improve world trade by new navigation routes. Yet, in order for the A5 to gain the most from the resources it will according to liberalists continue to be in their very interest to maintain virtuous and cooperative Arctic relations. If the states deal with the Arctic in the same manner as they have done until now it is for a liberalist very likely that they will deepen their cooperation and consolidate the Arctic international institutions, rather than developing conflicts.

Liberals would claim that the possibilities for trade through the Arctic will be easier to accomplish through cooperation than through conflict. The newly accessible resources will according to a liberalist deepen the interdependence between the Arctic states through increased trade. Liberalists could argue that even if Russia continues to be an autocratic state their strive for prosperity and wealth will be equally strong as for their democratic Arctic counterparts, leading to a focus on trade rather than war. According to liberalism Russia might have a situation specific power over the EU and USA in the Arctic but will still be dependent on these nations for trade. Especially since Russia’s economy is based upon export of natural resources to the EU. Given the expenses it would imply for the United States to improve their Arctic capabilities, which currently are far behind the rest of the A5, liberalists could argue that the U.S will prefer to import natural resources from for example Russia rather than developing industries themselves. Such a development would make the region severely interdependent and thereby peaceful according to liberalism.

Since the majority of the Arctic states are democratic a liberalist would argue that their cooperative and democratic attitudes of international relations will continue to be
transferred to Arctic relations. In fact, a liberalist could say that the Arctic natural resources might have a positive effect on democratization in the world. Even if an undemocratic China becomes an important Arctic actor in future they will have to adapt to prevailing democratic institutions and regulations. And Russia will need to continue adapting to democratic institutions and regulations in order for the EU or North America to import their resources. Hence, liberalists could argue that climate change in the Arctic will through trade and a free market create an increasingly interdependent, peaceful and democratic world which contrary to realist and structuralist predictions is a much more positive.

6.3 Arctic relations from the perspective of structuralism

Actors

According to structuralists the Arctic is a region where all of the surrounding states are core states in global politics. However structuralists would argue that the A5 are using their territorial advantages in order to exclude other non-riparian and non-Arctic states from the region, even though the Arctic by structuralists probably would be considered as a common human heritage. According to structuralists the A5 are imperialistic and together with capitalist corporations in the oil, gas and mining industry they are dominating and exploiting the Arctic.

Structuralists argue that the people are trying to gather themselves against the imperialistic A5 states and the capitalistic corporations through NGO: s in order to safeguard the interests of indigenous people and the exploited nature. However the structuralists would underline that these NGO: s are being suppressed in Arctic politics by not getting included in the decision making of the Arctic Council, were the NGO: s only have observer statuses. In fact, structuralists would argue that the Arctic Council, UNCLOS and CLCS were created on the initiative of the A5 in order to exclude less influential actors from the decision making. Thereby the states and stake holding corporations can continue to exploit the Arctic and its resources without the influence of the less powerful people.

Russia is according to structuralists and realists taking advantage of their position as the strongest Arctic state since their means for exploitation are severely greater than those of the western states. However, both structuralists and realists could argue that the other A5 states are forming alliances against Russia to secure their exploitative parts of the Arctic. The structuralists differ from the realists when it comes to actors in the Arctic since the former includes corporations as stakeholders and NGO: s as interest groups that tries to
influence the states, just as the liberalist would argue. However the structuralists are compared to liberalists severely more pessimistic on the intentions of the corporations and the capacity of the interest groups.

**Interests**

According to structuralism capitalist states always seek to maximize their profits and to maintain their privileges and the theory would argue for no exception in the Arctic. The region is rich in oil, gas and minerals which are natural objects for exploitation, not only for the riparian states but also for capitalists all over the world. As a consequence both structuralists and realists argue that it is in the very interest of the A5 to maintain their current dominance by increasing their military formations in the Arctic. This will keep other competitors, such as China, away from the region and also protect their economic interest from each other.

Structuralism theory believes that all capitalist states seek to conquer new markets in the developing world. A structuralist would therefore argue that the Arctic has through global warming become such a new market, which capitalists now will try to conquer. However a structuralist would also argue that the Arctic is a region with rich people and powerful states which is why the turnout of a conflict risks to become even and bloody. The A5 are according to structuralists aware of this and therefore it is in their very interest to form alliances that will protect themselves from getting destroyed by more powerful imperialistic states.

While capitalists have interests in exploitation the people are according to structuralists struggling to protect the environment and to enhance their suppressed positions. Therefore structuralists would argue that the states are trying to avoid revolutionary acts from groups that are engaged in environmental issues and indigenous people’s rights by officially showing interests in those areas in their state strategies. A structuralist would claim this as crucial since the states cannot handle the competition over the Arctic at the same time as they are facing revolts from their people.
Causes

Structuralists would argue that conflicts in the Arctic will arise when the capitalist A5 states tries to create an imperial oligarchy. Russia is according to structuralists on its way to gain control over a majority of the economic development in the Arctic and thereby create a monopoly capitalistic Arctic. Since Russia is claiming nearly half of the Arctic both structuralists and realists would argue that the four less influential states are delimited to share the remaining parts. And since the western states cannot solely win against Russia, due to Russian Arctic military dominance, they are according to both theories forced to cooperate in order to not be destroyed. But conflicts such as the border demarcation on Hans Island between Denmark and Canada and the U.S-Canadian disagreements over the Northwest Passage are factors that risks spoiling the western cooperation. If this cooperation fails, Russia is according to structuralists likely to create its Arctic imperial oligarchy.

Structuralists would argue that the western Arctic states unlike Russia to a greater extent are dominating other global political matters. The capitalistic states of the west the structuralists would say have created institutions such as the United Nations and IMF among others that enable global western exploitation of the weaker. Therefore a structuralist would see the United Nations through UNCLOS and CLCS as institutions favoring the western cause in the Arctic. That is why the Russian claims to CLCS were denied while Norway’s were approved they would argue. However, structuralists would conclude that the Arctic is Russia’s home arena and these institutions are thereby less powerful. But the structuralist could also argue that when these regular institutional means for exploitation fails for the western capitalist states a risk for armed conflicts arise. Therefore the Arctic is now according to both structuralists and realists facing an increased militarization.

Behavior

According to structuralists war is used as a tool to conquer new markets and to bring resources from the poorer states to the richer states. However, no wars have so far been occurring in the Arctic but the current behavior is for structuralists implying such a development. The smaller states Denmark and Norway and even Sweden and Finland are hosting NATO military maneuvers in the Arctic in order to secure and defend their economic interests against Russia. A structuralist would claim that it is clear that these smaller but still capitalistic states are favoring an alliance against the otherwise much stronger capitalistic state Russia.
But the structuralists would underline that Russia is aware of the fact that the western states are acting together both military and politically through NATO maneuvers and by CLCS’ denial of Russia’s territorial claims. Therefore structuralists would see it as an act of dominance when Russia decided to plant their flag on the Lomonosov Ridge. According to structuralists this act portrays to the west that Russia is prepared to take the Arctic by force if needed to secure their rights to exploitation. Russia also shows their willingness to war structuralists would argue, by continue patrolling and claiming fishing and hunting rights around the Svalbard waters, which by CLCS were given to Norway. Both structuralists and realists see these acts as proof for Russia’s disrespect of the rules drawn up by western states and institutions.

But it is not only the Russian behavior that according to structuralists reveals disrespect for international institutional agreements. The United States shows by not signing UNCLOS that their quest for imperialistic exploitation in the Arctic goes beyond the need of cooperation with the western Arctic states. United States obviously prefers to operate alone without restrictions from the smaller western states structuralists and realists would argue. USA is seemingly not prepared to offer any free rides on their apparently believed capacities in the Arctic. According to realists and structuralists the quite perfunctory U.S Arctic engagement, considering for example their lack of ice-breakers, shows that the U.S believes themselves and their capacities to be superior compared to the other actors. Structuralists and realists would argue that in case of war USA believes themselves to be able to secure their economic interests, perhaps not against Russia but against the Nordics and Canada.

**Outcome**

According to structuralists the capitalists in power of states and industries will never favor peace as a development option, but instead see to their own profit maximization. Therefore structuralists will argue that the only way in which the Arctic will face a positive, non-exploitative and peaceful development is if the people inhibiting the surrounding states demands social equality through revolution. However a structuralist would admit that these forces are too weak and not enough coordinated for such acts. In fact, the structuralists would argue that the people engaged in Arctic NGO: s will continue being tricked and manipulated by the imperialists. Exploitation of natural resources will be the dominating state agenda in the Arctic but the information reaching the public masses will portray a different reality. To avoid the risks for revolutionary acts the states will according to structuralists officially invest in environmental protection and in the safeguarding of indigenous rights. While in reality
structuralists believes that the Arctic will be exploited and destroyed in the world’s final phase of capitalism.

Structuralists could make a comparison with the outbreak of WW1 in Europe. They could argue that imperialistic European states were fighting over the exploitation of the poorer African continent while a small incident, the murder of the Austrian-Hungarian prince Ferdinand, triggered a massive war. The states tried to enhance their positions in a Europe that according to structuralists were saturated with strong capitalistic nations and therefore war became the only option in securing their imperialistic goals. Structuralists could argue that the same tends to be the risk in the Arctic. The states are militarizing the region and a single mistake can lead to a full scale war.

Structuralists could see that China and Asia will develop to become the world’s leading imperialistic region why the necessity for efficient trading routes with them will increase. The conflicts between Canada and USA over the Northwest Passage and between Europe and Russia over the North Eastern Passage can therefore turn out violent according to both structuralists and realists, since each one of them seeks the best trading relations with the dominating economies. A liberalist however would argue that such trading relations would create interdependence strong enough to never cause war between the trading states.

None or nothing will in a short perspective gain from the imperialistic strive for exploitation and profit in the Arctic a structuralist would argue. Structuralists would underline that these capitalistic Arctic states will eventually destroy each other on the cost of the people in these nations and on the cost of nature and wildlife. But perhaps, when the ruling capitalists have ended themselves in the Arctic resource war, the suppressed people that have struggled for peace and equality in these states will take control over the richness in the Arctic and distribute it equally to all the poor people of the world. Hence, climate change in the Arctic can according to structuralists lead to a brutal imperialistic war, but thereafter a classless world society could be born. This future would thereby differ from both liberalist and realist projections since the outcome is both containing conflict and peace.
7. Conclusion

This chapter will conclude the research by presenting projections of potential future Arctic developments that are based upon the findings and the analysis of the study.

This study has found that the Arctic in many ways risk outbreaks of severe conflicts in future. But it has also found that there are ways to avoid such developments. Climate change has started a process of melting ices that will change the world map drastically, not only in the Arctic region. The last remaining oil and gas resources are likely to be found in the Arctic when the ice cap melt and already now the surrounding states, among others, are preparing for such a development. The opportunities in the region seem to be many with both resource exploitation and new transportation routes.

The study has found that these new possibilities can trigger latent conflicts and also create new ones. In the past century, when the central parts of the Arctic had not become interesting for resource exploitation and navigation, there existed conflicts over border demarcation between the riparian Arctic states. These conflicts remained unresolved for decades but were rather latent and non-violent. Nonetheless, the recent Arctic changes in climate conditions might intensify them and have created two more potential conflict areas; the control over sea lanes and territorial expansion through states’ continental shelf’s. The Arctic states do not agree about whether the Northwestern Passage and the Northeastern Passage should be seen as internal or international waters. Conflicts about the continental shelf’s can develop since the states do have overlapping claims.

Due to this development the region can be said to face a so called increased militarization. The study has found that each of the Arctic 5 states keeps establishing new military formations in the Arctic. However, the study has also found that there are cooperative measures taken parallel with the increased military activities such as bilateral agreements. Therefore it can be argued that the changed Arctic conditions are occurring in a speed that is slow enough for the states to be able to adapt. The UN Commission on the law of the Continental Shelf (CLCS) was established in order to regulate all existing and potential conflicts in the Arctic, including the old latent border demarcation conflicts. Hence, the United Nations and the Arctic states have been aware of the conflict potential in the Arctic and therefore eager to establish institutions that can regulate the state claims. The CLCS seem to have been accepted by so far Russia and Norway since those two states have submitted their territorial claims. But still, that does not imply that the states cannot be dissatisfied over the directives given by the institution. The planting of the Russian flag on the Arctic sea floor
can be interpreted as either a warning for conflict if Russia’s claims are not approved, or just as an act that portrays the Russian discontent over CLCS decision.

While realists, liberals and structuralists are predicting totally different outcomes in the Arctic this study sees a combination of both realist and liberalist analysis as most accurate. The structuralist reasoning with its explanations to causes, behavior and outcome did not seem to apply perfectly for the Arctic case. But even though the structuralist perspective did not provide an alternate or credible scenario to the likely outcome of this situation, it did provide some very interesting interpretations of the motivation behind state behavior and therefore the causes behind any potential conflict or collaboration. The theory could perhaps have been better applied in areas where one can find exploitative relations between states of different economic strengths and not in the Arctic where the states are all rich and developed. Liberalist and realist reasoning were better applied in this study and will both serve as base for the conclusion of the study.

The primary actors are the riparian states and these are using the help from mediators such as the Arctic Council and the UN in order to avoid conflicts over what is interesting in the region; which are resources and transportation. Since the actors currently are trying to cooperate it is likely that they will continue to do so in future. If large scale cooperation fails and CLCS does not manage to satisfy the claims of some or all of the A5, these states will continue cooperating by applying bilateral agreements. However, the Arctic militarization is still likely to continue as a last resort safety capacity, since the A5 does not know how well the cooperation will develop. If or when both multilateral and bilateral agreements fails to provide virtuous cooperation between the states these will see military acts as necessary for securing their economic interests.

This study therefore predicts three potential future developments of the Arctic by following a combination of generally liberalist and realist reasoning.

1. The United Nations (UNCLOS and CLCS) and the Arctic Council are institutions that are effective enough to stabilize and regulate all the actors that are interested in exploiting Arctic resources. These institutions will manage to exclude non-Arctic states from involvement and will keep the A5 from the use of conflictive behavior. Perhaps not all conflicts will be resolved but they will remain latent and therefore cooperation will prevail over conflict. Each Arctic state will be satisfied enough with what they achieve in the region and will not cause any conflicts. This development leans towards a liberalist projection.
2. Large scale cooperation fails to be effective and does not solve all the conflicts over borders, the continental shelf and navigation. The CLCS system will be partly abandoned by the Arctic states who rather will try to produce functional bilateral agreements instead. Perhaps the UN will be able to deal with certain types of conflicts that are less controversial, such as hunting and fishing rights. But in general the states will favor bilateral agreements, not necessarily only with the Arctic states but also with new actors entering the region. The states will through this be satisfied enough not to cause any severe conflicts. This development also leans towards a liberalist projection but is not as utopian as in the first alternative.

3. Both multilateral and bilateral agreements fail to provide stability and thereby cooperation no longer becomes an option for some, or all of the Arctic states. The only ways to secure states’ economic and political interests are through hard instruments such as military acts and economic sanctions. This option only becomes likely if Russia does not get through with any of their Arctic claims through either CLCS or bilateral agreements with the western A5 states. In this future it will also be possible for those non-Arctic states that are strong enough, such as China, to get involved, form alliances and claim access to what the Arctic is offering. This development leans towards a realist projection but occurs first if the liberalist alternative fails.

Thus, by knowing these three potential outcomes it is possible for policy makers to act and make decisions that will favor an Arctic development similar to the first or the second projection. Hopefully other researchers, scholars and policy makers will consider this study as helpful in their engagement in Arctic issues.
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Appendix 1

Definition of the Arctic

There is no single definition of the areas around the North Pole and there are various terms and synonyms for the area meaning different things in different contexts. The map below shows the definition that is being used in the Arctic Human development report 2004 (AHDR).

The Arctic Circle is constant while the arctic boundary in the report is relative. That is due to neighboring states and their territories were Canada has an Arctic border going far more south than the border in Fennoscandia. If Canadian measures would have been applied in Scandinavia the capitals Oslo, Stockholm and Helsinki would all be placed in the Arctic.
which therefore is not applicable and accepted by Scandinavians. The ADHR Arctic includes all of Alaska, Canada North (60°N) as well as northern Quebec and Labrador, the entire Greenland, the Faroe Islands, Iceland and the northern parts of Scandinavia. In Russia the regions of Murmansk Oblast, Nenets, Yamalonerets, Taimyr, Chukotka, Vorkuta, Kormi republic, Norilsk, Igorska and the northern parts of the Sakha republic are included. (Oran Young, 2004, pp. 17-20). With this definition of the Arctic boundaries the area encompasses a total of 40 million square kilometers, in other terms representing 8 % of the surface of the earth. The area is 1.43 times larger than the USA and 3.25 times larger than the EU. Despite the seize of the Arctic region (defined as north of the Arctic Circle) the area only inhabits 4 million people and half of them are living within Russian borders. (Chrastansky, 2012, p. 115).