

Arctic policy in the United States 2007-2011.

Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Seriiia 25. Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia i mirovaia politika, No. 2, 2011, page(s): 228-243

[*Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta*]

alternative names: *Herald of Moscow State University, Series 25: International Relations and World Politics*

city: Moscow

editor: Moscow State University, Faculty of World Politics
119991, GSP-1, Moscow, Leninskie gory

editorial office: Kokoshin, Andrey A., Editor-in-Chief
phone: +7495 939-30-76
fax: +7495 939-30-76
email: dekanat@fmp.msu.ru

focus: Subjects: theory of international relations and world politics, military-political, economic and information aspects of the international security, activities of international governmental and non-governmental organisations, evolution of world integration processes, problems of complex regional studies and comparative regional geography, foreign policy of Russia and the CIS countries. The journal has been published since 2009 in Russian.

publisher: Moscow State University

last update: 19.01.2010 13:48

producer: GESIS

contributions online: not on the web

subject: International Relations, International Politics, Foreign Affairs, Development Policy

Database: GESIS SocioGuide]

<<http://www.gesis.org/knowledgebase/journals/index.asp?stock=journals&select=Russian%20Federation&slice=6&q=28002#28002>>

Author: IM Glazunov

The economic and strategic appeal of the Arctic causes increased global attention to the region and increase its role in contemporary international relations. One of the main contenders for the Arctic wealth of the United States of America, which, after the Russian expedition "Arctic 2007", organized with the aim to clarify the limits

of the shelf at the bottom of the Arctic Ocean and hoist the flag of the Russian Federation under the water at the North Pole, sharply stepped up its policy in the Arctic. Purpose of the article - highlight the main U.S. interests in the Arctic region, and describe the specific actions to implement them, taken by the administrations of George W. Bush and Barack Obama in the 2007 - 2011 years.

Key words: Arctic, the U.S., the Obama administration, the administration of George W. Bush., Safety, natural resources, ecology, Alaska.

* Glazunov Irina - Analyst-Expert Company Public Relations (CROS), Graduate Department of History of International Relations and International Affairs Faculty of World Politics, Moscow State University named after MV Lomonosov Moscow State University, member of the conference "Environmental Security in the Arctic Region" (University of California, Irvine, USA, 12 November 2010) (e-mail: Glazunova@mrpublic.ru).

Arctic policy in the United States 2007-2011

The modern world is increasingly in need of resources, especially energy resources, and by chance over the past 20 years in the lexicon of experts in the field of international relations, the term "energy security" took a very special place. In these circumstances, any resource-rich region in the world attracts the attention of various states.

Until recently, few could have predicted that the next battle for resources will unfold in the Arctic, but the factor of global warming brought the region into the category of the most attractive places in this respect in the world. According to geologists, under the seabed in the Arctic is a quarter of global oil reserves and natural gas [14]. The region is rich and numerous other natural resources. According to scientists, the Arctic hidden deposits of tin, manganese, gold, nickel, lead, platinum and even diamond [34]. In addition, the melting of Arctic sea ice creates an incredible human
(page 228)

number of possibilities - from the opening of new sea routes to the elimination of unique crop varieties. Finally, the Arctic is of great strategic military importance. Military experts say that in this region are comfortable position to launch ballistic missiles deployment of missile defense (BMD) and other elements of strategic deterrence. Naval forces due to global warming and the gradual reduction in ice area are able to operate in the Arctic for much of the year [7].

...Of course, these perspectives draw the attention of many countries in one form or another have already announced their intentions to participate in the future, "sharing." The main contenders for the wealth of the region are the five states that have direct access to Arctic waters of the U.S., Russia, Canada, Norway and Denmark (via Greenland). Moreover, the claims say three more polar state directly without an exit to the North Pole - Iceland, Sweden and Finland. More than 20 non-Arctic countries, including South Korea and China are also looking for an opportunity to join the "Arctic race" [21].

United States as a major importer of oil in the world for obvious reasons, are increasingly focusing on the Arctic region. It is known that parts of the U.S. continental shelf could provide oil in amounts corresponding to 10 years in the current annual oil consumption in the country [26].

However, in the U.S. realize that the melting of snow in the Arctic not only opens up new possibilities and prospects for the Arctic states, but also creates numerous and very serious problem. One of them - a threat to security, which theoretically contains the very fact of an opening to navigation of the new space. Representatives of the American political establishment is not without reason, pay attention to the fact that new sea routes - are potential channels for transport of not only drugs and illegal immigrants, but also weapons,

including those of mass destruction. Fear causes and vulnerabilities of U.S. borders. In this case, refers to "traditional" sense of security. But today more and more politicians and scientists, including American, aware of the fact that security threats are not confined weapons and terrorism, but also include environmental aspects.

All these factors undoubtedly have a significant influence on the formation of Washington's political approaches to the Arctic region. Despite the extremely
(page 229)

high degree of interest of the United States in the Arctic resources, especially oil, responsible for their policy-making must take into account the interests of national security and environmental threats alarmed public opinion, and needs of indigenous people, and, finally, the need to intensify and increase funding for scientific research.

In this paper we attempt to describe the main steps in the way of Washington's design "line of the Arctic," Arctic trace the evolution of the policies George Bush Jr. and the current Democratic administration, to give the author's vision of the current U.S. position on this issue.

Despite the fact that the discussion about the process of melting ice of the circumpolar region, capable of transforming energy markets and the global system of navigation, has been at least 20 years, the problems of the Arctic were left without due attention to both the State Department, and in the U.S. National Security Council. However, in the past few years, the region's strategic position and vast deposits of resources have attracted increasing attention of American leadership. Conventionally, you can even name the exact date of commencement of this process - in 2007. The event that gave a powerful impetus to this debate, of course, was the holding of the Russian submarine expedition "Arctic 2007" to clarify the boundaries of the shelf at the bottom of the Arctic Ocean and the establishment of the flag of the Russian Federation under the water at the North Pole.

The American press has reacted to this event is extremely nervous. Almost immediately appeared in the media countless articles that focused on outrage over Russia made claims for the Arctic. In particular, the words of a famous politician played Ariel Cohen, who described the Russian actions as "an attempt to capture the territorial" and called on the government of the United States "strongly respond" see [23]. The U.S. State Department said that the Russian polar researchers hoisted the flag does not add any legal weight of Russia's request to the territory of the sea shelf [20].

In order to match words with actions, in August 2007 after the U.S. Russian expedition "Arctic 2007" held a regular oceanographic research in the area of the Chukchi Rise. According to American researchers, the findings
(page 230)

pushing the foot of the continental slope of North America for more than 100 nautical miles from the line, where it was supposed before, that gives Americans the right to claim a large part of the Arctic [see 8]. However, the unique geography of the region and Russia can claim rights to these territories. According to the geologists of the North American and Eurasian continental plates - a unique pair, since the common boundary between them has not yet been conducted. According to the professor of Moscow State University named after MV Lomonosov, PN Kuprin, recent data indicate that it is taking place at the most of Eurasia - from Kamchatka to the New Siberian Islands and beyond is on the bottom of the Arctic Ocean. Chukotka is in this case on the North American plate, so no geological data cannot give an exact answer to the question of to what the Chukchi Peninsula, raising concerns more - to Alaska and Chukotka, the most [15].

U.S., however, is not limited to geological studies. Observing an increased interest in the Arctic from many countries have intensified and U.S. policy. Thus, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the U.S. Senate in September 2007 began hearings on the ratification of the Washington Convention on the Law of the Sea [17]. In this regard, it should be recalled that the Convention, often referred to as "the constitution of the oceans" [5], is the main legal document regulating the activities in the oceans and their resources used by States and **the United States, still have not ratified it, forced to stand aside the struggle for the region. Formally, Washington has no right to claim any resources in addition to the 200-mile economic zone along the northern coast of Alaska. Against ratification for over 20 years of performing group of conservative Republicans do not believe it possible for U.S. to give up part of its sovereignty, and that is how they regarded the Convention. Refusal to sign the American side of this important document was one of the obstacles to the start of the international section of the Arctic.** Looking ahead, we note that the issue of ratification of the United States now faced the most serious. Many American politicians and journalists insistently pay attention to a very disturbing fact: while the battle for the Arctic is entering a decisive stage, the United States, in fact, remain on the sidelines of an international process, and to share such an important strategic region without the participation of one of the most powerful and influential nations in the world will not be easy.
(page 231)

The next important document, which reflected the revision of U.S. policy toward the Arctic in favor of greater involvement, was adopted in October 2007, "Joint Strategy for the sea power of the XXI century." In it, in particular, noted that "climate change is gradually opening up the Arctic waters of space, making it possible not only to develop new resources, but also the emergence of new shipping routes, which could lead to a radical change in the entire global transport system. These may contain a significant potential for development, but they are also a source of competition for access to natural resources "[22]. Obviously, the strategy defines the main directions of the Navy, Marine Corps and U.S. Coast Guard requires a willingness to improve coordinated actions of these agencies in the Arctic.

Later, in 2008, the U.S. Geological Survey, after four years of work unveiled the first state assessment of mineral reserves in the Arctic region, which became one of the most authoritative studies of oil and gas potential of the planet. According to these data in the report, the Arctic is 13% of the world's undiscovered oil reserves, roughly 30% of the undiscovered natural gas reserves and 20% of gas condensate. The report says that most of the undiscovered resources are likely located near the Russian coast of Alaska and on the platform [4].

However, all these documents were only a preparation for writing a comprehensive material, designed to fully reflect the interests of the United States in the region. The overall policy context of George W. Bush on the Arctic has been identified he launched in January 2009, shortly before the inauguration of Barack Obama, National Security Directive. Even a cursory glance at the document is to be noted - he has identified a common "agenda" of the United States in the region. The directive identified three areas for which the U.S. government should pay special attention: security, resources and ecology, and every aspect was the subject of a separate unit. Looking ahead, we note that in respect of the Arctic current administration, in fact, implements the geopolitical plans of his predecessor. Despite the fact that Obama is eager to distance themselves from the "Bush legacy" in respect of the circumpolar region, there is actual continuity. All initiatives and instruments adopted under the new administration, affecting one of three areas on which to focus Bush Jr. Directive on National Security. Moreover, a feeling that the initiative
(page 232)

in this area of foreign policy the White House took over the military.

As becomes clear from the directive of George W. Bush Jr., One of the most important for Washington is the sphere of security in the Arctic. Thus, the text states that "the United States have a broad and fundamental

national interests in the Arctic region and are ready to defend their own or in cooperation with other countries. These interests include such areas as missile defense and early warning, strategic deterrence and sea operations to ensure security "[26]. In the directive instructed the Secretary of State, Minister for Defence and Minister of Internal Security, "to seek a peaceful resolution of all disputes in the Arctic" [26]. The document clearly tasked to maintain mobility of the U.S. military and civilian ships and aircraft in the region.

In fact, the text published by George W. Bush Jr. a few days before the inauguration of Barack Obama's new comprehensive directive on the Arctic, the U.S. made it clear that they consider the territory within the Arctic Circle area of its strategic interests, and the new administration was advised to increase the U.S. presence in the region.

Continuation of the security initiatives proposed by the Bush Jr. Can be considered a statement by NATO Secretary General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer, the need for a new Arctic military bases to defend the interests of members of the alliance. According to him, "an abundance of naval ships from countries that claim to disputed territory, could lead to a rather tense situation" [see 3].

Even for Barack Obama, April 29, 2009 in the Senate held hearings on "Modernization of the Coast Guard icebreakers: the main issues and recommendations to Congress' primary purpose was to appeal to the supreme legislative body of the United States to allocate funds for the improvement of icebreakers. In the list of "missions" of the polar ship the item appears on the "protection of U.S. sovereignty in the Arctic by the continued presence in the region," which clearly indicates the intention of the U.S. government to closely monitor the situation. During the hearing it was stated that two of the three icebreakers - "Polar Sea" and "Polar Star" - is now incapacitated due to the fact that 30 years of their life came to an end. Thus, the presence of a single vessel calls into question the ability to fully ensure the country's national interests, it was argued in [30].

Among the concrete measures to implement the presidential directive George W. Bush important to mention the establishment in May 2009
(page 233)

Working Group on Climate Change, headed by Chief of Oceanographic Service of the U.S. Navy Rear Admiral David Titley. The group worked to develop "the Naval Arctic road map" (Navy Arctic Roadmap), which was published on November 10, 2009, and contained a detailed list of strategic objectives for the U.S. Navy and the actions needed to achieve the desired results in the Arctic region until 2014 given map preserves legal force until the promulgation in 2014 of a new four-year report on defense issues see [6].

In the course of the August 20, 2009 Alaska Senate hearings on "The strategic importance of the Arctic in the policy of the United States" has also been raised about the need to protect the interests of U.S. security. Almost all participants at the hearing pointed out that the U.S. is due to arctic Alaska, the state and the region is of particular strategic value to the country. One of the measures required to implement a successful policy in the region, has been named the creation of new military infrastructure in the state. Of particular interest is the performance of Alaska Gov. Sean Parnell, who called his staff, "U.S. energy breadbasket" and reflected the need for "multidimensional" approach to the region. S. Parnell pointed out that the melting ice creates additional opportunities for trade, tourism and transportation. The study of the oceans shows that the increase in maritime traffic creates additional risks and threats. Arctic can no longer be called an insurmountable barrier. Alaska's strategic location, which is located at the intersection of transport routes in the north, making the state a potentially vulnerable to potential adversaries. In this connection, sounded the call addressed to the Congress to pay attention to the maintenance of the interception system based on the "Fort Greely," [36].

During the same hearings, C. Parnell said that the implementation of the current states of military and economic activities in the Arctic makes it necessary to ratify the United States of the UN Convention on the Law of the

Sea, which allow the country to lay claim to territory beyond the 200-mile radius, and so way to expand the U.S. border.

A separate part of speech of the Governor of Alaska has been devoted to the need to strengthen the U.S. Coast Guard. As noted by S. Parnell, climate change and the increasing military and commercial presence in the Arctic, a number of states require the purchase for the Coast Guard icebreakers, adapted (page 234)

for the passage of the arctic ice. In addition, the melting ice makes it easy to navigate in this region, and in this case, the Coast Guard acts as the guarantor of national security [36].

It is therefore necessary to apply to speak at the same hearing the U.S. Coast Guard commander Admiral Ted Allen, who once again stressed that the U.S. icebreaking capacity is under threat. In his claim, only one of three ice-breaker - "Healy" - fit for use, but it is a vessel of medium size and is designed for research, while the heavy icebreakers "Polar Sea" and "Polar Star", as mentioned previously, came out of the operation. Thus, it appears that the U.S. is losing the "Arctic race" both Russia and the three other main contenders for the wealth of the region [36].

The analysis stated in this article concerns would have been impossible without recourse to the Navy commissioned by March 10, 2011 report of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA "The impact of climate change for the U.S. Navy in the field of national security," on the compilation of which four years of work dedicated team of scientists and experts Navy retired admiral, under the chairmanship of Frank Bowman [see 11]. The document contains recommendations U.S. Navy to immediately begin a complete rethinking of the U.S. role in the polar region, as well as restructure its operations "due to the complication of the situation." The main rivals of the United States in the Arctic named seven countries: Canada, Russia, Denmark, Norway, Iceland, Sweden and Finland. Fleet made a number of requirements, among which a priority is to strengthen the call for the preparation of the Arctic Navy, Marine Corps and Coast Guard, Navy retrofitted with new icebreakers and ships suitable for navigation in Arctic waters, set in the region, constant station, surface and submarine tracking and monitoring, and modernize the GPS system for the needs of the Arctic [37]. The report also pointed out that the inevitability of global warming is likely to lead to a change in the relationship between Arctic states, borders, and a new section of the shelf, the struggle for natural resources, the wealth of the sea and waterways. Responsibility of the U.S. Navy in this regard, proclaimed the preparation for such an eventuality. According to the authors of the document, its content is largely influenced by the active behavior of Russia in the Arctic, from hoisting the flag of the Russian Federation on the shelf in 2007 (as mentioned earlier) and ending with the adoption in 2009 of Russia's new national security strategy until 2020. in the "Arctic section" which states that Russia does not (page 235)

exclude the possibility of conflicts on its borders around raw materials and the use of military force in resolving them. These formulations were considered in the U.S. as evidence that Moscow intends to go through in pursuing their interests in the Arctic [7].

The second most important sphere, which, according to the directive George W. Bush. Should be directed to the focus of the Arctic Policy in Washington, are the resources. One of the main points of the directive was addressed to Congress, the demand will soon ratify the International Convention on the Law of the Sea, which "will provide the sovereign rights of the United States on large shelf areas are rich in valuable natural resources" [26].

We already mentioned S. Parnell, in his speech during the hearings in Alaska said that in building policy in the region, the U.S. should first focus on four main areas: national security, resources, foreign policy and science. He also noted that the data area are closely linked, and any steps need to be discussed in the context of climate

change. The conviction of S. Parnell, "Alaska - a kind of storehouse of natural resources, where the stunning volume presents both traditional and renewable energy sources, which can greatly reduce the amount of oil and gas imports from abroad. Gold, zinc, coal, natural gas and oil - in the aggregate, these resources are of vital importance to U.S. energy security "[36]. In its report, S. Parnell also expressed confidence that the oil and gas reserves are concentrated on the continental shelf of Alaska, the Chukchi Sea and Beaufort Sea, will last for decades, but it will reduce U.S. dependence on foreign sources of energy. In addition, in terms of the governor of Alaska, will be a positive thing and that state residents will be employed.

During the hearing it was also noted that, despite numerous studies and reconnaissance expeditions, which have been going on for centuries, the region should be considered as poorly known. Older cards do not allow to fully assess the situation in the Arctic, but because the U.S. desperately in need of high quality modern maps of the region, with both continental and marine parts. This will give a more accurate idea of what to wealth in the Arctic can expect the United States.

The third point to a fundamental directive of George W. Bush Jr., without which is difficult to imagine the U.S. Arctic policy, concerned
(page 236)

sphere of ecology. The President once again noted that from an environmental point of view of the oil-rich Arctic region is very vulnerable. In this regard, it should be recalled that the United States already have the sad experience of the environmental disaster caused the tremendous harm to both local residents and flora and fauna of the region. We are talking about the destruction of the American tanker "Exxon Valdez" March 23, 1989, when more than 38 million liters of oil spilled in Prince William Sound. This environmental disaster has become one of the worst in the history of North America and caused great damage to the traditional habitat of Alaska Natives: the remains of oil vylivsheysya locals are on this day [10]. All this time has led to the imposition of the ban on oil production 80% of the shelf zone. Traditionally, however, is actively cooperating with oil companies the Republican Party has ensured that in July 2008 George W. Bush revoked the decree, citing the difficult times being experienced by the U.S. economy. Material interests once again prevailed. Nevertheless, in April 2010 disaster in the Gulf of Mexico on an oil platform "Deepwater Horizon" reminded the American public that these problems do not have a statute of limitations. Obama, who has repeatedly advocated the gradual transition to "clean energy" and called for reducing U.S. dependence on oil, was forced to impose a moratorium on the development of new fields on the U.S. continental shelf. However, as many analysts expected, the measure was temporary. Feeling the need to take into account the mood of the American electorate, "dissatisfied with the high prices of gasoline and not inclined to delve into the percentage of imported and hypothetically available to" their "oil" [16] Barack Obama in the presidential election was forced to cancel the moratorium [28].

Be that as it may, the analysis of recent congressional hearings showed that the natural resources of the Arctic remain a keen interest in the U.S.

During the Senate hearings have already mentioned on "The strategic importance of the Arctic in the policy of the United States," held August 20, 2009 in Alaska, were announced just two legislative initiatives concerning the sphere of ecology. The first of these was based on the recommendations of the scientific report of the Arctic Council "Assessment of the prospects of shipping in the Arctic" (Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment - AMSA) [36]. Council urged to pay attention to the need to improve the navigation system and port operation in the circumpolar re-
(page 237)

region, the prevention of oil spills and spill response, establishing support systems of icebreakers, the introduction of patrol vessels, as well as rescue and search operations and environmental monitoring. The second initiative contains a proposal to allocate funding for monitoring changes in the coastline and to ensure

safe navigation through the creation of modern maps of the Arctic, including the American Arctic continental shelf. In addition, there were calls for greater efforts in strengthening the U.S. icebreaker capacity [36].

The fact that the effects of climate change are of serious concern to the United States, and the administration and Congress did not intend to ignore this aspect confirms the creation of the Alaska Committee on Climate Change under the government of the state (Alaska Climate Change Sub-Cabinet) to be able to respond to the needs of local people and anticipate the problems of the region. The Committee has already taken concrete steps to improve the conditions of stay in Alaska. Thus, work began to stabilize the shoreline and the creation of an emergency evacuation plan [36].

Finally, another of the freshest evidence of the unflagging interest of the current U.S. administration to the problems of the Arctic region were hearing of the Senate in January 2011 on "Changes in the Arctic: General information and recommendations to Congress." In a rather lengthy document are listed in chronological order all of the major initiatives put forward by the U.S. government over the past 15 years. In fact, hearing repeated all the main points of the directive Bush Jr. As stated in the text, leading Arctic states in varying degrees, have announced their willingness to maintain a military presence in the region. In this regard, stressed the need to pay more attention to the needs of the U.S. Arctic. Once again, the question was raised about the environment and the creation of measures that will ensure the safe movement of ships in Arctic waters. Recommendations were made to Congress to solve the problem of the lack of robust navigation infrastructure. The text even contained an appeal to insurance companies: they were asked to calculate insurance rates, given the level of risk, which may be polar ships passing in the Arctic waters. This document can be called a detailed summary of all steps taken by the U.S. government against the Arctic [29].

(page 238)

Thus, summarizing the above, we can say with confidence a boost in recent years the attention of the leadership of the United States to the problems of the Arctic. Washington has started to develop a strategy to engage the dominant position in the region, and although formally "Arctic Line" has not yet become a priority in U.S. policy, the analysis of official documents in evidence of conduct expert and political circles of serious work to identify the most important activities in the circumpolar region.

This suggests that the topic relates to the hidden priorities of national security policy of the United States, the public discussion of which is deemed inexpedient [3]. It is also worth to note that the strategy of recent U.S. administrations from one central place is the recognition of the growing importance of the region not only for the economy, but also for military purposes. In Washington, realize that the strategic attractiveness of the Arctic contribute to the exacerbation of international disputes for the possession of territories in the region. Prepared in the military government will be easier to prove their "right to the Arctic" and engaged in mining there. [7] It is for this reason that the Arctic Circle there are signs of renewed activity patrol aircraft, military bases are being built and conducted major military exercises. Initiative in this area show the United States, thus building a "Arctic policy" in the region and influencing the actions of other Arctic nations.

Thus it is impossible not to draw attention to the fact that the policy of the Obama Administration with regard to the Arctic, in fact, is the embodiment described George W. Bush Jr. shortly before his departure from the presidency of ideas. The only difference to a certain point can be detected only in the economic sphere in the form of a temporary moratorium on the development of new offshore fields in the U.S. due to the tragic events of 2010 in the Gulf of Mexico. However, the rapid elimination of the ban shows the influence of conservation groups interested in developing a rich resource potential of the Arctic, the possibility to influence the political course of the White House in this area. Obama then entered a temporary moratorium on new offshore fields in the U.S. does not interfere with the United States keenly interested in natural resources in the Arctic.

(page 239)

Given all these factors, we can confidently assert that the growing attention to the region of one of the world's major players will entail strengthening the international community in the fight for resources in the Arctic and opening prospects out there.

REFERENCES

1. *Arnold, SL, Russell, S., J. Pluf* for the creation of the US-Canadian Committee on the Arctic [electronic resource] / / Geopolitics [web portal]. 04/21/2009, the URL: <http://www.geopolitics.ru/common/publics/115.htm> (date accessed: 04/24/2011).
2. *Banko Yu* Internationalization Arctic shipping [electronic resource] / / The Arctic today [web portal]. URL: <http://www.arctictoday.ru/news/872.html> (date accessed: 04/24/2011).
3. *Barannik A., I. Voznyuk* Arctic as an important geostrategic region clash of national interests of major countries / / Foreign Military Review. , 2009. N 1. S. 3 - 11.
4. When the turn of the Arctic? [Electronic resource] / / Oil & Gas Eurasia [official. site]. In 2008. N 8. URL: <http://www.oilandgaseurasia.ru/articles/p/81/article/698/> (date accessed: 04/24/2011).
5. The UN Convention on the Law of the Sea [electronic resource] / / United Nations [official. site]. URL: <http://www.un.org/ru/law/lawsea/convention.shtml> (date accessed: 24/04/2011).
6. *Ready Kopeiko S.* 2030: The U.S. Navy began active development of the Arctic theater [electronic resource] / / National Defense [official. site]. In 2010. N 12. URL: <http://wwwnationaldefense.ru/1437/1440/index.shtml?id=4730> (date accessed: 24/04/2011).
7. *Morozov V.* politico-military aspects of U.S. national interests in the Arctic and the challenges to regional stability [electronic resource] / / War and Peace [online portal]. 04/11/2011, the URL: <http://www.warandpeace.ru/ru/analysis/view/57124/> (date accessed: 04/24/2011).
8. *Mayer, LA* mapping and study of the bottom topography of the Arctic Ocean in the climate change / / Bulletin of Moscow University. A series of 25. International relations and world politics. , 2011. N 2. Arctic: politics, economics, sustainable development. S. 204 - 227.
9. *Orlov,* Russia beats USA "Arctic race", state the Congress [electronic resource] / / news agency RIA-Novosti [official. site]. 07/17/2008, the URL: <http://www.rian.ru/world/20080717/114158882.html> (date accessed: 04/24/2011).
10. *Ukhov S.* Alaska oil under the hood: the small peoples of Chukotka and Kamchatka against the decision of U.S. authorities to lift the ban to extract oil in Alaska [electronic resource] / / Rossiyskaya Gazeta [official. site]. 02/10/2008, the URL: <http://www.rg.ru/2008/10/02/neft.html> (date accessed: 24/04/2011).
11. *Fedyashin A,* U.S. Navy Arctic recommended procedures [electronic resource] / / news agency RIA-Novosti [official site]. 03/14/2011, the URL: <http://www.rian.ru/analytics/20110314/353807862.html> (date accessed: 04/24/2011).
12. Strategic Arctic Ocean [electronic resource] / / The Committee on Energy Policy and Energy Efficiency [official. site]. 01/14/2009, the URL: http://www.rspenergy.ru/main/content.asp?art_id=6266 (date accessed: 24/04/2011).
13. U.S. and Russia have prepared their own strategies for development in the Arctic [electronic resource] / / The Arctic & Antarctica [information-analytical portal]. 01/14/2009, the URL:

<http://www.arcticapulus.ru/index.php?id=0109/1412009212111.htm&dat = news & list = 01.2009> (date accessed: 24/04/2011).

14. Claims of the United States called on the shelf of the Arctic "challenge of a new era" [electronic resource] // NEWSru.com [online portal] was 18/10/2007 URL: <http://www.newsru.com/world/18oct2007/konflikt.html> (date accessed: 24/04/2011).

15. A U.S. tuna expanded ownership of Russia [electronic resource] // Gazeta.ga. [Online portal]. 14.02.2008 URL: http://www.gazeta.ru/science/2008/02/14_a_2636447.shtml (date accessed: 24/04/2011).

16. *Whiteley, JM* Problems of the Arctic in the context of contemporary political situation in the United States / / Bulletin of Moscow University. A series of 25. International relations and world politics. , 2011. N 2. Arctic: politics, economics, sustainable development. S. 180 - 203.

17. Accession to the 1982 Law of the Sea Convention and Ratification of the 1994 Agreement Amending Part XI of the Law of the Sea Convention. Written Testimony of John D. Negroponte, Deputy Secretary before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. September 27, 2007 [Electronic resource] // US Senate Committee on Foreign Relations [Official website]. System requirements: Adobe Acrobat Reader. URL: <http://foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Negroponte-Testimony070927.pdf> (accessed: 24.04.2011).

18. *Carafano J., Cohen A., McNamara S., Weitz R.* EUCOM Should Lead US Combatant Commands in Defense of National Interests in the Arctic [Electronic resource] // The Heritage Foundation [Official website]. March 28, 2011. URL: <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2011/03/EUCOM-Should-Lead-US-Combatant-Commands-in-Defense-of-National-Interests-in-the-Arctic> (accessed: 24.04.2011).

19. *Carafano J., Dean J.* Breaking an Ice-Bound US Policy: A Proposal for Operating in the Arctic [Electronic resource] // The Heritage Foundation [Official website]. February 24, 2011. URL: http://thf_media.s3.amazonaws.com/2011/pdf/wm3168.pdf (accessed: 24.04.2011).

20. *Cohen A.* From Russian Competition to Natural Resources Access: Recasting US Arctic Policy [Electronic resource] // The Heritage Foundation [Official website]. June 15, 2010. URL: <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2010/06/from-russian-competition-to-natural-resources-access-recasting-us-arctic-policy> (accessed: 24.04.2011).

21. *Conley H., Kraut J.* U.S. Strategic Interests in the Arctic. An Assessment of Current Challenges and New Opportunities for Cooperation. A Report of the CSIS Europe Program. April 2010 [Electronic resource] // Center for Strategic & International Studies [Official website]. System requirements: Adobe Acrobat Reader. URL: http://csis.org/files/publication/100426_Conley_USStrategic-Interests_Web.pdf (accessed: 24.04.2011).

22. A Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Seapower. October 2007 [Electronic resource] // The US Navy [Official website]. System requirements: Adobe Acrobat Reader. URL: <http://www.navy.mil/maritime/Maritimestrategy.pdf> (accessed: 24.04.2011).

23. *Graff J.* Fight for the Top of the World [Electronic resource] // Time [Official website]. September 19, 2007. URL: <http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1663445,00.Htm> (accessed: 24.04.2011).

24. *Kogan L.A.* What Goes Around Comes Around: How UNCLOS Ratification Will Herald Europe's Precautionary Principle as US Law // Santa Clara Journal of International Law, 2009. N 1 [Electronic resource] // The Institute for Trade, Standards and Sustainable Development (ITSSD) [Official website]. System requirements: Adobe

25. *Meese E., III, Spring B., Schaefer B.D.* The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea: The Risks Outweigh the Benefits [Electronic resource] // The Heritage Foundation [Official website]. May 16, 2007. URL: <http://www.heritage.org/Research/InternationalOrganizations/wml459.cfm> (accessed: 24.04.2011).

26. National Security Presidential Directive and Homeland Security Presidential Directive. January 9, 2009 [Electronic resource] // Federation of American Scientists [Official website]. URL: <http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/nspd/nspd-66.htm> (accessed: 24.04.2011).

27. Norman B. The Scramble for the Arctic [Electronic resource] // The Henry Jackson Society [Internet portal]. August 8, 2008. URL: <http://www.henryjacksonsociety.org/stories.asp?id=755> (accessed: 24.04.2011).

28. Obama Announces New Oil Drilling [Electronic resource] // Sky News [Official website]. May 14, 2011. URL: http://www.businesschannel.com.au/businessnews/article.aspx?id=61292_1_&vld= (accessed: 24.04.2011).

29. *O'Rourke R.* Changes in the Arctic: Background and Issues for Congress. Congressional Research Service. April 7, 2011 [Electronic resource] // Federation of American Scientists [Official website]. System requirements: Adobe Acrobat Reader. URL: <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R41153.pdf> (accessed: 24.04.2011).

30. *O'Rourke R.* Coast Guard Polar Icebreaker Modernization: Background, Issues, and Options for Congress. Congressional Research Service. April 29, 2009 [Electronic resource] // Policy Archive [Internet portal]. URL: http://www.policyarchive.org/handle/10207/bitstreams/20004_Previous_Version_2009-04-29.pdf (accessed: 4.05.2011).

31. *Pouliot J.* WWF: Bush Arctic Policy Should Be Obama's Starting Point, Not End Point [Electronic resource] // World Wildlife Fund [Official website]. June 14, 2009. URL: <http://www.worldwildlife.org/who/media/press/2009/WWFPresitem11267.Html> (accessed: 24.04.2011).

32. President Bush. "Statement on Advancing US Interests in the World's Oceans" [Electronic resource] // The White House [Official website]. May 15, 2007. URL: http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2007/05/2007_0515-2.html (accessed: 22.04.2011).

33. Report on Goals and Objectives for Arctic Research 2007 for the US Arctic Research Plan [Electronic resource] // US Arctic Research Commission [Official website]. System requirements: Adobe Acrobat Reader. URL: http://www.arctic.gov/publications/usarc_2007_goals.pdf (accessed: 24.04.2011).

34. *Schlauder W.E.* Adapting to a Changing World: The United States, Climate Change, and the Arctic Maritime Commons. November 6, 2007 [Electronic resource] // Defense Technical Information Center [Official website]. URL: <http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA476708> (accessed: 24.04.2011).

35. *Sheppard K.* Obama Administration Puts Halt to Bush-era Oil and Gas Policies [Electronic resource] // Grist Magazine [Internet portal]. February 2, 2009. URL: <http://www.grist.org/article/Change-we-Ken-believe-in> (accessed: 24.04.2011).

36. Strategic Importance of the Arctic in US Policy. Hearing before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations United States Senate, One Hundred Eleventh Congress, First Session, Special Hearing, August

20, 2009 - Anchorage, AK [Electronic resource] // Federation of American Scientists [Official website]. System requirements: Adobe Acrobat Reader. URL: http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/2009_hr/arctic.pdf (accessed: 24.04.2011).

37. US Naval Forces Need to Prepare for Effects of Climate Change [Electronic resource] // The National Academy of Science [Official website]. March 10, 2011. URL: http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12914#description (accessed: 24.04.2011).