مجلة كامبريدج للبحوث العلمية: مجلة علمية محكمة
تصدر عن مركز كامبريدج للبحوث والمؤتمرات–العدد الثالث الاربعون – آذار ٢٠٢٥– رمضان ١٤٤٦
ISSN–2536–0027

Geopolitics in the Arctic: Balancing Environmental Concerns and Resource Exploration

Dr. Rana Hijazi
Islamic University of Lebanon/ Faculty of Law

Abstract

The Arctic Ocean has become the subject of extraordinary global attention despite being the smallest ocean in the world. World leaders are competing to gain control over newly opened waterways as scientists are racing to understand how rising temperatures will alter the waters of the Arctic Ocean and, consequently, the global climate. In light of the Arctic's snowmelt, this study explores the complex interplay between resource extraction and environmental concerns. Because of this phenomenon, countries in the Northern Hemisphere have shown increased interest in the Arctic for a variety of reasons, such as the use of the region as a shipping route, the establishment of a military presence, and the investigation of commercial opportunities, with an emphasis on the extraction of oil and gas.

Through a comprehensive review of relevant literature and analysis of policy documents, this research explores the competing rights and disputes over territorial rights, newly accessible resources, and trade routes. It investigates the indigenous community and the threat that is imposed to their way of life, it calls for their inclusion in the decision-making process. This research explores the complex dynamics between environmental conservation and resource exploration in the Arctic, focusing on the need for a balanced approach that considers economic interests, environmental protection, and the rights of indigenous communities.

As the Arctic continues to gain international attention, this paper helps both scholars and researchers gain a better understanding of how its changing conditions will impact the environment, wildlife, and human communities in the region. This knowledge is crucial for informed decision-making and developing effective strategies to address the challenges posed by Arctic warming.

I- Introduction:

The Arctic region is defined by the Arctic Circle, which encompasses the Arctic Ocean and its surrounding lands[١]. This area experiences harsh cold conditions, with temperatures often dropping well below freezing. The Arctic's allure lies not

ISSN–2536–0027

only in its unique natural beauty and biodiversity but also in the vast reservoirs of untapped resources concealed beneath its icy surface.

Currently this region is experiencing rapid environmental changes, including the melting of ice and the impact of climate change which have opened up new opportunities and challenges for the countries and actors involved. The melting ice has opened new possibilities for maritime access and resource extraction, intensifying international competition for control and influence in the region[٢]. The Arctic is an area rich in natural resources, such as oil, gas, minerals, and fish, which have attracted the interest of both Arctic and non-Arctic states. The region is also strategically important, as it offers potential trade routes and military advantages. However, the exploitation of the Arctic's resources and the increased human activity in the region pose serious threats to the fragile environment and the livelihoods of the indigenous communities, such as the Inuit, who have a rich history and cultural heritage deeply tied to the Arctic environment[٣].

This publication aims to explore the geopolitical landscape shaped by nations and corporations competing for dominance while simultaneously addressing the critical need for sustainable environmental management. The tension between environmental preservation and resource exploration forms the core of our investigation. On one hand, the Arctic ecosystem faces existential threats due to climate change, endangering species and altering the delicate balance of this unique environment[٤]. On the other hand, the region holds vast reservoirs of oil, gas, and minerals, promising economic prosperity for those who can utilize its riches[٥]. Our exploration navigates the complex web of policies, strategies, and international collaborations required to achieve a harmonious balance between these seemingly conflicting necessities.

II- Objective

The primary objective of this research paper is to comprehensively analyze and assess the geopolitical dynamics in the Arctic region, with a specific focus on balancing environmental concerns and resource exploration. The study aims to achieve the following objectives:

١- Examine the Geopolitical Landscape:

Investigate and analyze the current geopolitical landscape in the Arctic, taking into consideration the involvement of key nations, international agreements, and regional conflicts.

٢- Assess Environmental Concerns:

ISSN–2536–0027

Evaluate the environmental challenges and risks associated with increased human activities, such as resource extraction and shipping, in the Arctic region.

٣- Evaluate Resource Exploration Policies:

Examine the resource exploration policies of Arctic nations, considering their economic motivations, regulatory frameworks, and the impact on local communities.

٤- Identify Trade-offs and Challenges:

Identify and analyze the trade-offs between economic interests, resource exploitation, and environmental preservation in the Arctic, highlighting potential conflicts and challenges.

٥- Propose Sustainable Geopolitical Strategies:

Develop recommendations and propose sustainable geopolitical strategies that balance the economic interests of resource exploration with the imperative of protecting the Arctic environment.

By achieving these objectives, this research aims to contribute valuable insights to the ongoing discourse on the geopolitics of the Arctic, offering a nuanced understanding of the delicate balance required to address both environmental concerns and resource exploration in the region..

III- Research Methodology

This study employs a multi-faceted research methodology to investigate the intricate interplay between geopolitics, environmental concerns, and resource exploration in the Arctic. The methodology encompasses several key components, each designed to provide a comprehensive understanding of the complex dynamics shaping the Arctic region. Relevant documents, agreements, and policies related to Arctic geopolitics are systematically analyzed to understand how environmental concerns are addressed within the frameworks of resource exploration.

This publication builds upon existing research, offering a comprehensive examination of the evolving dynamics in Arctic geopolitics. By incorporating the latest insights from environmental studies, political science, and international relations, we aim to contribute a new understanding of how nations struggle with the challenges presented by environmental degradation and the relentless pursuit of resources. We examine case studies, historical viewpoints, and potential future scenarios to offer a thorough understanding of the intricate geopolitical dynamics in the Arctic.

IV- Literature Review:

مجلة كامبريدج للبحوث العلمية: مجلة علمية محكمة
تصدر عن مركز كامبريدج للبحوث والمؤتمرات–العدد الثالث الاربعون – آذار ٢٠٢٥– رمضان ١٤٤٦
ISSN–2536–0027

The Arctic region has been a site of geopolitical interest and conflict since the early exploration and colonization by European powers, which competed for trade, resources, and strategic advantage. The history of Arctic geopolitics is deeply rooted in the Cold War era, where strategic interests and military presence in the region were heightened[٦]. After the end of the Cold War, the Arctic witnessed a period of increased cooperation and dialogue among the eight Arctic states; Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Russia, Sweden, and the United States, as well as the involvement of non-Arctic actors, such as China and the European Union. However, in recent years, the Arctic has also experienced rising tensions and competition, as climate change and global warming have opened up new opportunities and challenges for resource exploration, trade, and security.

On ١٦ March ٢٠٢١, the United States Army published its new Arctic strategy, Titled Regaining Arctic Dominance, the document states that the Army must "organize to win in the Arctic," and that the region represents "an arena of competition, a line of attack in conflict, a vital area holding many … natural resources, and a platform for global power projection." The US Army strategy follows similar publications from the Government of Canada, the Norwegian military, the United States Navy, and a host of other Arctic and non-Arctic state institutions committed to increased military engagement in the circumpolar north. And these ambitious new Arctic security policies are more than just a display of military power: NATO doubled Arctic military activities from ٢٠١٥ to ٢٠٢٠ and Russia has assigned at least ٨١٪ of its nuclear weaponry to northern fleets, all in the name of (re)gaining Arctic dominance[٧].

The Arctic region has emerged as a central area for research, encompassing not only studies related to the military but also environmental research, given its distinctive ecosystem and susceptibility to the impacts of climate change, understanding the environmental impacts in this delicate area is crucial for addressing global concerns. In this context, previous research has delved into various aspects of Arctic environmental changes, shedding light on the repercussions for both the local ecosystem and the broader climate system, such as rising temperatures, ice melt, and shifts in biodiversity. Studies consistently highlight the accelerating rate of Arctic warming, leading to the reduction of sea ice and changes in weather patterns. Additionally, investigations into the thawing permafrost reveal concerns about the release of greenhouse gases, contributing to global climate change. These findings collectively highlight the importance of

ISSN–2536–0027

continued research that address the escalating environmental challenges in the Arctic.

The existing body of knowledge provides valuable insights into historical perspectives, geopolitical dynamics, environmental challenges, and resource exploration policies in the Arctic. However, identified gaps underscore the need for future research to delve deeper into indigenous perspectives, examine climate change resilience, conduct comprehensive policy analyses, explore the impacts of emerging technologies, adopt longitudinal approaches, and embrace interdisciplinary methods. Addressing these gaps will contribute to a more nuanced understanding of the complex interactions shaping the Arctic region, informing sustainable policies and practices in this critical and evolving geopolitical landscape.

V- Geopolitical Dynamics in the Arctic:

The Arctic region, or the Arctic, is a geographic region spreading around the North Pole[٨], the term "Arctic" conjures images of vast icy landscapes, polar bears, and extreme cold. But beyond its natural beauty lies a complex geopolitical arena, it encompasses the northernmost region of our planet, including the Arctic Ocean, adjacent landmasses, and peripheral seas.

The receding Arctic ice cap has not only brought global challenges but also gifted new opportunities to the region. With shorter year-round ice coverage, the Arctic can be navigated with more direct and cost-effective routes, which is a boon to the shipping industry. Meanwhile, less ice coverage makes it easier to explore and exploit new energy resources[٩]. On the other hand, these benefits come with challenges, include conflicting claims regarding maritime boundaries. Despite the existence of such a conflictive discourse, however, all Arctic and non-Arctic states prioritize cooperative attempts rather than conflicting ones since exploitation, as well as transportation of most of the resources beneath and within exclusive economic zones, needs huge investments[١٠].

In the mid-٢٠th century, the Arctic was primarily viewed through the lens of Cold War tensions. The strategic significance of the region became apparent as both the United States and the Soviet Union sought to assert control over the Arctic for military purposes. The establishment of the Distant Early Warning (DEW) Line and the construction of military installations underscored the geopolitical importance of the Arctic during this period. The DEW Line was only one in a series of defense projects that Canada and the United States had jointly embarked upon in the Far North since the Second World War[١١].

مجلة كامبريدج للبحوث العلمية: مجلة علمية محكمة
تصدر عن مركز كامبريدج للبحوث والمؤتمرات–العدد الثالث الاربعون – آذار ٢٠٢٥– رمضان ١٤٤٦
ISSN–2536–0027

As the Cold War ended, the Arctic experienced a shift towards cooperation and diplomacy. After the Cold War, serious threats to Arctic security went into abeyance, inspiring talk of a 'pole of peace', and of a 'global Arctic'[١٢]. The signing of the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy in ١٩٩١ marked a turning point, emphasizing environmental concerns and collaborative efforts among Arctic nations. The end of the Cold War also led to increased attention on the region's natural resources, particularly oil and gas, sparking discussions on economic development and environmental sustainability.

In the ٢١st century, the melting of Arctic ice due to climate change has further intensified geopolitical interests. The opening of new shipping routes and access to previously unreachable resources has prompted Arctic nations, as well as non-Arctic states, to reassess their geopolitical strategies.

The Arctic states are the eight countries that border the Arctic Ocean: Canada, Denmark (through Greenland), Finland, Iceland, Norway, Russia, Sweden, and the United States. These countries have the most direct interests and influence in the region, as they claim sovereignty or jurisdiction over parts of the Arctic territory, waters, and resources. Their interest, which was originally scientific, must increasingly be viewed as strategic, touching all aspects: habitat, raw materials, traffic and power positions. They also cooperate through the Arctic Council, an intergovernmental forum that promotes cooperation and coordination on Arctic issues[١٣].

Currently, the USA and Russia control about half of the Arctic Ocean via their legally recognized "exclusive economic zones" (EEZs), extending ٢٠٠ nautical miles from their coasts[١٤]. At the heart of the problem is a geographical proximity of the Russian and American location connected by the Arctic region. This is combined with the existing weapon systems that place a premium on the Arctic as the best staging location for strikes against each other. These two key variables are the reason the Arctic became a region of overwhelming strategic importance when the United States and Russia began to challenge each other's interest in the international system[١٥].

The non-Arctic states are the countries that do not have a direct border with the Arctic Ocean, but have expressed interest or involvement in the region. These include China, India, Japan, South Korea, among others. These countries seek to gain access to the Arctic's resources, markets, and scientific opportunities, as well as to influence the governance and security of the region. They also participate in

ISSN–2536–0027

the Arctic Council as observers, but have limited rights and roles compared to the Arctic states[١٦].

The Arctic Council is the main intergovernmental forum that promotes cooperation and coordination on Arctic issues, such as environmental protection, sustainable development, and scientific research. However, the Arctic Council does not have the authority to make binding decisions or enforce agreements, and its membership and role are limited by the interests and preferences of the Arctic states. The non-Arctic states participate in the Arctic Council as observers, but have limited rights and roles compared to the Arctic states.

The Arctic Council serves as a pivotal forum for Arctic states and indigenous communities to address common environmental challenges and foster sustainable development initiatives. The Arctic Council provides a forum through which sensible measures can be negotiated, with the smaller nations able to apply at least the moral pressure of a nominal majority. Regrettably, however, the council is effectively in cold storage at this time, due to the Ukraine war[١٧]. The events in Ukraine have meant that the competition over the Arctic has taken on even more geopolitical significance. Projections of changing climate conditions, including melting ice, have the potential to further catalyst instability within the region[١٨].

A series of treaties, painstakingly negotiated by the Arctic Council and latterly by the UN, has established legally binding restrictions on fishing, agreed procedures on how to prevent and deal with maritime oil spills, principles for the conduct of scientific research and measures to coordinate search and rescue operations[١٩]. Most recently, the UNs newly adopted High Seas Treaty (United Nations, ٢٠٢٣) strengthens and extends to all its signatories the obligations and restrictions to which the nations bordering the Arctic Ocean are already bound[٢٠].

Additionally, the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) provides a legal framework governing maritime rights and responsibilities, although disputes over territorial claims persist despite most Arctic states being party to UNCLOS. Moreover, historic treaties like the Spitsbergen Treaty have established principles for sovereignty and economic activities in the Arctic, but interpretations of such agreements have occasionally sparked conflicts, particularly concerning fishing rights and resource exploitation. Complementing these agreements are various bilateral and multilateral arrangements on search and rescue operations and oil spill response, reflecting efforts to coordinate emergency response efforts in the harsh Arctic environment.

ISSN–2536–0027

Moreover, there are other international and regional organizations and agreements that address specific aspects of the Arctic environment and resources, such as the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the International Maritime Organization (IMO), and the Agreement to Prevent Unregulated High Seas Fisheries in the Central Arctic Ocean (CAOF Agreement).

The EU's interests exemplify the complex connections between changes in geography, policy choices, and its role of representing its members' and affiliated countries' interests as well as those of the corporate players with which the EU is linked in economic terms[٢١]. China's unilateral declaration that it is a "near-Arctic state" does not change the legal situation[٢٢], it has also stated its desire of creating a Polar Silk Road, for which it has built and continues to develop icebreakers, which would guarantee it access to northern reserves and reduce its dependence on energy imports via the Malacca straits[٢٣].

Despite these cooperative efforts, conflicts in the Arctic persist, primarily driven by territorial disputes, resource competition, and security concerns. Resource exploitation further exacerbates conflicts, as states and non-Arctic actors vie for control over the region's abundant oil, gas, and mineral resources. Additionally, Russia's increased military presence and activities in the Arctic, coupled with NATO allies' security concerns, have raised geopolitical tensions, contributing to a complex security landscape in the region. Furthermore, balancing environmental protection with economic development interests poses another source of conflict, as stakeholders grapple with the potential environmental impact of industrial projects like oil drilling and mining.

In conclusion, while international agreements provide a framework for cooperation and governance in the Arctic, unresolved territorial disputes, resource competition, and security concerns continue to challenge stability in the region. Addressing these conflicts necessitates diplomatic engagement, adherence to legal frameworks, and a commitment to sustainable development practices that prioritize environmental protection and indigenous rights. Efforts to mitigate conflicts and promote cooperation are essential for fostering stability and resilience in the Arctic amidst evolving geopolitical dynamics.

VI- Environmental Concerns in the Arctic

The Arctic is warming at least three times as fast as the global average[٢٤]. It is also intrinsically tied to global processes, whether they are climatic, environmental or socio-economic. The impacts of climate change on the vast and multiple

ISSN–2536–0027

interacting Arctic systems are inherently complex, although can be broadly summarized as an increase in temperature and the subsequent loss of sea-ice cover[٢٥]. Climate change dominates contemporary discussion of the Arctic. Warming brings with it profound consequences for people, animals, and ecosystems. The impact of warming is uneven; the loss of sea ice and the thawing of permafrost mean risks and vulnerabilities, but also allow opportunities and possibilities[٢٦].

Examining environmental concerns in the Arctic reveals a region uniquely vulnerable to the impacts of climate change and human activities. Arctic ecosystems, characterized by extreme cold, limited vegetation, and vast expanses of ice and permafrost, are intricately interconnected and finely balanced. However, they are particularly susceptible to the impacts of climate change, pollution, and human activities, which pose significant threats to their stability and resilience.

Pollution from shipping, oil and gas extraction, and industrial activities introduces toxins into Arctic waters and soils, contaminating food webs and endangering wildlife populations. Changes in ocean chemistry due to increased carbon dioxide absorption impact marine organisms, including shellfish and coral reefs, the loss of habitat and migration routes threaten Arctic species like polar bears, walruses, and migratory birds, while thawing permafrost destabilizes the landscape and releases stored carbon into the atmosphere, exacerbating global warming.

Degradation of near-surface permafrost can pose a serious threat to the utilization of natural resources, and to the sustainable development of Arctic communities[٢٧]. As temperatures rise, permafrost thaw releases large amounts of stored carbon dioxide and methane, contributing to greenhouse gas emissions and further exacerbating climate change. Thawing permafrost also destabilizes infrastructure, such as buildings, roads, and pipelines, jeopardizing human safety and economic activities in the region.

Maritime activities in the subarctic and Arctic Ocean are predicted to substantially increase in the future due to climate change and declining sea ice cover. Inevitably, the consequences will be seen in impacts on marine ecosystems in this region at many different levels, such as increased pollution load due to antifouling biocides, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, metals and pharmaceuticals[٢٨]. Pollution from various sources, including industrial activities, shipping, and agricultural runoff, further compounds the vulnerability of Arctic ecosystems. Contaminants such as heavy metals, persistent organic pollutants (POPs), and

ISSN–2536–0027

plastics accumulate in Arctic waters, soils, and organisms, posing risks to wildlife and human health. Infrastructure development, including roads, pipelines, and buildings, further fragments habitats and increases the risk of habitat degradation and fragmentation.

The vulnerability of Arctic ecosystems stems from a complex interplay of environmental, social, and economic factors. Climate change, pollution, and human activities are driving forces behind the degradation of Arctic ecosystems, posing significant challenges for their conservation and management. Addressing these vulnerabilities requires comprehensive strategies that prioritize environmental protection, sustainable development, and international cooperation. By safeguarding Arctic ecosystems, we can preserve biodiversity, maintain ecosystem services, and support the resilience of both Arctic communities and the global environment.

Biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation in the Arctic can have broader implications for environmental security and stability in the region. Disruptions to Arctic ecosystems, such as declines in keystone species or shifts in food webs, can have cascading effects on ecosystem services, traditional livelihoods, and indigenous communities' well-being. Addressing biodiversity challenges is thus essential for promoting environmental resilience and mitigating potential conflicts over resource access and management in the Arctic.

The Arctic's rich biodiversity, including its fish stocks, marine mammals, and mineral resources, has attracted the interest of Arctic and non-Arctic states alike. Sovereignty disputes over territory and maritime boundaries in the Arctic Ocean have implications for the management and conservation of Arctic biodiversity. Resource exploitation, such as oil and gas extraction and fishing, can directly impact Arctic ecosystems and species, leading to conflicts over access and control of these resources.

Biodiversity conservation in the Arctic requires coordinated efforts among Arctic states and international organizations. The Arctic Council, as a forum for Arctic governance, plays a crucial role in addressing biodiversity challenges and promoting sustainable management practices. However, geopolitical tensions and competing interests among Arctic states can hinder cooperation on biodiversity conservation initiatives, complicating efforts to protect Arctic ecosystems.

The impacts of climate change on Arctic biodiversity have geopolitical implications, as they affect the distribution of resources, access to shipping routes, and security concerns in the region. Melting sea ice opens up new opportunities

ISSN–2536–0027

for resource extraction and shipping, leading to increased competition among Arctic states and non-Arctic actors. Additionally, changes in biodiversity patterns, such as the migration of species to new areas, can exacerbate existing tensions over territorial claims and resource rights in the Arctic.

In conclusion, environmental concerns in the Arctic are multifaceted and interconnected, reflecting the complex interactions between climate change, human activities, and ecosystem dynamics. Addressing these challenges requires navigating complex geopolitical dynamics, fostering cooperation among Arctic states, and prioritizing sustainable management practices that safeguard Arctic biodiversity for future generations. By prioritizing environmental protection and adopting science-based approaches, we can safeguard the Arctic's unique ecosystems and ensure a sustainable future for generations to come.

VII- Indigenous Perspectives

People established communities and cultures in the Arctic thousands of years ago, and continue to thrive today[٢٩]. The Arctic is home to around ٤ million people, an estimated one-tenth of which are indigenous[٣٠]. These indigenous communities have adapted to the harsh conditions of the Arctic and have developed unique cultures, languages, and ways of life. These groups have a deep connection to the land and rely on Arctic ecosystems[٣١]. Many indigenous groups see the land and environment as intrinsic to their cultural identities, changes driven by climate change and resource extraction threaten traditions passed down for generations[٣٢].

The largest indigenous groups across the circumpolar Arctic are the Inuit in North America, the Sami in northern Europe, and indigenous populations in Russia like the Nenets, Yupik, and Chukchi peoples. Their traditional ways of life have depended on hunting, fishing, reindeer herding, and foraging[٣٣]. Indigenous Peoples of the Arctic contribute through science and diplomacy in responding to various challenges and crises. Arctic residents and Indigenous Peoples are at the front lines of the climate crisis, a changing geopolitical environment, and of shifts in international natural resource interests towards the Arctic region. At the same time, Arctic Indigenous Peoples continue to respond to a wide variety of important challenges related to colonial legacies, environmental degradation, and other interrelated socioeconomic challenges in the Arctic, while calling for inclusive and integrated knowledge systems to inform solutions and decision-making[٣٤].

Starting in the late ٢٠th century, regional, national, and international organizations increasingly recognized the political and cultural sovereignty of Arctic peoples.

ISSN–2536–0027

Rights to land and natural resources are an important part of this sovereignty. The protection of the rights of indigenous peoples living in the Arctic in relation to geopolitics and the environment involves a combination of international agreements, national laws, and advocacy efforts. Here are some key aspects:

International Agreements: Indigenous rights are addressed in various international agreements, including the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and the International Labor Organization's Convention No.١٦٩ concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples. These agreements recognize the rights of indigenous peoples to their lands, territories, and resources, as well as their rights to self-determination, culture, and traditional knowledge.

Political participation by indigenous groups has increased through organizations like the Inuit Circumpolar Council, formed to promote Inuit rights and interests internationally[٣٥]. This Council, represents the Inuit of Denmark, Canada, the US and Russia, it launched its Circumpolar Inuit Declaration on Arctic Sovereignty on ٢٨ April ٢٠٠٩, stating: '*It is our right to freely determine our political status, freely pursue our economic, social, cultural and linguistic development, and freely dispose of our natural wealth and resources.*'

The Arctic Council includes six indigenous peoples' organizations as Permanent Participants. This model provides a formal mechanism for indigenous representatives to engage directly in intergovernmental negotiations[٣٦]. Indigenous groups bring traditional knowledge and perspectives directly into international policy discussions on biodiversity, shipping, oil spills, and climate change via Arctic Council participation[٣٧]. However, some argue that Permanent Participant status should be strengthened with full decision-making authority for indigenous groups over policies affecting their rights and lands since their influence in the council remains advisory[٣٨].

National Legislation: Many Arctic nations have enacted laws and policies to protect the rights of indigenous peoples. These may include laws recognizing indigenous land rights, promoting indigenous participation in decision-making processes, and safeguarding traditional knowledge.

An agreement between the government of Canada and Inuit bands, for instance, ultimately resulted in the creation of the territory of Nunavut in ١٩٩٩[٣٩]. The Nunavut Land Claims Agreement Act recognized Inuit rights to land and resource royalties. It also established co-management boards to provide Inuit input on wildlife management and environmental reviews[٤٠].

ISSN–2536–0027

In Russia, federal laws were passed in the ١٩٩٠s and ٢٠٠٠s to protect the rights of northern indigenous minorities in Russia, including groups like the Nenets, Evenki, and Chukchi peoples. Examples include the ١٩٩٩ Law on Guarantees of the Rights of Numerically-Small Indigenous Peoples and the ٢٠٠١ Law on Territories of Traditional Nature Use[٤١]. These laws aimed to promote indigenous self-governance, protect traditional economic activities like reindeer herding, and establish indigenous territories. However, the implementation has been criticized as ineffective, with indigenous groups lacking meaningful control over lands and resources[٤٢].

Environmental Protection: Indigenous peoples often play a crucial role in environmental conservation and sustainable resource management in the Arctic. Recognizing and supporting indigenous-led conservation initiatives can help protect both the environment and indigenous rights. Indigenous groups have leveraged traditional ecological knowledge and community monitoring networks to identify areas and species of concern. For example, Inuit observers were central to documenting initial polar bear population declines[٤٣]. Some indigenous-led land management models, like the Dehcho First Nations' Edéhzhíe in Canada, establish indigenous protected areas and management plans informed by traditional knowledge[٤٤].

Networks like the Indigenous Observers Network allow indigenous experts to collect and share localized observations of environmental change across the circumpolar Arctic[٤٥]. Indigenous protected areas designated and managed by native communities have shielded vast ecologically significant landscapes from development. Indigenous co-management boards integrate traditional knowledge into decision-making around resource management and land use. Indigenous communities directly monitor ecosystems through activities like participatory mapping of sea ice and wildlife sightings. This traditional ecological knowledge informs adaptation and conservation strategies[٤٦]. Overall, the active involvement of Arctic indigenous groups in ecological research, monitoring, governance, and activism makes them indispensable partners in efforts to sustainably protect the Arctic environment in the face of escalating pressures.

Some argue Arctic states have fallen short in consulting indigenous groups and integrating traditional ecological knowledge into policy. Groups continue pressuring for inclusion and consent processes[٤٧]. Cooperation in the Arctic region could be successful only if all indigenous peoples are part of the process representing local level participation. This grassroots involvement should be

مجلة كامبريدج للبحوث العلمية: مجلة علمية محكمة
تصدر عن مركز كامبريدج للبحوث والمؤتمرات–العدد الثالث الاربعون – آذار ٢٠٢٥– رمضان ١٤٤٦
ISSN–2536–0027

followed by the engagement of all, Arctic states, and this regional collaboration must be supported globally by non-Arctic states.

VIII- Resource Exploration Policies

Energy and mineral resources have been key to the intense interest of Arctic-adjoining states in the High North. In the late ١٩٦٠s, the largest oil field in North America was discovered on Alaska's North Slope at Prudhoe Bay. This discovery helped spur extensive oil exploration and development in Alaska with the construction of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System beginning in ١٩٧٤[٤٨], this major find shifted attention to the hydrocarbon potential of Alaska and the broader Arctic region. It illustrated the rush for new sources of oil and gas to fuel economic growth after World War II, even in remote polar regions. The Prudhoe Bay discovery set the stage for accelerated Arctic drilling efforts by the U.S. and other countries in subsequent decades.

In the late ١٩٦٠s and ١٩٧٠s, major oil and gas fields were discovered in western Siberia, including the Samotlor field. To exploit these resources, the Soviet Union undertook extensive industrial development, including building pipelines, roads, and the city of Surgut as a key energy production center[٤٩]. The impact of the oil industry had a great impact on indigenous peoples across the Circumpolar Arctic: in Canada, Scandinavia, Russia, and Siberia. In Siberia, the Khanty, traditional hunters and reindeer herders and once the ethnic majority in the region, are now a small minority among the settlers and migrant workers in the oil rich republic. Their once clean wilderness has been polluted by oil and damaged through deforestation, undermining the resilience of their traditional ways of life[٥٠].

Resource exploration policies in the Arctic region are particularly complex due to the unique environmental, social, and geopolitical considerations of the area. Examining the regulatory frameworks, environmental considerations, geopolitical dynamics, and indigenous rights issues that shape the management and governance of Arctic resources Here are some key aspects of resource exploration policies specific to the Arctic:

Environmental Protection:

Arctic ecosystems are fragile and vulnerable to environmental damage, making robust environmental protection measures essential. Resource exploration policies in the Arctic typically require comprehensive environmental impact assessments (EIAs) to evaluate potential impacts on sensitive ecosystems, wildlife, and indigenous communities. Some of these policies adhere to the precautionary principle, advocating for cautionary measures even with incomplete scientific

ISSN–2536–0027

knowledge to avoid irreversible environmental damage[٥١]. Establishing protected areas for sensitive ecosystems and critical habitats helps minimize the impact of resource exploration[٥٢]. Special regulations may be in place to protect areas of ecological significance, such as marine mammal habitats, migratory bird nesting grounds, and permafrost zones. Many Arctic nations have implemented stricter environmental regulations for resource exploration than in other regions. This includes requirements for impact assessments, mitigation measures, and pollution control[٥٣].

Norway: Norway is known for its rigorous environmental regulations, particularly in the offshore oil and gas sector. The country has strict requirements for environmental impact assessments (EIAs) and risk assessments for oil and gas activities in its Arctic waters. Norway's Petroleum Safety Authority (PSA) oversees offshore operations and enforces regulations aimed at preventing accidents and minimizing environmental impacts. Additionally, Norway has taken steps to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from its oil and gas sector and has committed to phasing out fossil fuel exploration in certain environmentally sensitive areas. The Svalbard Environmental Protection Act aims to conserve the Arctic environment against damage from mining and other activities. But the act has struggled to balance economic interests[٥٤]. Norway's "Climate Action Plan ٢٠٢١-٢٠٣٠" aims to halve greenhouse gas emissions by ٢٠٣٠, impacting future oil and gas exploration policies[٥٥].

Canada: Canada has implemented rigid environmental regulations for resource exploration and development in its Arctic regions, including the offshore oil and gas sector and mineral extraction projects. Environmental assessments are required for all major projects, and companies must consult with indigenous communities and address their concerns. Canada has also established marine protected areas and conservation measures to safeguard vulnerable Arctic ecosystems and wildlife habitats. Canada's "Pan-Territorial Approach to Sustainable Mining in the Arctic" incorporates climate change considerations into mining exploration and development guidelines.

Greenland: Greenland, an autonomous territory within the Kingdom of Denmark, has adopted strict environmental regulations for resource exploration, particularly in its mining sector. Companies seeking to explore and develop mineral resources in Greenland must adhere to comprehensive environmental impact assessment (EIA) processes, obtain permits, and comply with environmental management

ISSN–2536–0027

plans. Greenland's government places a strong emphasis on sustainable development and environmental protection in its resource policies.

United States (Alaska): Alaska, the northernmost state of the United States, has implemented stringent environmental regulations for resource exploration and development in its Arctic regions, including the offshore oil and gas industry and mining activities. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) enforce regulations aimed at protecting sensitive ecosystems, wildlife habitats, and indigenous communities. Alaska has also designated protected areas, such as the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, to conserve pristine wilderness areas from development, this area is closed to oil and gas drilling, protecting it from development. But the Trump administration pushed to open parts of it, despite opposition from indigenous Gwich'in people[٥٦].

Russia: Russia has implemented environmental regulations for resource exploration in its Arctic territories, although enforcement and oversight mechanisms may vary. The Russian government requires companies to conduct environmental impact assessments (EIAs) and obtain permits for resource extraction projects. Russia's federal laws protect some remote wilderness areas from resource extraction, but enforcement is often weak. Protected areas cover twice as much territory on paper versus what is functionally implemented on the ground[٥٧].

Climate Change Considerations:

Climate change casts a long shadow over resource exploration in the Arctic, demanding policies that prioritize its unique vulnerabilities and long-term environmental integrity. Policies may require companies to assess and mitigate greenhouse gas emissions, minimize disturbance to permafrost, and adapt to changing weather patterns and sea ice conditions. Some jurisdictions may also incorporate climate change adaptation strategies into resource exploration policies to address long-term risks and uncertainties.

The Arctic warms at twice the rate of the global average, amplifying melting permafrost, sea ice loss, and changes in precipitation patterns. These threaten ecosystem stability, infrastructure security, and cultural practices of Indigenous communities[٥٨]. Regulations must reflect the heightened vulnerability of the Arctic environment. This includes enhanced impact assessments, stricter pollution controls, and mandatory adaptation plans for exploration projects[٥٩]. In response to the significant impacts of climate change in the Arctic region, various regulatory measures have been taken to address these challenges. These measures aim to

مجلة كامبريدج للبحوث العلمية: مجلة علمية محكمة
تصدر عن مركز كامبريدج للبحوث والمؤتمرات–العدد الثالث الاربعون – آذار ٢٠٢٥– رمضان ١٤٤٦
ISSN–2536–0027

mitigate greenhouse gas emissions, adapt to changing environmental conditions, and protect the vulnerable Arctic ecosystem. Some examples of regulatory measures related to climate change in the Arctic include:

Emission Reduction Targets: Arctic nations have committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions through international agreements such as the Paris Agreement. These agreements set targets for emission reductions and encourage countries to implement policies and measures to achieve their goals, including regulations targeting specific sectors such as transportation, energy production, and industrial activities. Norway has a target to reduce emissions by ٥٠-٥٥٪ below ١٩٩٠ levels by ٢٠٣٠ as part of the Paris Agreement. Key policies include its carbon tax on offshore oil and gas production, support for electric vehicles, and funding for carbon capture and storage projects. However, Norway continues to face criticism for its Arctic oil drilling plans which could undermine its climate goals. Environmental groups argue for ending new oil licensing rounds in the Norwegian Arctic.

Renewable Energy Development: Regulatory frameworks in the Arctic promote the development of renewable energy sources such as wind, solar, and hydroelectric power to reduce reliance on fossil fuels and decrease greenhouse gas emissions. Incentives, subsidies, and feed-in tariffs may be implemented to support the deployment of renewable energy technologies in remote Arctic communities. Prioritizing exploration of renewable energy sources like wind and geothermal could reduce reliance on fossil fuels and minimize the contribution of resource extraction to climate change[٦٠]. Integrating climate change adaptation measures into resource exploration policies strengthens the long-term resilience of infrastructure, communities, and ecosystems[٦١].

Adaptation Planning: Arctic nations are developing adaptation strategies and action plans to address the impacts of climate change on infrastructure, communities, and ecosystems. These plans may include measures such as coastal protection, permafrost monitoring, community relocation, and changes in land use practices to adapt to changing environmental conditions and minimize risks. In Alaska, tribal governments and native corporations developed adaptation plans with support from federal agencies like the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Strategies include monitoring shoreline erosion, improving storm prediction models, community relocation planning for threatened villages like Newtok, and integrating indigenous knowledge of environmental changes. However, funding constraints have hampered implementation of some adaptation priorities[٦٢].

ISSN–2536–0027

Balancing economic development with climate change considerations remains a complex challenge. Effective policies require ongoing scientific research, robust community engagement, and flexible adaptation strategies to navigate the unique and rapidly changing Arctic environment.

IX- **Maritime and Sovereignty Issues:**

Due to the intensified melting of the ice in the Arctic Ocean, sea routes are of increasing importance for transit and especially for shipping bound for certain ports. The Northeast Passage from Norway to the Pacific Ocean is currently navigable for longer periods of time in the summer. This northern sea route runs through Russian territorial waters[٦٣]. The Arctic Ocean is subject to competing territorial claims and sovereignty disputes among Arctic nations. Resource exploration policies must navigate these geopolitical complexities while promoting cooperation, transparency, and peaceful resolution of disputes.

Policies related to offshore exploration may require adherence to international maritime law, including the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), and adherence to bilateral or multilateral agreements governing Arctic waters. The Convention was created in ١٩٨٢, any signatory that can prove that its continental shelf extends beyond ٢٠٠ nautical miles (nm) from its shoreline is automatically entitled to legal rights allowing it to exploit oil, gas and minerals in this zone. This provision is a one-of opportunity: the extension must be claimed within ten years of signing the convention[٦٤]. However, the CLCS does not have the authority to resolve disputes or delimit boundaries between states. Therefore, the Arctic states need to negotiate and agree on the delimitation of their continental shelf areas, which may overlap or conflict with each other. For example, Canada, Denmark, and Russia have competing claims over the Lomonosov Ridge, a submarine mountain range that crosses the Arctic Ocean.

The Arctic region is governed by eight different sovereign states in conformity with their own domestic interests and international legal conventions (for example, the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea concerning the Arctic Ocean) and by forums for intergovernmental co-operation (such as the Arctic Council). The result has been remarkable geopolitical stability and peaceful intergovernmental co-operation.

The Arctic Council serves as a key forum for diplomatic dialogue and cooperation among Arctic states, providing a platform for addressing common challenges such as environmental protection, scientific research, and sustainable development. While the collaborative work of the Arctic Council (AC) was paused, consistent

ISSN–2536–0027

with the Western community's condemnation of the escalation of hostilities in Ukraine, it remains true that geopolitical order has been remarkably stable in the North. Rules and international agreements negotiated through the AC, and outside of it, still hold[٦٥].

Effective resource exploration policies in the Arctic often require close coordination among multiple government agencies, indigenous organizations, industry stakeholders, and international partners. Policies may emphasize the need for regulatory coherence, capacity building, and information sharing to facilitate responsible resource development while minimizing risks and maximizing benefits for Arctic communities and ecosystems. Territorial claims and disputes in the Arctic region are complex and dynamic, as they involve multiple actors, interests, and legal frameworks. The Arctic states have overlapping claims over parts of the Arctic territory, waters, and resources, based on different criteria and interpretations of international law. The non-Arctic states also have interests and involvement in the region, as they seek to access its resources, markets, and scientific opportunities. The main issues and challenges for Arctic territorial claims and disputes are:

The rights to passage and jurisdiction over Arctic Sea routes: The Arctic Sea routes are the waterways that connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans through the Arctic Ocean, such as the Northwest Passage, the Northeast Passage, and the Transpolar Sea Route. These routes offer potential benefits for shipping, trade, and tourism, as they reduce the distance, time, and cost of transportation between Asia and Europe or North America. However, they also pose challenges for navigation, safety, and environmental protection, as they are affected by the changing ice conditions, weather, and infrastructure in the region. The Arctic states and the non-Arctic states have different views and interests on the legal status and regulation of these routes, which may affect their rights and obligations to use and manage them. For example, Canada considers the Northwest Passage as part of its internal waters, where it has full sovereignty and jurisdiction, while the United States and other states regard it as an international strait, where they have the right of transit passage. Similarly, Russia considers the Northeast Passage as part of its territorial waters and exclusive economic zone, where it has the right to regulate and charge fees for navigation, The legal status of the Northern Sea Route through Russia's Arctic waters remains contested, as some nations like the United States argue it constitutes an international strait where rights to free passage should apply under the U.N. Convention on the Law of the

ISSN–2536–0027

Sea. However, Russia claims territorial sovereignty over the route and requires vessels to obtain permissions for transit passage[١٦].

The modernization and expansion of military capabilities in the Arctic: The Arctic states and the non-Arctic states have been upgrading and increasing their military capabilities for Arctic use, such as submarines, surface ships, aircraft, satellites, radars, missiles, and bases. These capabilities are intended to enhance their defense and deterrence, as well as their presence and influence in the region. However, they also raise concerns about the militarization and escalation of tensions in the Arctic, especially between Russia and NATO members.

The balance between military and civilian activities in the Arctic: The Arctic states and the non-Arctic states have been developing and promoting their civilian activities in the region, such as scientific research, environmental protection, economic development, and cultural exchange. These activities are intended to foster cooperation and trust, as well as to demonstrate their legitimate interests and involvement in the region. However, they also face challenges from the military activities and interests of other states, which may affect their security and sovereignty in the region.

The Arctic is no longer just a scientific curiosity; it's a geopolitical battleground. Strengthened legal and regulatory frameworks in the Arctic will be necessary to attract international investment and development. The debate on the future of Arctic governance centers on whether to create new or use existing multinational frameworks.

X- Conclusion

In conclusion, the geopolitics of the Arctic region present a complex landscape shaped by competing interests, environmental concerns, and resource exploration endeavors. Throughout this discourse, we have delved into the intricate interplay between geopolitical dynamics, environmental considerations, and resource exploration activities in the Arctic, highlighting the challenges and opportunities inherent in this multifaceted domain. The Arctic's geopolitical landscape is influenced by a multitude of factors, including territorial disputes, sovereignty claims, and strategic interests of Arctic and non-Arctic nations alike.

Resource exploration in the Arctic holds immense potential for economic growth and energy security, yet it also presents significant risks to the environment, indigenous rights, and geopolitical stability. The pursuit of oil and gas extraction, mining, shipping, and fishing in the region raises concerns about pollution, habitat destruction, and the displacement of indigenous communities. Regulatory

ISSN–2536–0027

frameworks have been established to govern resource exploration activities, with an emphasis on environmental impact assessments, indigenous consultation, and sustainable development principles. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of these regulations rests upon their enforcement, transparency, and accountability, as well as the commitment of stakeholders to uphold environmental standards and respect indigenous rights.

The Arctic stands at a crossroads. Resource riches beckon, fueling the ambitions of regional and international players. Yet, the delicate environment and the rights of Indigenous communities demand careful consideration. Climate impacts must be robustly assessed and mitigated from all activities, and binding international law can elevate environmental priorities over national commercial interests. With foresight and care, the Arctic's economic potential and ecological riches can be judiciously harnessed.

At the forefront of Arctic geopolitics is the assertive role played by Russia, which views the Arctic as a strategic priority and asserts its sovereignty over vast swaths of the region. Russia's military buildup, infrastructure development, and resource exploitation activities in the Arctic have raised concerns among neighboring Arctic states and NATO members about Moscow's intentions and ambitions in the region. The annexation of Crimea and ongoing conflict in eastern Ukraine have further strained Russia's relations with the West, complicating efforts to foster cooperation and dialogue in the Arctic. The Arctic Council, was suspended on February ٢٠٢٢, due to the armed conflict between Russia and Ukraine which left the region without a platform for dialogue and cooperation on environmental, scientific, and social matters.

The deployment of Russian military forces in Ukraine has also affected its military capabilities and readiness in the Arctic. On one hand, Russia has diverted some of its ground forces and equipment from the Arctic to the Ukrainian front, reducing its presence and mobility in the region. On the other hand, Russia has maintained or increased its naval and air forces in the Arctic, as well as its deployment of precision munitions and hybrid tactics, such as cyberattacks and sabotage.

Russia's economic and strategic interests in the Arctic have not diminished due to the war. Russia still relies on the Arctic for its oil and gas production, as well as for its development of the Northern Sea Route, a potential global trade route that runs along its Arctic coast. Russia also views the Arctic as a vital region for its nuclear deterrence and homeland defense.

ISSN–2536–0027

Scientific collaborations have been similarly affected. Much of the research and data sharing relating to the Russian Arctic is on hold, in part because of restrictions imposed by funding agencies in Europe and the United States. Moreover, a number of field experiments originally planned for the region have shifted to the North American or European Arctic. Several international efforts to study permafrost have already been disrupted as a result of economic sanctions against Russia. Although permafrost research is undoubtedly continuing in Russia, the data are no longer widely accessible — cutting off a key source of information for climate models that help researchers to predict future warming[٦٧].

Considering the current situation, NATO's involvement in the Arctic has become increasingly pronounced, as the Alliance seeks to safeguard its interests and ensure security and stability in the region. NATO's Arctic strategy emphasizes deterrence, and defense, with a focus on enhancing military capabilities. However, NATO's presence in the Arctic has also fueled tensions with Russia, exacerbating existing geopolitical rivalries and raising concerns about the militarization of the region. Finland and Sweden, two non-NATO Arctic states, have requested to join the alliance in response to Russia's aggression. This would mean that every Arctic country except Russia would be a NATO member, potentially increasing the military tensions and mistrust in the region.

In conclusion, the geopolitics of the Arctic region presents a complex and dynamic landscape, influenced not only by environmental concerns and resource exploration but also by broader geopolitical tensions involving Russia, Ukraine, and NATO. Throughout this discourse, we have explored the intricate interplay between these factors, highlighting the challenges and opportunities inherent in navigating this multifaceted domain.

These geopolitical tensions add a layer of volatility to the Arctic equation. Concerns around militarization, resource control, and potential spillover effects raise vital questions about the future of cooperation and responsible development in the region.

While diplomatic efforts and international frameworks are crucial, building trust and fostering dialogue amid geopolitical tensions remains a significant challenge. With billions of barrels of oil equivalent at stake, the geopolitical maneuvering for access and influence will likely accelerate. But tensions can be managed through norms of cooperation and compromise. The Arctic will continue to be a focal point of international attention as climate change accelerates and resource potential beckons. By prioritizing sustainability, respecting Indigenous rights, and

fostering international cooperation, we can navigate the complex geopolitical landscape and chart a course towards a just and sustainable future for this unique and vital region.

List of all sources cited in the research paper following a specific citation style.

Acknowledgments:

١- **Overland, J., & Sovacool, B. K.** (٢٠٢٠). The Arctic's new normal. *Science*, ٣٦٩(٦٥٠٩), ٦٢٩-٦٣٠. https://doi.org/١٠.١١٢٦/science.abc٩١٤١

٢- **Soper, T.** (٢٠١٢). *Arctic: A guide to coastal wildlife.* Bradt Travel Guides.

٣- **Stuhl, A.** (٢٠١٦). *Unfreezing the Arctic: Science, colonialism, and the transformation of Inuit lands.* The University of Chicago Press.

٤- **Watt-Cloutier, S.** (٢٠١٥). *The right to be cold: One woman's story of protecting her culture, the Arctic, and the whole planet.* Penguin Canada.

٥- **United Nations.** (٢٠٢٣). *High Seas Treaty: Strengthening international obligations in the Arctic*. Retrieved from https://www.un.org/bbnj

٦- **United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS).** (١٩٨٢). Retrieved from https://www.un.org/depts/los/convention_agreements/texts/unclos/unclos_e.pdf

٧- **U.S. Army.** (٢٠٢١). *Regaining Arctic dominance: The U.S. Army in the Arctic.* Department of the Army. Retrieved from https://www.army.mil/standto/archive/٢٠٢١/٠٣/١٦/

٨- **Arctic Council.** (٢٠٢١). *Arctic environmental protection strategy.* Retrieved from https://www.arctic-council.org/

٩- **International Maritime Organization (IMO).** (٢٠٢٠). *Polar Code: International code for ships operating in polar waters.* Retrieved from https://www.imo.org/en/MediaCentre/HotTopics/Pages/Polar-default.aspx

١٠- **Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment.** (٢٠٢١). *Norway's climate action plan ٢٠٢١-٢٠٣٠.* Retrieved from https://www.regjeringen.no/en/dokumenter/norway-climate-plan/id٢٨٣٣٢٣٥/

[١] Soper Tony. A Guide to Coastal Wildlife. Bradt Travel Guide, April ٢٠١٢, p. ٢.

[٢] Overland James, Sovacool Benjamin. The Arctic's New Normal. Journal Science, Volume ٣٧٠, Issue ٦٥١٦, ٢٠٢٠. P. ٣٧٠.

مجلة كامبريدج للبحوث العلمية: مجلة علمية محكمة
تصدر عن مركز كامبريدج للبحوث والمؤتمرات–العدد الثالث الاربعون – آذار ٢٠٢٥– رمضان ١٤٤٦
ISSN–2536–0027

[٣] Watt-Cloutier Sheila. The Right to Be Cold: One Woman's Story of Protecting Her Culture, the Arctic and the Whole Planet. Allen Lane. United Kingdom ٢٠١٥ P١٧

٤ Post Eric, Forchhammer Mads, Bret-Harte Syndonia, Callaghan Terry, Christensen Torben, Elberling Antony... & Schmidt Wookey.. Ecological dynamics across the Arctic associated with recent climate change. Science VOL. ٣٢٥, ٢٠٠٩, P. ٣٢٥.

٥ Huebert, Rob. Canada's Arctic policy: looking back, looking forward. International Journal, ٢٠١٦. P. ٧١.

[٦] Hueber Rob. Canada's Arctic policy: looking back, looking forward. *International Journal*, ٧١(٤), ٢٠١٦, ٥. P. ٥٤٣.

[٧] Nurlan Aliyev. Russia's Military Capabilities in the Arctic. RKKICDS International Center for Defense and Security. June ٢٥ ٢٠١٩. https://icds.ee/en/russias-military-capabilities-in-the-arctic/

[٨] Basic Information about the Arctic. Arctic Center University of Lapland. https://www.arcticcentre.org/EN/arcticregion

[٩] Uğur Mehmet Ali, Dal Adnan Dal. Evolving Arctic Security Architecture Towards a Cooperative One. International Journal of Politics and Security (IJPS), Vol. ٣, No. ١, ٢٠٢١. pp. ١-٢٤.

[١٠] Uğur Mehmet Ali, Dal Adnan Dal. Evolving Arctic Security Architecture Towards a Cooperative One. International Journal of Politics and Security (IJPS), Vol. ٣, No. ١, ٢٠٢١. P. ١-٢٤.

[١١] Lajeunesse Adam. The Distant Early Warning LineE and the Canadian Battle for Public Perception. Canadian Military Journal. http://www.journal.forces.gc.ca/vo٨/no٢/lajeunes-eng.asp

[١٢] Gomes Tomé Ribeiro. The transformation of Arctic geopolitics and its implications for the North Atlantic. Atlantic Central, Policy Bried Issue ١٤, November ٢٠٢٢.

[١٣] Gross Matthew. Geopolitical Competition in The Arctic Circle. Harvard International Review. ٠٢.DEC.٢٠٢٠. https://hir.harvard.edu/the-arctic-circle/

[١٤] Howy Jacobs. On ice. EMBO Rep. ٢٠٢٣ Nov ٦;٢٤(١١):e٥٨١٦٣. doi: ١٠.١٥٢٥٢/embr.٢٠٢٣٥٨١٦٣. Epub ٢٠٢٣ Sep ٢١. PMID: ٣٧٧٣٣١٩٥; PMCID: PMC١٠٦٢٦٤١٦.

[١٥] Huebert Rob. A new Cold War in the Arctic?! The Old One Never Ended!. Arctic Portal. ٢٠١٩. https://arcticyearbook.com/arctic-yearbook/٢٠١٩/٢٠١٩-commentaries/٣٢٥-a-new-cold-war-in-the-arctic-the-old-one-never-ended

[١٦] Brimmer Esther. Changing Geopolitics in the Arctic. International Institutions and Global Governance Program. Council on Foreign Relation. https://www.cfr.org/report/changing-geopolitics-arctic-٠

ISSN–2536–0027

[١٧] Howy Jacobs. On ice. EMBO Rep. ٢٠٢٣ Nov ٦;٢٤(١١):e٥٨١٦٣. doi: ١٠.١٥٢٥٢/embr.٢٠٢٣٥٨١٦٣. Epub ٢٠٢٣ Sep ٢١. PMID: ٣٧٧٣٣١٩٥; PMCID: PMC١٠٦٢٦٤١٦.

[١٨] Gavin Jerome. The melting Arctic and raising tensions among Arctic nations. Vision of Humanity. https://www.visionofhumanity.org/the-melting-arctic-and-a-new-cold-war/

[١٩] Jorundur Svavarsson , Hermann Guls, Sham Ronia, Leung Kenneth, Halldórsson Halldór. Pollutants from Shipping - New Environmental Challenges in the Subarctic and the Arctic Ocean. Mar Pollut Bull. ٢٠٢١ Mar;١٦٤:١١٢٠٠٤. doi: ١٠.١٠١٦/j.marpolbul.٢٠٢١.١١٢٠٠٤. Epub ٢٠٢١ Feb ٢. PMID: ٣٣٥٤٠٢٧٤.

[٢٠] Howy Jacobs. On ice. EMBO Rep. ٢٠٢٣ Nov ٦;٢٤(١١):e٥٨١٦٣. doi: ١٠.١٥٢٥٢/embr.٢٠٢٣٥٨١٦٣. Epub ٢٠٢٣ Sep ٢١. PMID: ٣٧٧٣٣١٩٥; PMCID: PMC١٠٦٢٦٤١٦.

[٢١] Nilsson Annika and Christensen Miyase. Arctic Geopolitics, Media and Power. Routledge Geopolitics Series. Routledge, London and New York, ٢٠١٩. p ١٧.

[٢٢] Fontaine-Skronski Kim, Thool Valeriane, and Eschborn Norbert. Does the UN Model Still Work? Challenges and Prospects for the Future of Multilateralism. BRILL, Boston ٢٠٢٢. P.٦٥.

[٢٣] Tomé Ribeiro Gomes. The Transformation of Arctic Geopolitics and its Implications for the North Atlantic. Atlantic Central, Policy Bried Issue ١٤, November ٢٠٢٢.

[٢٤] For the climate's sake, keep Arctic communication open. Spring Nature LMT, ٢٠ July ٢٠٢٢. Nature. ٢٠٢٢ Jul;٦٠٧(٧٩١٩):٤٢٢. doi: ١٠.١٠٣٨/d٤١٥٨٦-٠٢٢-٠١٩٥٦-w. PMID: ٣٥٨٥٩٢٠١.

[٢٥] Thomas David, Arévalo-Martínez Damian., Crocket Kristy et al. A changing Arctic Ocean. Ambio ٥١, ٢٩٣–٢٩٧ ٢٠٢٢. https://doi.org/١٠.١٠٠٧/s١٣٢٨٠-٠٢١-٠١٦٧٧-w

[٢٦] Dodds Klaus and Nuttall Mark. The Arctic What Everyone Need to know. Oxford University Press. New York ٢٠١٩. P.٢٨.

[٢٧] Hjort Jan., Karjalainen Olli, Aalto Juha. et al. Degrading permafrost puts Arctic infrastructure at risk by mid-century. Nat Commun ٩, ٥١٤٧ (٢٠١٨). https://doi.org/١٠.١٠٣٨/s٤١٤٦٧-٠١٨-٠٧٥٥٧-٤.

[٢٨] Svavarsson Jorundur, Guls Hermann, Sham Ronia, Leung Kenneth, Halldórsson Halldór. Pollutants from shipping - new environmental challenges in the subarctic and the Arctic Ocean. Mar Pollut Bull. ٢٠٢١ Mar;١٦٤:١١٢٠٠٤. doi: ١٠.١٠١٦/j.marpolbul.٢٠٢١.١١٢٠٠٤. Epub ٢٠٢١ Feb ٢. PMID: ٣٣٥٤٠٢٧٤.

[٢٩] The Arctic is the northernmost region of the Earth. Encyclopedic Entry, National Geographic. https://education.nationalgeographic.org/resource/arctic/

[٣٠] The Arctic Region, Arctic Center. University of Lapland. https://www.arcticcentre.org/EN/arcticregion

ISSN–2536–0027

[٣١] Brinkman Todd, Kofinas Gary. and BurnSilver Shauna et al. ٢٠١٧. Arctic communities perceive climate impacts on access as a critical challenge to availability of subsistence resources. Research Gate ٢٠١٦. P.٤١٣-٤٢٧.
[٣٢] Inuit Circumpolar Council. ٢٠١٨. Utqiagvik Declaration. ICC Alaska. https://iccalaska.org/wp-icc/wp-content/uploads/٢٠١٩/٠٥/FINAL-Utqiagvik-Declaration-٢٠١٨.pdf
[٣٣] Arctic Human Development Report (AHDR). Akureyri: Stefansson Arctic Institute. ٢٠٠٤. https://oaarchive.arctic-council.org/items/f٦c٦٣١٥٨-٤٠١c-٤a١٤-a٨d٢-٥bc٩f١٠٧١٠bf
[٣٤] Heininen Lassi, Olsvig Sara, Barnes Justin,and Exner Heather-Pirot. Arctic Indigenous Peoples: Climate, Science, Knowledge and Governance. Arctic Yearbook ٢٠٢٣.
[٣٥] Loukacheva, Natalia. Indigenous Inuit law, "Western" law and Northern issues. Arctic Review on Law and Politics, Arctic Review on Law and Politics, vol. ٣, ٢/٢٠١٢, pp.٢٠٠-٢١٧.
[٣٦] Good Practices for Environmental Impact Assessment and Meaningful Engagement in the Arctic. Arctic Council. ٢٠١٥.
[٣٧] Arctic Peoples. Arctic Council. ٢٠٢٢. https://arctic-council.org/about/indigenous-peoples/
[٣٨] Smieszek, Malgorzata. How permanent? The role of Arctic Indigenous Permanent Participants in Arctic Council negotiations. The Polar Journal Volume ٩ Issue ٢, ٢٠١٩: P.١٩٤-٢١٢.
[٣٩] The Arctic is the northernmost region of the Earth, Encyclopedic Entry. National Geographic. https://education.nationalgeographic.org/resource/arctic/
[٤٠] Abele Francis, Courchene Thomas, Seidle Leslie, and St-Hilaire France. Northern Exposure: Peoples, Powers and Prospects in Canada's North. Institute for Research on Public Policy, ٢٠٢٠.
[٤١] Zadorin Maksim, Shestova Tatiana. Legal protection of minority peoples' rights in the Russian Arctic. Polar Geography Volume ٤٠, ٢٠٧–٢٢٧ (٢٠١٧).
[٤٢] James Anaya. Report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples: The situation of indigenous peoples in the Russian Federation. UN Human Rights Council. ٢٠١٣.
[٤٣] Dowsley Martha, and Wenzel George. The time of the most polar bears,A co-management conflict in Nunavut. Arctic, ٢٠٠٨. pp.١٧٧-١٨٩.
[٤٤] Edéhzhíe Dehcho Protected Area and National Wildlife Area. Dehcho First Nations. ٢٠٢١. https://dehcho.org/edacho-protected-area
[٤٥] Indigenous Observers Network. ELOKA. ٢٠٢٢ https://eloka-arctic.org/communities/observers/index.html
[٤٦] Inuit Circumpolar Council. Alaskan Inuit Food Security Conceptual Framework. Alaska. ٢٠١٦. https://iccalaska.org/wp-icc/wp-

ISSN–2536–0027

content/uploads/٢٠١٦/٠٣/Food-Security-Summary-and-Recommendations-Report.pdf

[٤٧] Inuit Circumpolar Council. Utqiagvik Declaration. ICC Alaska, ٢٠١٨. https://iccalaska.org/wp-icc/wp-content/uploads/٢٠١٨/٠٧/FINAL-Utqiagvik-Declaration-٢٠١٨.pdf

[٤٨] Harsem Østein., Eide Arne. and Heen Knut. Factors influencing future oil and gas prospects in the Arctic. Energy policy ٢٠١١, ٣٩(١٢), pp.٨٠٣٧-٨٠٤٥.

[٤٩] Harsem, Ø., Eide, A. and Heen, K. Factors influencing future oil and gas prospects in the Arctic. Energy policy, Volume ٣٩ (١٢), ٢٠١١. pp.٨٠٣٧-٨٠٤٥.

[٥٠] Bravo Michael, and Triscott Nicola. Arctic Geopolitics & Autonomy. Arctic Perspective Cahier No. ٢, HATJECANTZ, ٢٠٠٨. p ٢٢.

[٥١] Simon Marr. The Precautionary Principle in the Law of the Sea - Modern decision Making in International Law. Publications on Ocean Development ٣٩. Den Haag/London ٢٠٠٣.

[٥٢] Convention on Biological Diversity - Protected Areas in the Arctic. https://arctic-council.org/explore/topics/biodiversity/

[٥٣] Arctic Council - Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment ٢٠٠٩. https://oaarchive.arctic-council.org/items/b٠١٤٦٥f٩-٤١٣d-٤٥٥٥-af٥٩-٠٧ddc٧b٧٤٩٩a

[٥٤] Protecting the Environment of the Arctic Ecosystem: Now What's Wrong with That? The George Washington International Law Review. Jensen ٢٠١٦.

[٥٥] Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment, https://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/kld/id٦٦٨/

[٥٦] Trump Administration Pushes to Expand Arctic Drilling. Los Angeles Times. Reid ٢٠٢٠.

[٥٧] The State of the Arctic Environment: Regional cooperation on the road to the top of the world? The George Washington International Law Review. Wilson ٢٠١٦.

[٥٨] Arctic Monitoring Assessment Programme (AMAP) ٢٠٢٢ Report, https://www.amap.no

[٥٩] Stockholm Environment Institute - Policy Options for Addressing Climate Change Impacts on Extractive Industries in the Arctic, https://www.sei.org

[٦٠] Arctic Council Framework for a Sustainably Developed Arctic, https://arctic-council.org/projects/sustainable-development-goals-in-the-arctic/

[٦١] UN Environment Programme - Adaptation Finance Tracking Mechanism, https://www.unep.org/topics/climate-action/climate-finance/access-adaptation-finance

[٦٢] Reidmiller, D.R., C.W. Avery, D.R. Easterling, K.E. Kunkel, K.L.M. Lewis, T.K. Maycock, and B.C. Stewart (eds.). USGCRP. Impacts, Risks, and Adaptation in the United States. Fourth National Climate Assessment, Volume II. U.S. Global Change Research Program, Washington, DC, USA, ٢٠١٨. pp. ١١٤٤–١١٨٦.

مجلة كامبريدج للبحوث العلمية: مجلة علمية محكمة
تصدر عن مركز كامبريدج للبحوث والمؤتمرات–العدد الثالث الاربعون – آذار ٢٠٢٥– رمضان ١٤٤٦
ISSN–2536–0027

[٦٣] Northern Sea Route Information Office ٢٠٢٠, https://arctic-lio.com
[٦٤] Ebinger Charles and Zambetakis Evie. The geopolitics of Arctic melt, INTA٨٥_٦_٠٨_Ebinger.indd ١٢١٦, ٢٦/١٠/٢٠٠٩, https://www.academia.edu/٢٤٢١٥٩٥٦/The_geopolitics_of_Arctic_melt
[٦٥] Heather Nicol and Lassi K. Heininen. The Evolving Geopolitics of Polar Regions, Polar Cousins interior EPUB.indd. https://ucp.manifoldapp.org/system/resource/c/١/f/c١f٨٣٦٩٥-٤١٢٥-٤٤٠٣-b٧d٨-٩٢٠٢c٩٨٢c٨c٢/attachment/٥b٦f٥٢٤fc٢٤b٦fad٢٢٣٣b٢ed٠c٣٤٣٥b٣.pdf
[٦٦] Staiger Jennifer. The Northern Sea Route: The Myth of an International Strait. The International Lawyer, ٥٥(١), ٢٠٢٢. pp.٣٩-٦٦.
[٦٧] For the climate's sake, keep Arctic communication open. Spring Nature LMT, ٢٠ July ٢٠٢٢. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/٣٥٨٥٩٢٠١/