



*The USSR/Russia, Norway and international
co-operation on environmental matters in the Arctic,
1984–1996*

SVF-3901

Irina Karelina

Master's Thesis in Peace and Conflict Transformation

Faculty of Humanities, Social Sciences and Education

University of Tromsø

Spring 2013

Abstract

This thesis examines the USSR, Norway and international cooperation on environmental matters in the Arctic (1984-1996). During the Cold War, the region attracted much attention from of the main adversaries. It was a playground for strategic planners and a laboratory for the improvement of military technology. But at the same time these territories were also – at least potentially – a source for contacts between scientist of the East and the West. Especially in the last decade of the Cold War, scientists from both blocks more aware of the vulnerability of the environment and the intensification of exploration of natural resources. The Arctic, which was a highly militarized region during the Cold War, can thereby serve a good case to test out the impact of international cooperation.

This thesis considers two main areas: the first area is about the historical development of political relations between USSR/Russia and Norway; Gorbachev's policies contribution to the development of cooperation in international relations in the Arctic. The second area is about scientific environmental cooperation, which has can be described as transnational in scope and character, and its influence to the political situation in the Arctic.

The thesis based on two theoretical approaches: the so-called "Copenhagen school", and especially the concept of "securitization" on the one hand, and transnationalism theory on the other. The concept of securitization demonstrates the important transition from military security to environmental security in the Arctic region. Transnationalism shows how the joint the problem of the protection of the Arctic environment managed to bring the international works of scientists, independent organizations, states closer in some aspects.

The thesis is based on case-study, it is qualitative study. It draws on a variety sources, where Russian articles, especially dissertations play a crucial role. The text starts from introduction chapter, focusing on theory and methodology, followed by four chapters and ends with a concluding chapter, which discusses the findings of this work.

Key words: Arctic region, Barents-Euro Arctic region, Arctic Council, securitization, transnationalism, Arctic environment, Gorbachev's Murmansk Initiative, Kirkenes Declaration

Aknowledgements

My sincerest thanks go to all people whose help has made this thesis possible:

To my supervisor Stian Bones, for his guidance and support at all stages of the process;

To Valentina Hazova, the librarian of Polar Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography, N.M. Knipovicha;

To Center of Peace and Conflict Studies for having been given the opportunity to do research on a topic;

To Hege Kristin Widnes, the coordinator of Quota Students in Tromsø University, for her kindness and helping.

Table of contents

Chapter I. Introduction	1
Chapter II. The history of Russian –Norwegian cooperation in the Arctic region	13
2.1 <i>The evolution of Russian-Norwegians ties</i>	13
2.2 <i>The main areas of the Soviet-Norwegian relations</i>	17
2.3 <i>Gorbachev’s “Murmansk Initiatives” and the Kirkenes Declaration (1993) as a new vector in politics between Russia and Norway</i>	21
Chapter 3. The problems and prospects of Russian-Norwegian transboundary regional cooperation in the Arctic	27
3.1 <i>The place of transboundary regional cooperation in international integration</i>	27
3.2 <i>The environmental factor of transboundary cooperation between northern Russia and Europe</i>	29
3.3 <i>The system formation of transnational cooperation in the Arctic, from its establishment to the realization in the Arctic (BEAR and Arctic Council)</i>	31
Chapter 4. The main sources of the Arctic pollution	36
4.1 <i>The Arctic environmental stung</i>	36
4.2 <i>Chernobyl accident spread radioactive cesium throughout the European Arctic</i>	38
4.3 <i>The truth about Novaya Zemlya: nuclear explosions and their effects</i>	39
4.4 <i>The problems of nuclear and radiation safety</i>	40
4.5 <i>The problem of radioactive waste disposal</i>	41
4.6 <i>The petroleum hydrocarbons</i>	43
Chapter 5. The international environmental cooperation in the Arctic	44
5.1 <i>Environmental policy in the Russian Arctic</i>	44
5.2 <i>Factors that hinder to environmental cooperation in the Arctic</i>	45
5.3 <i>The international environmental agreements and researches in the Arctic</i>	46
Chapter VI. Conclusion.....	54
Literature	58

Chapter I. Introduction

One of the most effective mechanisms for the preservation and dissemination of peace is international co-operation.¹

The Arctic, which was a highly militarized region during the Cold War, can serve as a very good case to test out the impact of international co-operation. Did transnational contacts within Arctic research matter?

During the Cold War, the region attracted very much attention from of the main adversaries. It was a playground for strategic planners and a laboratory for the improvement of military technology. But at the same time these territories opened for up for contacts between scientist of East and West. In recent years the Arctic has again caught the attention, both within traditional polar nations and on the international scene.

During the last phase of the Cold War, Norway and Soviet Union also made the impressive progress on a wide range of political topics. In 1984, Canada and the Soviet Union agreed to make a formal scientific cooperation in the Arctic, and because of this agreement, the Norwegian-Soviet cooperation has also become a reality.

Mikhail Gorbachev made a great contribution. As Shirina Danara has pointed out: “Researches assign a special place Gorbachev’s speech in Murmansk in 1987. Murmansk Soviet Initiatives demonstrate the desire to rebuild the international situation in the Arctic and to oppose the military interests the production system of international security.”²

Following up on this, a conference was held in Leningrad in 1988 with the participation of the Arctic states. Conference made general recommendations on key areas of cooperation. In 1990 the International Arctic Science Committee (IASC) was established.

On 8 March in 1992, the Russian Minister of foreign affairs A. Kozyrev and Norwegian Foreign Minister T. Stoltenberg signed a program of bilateral contacts and cooperation. The foreign policy positions of the Russian leadership at that time can be probably exemplified by quoting the Russian Foreign Minister A. Kozyrev in Severomorsk in January 9, 1993:

“...Gone is the past ruinous confrontation. In essence, Russia does not have standing opponents. But there are permanent interests, which are better to solve on the principles of cooperation and partnership with the world. The Arctic has ceased to be the theater of military rivalry. There are a lot of problems, such as social, economic and environmental.

¹ Shirina, D.A. (2005) “Mezhdunarodnoye sotrudnichestvo: k novomu myshleniyu v Arktike” (International cooperation to new thinking in the Arctic), *Sovremennaya Arktika opyt izucheniya i problem*, p. 7

² All translations from Russian to English are made by the author. Ibid. p. 10

To solve them, it is important to bring advanced technology, major partners and investors...”.³

1. Approach to the problem

In this thesis I will focus on USSR/Russia’s and Norway’s approach to international co-operation on environmental matters in the Arctic, 1984–1996. Chronologically this investigation is limited to the period where the Soviet approach to Arctic cooperation changed in the direction of an “increasing desire to overcome long-standing opposition from the West”.⁴ The Arctic Council was founded in 1996 as a forum for circumpolar cooperation⁵. Initially, the Arctic Council worked on environmental cooperation and continuation the strategy of the Arctic environment. Gradually, the focus of cooperation has increasingly been paid to climate change and the significant impacts that these may have in the Arctic. Today, the cooperation of Russia and Norway in the Arctic Council includes not only the climate and environment, but also the cooperation in the field of navigation, the management of oil and gas, tourism, education, research, health care, economic and cultural activities. The Arctic Council is the only Circumpolar and the most important institutional framework for discussing a political issues related to economic and cultural activities.⁶

2. Assumptions/ hypothesis

The change in the Soviet and Russian approach can be traced back to several motifs. Since the late 80’s environmental problems have been most important in the relations between Russia and Norway at all levels. First, it is linked to pollution in the Arctic. Nowadays, the

³ Nilssen, A. (2001) *Sosedi na Kraynem Severe: Rossiya i Norvegiya. Ot pervykh kontaktov do Barentseva sotrudnichestva* [Neighbors in the Far North: Russia and Norway. From the first contact to the cooperation]. Murmansk: BookPublishers. p. 291-292

⁴ Bones, S. Science in-between: Norway, the European Arctic and the USSR. (in press)

⁵ Circumpolar civilization – it is a local type of civilization, which is actively formed in the 20-21 centuries. “The most important foundation of the Circumpolar Civilization is the commitment to the culture of peace, nonviolence, concentration on the life of person, and the identity of peoples in historical succession. The main mechanism of interaction is dialogue”. See: Vinokurova U. Circumpolar Civilization: a geocultural approach, available at

<http://www.google.ru/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=circumpolar+civilization+definition&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CDEQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Farccticmuseum.com%2Fen%2Ffiles%2FVino>, (accessed 18 April 2013)

⁶ See: Norvegiya i Rossiya nesut otvetstvennost’ za razvitiye Arktiki (Norway and Russia are responsible for the Arctic development), available at http://nord-news.ru/main_topic/?mtopicid=392, (accessed 21 April 2012)

Arctic is polluted by more than 10 million barrels of fuel, a large number of abandoned and broken equipment, uncontrolled stored chemicals that poison the fragile environment.⁷

The Russian interests in the Arctic does, however, cover a wide range of interests, such as economy, ecology, science, natural resources, defense and geopolitics. The issues of environmental security in the Arctic are particularly important due to the increased vulnerability of the environment and the intensification of exploration of natural resources. Arctic islands and some continental areas have unique ecosystems that have no analogues in the world. Therefore, the Arctic plays an important role in maintaining the ecological balance of the planet.

Due to the particular geographical location, the availability of large reserves of natural resources, defense, scientific and ecological importance, the Arctic is a place of intersection of the interests of many countries.⁸ This was acknowledged by Gorbachev and influenced his policy on cooperation within the Arctic, including the cooperation with Norway.

Hypothesis:

- The scientific co-operation within the field of ecology and marine research, which has contributed substantially to the successful management of marine resources in the Barents Sea, can be described as transnational in scope and character;
- These activities also promoted and improved the relations between Norway and Russia;

In order to test this hypothesis I will have to identify Russian strategies and scientific interests in the Arctic in the environmental issues in that time, but I will also have to consider the broader Soviet interests during this time: the goals and objectives.

3. Theoretical or conceptual framework

The theoretical basis for this investigation rests on two pillars, namely the Copenhagen School and its concepts of securitization/desecuritization, and by transnational theory. For several decades after the Second World War, the Cold War forced the whole world to support

⁷Rossiyskiye polyarnyye issledovaniya. Informatsionno-analiticheskiy sbornik. [Russian Polar research. The information-analytical collection], available at <http://www.aari.ru/misc/publicat/sources/RPR-3light.pdf>, (accessed 14 April 2012)

⁸Osnovy gosudarstvennoy politiki rossiyskoy federatsii v Arktike. [Principles of state policy of Russian Federation in the Arctic], available at <http://www.sci.aha.ru/econ/A111c.htm>, (accessed 12 April 2012)

on side of bipolar system in the face of U.S. and USSR. Highly militarized and polarized ideological confrontation prevailed in matters of security. The risk of war was real because of high competition between the superpowers. Security was the most important and constantly discussed subject between the states. The end of the Cold War was an act of desecuritization. On the military scene in the 1990's, the securitization concept seems plausible also for other questions, not only the military.⁹ It is possible to say that the environment now in away became securitized. This paved the way for transnational scientific cooperation and to strengthening the political relations between the states.

Arctic can be considered as a single region, but it can be identified and differentiated in various ways. From the AMAP site: "In order to establish a geographical context for its assessments AMAP has defined a regional extent based on a compromise among various definitions. The "AMAP area" essentially includes the terrestrial and marine areas north of the Arctic Circle (66°32'N), and north of 62°N in Asia and 60°N in North America, modified to include the marine areas north of the Aleutian chain, Hudson Bay, and parts of the North Atlantic Ocean including the Labrador Sea".¹⁰

4. Theory of securitization in international relations.

The theory of securitization is one of the most innovative developments of the security concept. The theory developed by B. Buzan, Ole Wæver and their associates, "a body of work that has now come to be called the "Copenhagen School".¹¹

The representatives of the Copenhagen School has developed some basic concepts that help to reassess the concept of security, namely securitization and desecuritization. The school has played an important role in expanding the International Relations.¹²

The concept of securitization appeared because these political scientists meant that the problem of security was being studied on too narrow basis. Buzan and his colleagues saw it as their task to deconstruct the concept of security. They are interested how objects are defined as security threats, how they are politicized in a particular context, and thereby securitized. This is a constructivist approach. Realism would put much more emphasize on the

⁹ Teoriya sekyuritizatsii v mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniyakh [securitization theory in international relations], available at URL: <http://old.geopolitica.ru/Articles/1406/> (accessed 17 October 2012)

¹⁰ Arctic Boundaries, available at <http://www.uarctic.org/atlasmaplayer.aspx?m=642&amid=5955> (accessed 17 October 2012)

¹¹ Williams, Michael (2003) "Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics" *International Studies Quarterly* 47, p. 511

¹² Kopenhagenskaya shkola (sekyuritizatsiya) [the Copenhagen School (securitization)], available at <http://www.securitylab.ru/blog/personal/avetjan/22855.php> (accessed 2 October 2012)

relationship between security and military or economic power.¹³ Military factor, so important in the traditional discourse of security, has lost its prime importance, because there are other security issues that cannot be ignored. For this purpose Barry Buzan has proposed a theory of securitization, in which he included the facts and phenomena that has not been previously considered as a part of security problem.¹⁴

B. Buzan and O. Wæver defined securitization as a successful speech act “through which an intersubjective understanding is constructed within a political community to treat something as an existential threat to a valued referent object, and to enable a call for urgent and exceptional measures to deal with the threat”.¹⁵ According Kristian Åtland “the terms securitization and desecuritization refer to the process that take place when an issue or development is placed on, or removed from, the security agenda of a state or society”.¹⁶

While the realist approach considers that the state is object and actor, securitization theory differentiates between the referent objects of threats and securitization actors, and between securitization actors and functional actors. Referent object – the object that is perceived as threatened and whose survival is at stake. Securitizing actors – the one(s) who make(s) the argument about the existence of an existential threat. Functional actors – actors who are not directly involved in the securitization but influence the dynamics within the sector where the securitization takes place.¹⁷

Holger Stritzel has underlined that “the skeleton of more comprehensive theory of security action by the Copenhagen School itself is marked by three elements: 1) the speech act, 2) the securitizing actor and 3) the audience.”¹⁸ The Copenhagen School separates the actor into two elements: the securitization actor performing the security speech act, and the relevant audience accepting or refusing this speech”.¹⁹ Thus, we can distinguish two phases in the process of securitization: 1) a statement that there is a threat to the existence of the reference object 2) the completion of the securitization process, which is considered successful if the actor was able to convince the audience.²⁰

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Teoriya sekyuritizatsii v mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniyakh [securitization theory in international relations], available at <http://geopolitica.ru/Articles/1404/> (accessed 2 October 2012)

¹⁵ Stritzel, Holger (2007) “Towards a theory of securitization: Copenhagen and beyond” *European Journal of International Relations* 13:358

¹⁶ Åtland, Kristian (2009) *The European Arctic in Soviet and Russian security policy, 1987-2007*, p. 25

¹⁷ Ibid. p. 25

¹⁸ Stritzel, Holger (2007) “Towards a theory of securitization: Copenhagen and beyond” *European Journal of International Relations* 13:362

¹⁹ Ibid. p. 363

²⁰ Teoriya sekyuritizatsii v mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniyakh [securitization theory in international relations], available at <http://geopolitica.ru/Articles/1404/> (accessed 2 October 2012)

We noticed how Buzan gave preference to constructivism in his analysis. This implies that the security issues need to be identified at the appropriate levels and sectors. It means moving away from the notion of security as a struggle for power, the main focus of his analysis are the sectors. The main challenge is to isolate each sector and to analyze the dynamics of security. All sectors, however, form an interconnected network.²¹

As noted by K. Åtland: “the typical subjects and objects of threats are different within the various sectors (military, environmental, economic, societal, and political), and the dominant processes of securitization and desecuritization may occur at different level”.²²

As my Master thesis is about international cooperation in the Arctic on environmental issues, I am particularly interesting on environmental sector. The awareness that the human impact on the planet, which is reflected in phenomena such as global warming, pollution and destruction of the ozone layer, is what can formulate a security risk. It is important for my Master thesis to see how the environmental problems were receiving more attention and were lifted higher up on the political agenda.

B. Buzan has identified two different agenda in the environmental sector: a scientific agenda and a political agenda. “Although they overlap and shape each other a part, the scientific agenda is typically embedded in the (mainly natural) sciences and nongovernmental activity. (...) The political agenda is essentially governmental and intergovernmental. It consists of the public decision-making process and a public policies that address how to deal with environmental concerns.”²³ In my Master thesis I would like to make slant on scientific agenda more. Especially its impact on international politics in the Arctic.

Representatives from Copenhagen School also highlighted that securitization has advantages and disadvantages. The biggest achievement of this concept is to move away from state-centric model that existed before. There has been a growing range of actors, it was identified five sectors, and military was not the most important of them. The disadvantage is that the field of security started to include absolutely everything, in this case there is lost of clarity of the safety analysis. If all the major issues and disasters will be considered is a threat to national security, then it could be lost the meaning of the term “threat”. Another argument of critics is that the framework of securitization is narrow because it’s nature determined

²¹ Ibid.

²² Åtland, Kristian (2009) *The European Arctic in Soviet and Russian security policy, 1987-2007*, p. 27

²³ B.Buzan (1998) *Security: a new framework for analysis*. p. 71-72

solely from the point of view of security threats and conceptualized as inherently negative. On the contrary the securitization must be considered from two sides – positive and negative.²⁴

O. Wæver has proposed the idea of “deseuritization” to make a conceptual perfection of securitization theory.²⁵ As Michael C. Williams argued “deseuritization is a moving of issues off the “security” agenda and back into the realm of public political discourse and “normal” political dispute and accommodation. The transformation of many elements of European security as part of the end of the Cold War stands as a key example”.²⁶

The Copenhagen School has been subject to criticism from the neo-realists and “human security” scholars for the distraction from the real threats and for paying attention to the state as a referent object for security. In reply to this, Kristian Åtland states: “threats in the Copenhagen School’s sense of the word, do not have an independent existence. Threats essentially originate from actors fears, but “whether an issue is securitized is not decided on by individual perceptions – it is an inter-subjective, political process of negotiating the possible acceptance of a specific kind of argument”, allowing for the issue to be lifted out of the sphere of ordinary politics and into the sphere of security.”²⁷ In other words, securitization is not militarization.

Thus, I think securitization theory could be a fruitful approach to my theme: USSR/Russia, Norway and international cooperation on environmental matters in the Arctic, 1984-1996. From Murmansk Initiatives (1987) Gorbachev offered in cooperation with the Nordic countries to develop a joint comprehensive plan for environmental protection of the North, including monitoring for the radiation safety.²⁸ Then in the context of shared ministerial declaration on environment of Nordic countries and Russia in Kirkenes on September 3, 1992 and the Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic on September 22, 1992, the participants emphasized importance of protecting the fragile environment of the region.²⁹ Thus, if we apply the theory of securitization to my subject, the existential threat is pollution, radiation; the reference object

²⁴ Teoriya sekyuritizatsii v mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniyakh [securitization theory in international relations], available at URL: <http://old.geopolitica.ru/Articles/1406/> (accessed 17 October 2012)

²⁵ Bartenev, V. (2011) “Sekyuritizatsiya sfery sodeystviya mezhdunarodnomu razvitiyu: analiz politicheskogo diskursa” [“Securitization of international development assistance: the analysis of political discourse”], *Vestnik mezhdunarodnykh organizatsiy* № 3(34) p. 38

²⁶ Williams, Michael (2003) “Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics” *International Studies Quarterly* 47, p. 523

²⁷ Åtland, Kristian (2009) *The European Arctic in Soviet and Russian security policy, 1987-2007*, p.29

²⁸ Smirnov, A. (1998) *Murmanskiy korridor*. Izdatel'stvo Sever. p. 32

²⁹ *Ibid.* p. 38

is Arctic; the securitization sector is environmental; the securitizing actor is Gorbachev, who gave his speech in Murmansk.

5. Transnationalism theory

With this theory, I want to show how the international scientific cooperation in the Arctic promoted transnational cooperation.

Transnational cooperation is a process of transboundary interaction between two or more actors, which excludes the use of violence, and where the joint search for the realization of common interest's dominates.³⁰

Representatives of transnationalism have criticized the basic tenets of realism and neorealism, for restricting the field of interest to power structures, military alliances, etc. Brought to the fore is the problem of environment international regimes and institutions, etc.³¹

According to the liberal institutionalism of J. Nye and R. Keohane, the variety of non-governmental participants, types and channels of interaction are gradually squeezed out the state from the center of global communication, and this communication is transformed from interstate to transnational.³²

In my work I am interested in transnational interactions between scientific organizations and their influence on public policy. There is a difference between the interstate interaction and transnational interaction. Transnational interaction means interaction involving non-governmental actors-individuals and organizations. Interstate cooperation is fully supported by the governments.³³ According to Thomas Risse-Kappen: "Transnational relations, i.e., regular interactions across national boundaries when at least one actor is a non-state agent or does not operate on behalf of a national government or an intergovernmental organization, permeate world politics in almost every issue-area."³⁴ During the 1980s the western social movements managed to set the public agenda on peace and environmental issues in many countries. Transnational groups of scientists boosted the global awareness about various environmental issues.³⁵

With respect to this, the 1980's and 1990's was a transnational moment in Arctic politics. Growing international community's interest to the Arctic region in the late 20th early

³⁰ Muntean, M. (2007) *Osnovy teorii mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniy [Foundations of International relations]*, available at <http://www.twirpx.com/file/90415/>, (accessed 2 October 2012)

³¹ Ibid.

³² Keoheyn, Nye (2002) "Transnatsionalnyye otnosheniya i mirovaya politika" ["Transnational relations and worlds politic"] in Tsygankov *Teoriya mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniy [International Relation Theory]*, p. 229

³³ Tsygankov, P. (2002). *Teoriya mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniy [Theory of international relations]*, p. 154

³⁴ Risse-Kappen, Thomas (1995) *Bringing transnational relations back in: non-state actors, domestic structures, and international institutions*. p. 3

³⁵ Ibid. p. 4

21st century has become an integral part of the foreign policy of the Arctic countries and public entities.³⁶ One major problem became environmental security in the Arctic. Pollution, climate change in the Arctic are now even more highlighted than military threats.³⁷ All interested parties together with the national states were involved in a dialogue about environmental security: multinational companies, NGO's and social movements. These transnational actors transformed the traditional inter-state relations and formed a transnational environment in the Arctic.³⁸

It is impossible to solve the problem of environmental pollution in the Arctic only by the interstate level. The global nature of the challenges and threats makes many actors to work together.³⁹ The Northern Forum, which was established in 1991, is a good example of the effective non-profit entity in the Arctic. The goal was to improve the quality of life in the North through the Nordic cooperation.⁴⁰ Other non-governmental organizations can be added: the International Arctic Science Committee, the Advisory Committee of the seas, the World Association of herders, the International Arctic Social Science Association, etc. These organizations are committed to environmental protection and develop the scientific knowledge about the Arctic.⁴¹

It must be emphasized that it is not only the non-governmental organizations are members of the international community in the Arctic. An important role has been played by scientists and science diplomacy. Here, I would like to turn to the book "Unarmed Forces: The Transnational Movement to End the Cold War" by Matthew Evangelista.

In *Unarmed Forces*, Matthew Evangelista argues that a transnational movement of scientists, who were armed only with ideas, data, and fear of nuclear war, was able to convince Soviet leaders on several occasions to continue the path of de-escalation during the Cold War.⁴² He told about the transnational peace movement, focusing on several groups, including the Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs, the Soviet-American Disarmament Study group, and the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Kulagin, V. (2012) "Globalnaya ili mirovaya bezopasnost?" ["Global or world security?"], *Zhurnal teorii mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniy i mirovoy politiki* [Journal of international relations theory and world politics], 1 (28)

³⁸ Uchenyye predlozhili transnatsionalnuyu model arkticheskogo upravleniya v XXI veke [Scientists has proposed a transnational model of Arctic governance in the XXI century], available at <http://www.wpru.ru/?p=2422> (accessed 4 October 2012)

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Sperling, Valerie (2001) *Unarmed Forces: The Transnational Movement to End the Cold War* (review) *Journal of Cold War studies*, Volume 3, Number 3, p. 100

War (IPPNW), all of which brought together scientists who could contribute to peace between the superpowers.⁴³

Transnational efforts to promote disarmament slowed down in the 1970's between US and USSR. But many US scientists had maintained contacts with Soviet colleagues, both professionally and politically. In the late 1970s the deterioration of East-West relations and bellicose policies of the Reagan in the early 1980s had revived the transnational ties of past, and new ones were created.⁴⁴

As Thomas Risse argues: "Matthew Evangelista claims that transnational networks of arms control supporters, (nuclear) scientists, and peace activists played a crucial role in promoting "new thinking" in foreign policy".⁴⁵

With this example, I would like to emphasize that collaboration between the scientists on environmental issues in the Arctic is a potentially important question. Pursuing environmental issues, they contribute the strengthening of policies between the states.

Science has a fundamental role and responsibilities to promote cooperation and to make recommendations for policy for the benefit of our world.⁴⁶ As Berkman argues "the experience of recent decades in both the Antarctic and the Arctic suggest that science can thrive in settings involving extensive interactions between the science community and the policy community".⁴⁷

6. Motivation for the research project

One of the major positive trends in contemporary international relations between Russia and West is the transition from confrontation to partnership and cooperation. Governments understand feasibility and mutually beneficial cooperation in various spheres, the development of cultural relations, scientific exchanges, etc.

As I am a resident of the North of Russia, it is important for me which kind of processes are happening in my country and in my region. For two decades, the relationships between Norway and Russia moved from confrontation during the Cold War to the relationship which characterized by increased confidence, increasing points of contact and

⁴³ Ibid. p. 100

⁴⁴ Evangelista, M. (1995) Transnational relations in the USSR and Russia in *Bringing transnational relations back in: non-state actors, domestic structures, and international institutions*. p. 156

⁴⁵ Risse, Thomas (2001) Unarmed Forces: The Transnational Movement to End the Cold War by Matthew Evangelista *The International History Review*, Vol. 23, No.1 p. 227

⁴⁶ Berkman, P., Lang, M, Walton, D., Young, O. (2011) Science Diplomacy Antarctica, Science, and the Governance of International Spaces, p. 305

⁴⁷ Ibid. p. 308

enhanced cooperation. For me is interesting to see, how did it happen? Therefore I turn to the history of our relations.

Gorbachev's policy toward to Norway and Arctic in general is also interesting to consider. His role in the development of good relations between Russia and Norway is great. The international tensions were eased and the Cold War was ended. In recognition of his leadership role in the peace process which today characterizes the important part of the life of the international community, Mikhail Gorbachev was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize on October 15, 1990.

And further, one of the most topical issues of cooperation between Norway and Russia are the ecology and environmental protection in the Arctic. Arctic should be governed carefully and competently. All the scientific community must work together and use their potential to learn and preserve the natural Arctic's heritage.

7. Methodological framework

Study area – the European Arctic

Selection of informants / sources

Murmansk and Saint-Petersburg are the strongholds of Russian research on ecology/marine sciences concerning the Arctic waters. The research library in Murmansk and Polar Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography, N.M. Knipovicha is the best place to look the Russian approach to international co-operation on ecological matters in the Arctic, 1984–1996. In Saint-Petersburg, the Arctic and Antarctic Research Institute is the oldest research institution in Russia, conducting a comprehensive study of the polar regions of Earth. Written sources from the archives of the Norwegian Polar Institute have also been collected and interpreted.

Method

The research project is a case study. It is based on historical method – primarily interpretations of written official documents from representative institutions in Russia and, to some degree, Norway.

A case study is a deep, detailed study of one object that has clear temporal and spatial boundaries.⁴⁸ Case study is fruitful as tools in order to grasp the complexity of social phenomenon. Source material for this case can be obtained through the analysis of scientific

⁴⁸ Semenova, V. *Kachestvennyye metody: vvedeniye v gumanisticheskuyu sotsiologiyu: glossariy k knige* [Qualitative methods: an introduction to humanistic sociology: a glossary for the book], available at <http://voluntary.ru/dictionary/588/word/keis-stadi> (accessed 25 April 2012)

articles, monographs and research methods. Scientific paper is usually characterized by a profound understanding of an issue, whereas a scientific monograph gives a systematic and comprehensive description of the research subject. But the products of science doesn't always describe and explain the situation. Therefore, they require special understanding of the situation; a proper interpretation requires contextualization.⁴⁹

⁴⁹ Case-study, available at www.nmtu.ru/RUS/otd_sl/metod_uprav/innov_met/keis.doc, (accessed 23 April 2012)

Chapter II. The history of Russian –Norwegian cooperation in the Arctic region

2.1 *The evolution of Russian-Norwegians ties*

Initial contacts between the Russian people and the Norwegians goes back to ancient times. According to N. Volkov:

“European historiography suggests that the first man, penetrated from the West to the White Sea and made this fact known was Norwegian Othar. And this event occurred in the 9th century”.⁵⁰

Scandinavian sagas can also serve as an example to the fact that the priority in this case belongs to the Norwegians. In the 11th – 12th century with the first settler arrivals from Novgorod to White Sea, communication between Russian and Vikings acquired commercial character. They were getting closer with the development of fishing and hunting off the coast of the Kola Peninsula, Novaya Zemlya and Spitsbergen, and include elements of labour cooperation and mutual assistance.⁵¹

According to Evstigneeva: “In 1251 it was the first agreement between Russia (Novgorod State) and Norway about settlement of relations in the border areas. In 1326 it was the treaty of the land border between the two states. It was the first treaty cemented abroad in Europe and the oldest of the Russian state borders. It’s length 196 km.”⁵²

In the 17th century, the intensive commercial development of Russian Murmansk coast unfolded, and it began to deep the trade ties with Norway.⁵³ Pomors on their boats brought to Vardø and other areas of Varanger fjord products, which there were eagerly purchased: flour, groats, ropes, shackles, leather, canvas and household items, jewelry and food products. These goods were exchanged for leather goods, textiles, and other factory made materials.⁵⁴ In the 17th century, Russia played an important role with the Norwegian’s trade and other

⁵⁰ Volkov (1989) “Sotrudnichestvo v Arctike” [Cooperation in the Arctic], in *Istoricheskiye svyazi Russkogo Severa i Norveгии*. Arkhangelsk Press. p. 100

⁵¹ Ibid. p. 101

⁵² Yevstigneyeva (2008) “*Osobennosti sovremennogo razvitiya rossiysko-norvezhskikh otnosheniy (na primere vzaimodeystviya v Arktike)*” [Features of the modern development of the Russian-Norwegian relations (for example, cooperation in the Arctic)]. Moscow: Diplomatic Academy of the Russian Foreign. p.12

⁵³ Sukharev (2003) “*Rossia i Norvegiya: istoriya dobrososedctva* ” [Russia and Norway: the history of neighbourhood]. Murmansk: Pazori. p. 31

⁵⁴ Smirnov (2003) “*Rossiysko-norvezhskkiye otnosheniya v Barentsevom-YevroArkticheskom regione 90-gody XX veka*” [Russian-Norwegian relations in the Barents Euro-Arctic region 90 years of the XX century]. Moscow: Diplomatic Academy of the Russian Foreign Ministry. Dissertation. p. 39

Scandinavian countries. The same character of Russian-Norwegians relations remained in the 19th century.⁵⁵

The late 19th century and early 20 century it was the outset for large-scale Arctic research. In 1878-1879 the Swedish expedition led by Adolf Nordenskiöld was the Northeast Passage from the Norwegian coast to the Pacific Ocean. Otto Sverdrup and Roald Amundsen continued the Norwegian Polar “School” after Fridtjof Nansen.⁵⁶ At the forefront of Russian cooperation were trade and industry figures, Michael Sidorov and Alexandr Sibiryakov and Arctic explorers Edward Toll and Stepan Makarov.⁵⁷

M. Sidorov sought to establish direct trade relations between Siberia and Western Europe. He proposed the idea to use the Northern Sea Route. But he encountered difficulties with the government and captivated with this idea to Nordenskiöld. Due to major donations of A. Sibiryakov, O. Dickson and the King of Sweden, Nordenskiöld managed to carry a historic voyage on the Northern Sea Route on the vessel “Vega” in 1878.⁵⁸

“Vega” gave the first scientific presentation of the many features of the nature of the northern seas, and has attracted a wide attention to the problems of the Arctic.⁵⁹

Russia cooperated with the Norway in the study of the Arctic. As Smirnov pointed out in his dissertation: “Nansen in the report on the expedition 1893-1896 had thanks for her support in equipping to General Alexander von Toll (St. Petersburg) and baron E. von Toll. In turn, Nansen helped to E. von Toll to prepare a Russian polar expedition”.⁶⁰

Important events in the international scientific cooperation of Russian and Scandinavian scientists did occur at the turn of the 19th -20th centuries. One of the urgent tasks of the higher geodesy were new degree measurements between geographical latitudes in connection with the question of the study of the Earth. Measurements were carried out in the polar latitudes, namely in Spitsbergen. The Russian commission consisted of prominent scientists: academicians O. Backlund, F. Schmidt, A. Karpinski, etc. The Swedish-Norwegian commission, which was formed in 1898, included A. Nordenskiöld, A. Luwero, E. Ederin.

⁵⁵ Sukharev (2003) “*Rossia i Norvegiya: istoriya dobrososedctva* ” [Russia and Norway: the history of neighbourhood]. Murmansk: Pazori. p. 32

⁵⁶ Smirnov (2003) “*Rossiysko-norvezhskiye otnosheniya v Barentsevom-YevroArkticheskom regione 90-gody XX veka*” [Russian-Norwegian relations in the Barents Euro-Arctic region 90 years of the XX century]. Moscow: Diplomatic Academy of the Russian Foreign Ministry. Dissertation. p. 46

⁵⁷ Volkov (1989) “Sotrudnichestvo v Arctike” [Cooperation in the Arctic], in *Istoricheskiye svyazi Russkogo Severa i Norvegi*. Arkhangelsk Press. p. 102

⁵⁸ Ibid. p. 103

⁵⁹ Ibid. p. 103

⁶⁰ Smirnov (2003) “*Rossiysko-norvezhskiye otnosheniya v Barentsevom-YevroArkticheskom regione 90-gody XX veka*” [Russian-Norwegian relations in the Barents Euro-Arctic region 90 years of the XX century]. Moscow: Diplomatic Academy of the Russian Foreign Ministry. Dissertation. p. 47

Both commissions interacted with each other during three years. Their works resulted in unique zoological collections, measured depth in Spitsbergen fjords and conducted meteorological, geophysical and botanical observations.⁶¹

F. Nansen facilitated an active cooperation between Norway and Russian in Arctic. He was closely associated with the Geographical Society and Russian academic leaders in the field of Arctic. The big event in the life of Geographical Society was F. Nansen's report about the results of the "Fram" drift, which he did in Saint-Petersburg after expedition.⁶²

The Leningrad branch of the archive of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR are keeping the correspondence between F. Nansen and E. Toll, S. Makarov, M. Gorky, and other scientists and writers, and Volkov believes that on many issues, especially relating to Arctic, they were like-minded.⁶³

In his book "To the future country", F. Nansen proposed a detailed program of ice observation at sea, advocated the need for physical-geographical study of the Arctic seas and above all – the ice regime. F. Nansen was the first person who set for the science the ice forecasting techniques. The main task, which he considered, was the creation a radio meteorological stations on the islands and the coast of the Arctic seas and organization of regular observations of ice conditions in the sea.⁶⁴

Polar bonds between Norway and Russia were intensified when Norway got independence in 1905, which was guaranteed by Russia, Sweden and Great Britain. In these years there were attempts to conquer the North and South Poles. The indisputable first at the South Pole was R. Amundsen.⁶⁵

The Russian pomor A. Kuchin took part in Amundsen's expedition in the ship "Fram" to the coast of Antarctica in 1911. He was the first certified Russian oceanographer in Norway, and the first Russian who entered to the mainland of Antarctica.⁶⁶

In 1914 Russia and Norway were together again in the Arctic in a joint rescue mission to search "Hercules" and "St. Anna". Otto Sverdrup, who was close associate with Nansen's Arctic campaigners, led an expedition on the ship "Eclipse". He enjoyed a great reputation in

⁶¹ Volkov (1989) "Sotrudnichestvo v Arctike" [Cooperation in the Arctic], in *Istoricheskiye svyazi Russkogo Severa i Norvegii*. Arkhangelsk Press. p. 104

⁶² Ibid. p. 105

⁶³ Ibid. p. 105

⁶⁴ Ibid. p. 106-107

⁶⁵ Ibid. p. 107

⁶⁶ Ibid. p. 108

Russia and was many times invited by the Soviet government to perform important operations in the Arctic.⁶⁷

In 1920 was the first Soviet-Norwegian rescue operation of the ship “Solovey Budimirovich”, which was in a winter drift. This operation was widely reported in the Soviet press. People’s Commissar for Foreign Affairs of Russia G. Chicherin sent a thanks telegram to Otto Sverdrup.⁶⁸

Another example of active cooperation between Russia and Norway was the Norwegian Arctic expedition on ship “Maud”, which was led by R. Amundsen. Radist-pomor G. Olonkin took part in this expedition too. As a result of the campaign, he was awarded the Legion of Honor and he worked in Tromsø Scientific Institute of Meteorological Research.⁶⁹

Despite the fact that there was the scientific and economic competition between two countries, they continued to cooperate in rescue operations for instance, through joint financial resources, icebreakers, marine charts. Even during the rescue missions in the Arctic, there was exchange of information between two countries with joint discussions and publications.⁷⁰

In 1920 Russian-Norwegian trade relations were renewed after the end of the civil war in the north. Trade with Norway was increasing every year. In 1922, 47 Norwegian vessels came to Archangelsk port, in 1923 – 130 vessels. Russia was selling bread, wood, resin, skins of sea animals. The industry in northern Russia was rebuilt through connections with Norway.⁷¹

A significant Soviet-Norwegian Arctic event was a joint participation in the rescue of the crew of the ship “Italia”, led by U. Nobile in 1928. The Soviet expedition on the ice-breaker “Krasin” and boat “Malygin” played a crucial role in this event. When during the search, the hero of the Arctic R. Amundsen died, Soviet ice-breakers and aircrafts conducted a thorough survey of the area where “Latham” had crashed, but the search did not yield results. The Norwegian government has expressed its gratitude to the Soviet government and to the members of expeditions.⁷²

⁶⁷ Ibid. p. 108

⁶⁸ V. Bulatov (1987) “Sovetskiy soyuz i Norvegiya: sotrudnichestvo i konflikty v Arktike” [The Soviet Union and Norway: cooperation and conflict in the Arctic] in B. Goldin and Jens-Petter Nielsen (eds.) *Strakh i ozhidaniya. Rossiya i Norvegiya v XX veke*. Arkhangelsk: Pomor University Press. p. 126-127

⁶⁹ Ibid. p. 128

⁷⁰ Ibid. p. 130

⁷¹ Ibid. p. 131

⁷² Volkov (1989) “Sotrudnichestvo v Arctike” [Cooperation in the Arctic], in *Istoricheskiye svyazi Russkogo Severa i Norvegi*. Arkhangelsk Press. p. 112

2.2 The main areas of the Soviet-Norwegian relations

The revolution in Russia in 1917 eventually became a setback for Russian-Norwegian relations, because Soviet Russia decided to build its international relations on different principles than the Russian Empire.⁷³

All politicians of this period recognized the strategic importance of the Russian North and V. Lenin signed a decree on the allocation of 10 million rubles for the Archangelsk and Murmansk port on 14 February 1918.⁷⁴ As V. Bulatov points out:

“The first years of Soviet power in the North, the government was looking for new forms of economic cooperation between Russia and Norway.”⁷⁵

However, Norway recognized de-jure USSR on February 15, 1924. Thus Norway was the first Scandinavian country, that established diplomatic relation with the USSR. The main reason for this approach was the traditional, centuries-old economic ties between Norway and the Russian North. Also, it was required by the workers, business people, and community leaders, led by F. Nansen.⁷⁶

Arctic cooperation continued: there was the second conference of the International Society for the study of the polar machines “Aeroarctic” in Leningrad from 18 to 23 June, 1928. The Council of People’s Commissars USSR adopted a decree on strengthening scientific research in the Arctic on July 31, 1928. This paved the way for the Arctic Government Commission. It brought together and coordinated all work of all organizations, which were involved in the research and development of the Arctic.⁷⁷

The Soviet flag was raised at Cape Flora in Franz Josef Land by O. Schmidt’s expedition on 30 July, 1929. He declared that the Soviet government decided to claim the Franz Josef Land on behalf of USSR. Norwegians attempted to settle in this land, but their expeditions were returned to their home country. Norwegians visiting to the archipelago of Franz Josef Land was discontinued due to the constant presence of soviet scientific expeditions, works of polar stations in the following years. So, the conflict was settled.⁷⁸

⁷³ Smirnov (2003) “*Rossiysko-norvezhskiy otnosheniya v Barentsevom-YevroArkticheskoy regione 90-gody XX veka*” [Russian-Norwegian relations in the Barents Euro-Arctic region 90 years of the XX century]. Moscow: Diplomatic Academy of the Russian Foreign Ministry. Dissertation. p. 49

⁷⁴ Ibid. p. 49

⁷⁵ V. Bulatov (1987) “Sovetskiy soyuz i Norvegiya: sotrudnichestvo i konflikty v Arktike” [The Soviet Union and Norway: cooperation and conflict in the Arctic] in B. Goldin and Jens-Petter Nielsen (eds.) *Strakh i ozhidaniya. Rossiya i Norvegiya v XX veke*. Arkhangelsk: Pomor University Press. p. 131

⁷⁶ Ibid. p. 132

⁷⁷ Ibid. p. 135

⁷⁸ Ibid. p. 136-137

In the early 20s, a new conflict situation emerged in White Sea. 50 Norwegian vessels illegally hunted the sea mammals and fish every year. Three Norwegian ships were arrested and transferred to Archangelsk on 16 April, 1921. Norwegians have been exposed to a fine, and the illicit cargo was confiscated.⁷⁹

The Council of People's Commissars adopted a decree "About protection of fish and animal areas in the Arctic Ocean and the White Sea" on 21 May, 1921. According to this document, the foreign vessels were prohibited without permission of the Soviet authorities to enter a coastal zone to a distance of 12 nautical miles.⁸⁰

But despite this, the violations continued by the Norwegian and the British industrialists. Conflict with Norway was completed in 1923, because the concession was granted to a private industrial firm "Winge & Co." in Oslo.⁸¹

According to V. Bulatov: "To sum up the conflict situations in the Arctic, it should be noted that for Russia "Spitsbergen syndrome in 1920" imposed a large imprint concerning the Novaya Zemlya and Franz Josef Land. Some leaders and scientists, the media created a negative public opinion against territorial claims of Norway, but only because the diplomatic tact and wisdom of department of Russia and the Norwegian official and public opinion had overcome the problem".⁸²

In May 1939, the Norwegian fascist party (National sampling) has launched an intensive propaganda of fascism and hatred to the Soviet Union. In response to that, the Soviet Union sent a protest to Norway, which stated that Norway was host for a negative campaign against the Soviet Union, which only could lead to complications between Norway and Russia.⁸³

The Soviet-Finnish War in 1939 did also have a bad effect on the already cool the Soviet-Norwegian relations. Many Norwegians with a growing fear of the Soviet Union, watched the unfolding in relative proximity to its borders of the military campaign against Finland. The Norwegian historian Egil Danielsen said:

"The seriousness of the situation can be seen in the fact that rumours said that the Soviet Union was planning attack Finnmark".⁸⁴

⁷⁹ Ibid. p. 137

⁸⁰ Ibid. p. 137

⁸¹ Ibid. p. 138

⁸² Ibid. p. 139

⁸³ Sukharev (2003) "*Rossia i Norvegiya: istoriya dobrososedctva* " [Russia and Norway: the history of neighbourhood]. Murmansk: Pazori. p. 35

⁸⁴ Repnevsky, A. (2005) *Zimnyaya voyna v politike Norvegii* [A Winter War in Norwegian Policy] in materials of the Sixth Annual Conference (14-16 April 2004), ed. Baryshnikov, V. available at http://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/History/Article/repn_zimv.php, (accessed 25 February 2013)

However, with the advent of the Second World War, the world politic began to change. German troops invaded in Norway on 9 November, 1940. For the complete defeat of Nazi troops, in accordance with the agreement of 16 May, 1944, signed by the Soviet Union and Norway, Soviet troops entered to the country.⁸⁵

The liberation was a part of the famous Petsamo-Kirkenes operation.

Offensive forces of the Karelian Front and the Northern Fleet was held 7-29 October 1944 to oust the Nazi occupation from the Soviet Arctic. The Northern Fleet had to put marines behind enemy, disrupt enemy sea transportation, block ports Petsamo and Kirkenes, and support ships and aircraft on the coastal area.⁸⁶

As a result of the Petsamo-Kirkenes operation, Soviet troops advanced 150 km to west, liberated Petsamo and Eastern Finnmark, marking the beginning of the country's liberation of Nazi occupation. German troops lost killed 30,000 people. Northern Fleet sank 156 enemy ships and vessels and Soviet pilots destroyed 125 enemy aircraft.⁸⁷

The Norwegian King Haakon VII expressed "admiration and appreciation for the excellent fighting of Soviet forces for the cause of freedom" in greeting telegram to M. Kalinin⁸⁸ on the victory over Nazi Germany.⁸⁹

But soon after the Second World War, the confrontation between East and West influenced negatively on USSR relations with Norway.

After Stalin's death, however, the relations between USSR and Norway improved. In November 1955, the Prime Minister Gerhardsen was first Scandinavian leaders, who made an official visit to the USSR. In Moscow he said that "norwegian government will not promote a policy that has aggressive goals and not provide basis on Norwegian territory to foreign armed forces, until Norway is not under attack or threat of attack".⁹⁰

Several important Soviet-Norwegian agreements were signed in 1956-1957: on cultural cooperation; on the sea border in the Varanger Fjord; on the use of hydro resources of

⁸⁵ Sukharev (2003) "*Rossia i Norvegija: istoriya dobrososedetva* " [Russia and Norway: the history of neighbourhood]. Murmansk: Pazori. p. 35

⁸⁶ Petsamo-Kirkenesskaya operatsiya [Petsamo-Kirkenes operation], Norway during the second World War, available at http://www.norge.ru/petsamo_kirkenes/ (accessed 22 January 2013).

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ See M.I. Kalinin (07. 11.1875-03.06.1946) was the Soviet Party and State leader, the Central Executive Committee Chair (1919-1922), the CEC of the USSR (1922-1938), Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR (1938-1946). Znamenitosti Rosii (Russian celebrities), available at <http://www.bankgorodov.ru/fame/index.php?fid=376> (accessed 22 January 2013).

⁸⁹ Smirnov, A. (1998) *Murmanskiy koridor* [Murmansk corridor]. Murmansk: Sever. p. 24

⁹⁰ Ibid. p. 28

the border river Paz; on cooperation on rescue operations in the Barents Sea and on the regulation of the sea hunting in the North-East Atlantic.⁹¹

Scientific contacts increased after 1955. A high-latitude expedition from the Arctic and Antarctic Research Institute on electric ship “Ob” in Northern Greenland Sea was the first example of fruitful scientific cooperation of Soviet and Scandinavian explorers in 1956. The expedition was conducted under the Program of the International Geophysical Year, and the Scandinavian scientists participated in it by special invitation.⁹²

During the 1950s and 1960s, productive contacts were taken up between Norwegian research institutions and various organizations from Leningrad, Moscow, Murmansk and Archangelsk which were associated with Arctic exploration.⁹³

A new level of relations between Norway and USSR emerged in the 70’s. The issues of trade and economic cooperation, shipping and fishing were discussed at the ministry level. 20 international agreements and treaties were signed between 1973 and 1983. The most important contacts were an agreement about payments, which regulated the Soviet-Norwegian foreign economic relations (1965); about long-term trade (1971); about the economic industrial and scientific-technical cooperation (1972).⁹⁴

In 1971 the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union Kosygin visited Norway with the question about cooperation in Polar research. Also, there was interest from Norwegian side about exploration of possibilities, that’s why in 1974, delegations from both countries met to reach an agreement. But it failed, mainly because “there was an insistence on the Soviet side that the cooperation should relate only to Svalbard (Norway wanted to include “adjacent areas”) and the Russians wanted the cooperation to depend on higher level agreement, a so-called administrative agreement”.⁹⁵

From the late 1970s on the Soviet Union’s relations with Norway was negatively effected by such events as the conflict over the deployment of nuclear missiles in Europe; the Soviet invasion to Afghanistan (1979); state of emergency in Poland (1981) and the arrest of Norwegian diplomat Arne Treholt, who was charge of spying for the Soviet Union (1984). A

⁹¹ Ibid. p. 28

⁹² Volkov (1989) “Sotrudnichestvo v Arctike” [Cooperation in the Arctic], in *Istoricheskiye svyazi Russkogo Severa i Norvegii*. Arkhangelsk Press. p. 113

⁹³ Ibid. p. 115

⁹⁴ Yevstigneyeva (2008) “Osobennosti sovremennogo razvitiya rossiysko-norvezhskikh otnosheniy (na primere vzaimodeystviya v Arktike)” [Features of the modern development of the Russian-Norwegian relations (for example, cooperation in the Arctic)]. Moscow: Diplomatic Academy of the Russian Foreign. p. 13

⁹⁵ Bones, S. (2010) Fieldwork: Polar Research and Norway’s relations with the Soviet Union in Bones, S. and Mankova, P. (eds.) *Norway and Russia in the Arctic*. University of Tromsø, the publication series of the department of the history and religious studies, № 12, p. 134

new round of Cold War came. A placement of Soviet military units near the Norwegian border in the Kola Peninsula is increasingly associated with the threat in Norway.⁹⁶

2.3 Gorbachev's "Murmansk Initiatives" and the Kirkenes Declaration (1993) as a new vector in politics between Russia and Norway

In the 80s, the confrontation between the U.S. and the USSR caused a great damage to the relations between Norway and the Soviet Union. In December 1986, the Norwegian Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland visited Moscow.⁹⁷

This remarkable woman, leader of the Social Democratic Party and Prime Minister, has played a huge role in making Norway one of the prosperous and socially advanced countries. She supported economic recovery, the foundation of which was the opening of rich offshore oil fields. She is also known as the international leader for her initiatives in support of the Third World and to protect environment.⁹⁸ At a meeting with Norwegian Prime Minister, M. Gorbachev noted that the Soviet Union has no aggressive intentions. He called that it was not normal, that high-level contacts were not 15 years.⁹⁹

Given the approaching 70th anniversary of the October revolution, the CPSU Central Committee attached particular importance especially to Gorbachev's trip to the Murmansk region (30 September – 2 October 1987).¹⁰⁰ Murmansk is the most important port of cooperation, a major economic and military center. It was therefore decided to use the platform of Murmansk and to refer to the wider international community, particularly to the North European, to radically reduce the level of confrontation in the north.¹⁰¹

Gorbachev pointed out:

“The Soviet Union supports the drastic reduction in the level of military confrontation in the region. Let the north of planet, the Arctic become a zone of peace. Let the North Pole be a zone of peace. We invite all interested states to begin negotiations on the limitation and

⁹⁶ Ibid. p. 13

⁹⁷ Yevstigneyeva (2008) “*Osobennosti sovremennogo razvitiya rossiysko-norvezhskikh otnosheniy (na primere vzaimodeystviya v Arktike)*” [Features of the modern development of the Russian-Norwegian relations (for example, cooperation in the Arctic)]. Moscow: Diplomatic Academy of the Russian Foreign. p. 14

⁹⁸ See: (2010) *Otvechaya na vyzov vremeni, vneshnyaya politika perestroyki: dokumental'nyye svidetel'stva po zapisyam besed M. Gorbacheva s zarubezhnymi deyatelyami i drugim materialam* [responding to recall of time, foreign policy of perestroika: documented by records of conversations of M. Gorbachev with foreign leaders and other materials]. Moskva: Ves' Mir. p. 478

⁹⁹ Yevstigneyeva (2008) “*Osobennosti sovremennogo razvitiya rossiysko-norvezhskikh otnosheniy (na primere vzaimodeystviya v Arktike)*” [Features of the modern development of the Russian-Norwegian relations (for example, cooperation in the Arctic)]. Moscow: Diplomatic Academy of the Russian Foreign. p. 14

¹⁰⁰ Smirnov (2003) “*Rossiysko-norvezhskiy otnosheniya v Barentsevom-YevroArkticheskom regione 90-gody XX veka*” [Russian-Norwegian relations in the Barents Euro-Arctic region 90 years of the XX century]. Moscow: Diplomatic Academy of the Russian Foreign Ministry. Dissertation. p. 78

¹⁰¹ Smirnov, A. (1998) *Murmanskiy korridor*. [Murmansk corridor]. Izdatel'stvo Sever. p. 31

reduction of the military activity in the north as a whole – in the eastern and western hemisphere”.¹⁰²

What was proposed?¹⁰³

1. Nuclear free-zone in the Northern Europe. Soviet Union was ready to act as guarantist of this zone for the states.

2. Limitation of naval activity in the surrounding seas of northern Europe. There was a proposal to hold a meeting in Leningrad for the prohibition of naval activities in the areas of international straits and on the ways of heavy traffic in general. And to stop the nuclear explosions in the Novaya Zemlya.

3. Peaceful cooperation for the rational development of resources in the North and the Arctic. There was proposed the idea of creating a single energy program. Canada and Norway were invited to create the mixed companies for the development of continental shelf of the North Sea, as well as the sharing of resources of the Kola Peninsula.

4. Scientific studies of the Arctic. It was proposed to hold an international conference in Murmansk about coordination of international studies, as well on issues of the indigenous population in the North.

5. Environmental protection of the North. It was asked to develop a comprehensive plan for the overall environment of the North with the Nordic countries, including the monitoring of the radiation safety.

6. The Northern Sea Route. It was promised to open a northern sea route to foreign ships with Soviet icebreaker assistance.

Some Gorbachev’s ideas were successfully implemented. Several research programs were developed in environmental direction. An agreement was signed between the Polar Institute and the Murmansk Marine Biological Institute includes the fact that “the parties recognize the Svalbard, the Barents Sea and the Western Soviet Arctic probably form an ecological entity, and geophysical program, which was established in 1988, about studying the transport of water and ice through the straits from Greenland in the west to Franz Josef Land”.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰² See: (1988) SSSR v bor’be za bezopasnost’ I sotrudnichestvo v Yevrope, 1964-1987 [USSR in the struggle for security and cooperation in Europe, 1964-1987]. *Sbornik dokumentov*. Moskva mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya p. 500

¹⁰³ Ibid. p. 500-502

¹⁰⁴ Bones, S. (2010) Fieldwork: Polar Research and Norway’s relations with the Soviet Union in Bones, S. and Mankova, P. (eds.) *Norway and Russia in the Arctic*. University of Tromsø, the publication series of the department of the history and religious studies, № 12, p. 135

A Conference of Arctic states was also held in Leningrad in 1988, which was attended by a large number of polar researches from different countries. The conference developed the platform as well as private research programs for coming years.¹⁰⁵

Resulting from the “Murmansk Initiatives” were also a treaty on average and shorter range missiles; the withdrawal of missiles from combat duty in the areas adjacent to the European north; the elimination of nuclear weapons in the Baltic Sea as well as troop reduction by 200 thousand people in the European part in the USSR.¹⁰⁶

M. Gorbachev gave a short interview to Norwegian TV where he said: “Before my visit, I was a staunch supporter of our traditionally good relations with the closest neighbors – with Finns, with Norwegians, with Swedes – this is priority”.¹⁰⁷

In June 1991, M. Gorbachev as Nobel Prize winner visited Oslo. On 5 June, M. Gorbachev and G. Brundtland signed the Norwegian-Soviet agreement, with special emphasis on cooperation in the North.¹⁰⁸

To sum up, it may be concluded that the Soviet Union and Norway was established a solid relations, which is based on political, international law, trade, economic and humanitarian directions. This is expanded the interests of both countries.

Also, as Stian Bones has underlined: “When Mikhail Gorbachev became a General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1985, contact had already been established with individuals at a high level in the decision-making hierarchy on the Soviet side, and this provided the basis for a steadily improving relationship of trust”.¹⁰⁹

In 1987 when Gorbachev made his famous speech in Murmansk, from which the scientific cooperation in the Arctic was one of the important parts, the Norwegians pointed towards Nikolaj Borisov, the Director of Foreign Relations of the State Committee for Science and Technology, who was responsible for this section. And there was Canadian-Norwegian initiative behind Borisov’s input.¹¹⁰

According to A. Smirnov, the rich historical heritage of the pre-revolutionary Russian-Norwegian relations, which was dominated by good-neighborliness and mutually beneficial trade, including Pomor trade also played a role. The Soviet-Norwegian relations were uneven

¹⁰⁵ Volkov (1989) “Sotrudnichestvo v Arctike” [Cooperation in the Arctic], in *Istoricheskiye svyazi Russkogo Severa i Norvegii*. Arkhangelsk Press. p. 118

¹⁰⁶ Smirnov, A. (1998) *Murmanskiy koridor* [Murmansk coridor]. Izdatel'stvo Sever. p. 33

¹⁰⁷ Ibid. p. 33

¹⁰⁸ Ibid. p. 34

¹⁰⁹ Bones, S. (2010) Fieldwork: Polar Research and Norway’s relations with the Soviet Union in Bones, S. and Mankova, P. (eds.) *Norway and Russia in the Arctic*. University of Tromsø, the publication series of the department of the history and religious studies, № 12, p. 136

¹¹⁰ Ibid. p. 136

because of political confrontation in the Cold War. But the “Murmansk Initiative” was an important breakthrough in the promotion of peace, trust and good neighborliness in the north of Europe.¹¹¹

After the collapse of the USSR, Norway was first state which recognized the sovereignty of Russia. On 8 March 1992, Russian Foreign Minister Andrei Kozyrev and Norwegian Foreign Minister T. Stoltenberg signed a joint protocol on the work program of contacts and cooperation in Oslo. It was emphasized the development of economic cooperation between the two countries in the northern regions, and the desirability of restoring contacts between local authorities.¹¹²

On 24 April, 1992 T. Stoltenberg introduced into political vocabulary the concept “Barents region”. On the same day in Tromsø leaders of the three provinces of the northern Norwegian: Finnmark – Erling Fløtten, Tromsø – Jan Henry T. Olsen and Nordland – Sigbjørn Eriksen had meeting with the Head of administration of the Murmansk region – E. Komarov and the Deputy Head of the Archangelsk administration – A. Efremov. A special working group was established there, headed by a representative of Finnmark – Tor Robertsen.¹¹³

The working group was given the task to promote bilateral cooperation in economy, science and the environment. In the signed protocol, the leaders stressed that an important instrument for working group will be an action plan for Russia and Eastern Europe, adopted by the Government of Norway on 24 April, 1992.¹¹⁴

The next major step in creating the Barents Euro-Arctic Region was signed Declaration in Kirkenes on 11 January, 1993. Norway, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Russian Federation, Sweden and European Commission took part in the Conference on which were also attended by observers from the U.S., Canada, France, Germany, Japan, Poland and the UK.¹¹⁵

Before this event, there was a speech of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Russia A. Kozyrev to the Northern Fleet. He said that: “the Arctic is no longer a theater of military

¹¹¹ Smirnov (2003) “*Rossiysko-norvezhskiyе otnosheniya v Barentsevom-YevroArkticheskoy regione 90-gody XX veka*” [Russian-Norwegian relations in the Barents Euro-Arctic region 90 years of the XX century]. Moscow: Diplomatic Academy of the Russian Foreign Ministry. Dissertation. p. 90

¹¹² Smirnov, A. (1998) *Murmanskiy korridor*. [Murmansk corridor]. Izdatel'stvo Sever. p. 35

¹¹³ Smirnov (2003) “*Rossiysko-norvezhskiyе otnosheniya v Barentsevom-YevroArkticheskoy regione 90-gody XX veka*” [Russian-Norwegian relations in the Barents Euro-Arctic region 90 years of the XX century]. Moscow: Diplomatic Academy of the Russian Foreign Ministry. Dissertation. p. 94

¹¹⁴ Ibid. p. 94

¹¹⁵ Declaration on Cooperation in the Barents Euro-Arctic region, available at http://www.lawrussia.ru/texts/legal_555/doc55a708x422.htm (accessed 29 January 2013)

competition. Here, there are a lot of problems such as social, economic and political. It is important to attract high technologies, large investors and partners to address them. With this facilities, our delegation and the leadership of Murmansk and Archangelsk regions goes to Kirkenes to sign the Declaration on cooperation in the Barents Euro-Arctic region”.¹¹⁶

The Declaration was a new way of foreign policy thinking, which focused on the contact between peoples and which provided the direct involvement of local and regional authorities.¹¹⁷



The signing of the Kirkenes Declaration on 11 January, 1993, Kirkenes. Left to the right: Jürgen Orstrem (Denmark), Andrey Kozyrev (Russia), Paavo Väyrynen (Finland), Thorvald Stoltenberg (Norway), Margaretha af Ugglas (Sweden) and Jon Sigursson (Iceland). Photo: Heikki Sarviaho / LEHTIKUVA / SCANPIX¹¹⁸

There are main following directions in the Barents program:¹¹⁹

- The joint development of natural resources, oil and gas;
- Cooperation in the field of environment;
- Conversion of defense enterprises in telecommunications, shipbuilding, the study of natural resources in the Arctic;

¹¹⁶ Ibid. p. 96

¹¹⁷ Espen Barth Eide “Barentsevo sotrudnichestvo – severnoye vozrozhdeniye” [The Barents cooperation – Northern Renaissance] available at http://www.norvegia.ru/News_and_events/happenings/The-northern-regions/Barents-cooperation---Northern-Renaissance/ (accessed 29 January 2013)

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

¹¹⁹ Declaration on Cooperation in the Barents Euro-Arctic region, available at http://www.lawrussia.ru/texts/legal_555/doc55a708x422.htm (accessed 29 January, 2013)

- The development of small and medium businesses, the transport infrastructure, the Northern Sea Route and tourism.

For this study the first paragraph of the Declaration is particularly interesting, as it addresses to problem of protection the environment in the Barents Euro-Arctic region.

According to A. Smirnov, it was based on a joint ministerial declaration on environment of Nordic countries and Russia, held in Kirkenes on September 3, 1992 and the Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic on September 22, 1992.¹²⁰

The Declaration emphasized that the environmental parameters must be integrated into all activities in the region. International cooperation should be promoted in the following areas:¹²¹

- to enhance environmental and radiation monitoring in the region;
- the improvement works on the operational safety of nuclear facilities;
- the rehabilitation of contaminated areas, resulting operation of nuclear facilities.

To summarizing this paragraph, we can say, that “the Murmansk Initiatives” demonstrate the commitment to rebuild the international situation in the Arctic, where the development of the international security interests is opposed to military interests. Barents cooperation, which was based on 11 January, 1993, was essentially a new platform for regional cooperation between Russia, Norway, Sweden and Finland. And as Governor of Murmansk Marina Kovtun has repeatedly stressed in June at a meeting with representatives of the Ministry of the Foreign Affairs of Norway: “The Kirkenes Declaration (1993) is a unique instrument that opened the new calculus of cooperation at the international level. We greatly appreciate the work which begun by the Norwegian Foreign Ministry to draft II Kirkenes Declaration”.¹²²

¹²⁰ Smirnov (2003) “*Rossiysko-norvezhskiyе otnosheniya v Barentsevom-YevroArkticheskoy regione 90-gody XX veka*” [Russian-Norwegian relations in the Barents Euro-Arctic region 90 years of the XX century]. Moscow: Diplomatic Academy of the Russian Ministry. Dissertation. p. 101

¹²¹ Declaration on Cooperation in the Barents Euro-Arctic region, available at http://www.lawrussia.ru/texts/legal_555/doc55a708x422.htm (accessed 29 January 2013)

¹²² Arkticheskiye sosedi ukrepyayut Barentsevo sotrudnichestvo [Arctic neighbors reinforce the Barents cooperation] available at <http://barentsobserver.com/ru/arktika/arkticheskiye-sosedi-ukrepyayut-barentsevo-sotrudnichestvo-17-11> (accessed 31 January 2013)

Chapter 3. The problems and prospects of Russian-Norwegian transboundary regional cooperation in the Arctic

3.1 The place of transboundary regional cooperation in international integration

The general trend of development of integration processes in the modern world is globalization. Globalization denotes 1) a process of international integration arising from the interchange of world views, products, ideas, and other aspects of culture;¹²³ 2) a continuing process of accelerated and deepened social interaction on a global scale formerly independent units;¹²⁴ 3) describes the interplay across cultures of macro-social forces. These forces include religion, politics and economics¹²⁵; 4) impact of what is happening in one part of the world to another part, and it is not necessarily directly related to each other.¹²⁶

Globalization is caused by the interconnectedness of the world, the information revolution, the development of global communications and digital networks. As noted H.V. Maul, German politician, there are three major strategies – retreat, cooperation and integration, using of which the nation state has a chance to succeed in the era of globalization. Speaking about the cooperation, he notes that “the states can pool their resources and thus improve their chances for the future”.¹²⁷

Globalization and regionalization are dialectically related. As V. Makarov noted:

“Regionalization is a tool that allows to adequately reflect the specific conditions, the way of thinking, the mentality and experience of individual parts of the world. Regionalization exists as regional development and consciously formulated purpose”.¹²⁸

According to Makarov: “there are following factors for the successful implementation of regional integration:”¹²⁹

- Geographical proximity of countries;
- Availability of similar or joint strategies for socio-economic development;
- Availability of developed relations between economic agents of countries;
- Common political interests of the countries;

¹²³ Dr. Nayef R.F. Al-Rodhan (2006) Definitions of globalization: a comprehensive overview and a proposed definition, <http://www.sustainablehistory.com/articles/definitions-of-globalization.pdf>, (accessed 8 February 2013)

¹²⁴ Definitions, “Globalization” <http://qed.princeton.edu/main/MG/Definitions>, (accessed 8 February 2013)

¹²⁵ Definition, “Globalization” <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Globalization>, (accessed 8 February 2013)

¹²⁶ Makarov, V. (2000) Sistema transgranichnogo regional'nogo sotrudnichestva v barentsevom yevro-arkticheskom regione [the system of cross-border regional cooperation in the Barents Euro-Arctic region]. Moscow: Diplomatic Academy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Department of Foreign Policy and International relations. Dissertation. p. 16

¹²⁷ Ibeed. p. 18

¹²⁸ Ibeed. p. 20

¹²⁹ Ibeed. p. 21

- The history of relations between the states and the presence among them a favorable psychological climate.

Modern international relations have developed towards political and economic integration. It also strengthens regionalism. Thus, regional authorities may now play a stronger role than before.¹³⁰

The process of world development is inextricably linked to coastal areas. It is a geopolitical and economic base of mastering continents and oceans. In the second half of the 20th century there was industrial shift to the seas and the formation of large ports and industrial complexes. The coastal zone is a basis of the world economy.¹³¹

The trends of globalization and regionalization have increased the importance and attractiveness of the coastal zone of seas and oceans. The coastal zone of the Arctic seas of Russia in the 20th century becomes the main object of mastering due to the production, storage and transport of mineral resources, especially hydrocarbons. 92% of Russian natural gas production is located in the Arctic.¹³² The Arctic shelf is the main area of hydrocarbons. It's hides a quarter of the world's hydrocarbons. There is also rich in oil, gas and minerals.¹³³

The seas and oceans are major "filters" of the Earth. The development of the coastal zone of Arctic is significantly affected by using the resources in Arctic, the development of fisheries and maritime communications. If in the second half of 20th century, the rivalry between the states unfolded over fuel and energy resources, the 21st century it will be very important to establish regimes in the Arctic that ensures a sustainable development. The epicenter of the struggle will be again the coastal zone of the seas and oceans.¹³⁴

¹³⁰ Ibeed. p. 23

¹³¹ Makarov, V. (2000) Sistema transgranichnogo regional'nogo sotrudnichestva v barentsevom yevro-arkticheskom regione [the system of cross-border regional cooperation in the Barents Euro-Arctic region]. Moscow: Diplomatic Academy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Department of Foreign Policy and International relations. Dissertation. p. 27

¹³² Ogorodov, S. (2008) "Vliyaniye izmeneniy klimata i ledovitosti arkticheskikh morey na dinamiku beregov Yevrazii" ["Effects of changing climate and sea ice extent on Eurasian arctic coastal dynamics"] *Journal Problemy Arktiki i Antarktiki*, №1 (78), p. 123

¹³³ Alimov, A. (2012) "O mezhdunarodnoy konferentsii "Arktika v uslovii mezhdunarodnykh izmeneniy"" [the international conference "The Arctic with international changes"], *Journal Obshchestvo. Sreda. Razvitiye (Terra Humana)*, № 2, p. 261

¹³⁴ Makarov, V. (2000) Sistema transgranichnogo regional'nogo sotrudnichestva v barentsevom yevro-arkticheskom regione [the system of cross-border regional cooperation in the Barents Euro-Arctic region]. Moscow: Diplomatic Academy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Department of Foreign Policy and International relations. Dissertation. p. 56

3.2 The environmental factor of transboundary cooperation between northern Russia and Europe

According to V. Makarov: “The environmental factor has come to play a significant role in the geopolitics of the developed countries after the fact that their national security, the present level of life cannot be achieved without using the resources of the planet”.¹³⁵

Global changes of climate and environmental condition are dramatically increasing the importance of correct adaptation actions to the country’s economy and population. It requires a comprehensive approach that considers all aspects of the interaction between nature and society to the solution of any local issues, with regard to economic, environmental, resource, demographic and cultural characteristics of the country.¹³⁶

Here, we may recall the Chernobyl disaster – the distraction of the fourth unit of the Chernobyl nuclear power plant on 26 April 1986 in Ukraine. The reactor was completely destroyed and large quantities of radioactive substances were released in the environment. In contrast to the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, explosion resembled a very powerful “dirty bomb”, where the radioactive contamination was the main affecting factor.¹³⁷

After the Cold War, a new threat emerged for Norway. The cause of the threat was the recession of the Russian economy and armed forces, including the physical erosion of nuclear reactors on submarines of the Northern Fleet. This threat was very unfortunate for Norwegians. The risk of nuclear contamination from Russian submarines caused more trouble than the military threat.¹³⁸

The fragments of the Cold War remains on the Kola Peninsula in the form of the nuclear waste. This waste consists of plutonium from nuclear warheads, bombs, artillery shells and torpedoes, from rods of spent fuel engines of nuclear submarines and icebreakers, and also from other types of waste. Four aging reactors at the Kola NPP have civilian use, but at the same time they are an integral part of the post-war development of the region. 70 nuclear submarines have been removed from service, but in fact they are in the dock with the rods of spent nuclear fuel in reactors of engines.¹³⁹

The accumulation of nuclear materials and waste, which are in different conditions and locations, have represented a significant risk. It can cause air and water pollution due to

¹³⁵ Ibid. p. 57

¹³⁶ Ibid. p. 58

¹³⁷ Katastrofa na Chernobyl'skoy AES [The accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant], available at <http://o-chaes.ru/>, (accessed on 12 February 2013)

¹³⁸ Ibid. p. 58

¹³⁹ Ekologicheskaya bezopasnost' Norvegii [Environmental safety in Norway], available <http://www.reforus.org/referat-text-330-13.html>, (accessed February 12 2013)

accidental leakage of liquids and gases. This situation poses a risk to the health and well-being of the local population, especially the inhabitants of Murmansk and Archangelsk regions and Finnmark. Some of these stores are located at a distance of less than 50 km from the nearest Norwegian settlements. This causes a great concern to their residents. So for Norway, it is extremely important to develop cooperation in the dismantling and disposal of decommissioned Russian's nuclear submarines.¹⁴⁰

The effects of radioactive waste in the north, to the environment and public health, was a contributing factor to the fact that in the 1980's the Norwegian-Soviet cooperation was established in the field of environmental protection. Starting from 1992, the Plan Action on Nuclear Issues is the basis of the contribution that Norway is making in the field of nuclear safety. Since then, for this important work was allocated more than 1 billion Kr.¹⁴¹

Adding to this picture is the fact that the rivers of the north-west of Russia fall into the Barents Sea, where Norway and Russia engaged in management of some of the world's richest fish stocks. This represents a significant political and economic interest for both countries. It is very important that the international markets remain confident in the quality and purity of the fish from the Barents Sea. The smallest rumor of insufficient quality and radioactivity of fish from Barents Sea can have serious consequences.¹⁴² Again, going back to V. Makarov:

“Public opinion is suppler, especially when the media writes and speaks about the risks associated with nuclear theme. The reaction of consumers in terms of acceptability of products can be harsh and prolonged. The Norwegian government is aware of the seriousness of these issues and takes effective measures to solve the situation”.¹⁴³

Norway has a keen interest to work with Russia on finding effective ways of preventing threats to environment and finding solutions to the most difficult tasks in the field of nuclear safety in the Northwest of Russia. Such problems are not capable to solve by Russia itself, but only through the international cooperation.¹⁴⁴

¹⁴⁰ Yadernaya bezopasnost' na severo-zapade Rossii [The nuclear safety in northwest of Russia], available <http://handlingsplan.nrpa.no/Stralevernet-russisk1304.pdf>, (accessed 14 February 2013)

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

¹⁴² Makarov, V. (2000) Sistema transgranichnogo regional'nogo sotrudnichestva v barentsevom yevro-arkticheskom regione [the system of cross-border regional cooperation in the Barents Euro-Arctic region]. Moscow: Diplomatic Academy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Department of Foreign Policy and International relations. Dissertation. p. 59

¹⁴³ Ibid. p. 73

¹⁴⁴ Ibid. p. 73

3.3 *The system formation of transnational cooperation in the Arctic, from its establishment to the realization in the Arctic (BEAR and Arctic Council)*

A new start point in the relations between Russia and Norway were the years from 1992 to 1993. Russia and the Scandinavian countries have sought to create conditions for closer cooperation, which had not only bilateral nature, but the multilateral too. In 1992, Thorvald Stoltenberg, the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs initiated the formation of a formal cooperation in the Barents Region.¹⁴⁵ Regarding to Russia, Stoltenberg has openly declared that “all Barents cooperation built around the axis Northern Europe and Russia...”¹⁴⁶

On January 11, 1993 the Kirkenes Declaration on cooperation in the Barents Euro-Arctic region was signed, and the Barents Euro-Arctic Council was established. The Council included Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Russia, Finland, Sweden and the representative of the EU Commission.

The Declaration characterized by many international experts as “*the art of possible*”. A. Kozyrev wrote in a letter to T. Stoltenberg: “The Kirkenes Declaration creates conditions for a productive collaboration with the challenges of our time as well as concern for future generations”¹⁴⁷.

The Declaration was a kind of “constitution” for the ministerial floor of BEAR. But as noted Stoltenberg: “countries may through the Barents Euro-Arctic Council create the conditions for political and economic cooperation in the North, but only those who live in the region should give to cooperation a specific content and it is here should be based”.¹⁴⁸

Thus, the Barents Regional Council was created; it was responsible for interaction at the local level, so-called regional floor of BEAR. BRC included the heads of the regions of Russia and the Scandinavian provinces.¹⁴⁹

This type of cooperation was the result of the need for a changing face of Europe, towards a favorable climate for normal international relations. This represented a revival of former closer economic, political, trade and human relations, especially between Russia and Norway. A well-known is a fact about the beneficial and useful Pomor trade, which flourished

¹⁴⁵ Sukharev (2003) “*Rossia i Norvegija: istoriya dobrososedctva* ” [Russia and Norway: the history of neighbourhood]. Murmansk: Pazori. p. 268

¹⁴⁶ Smirnov, A. (1998) *Murmanskiy korridor*. [Murmansk corridor]. Izdatel'stvo Sever. p. 37

¹⁴⁷ Ibid. p. 39

¹⁴⁸ Ibid. p. 40

¹⁴⁹ Makarov, V. (2000) Sistema transgranichnogo regional'nogo sotrudnichestva v barentsevom yevro-arkticheskom regione [the system of cross-border regional cooperation in the Barents Euro-Arctic region]. Moscow: Diplomatic Academy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Department of Foreign Policy and International relations. Dissertation. p. 76

for over two centuries. It should be kept in mind that the economic and social development of the northern regions are very similar, which suggest their joint decision.¹⁵⁰

In Norway and other Nordic countries, has considerable experience in developing relations between the neighboring territories. In Europe, cross-border relations have a long tradition, based on well-developed legal framework and complete integration processes. The Kirkenes Declaration defined the concept and organization of the cross-border regional cooperation of northern areas.¹⁵¹

On 15 January, 1993 in a letter of gratitude to T. Stoltenberg, A. Kozyrev said: “I am confident that Norway as the initiator of multilateral cooperation in the Northern Europe and the chairman of the Barents Council lead the ship board at an important initial stage of its activity”.¹⁵²

On April 21, 1993 Minister of Foreign Affairs Johan Jørgen Hølst arrived in Arkhangelsk, where he met with A. Kozyrev in the conference in Pomor University, visited the place where nuclear submarines were built in Severodvinsk, and then held talks with A. Kozyrev in Moscow, where they adopted a joint protocol of the work program to develop contact and cooperation in 1993-1994.¹⁵³

Meanwhile, in preparation of the ministerial meetings on 23-27 August in Kirkenes, the scientific elites (more than 100 scientists from 19 countries, including 20 from Russia) made a brainstorming on the protection of Polar Regions from radioactivity. The “White book” publication by presidential advisor A. Yablokov, the weighted speech from first deputy Ministry of Ecology A. Poryadin, who stressed that environment problems are especially in first section of Kirkenes Declaration, held a conference in a constructive direction.¹⁵⁴

Participants welcomed the Russia’s agreement on the organization of the second Russian-Norwegian expedition to Novaya Zemlya (12-25 September 1993); advocated for accelerated examination of the situation around the nuclear submarine “Komsomolets”; increased security of the Kola NPP, and also the creation of the Russian-Norwegian-Finnish reserve on junction of the borders of these countries.¹⁵⁵

BEAR countries pledged themselves to take the necessary measures to promote joint projects to protect the environment, especially the protection and improvement of

¹⁵⁰ Ibid. p. 75

¹⁵¹ Ibid. p. 76

¹⁵² Smirnov, A. (1998) *Murmanskiy corridor*. [Murmansk corridor]. Izdatel'stvo Sever. p. 43

¹⁵³ Ibid. p. 43

¹⁵⁴ Ibid. p. 44

¹⁵⁵ Ibid. p. 44

environmental conditions in the Barents Sea, as well as the conservation, use and development of its welfare and production potential.¹⁵⁶

The core of BEAR creation was a desire to ensure the transformation of the Barents region into zone of peace, stability and prosperity, successfully developing the good-neighborly and friendly relations.¹⁵⁷

The Arctic Council

In 1996, the Ottawa Declaration formally established the Arctic Council “as a high level intergovernmental forum to provide a means for promoting cooperation, coordination and interaction among the Arctic States, with the involvement of the Arctic Indigenous communities and other Arctic inhabitants on common Arctic issues: in particular, issues of sustainable development and environmental protection in the Arctic”.¹⁵⁸ The Arctic Council is treating military security issues.

The Arctic Council is the successor of strategy for the Arctic environmental protection (AEPS)¹⁵⁹, where all eight Arctic countries were brought together in 1991, on initiative of Finland. According to E. Bloom: “AEPS has become a political, not a legal obligation to establish a comprehensive framework for cooperation”.¹⁶⁰

This strategy represents the culmination of the cooperative efforts of the eight Arctic countries: Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Sweden, Norway, USSR, and U.S.

There are six Working groups of the Arctic Council:¹⁶¹

- Arctic Contaminants Action Program (ACAP)
- Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Program (AMAP)
- Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF)
- Emergency Prevention, Preparedness and Response (EPPR)
- Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME)
- Sustainable Development Working Group (SDWG)

¹⁵⁶ Makarov, V. (2000) Sistema transgranichnogo regional'nogo sotrudnichestva v barentsevom yevro-arkticheskom regione [the system of cross-border regional cooperation in the Barents Euro-Arctic region]. Moscow: Diplomatic Academy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Department of Foreign Policy and International relations. Dissertation. p. 79

¹⁵⁷ Ibid. p. 80

¹⁵⁸ Arctic Council, available <http://www.arctic-council.org/index.php/en/about-us/history>, (accessed 19 February 2013)

¹⁵⁹ Tsentr voyenno-politicheskikh issledovaniy [Center for military-political studies], available <http://www.eurasian-defence.ru/content/%D0%B0%D0%B5%D0%BF%D1%81>, (accessed 19 February 2013)

¹⁶⁰ Bloom E. (1999) Establishment of the Arctic Council. - *The American Journal of International Law*, Vol. 93, №3, p.713

¹⁶¹ Arctic Council, available <http://www.arctic-council.org/index.php/en/about-us/working-groups>, (accessed 19 February 2013)

Two of the most important issues that the Arctic Council has contributed: the understanding of the global growth of environmental pollution and climate change and its effects on the Arctic. It has also established a political and diplomatic debate over the use and preservation of the natural and cultural resources of the Arctic.¹⁶²

Also, Arctic countries, using the new possibilities of cooperation from the end of the Cold War, were particularly interested in the making efforts to eliminate toxic waste in the Russian Arctic.¹⁶³

It would seem that the Arctic Council does not improve situation in the Arctic region as a large organization like the World Bank or the European Union, but it has in fact played an important role. Council cannot bring huge projects to life, it uses the system, where a lot of small projects, often cover only 50-60 people, are joined into a big system that serves one big purpose: to preserve the Arctic and its unique environment.¹⁶⁴ International cooperation in the circumpolar north is vital, because only through joint efforts, we can solve the most complex problems of sustainable development and environmental protection.¹⁶⁵

To sum up this chapter, regionalization is linked with globalization. If the concept of regionalization for decades was used mainly in the field of geography, so after the Cold War the concept went beyond that. The term was picked up by political scientists, experts on international relations and others, who seek to understand the trends of world development after the Cold War. Regionalism closely linked with political objectives, environmental safety, historical aspects. The Barents region was called a regionalization project in the wake of the Cold War.¹⁶⁶

The result of the transboundary regional integration in the Arctic region can be illustrated with the such organizations as BEAR and Arctic Council. The features of this integration process are the fact that the countries included in this alliance have different political composition, the level of economic and social life, but all of them have the same goals. It is primarily deepening mutually beneficial cooperation. Especially on environmental matters in the Arctic region. For Russia, this integration with Northern Europe has a great

¹⁶² Miller, M. (2008) Arctic Council, available

<http://marilijamihkel.weebly.com/uploads/2/2/1/5/2215937/uurimus.pdf>, (accessed 19 February 2013)

¹⁶³ Aleshkina, A.S. (2009) Vneshnyaya politika Kanady v otnoshenii Rossii v kontse 20 – nachale 21 veka: problemy Arktiki [Canada's foreign policy in relation to Russia in the late 20th – early 21st century: problems of the Arctic], Petrozavodsk State University, Dissertation, p.105

¹⁶⁴ Miller, M. (2008) Arctic Council, available

<http://marilijamihkel.weebly.com/uploads/2/2/1/5/2215937/uurimus.pdf>, (accessed 19 February 2013)

¹⁶⁵ Aleshkina, A.S. (2009) Vneshnyaya politika Kanady v otnoshenii Rossii v kontse 20 – nachale 21 veka: problemy Arktiki [Canada's foreign policy in relation to Russia in the late 20th – early 21st century: problems of the Arctic], Petrozavodsk State University, Dissertation, p.106

¹⁶⁶ See: Stokke, O. (1994) *The Barents Region: Cooperation in the Arctic Europe*. London: Sage.

importance. The cross-border regional cooperation is significantly increases the importance of North-West of Russia for North Europe.

Chapter 4. The main sources of the Arctic pollution

4.1 *The Arctic environmental stung*

The environmental importance of the Arctic imperative is recognized by the international community and an increasing number of states takes interest in this, like China and India.¹⁶⁷

In 1989, by Finland's initiative, eight Arctic countries – the Soviet Union (later transferred to the place of Russia), the United States, Canada, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland and Iceland began to work together to protect the unique nature of the Arctic.¹⁶⁸

In June 1991 the ministers of Canada, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Iceland, Finland, U.S. and USSR meet in the Finish town of Rovaniemi and adopted the Declaration on the Protection of Arctic environment.¹⁶⁹ This declaration laid the basis for cooperation in the field of scientific research to identify the sources, destinations and the effects of pollution, particularly oil, acid, organic pollutants, radioactivity, heavy metals and to exchange of this information. Also the assessment of environmental impact of Northern development and full implementation of measures to control and reduce of pollution and it is impact on the environment to the Arctic.¹⁷⁰

The Declaration of the establishment of the Arctic Council was signed on September 19, 1996 in Ottawa (Canada) by the representatives of the eight Arctic countries: Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Russia, the U.S., Finland and Sweden. The Arctic Council works on the basis of the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy (AEPS).¹⁷¹

But, as Lukin Y. mentioned, the real situation in the Arctic is not simple as it is stated in the major international acts. The efforts to protect Arctic environment are clearly useful and vital to the future. In this respect, it is possible to establish a positive change, but still it is many unresolved environmental problems.¹⁷²

¹⁶⁷ Lukin, Y. (2010) *Velikiy peredel Arktiki* [A great division of the Arctic]. Arkhangelsk: Northern Arctic Federal University, Pravda Severa, p. 363

¹⁶⁸ Arctic Council, available at http://bellona.ru/filearchive/fil_Arctic_council_RUS.pdf, (accessed 4 March 2013)

¹⁶⁹ Arctic Universe. Analytical resource. available at <http://www.arcticuniverse.com/ru/finland.html>, (accessed 4 March 2013).

¹⁷⁰ Lukin, Y. (2010) *Velikiy peredel Arktiki* [A great division of the Arctic]. Arkhangelsk: Northern Arctic Federal University, Pravda Severa, p. 363

¹⁷¹ Arctic Council, available at http://bellona.ru/filearchive/fil_Arctic_council_RUS.pdf, (accessed 4 March 2013)

¹⁷² Lukin, Y. (2010) *Velikiy peredel Arktiki* [A great division of the Arctic]. Arkhangelsk: Northern Arctic Federal University, Pravda Severa, p. 364

They are in part caused by intense development of its mineral and energy resources, as well as the creation of large-scale mining, oil and energy complexes over the past 40-60 years.¹⁷³

The main sources of pollution in the Arctic were in its western sector of Russia and near mineral deposits, such as oil, gas, gold and tin. Among the well-known environmental pollutants especially note oxides of sulfur and nitrogen compounds, petroleum hydrocarbons, radionuclides, solid waste and heavy metals. The highest concentration of contaminants observed in the companies included in the *JSC Norilsk Nickel*. Here were affected areas in 5000 square km. The soil contains a high level of heavy metals and there is total degradation of plant and forest. Emissions from the company Norilsk Nickel contain a huge amount of dangerous substances.¹⁷⁴

Many enterprises that pollute the atmosphere in the Arctic, are in the Murmansk region. The main emissions come from the enterprises of nonferrous metallurgy – “*Pechenganickel*” in Monchegorsk and enterprises “*Severonickel*” in Zapolyarnyy and Nickel city. They account for 86 % of the total regional emissions of sulfur dioxide.¹⁷⁵

In recent years environmentalists have warned about the chemical pollution of the atmosphere in the Murmansk region. It is primarily due to the transfer of large amounts of dust from the quarries, processing plants. Especially a lot of dust emissions are accounted for enterprise “*Apatit*”.¹⁷⁶ So, only in the central Arctic Norilsk combine emitted a million tons of sulfur dioxide and thousands of tons of harmful dust.

37 % of lead deposition originates mainly from Leningrad, Arkhangelsk, Murmansk region and Karelia. The pollutants from the land transfer by air and rivers and reach the Northern seas. Moreover pollutants from some companies caused transboundary problems due to pollution by sulfur compounds neighboring Finland and Norway.¹⁷⁷

But as Greshnevikov A. noted: “But it would be rashly and unobjectively assume that only the Russian industrial emissions attack the Arctic. Ecologists are well aware that foreign industrial countries are more active and more powerful polluting the Arctic, and this not only

¹⁷³ Gramberg, I., Laverov, N., Dodin, D. (2000) *Arktika na poroge tret'yego tysyacheletiya (resursnyy potentsial i problemy ekologii)* [Arctic on the threshold of the third millennium (resource potential and environmental issues)]. Saint-Petersburg: Nauka, p. 145

¹⁷⁴ Greshnevikov, A. (2002) *Zov Arktiki* [Call of Arctic]. Moscow: Zhizn' I mysl'. p. 14

¹⁷⁵ Ibid. p. 15

¹⁷⁶ Ibid. p. 15

¹⁷⁷ Ibid. p. 16

lead led to deterioration of the environment of the North, but also gave rise to transboundary pollution problems.”¹⁷⁸

All the Nordic countries are worried about the health of the northern and Arctic regions. The Norwegian government allocated to Russia 40 million dollars for the reconstruction factory *Pechenganickel* and rehabilitation the area near it. As already noted Norway has been increasingly concerned about marine environment of the Barents Sea.¹⁷⁹

In the first place of oil and gas development stands the hydrocarbon risk – oil spills, accidents of pipelines and etc. The construction of giant supertankers led to oil spills that occur almost every year.¹⁸⁰ For example, in March 1989, the tanker *Exxon Valdez* ran on the reef in Prince William Sound in Alaska that resulted to the largest oil spill in the sea. It was the biggest disaster in the Arctic.¹⁸¹

Also the gas and oil complex of Yamal and northern Siberia adversely affect to the environment. And special environmental danger is uncontrolled emissions from oil and gas wells in long term.

4.2 Chernobyl accident spread radioactive cesium throughout the European Arctic

On April 26, 1986, two explosions in a row blew up the cover from one of the four reactor units at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant in the Ukraine. Concrete, graphite, and other waste were thrown into the air, and a gaping breach left, which exposed the reactor core. Within 10 days of fire, smoke and gases, which had particles of uranium fuel, rose in the atmosphere by more than a kilometer. Flame throws radioactive iodine, a significant number of metals, radioactive cesium, and smaller amounts of other radionuclides, which are usually located in the reactor.¹⁸²

The radioactive cloud from Chernobyl reached to Arctic. The winds brought the radioactive products first in the Baltic States, then in Sweden, Norway and Finland, and in Russia – in the Arkhangelsk region, the southern part of Kola Peninsula. After the Chernobyl accident, the indigenous inhabitants of the Arctic had a significant increase in radioactivity. It was contaminated foods, which concentrate radiocaesium – reindeer meat, freshwater fish,

¹⁷⁸ Ibid. p. 16

¹⁷⁹ Ibid. p. 16

¹⁸⁰ Gramberg, I., Laverov, N., Dodin, D. (2000) *Arktika na poroge tret'yego tysyacheletiya (resursnyy potentsial i problemy ekologii)* [Arctic on the threshold of the third millennium (resource potential and environmental issues)]. Saint-Petersburg: Nauka, p. 146

¹⁸¹ Proshlo 17 let so dnya avarii tankera “Exxon Valdez” na Alyaske (It has been 17 years since the tanker accident “Exxon Valdez” in Alaska), available at <http://www.pravda.ru/science/planet/environment/24-03-2006/79810-tanker-0/>, (accessed 6 March 2013)

¹⁸² Arctic monitoring and evaluation (1998) *Zagryazneniye Arktiki: doklad o sostoyanii okruzhayushchey sredy Arktiki* [Arctic pollution report on the state of the Arctic environment]. Saint-Petersburg: AMAP, p. 114

mushrooms and berries. The phenomenon was observed in 1986-1989, to the Saami of Norway and Sweden, and up to 1991 – to the indigenous inhabitants of the Kola Peninsula (Russia).¹⁸³

4.3 *The truth about Novaya Zemlya: nuclear explosions and their effects*

Novaya Zemlya is a unique Arctic Archipelago, which entered the history of the 20th century as a nuclear test site. More than 90% of all nuclear weapons tests in the Soviet Union were done there. Their history is closely linked to the Cold War 1946-1991.¹⁸⁴

132 nuclear explosions were produced in Novaya Zemlya from 21.05.56 to 24.10.90. A ground tests of 1961-1962 led to the destruction of many bird colonies in the Novaya Zemlya.¹⁸⁵

Novaya Zemlya has a profound effect on the climate, water, biotope, and biogeochemical processes in a whole Russian Arctic. A unique biotope of the Novaya Zemlya is closely connected with the adjacent areas, as nowhere else in the Arctic, there are no specific conditions. Bird rookeries of Novaya Zemlya are one of the most important natural ingredients of Barents Sea ecosystem, which is the basic condition for its normal state and the biological productivity.¹⁸⁶

Nuclear weapons have primarily been used to maintain the global political and military stability. But its trials caused the contamination of the environment and global negative environmental consequences in peacetime. But not only Russia has contributed to global pollution in the 20th century, also United States, Japan, Australia, Great Britain, France, China, India participated in it.¹⁸⁷

The world has accumulated so many warheads, which are enough to destroy our Earth for several times. The production of nuclear weapons started in 1945. Since there were more than 128 thousand of charges: 55% - U.S. and 43% - Russia. The peak of nuclear race was reached in 1986, when the world's nuclear arsenal was 70 481 charge. The end of the Cold War marked the beginning of the nuclear arms reduction.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸³ See: United Nations Environment Programme, GEO: Global Environment Outlook, available at <http://www.unep.org/geo/geo3/russian/397.htm>, (accessed on 6 March 2013)

¹⁸⁴ Lukin, Y. (2010) *Velikiy peredel Arktiki* [A great division of the Arctic]. Arkhangelsk: Northern Arctic Federal University, Pravda Severa, p. 366

¹⁸⁵ Gramberg, I., Laverov, N., Dodin, D. (2000) *Arktika na poroge tret'yego tysyacheletiya (resursnyy potentsial i problemy ekologii)* [Arctic on the threshold of the third millennium (resource potential and environmental issues)]. Saint-Petersburg: Nauka, p. 149

¹⁸⁶ Ibid. p. 150

¹⁸⁷ Lukin, Y. (2010) *Velikiy peredel Arktiki* [A great division of the Arctic]. Arkhangelsk: Northern Arctic Federal University, Pravda Severa, p. 367

¹⁸⁸ Ibid. p. 371

4.4 The problems of nuclear and radiation safety

The problem of radioactive contamination of the Arctic area has attracted attention not only the Russian media, but a foreign environmental organizations like Greenpeace, “Bellona”, as well as foreign intelligence agencies and states.¹⁸⁹

In the Soviet Union nuclear explosions were used in mining and construction. From 1967-1988 several underground nuclear explosions were carried out in Arctic. This led to significant pollution. In the Arctic there are two nuclear stations: *Kol'skaya*, near the city of Polyarnyye Zori on the Kola Peninsula, and *Bilibinskaya* in the Chukotka in the east of Russia. In addition, some NPP is located within 1000 km near Arctic in Sweden, Finland and Russia. The emissions from Russian stations are higher than from the Swedish and Finnish, but they are within the standards, which set by international safety regulations.¹⁹⁰

To analyze the economic and military-strategic development of the Arctic region (Murmansk and Arkhangelsk regions) in the second half 20th century, it should be clear that it is accompanied by a rapid growth of various objects with nuclear reactors, nuclear powered icebreakers in Murmansk Shipping Company, underwater and surface Russian northern Fleet ships. Nuclear power, with its advantages and disadvantages, came to the north with the military power.¹⁹¹

During the Cold War, in the pursuit of amount, in the bustle of the arms race, the submarine developing was with poor quality. Human errors, infringements of technology led to accidents on submarines in the open sea and at berth.

On April 7, 1989 the nuclear submarine K-278 “*Komsomolets*” returned with a third of military service in the Norwegian Sea. The submarine was at a depth of 380 meters. Because of fire, the submarine sank in international waters in Norwegian Sea, 180km southwest of Medvezhiy island and 490 km off the coast of Norway. From 69 members of crew, four were killed in a fire, 38 drowned or died of hypothermia.¹⁹²

Today, six submarines lie on the bottom of the oceans: two American “Thresher” and “Scorpion” and four Soviet (K-8, K-219, K-278 “*Komsomolets*”, K-27). Three Soviet nuclear submarines were disabled and sank in a state of emergency, and one was sunken in the Kara

¹⁸⁹ Ibid. p. 371

¹⁹⁰ Arctic monitoring and evaluation (1998) *Zagryazneniye Arktiki: doklad o sostoyanii okruzhayushchey sredy Arktiki* [Arctic pollution report on the state of the Arctic environment]. Saint-Petersburg: AMAP, p. 117

¹⁹¹ Lukin, Y. (2010) *Velikiy peredel Arktiki [A great division of the Arctic]*. Arkhangelsk: Northern Arctic Federal University, Pravda Severa, p. 373

¹⁹² Gubel' atomnoy podvodnoy lodki “*Komsomolets*” [The death of a nuclear submarine “*Komsomolets*”]. available at <http://ria.ru/infografika/20090407/167344596-ig.html>, (accessed on 9 March 2013)

Sea by decision of state agencies because of the impossibility of recovery and the high cost of disposal. All submarines belonged to the Northern Fleet.¹⁹³

In this connection it should be emphasized:

1) The exploitation of nuclear submarines with nuclear reactors and their recycling is not only the national, but also the global problem. In the Soviet Union two-thirds of all submarines has been attributed to the northern fleet and one third was in the Pacific Fleet. By the end of 80 years the Soviet Union surpassed of submarine fleets of all countries in the world. Of course having the world's largest fleet of nuclear-powered submarines, Russia had more accidents with them. A planned economy destroyed the Soviet Fleet, the ships produced with imperfections and designed flaws, and because of that drowned 507 sailors. The accidents with nuclear ships can turn into ecological disasters. Therefore, it is important to increase the reliability of power plants, the quality of work and safety of nuclear submarines.¹⁹⁴

2) The management of risks requires an appropriate level of investment, quality of training and developed infrastructure of fleet service. Because of rapid increase in nuclear submarines, the Navy was not ready for the challenges of utilization of reactors and disposal of radioactive waste.¹⁹⁵

3) In 1990 Arkhangelsk and Murmansk regions had 270 nuclear power plants. In the late 20th century, it was difficult situation with the organization and implementation work on the charge of nuclear reactors. The shore technical bases were outdated; most of their buildings are in disrepair. A submarine dismantlement has become a serious problem for Russia.¹⁹⁶

4.5 The problem of radioactive waste disposal

From 1959-1991 the Soviet Union produced reset and disposal of high, medium and low-level waste in the Arctic seas, including the six reactors from submarines together with a large amount of nuclear fuel. Nuclear waste was dumped in the Kara Sea and the fjords of the Novaya Zemlya to a depth of 12 to 135 m.¹⁹⁷

In 1992-1994 the Norwegian-Russian Expert Group used sonar to explore the waste. Test of water of this area was also conducted during the expedition. The results showed no

¹⁹³ Katastrofy na atomnykh podvodnykh lodkakh [the disaster of nuclear submarines], available at <http://mypage.sbor.net/psv/SeaWolf/subcrash.htm> (accessed on 9 March 2013)

¹⁹⁴ Lukin, Y. (2010) *Velikiy peredel Arktiki [A great division of the Arctic]*. Arkhangelsk: Northern Arctic Federal University, Pravda Severa, p. 377

¹⁹⁵ Ibid. p. 377

¹⁹⁶ Ibid. p. 377

¹⁹⁷ Arctic monitoring and evaluation (1998) *Zagryazneniye Arktiki: doklad o sostoyanii okruzhayushchey sredy Arktiki [Arctic pollution report on the state of the Arctic environment]*. Saint-Petersburg: AMAP, p. 126

contamination of the Kara Sea. However, the high levels of radioactivity in the immediate vicinity of the landfill indicate the presence of local pollution. The main risk is postponed for a long time, the destruction of protective shells occurs from a result of corrosion.¹⁹⁸

Radioactive waste storage facilities are also kept on shore: in the Kola Peninsula, near Arkhangelsk and Norilsk. First discharges of liquid radioactive waste into the seas have been associated with the sea tests of nuclear submarines and nuclear-powered icebreaker *Lenin* in 1959-1960. Also the nuclear torpedoes of the submarine *Komsomolets* has begun to break down that in the coming years could lead to contamination.¹⁹⁹ There is a danger that fish, mollusks, crustaceans and other objects of fishing might become polluted, and the subsequent transition to the food chains of radionuclides in the human body.²⁰⁰

The radioactive waste disposal in open seas is a subject of international conventions. Since 1972, the London Convention banned the flooding of spent nuclear fuel and restrict discharge of low and intermediate level waste from ships. The Soviet Union joined the Convention in 1975. In 1983, seven representatives of the Consultative Meeting adopted the resolution calling temporarily refrain from dumping at sea of all types of radioactive waste, and in 1993 a temporary moratorium became a permanent ban. The last resolution has not been ratified by Russia.²⁰¹

A British enterprise for processing and storage of nuclear waste in Sellafield is one of the main sources of pollution of the Northern and Norwegian Seas. The level of radioactivity of Norwegian waters increased by 6 times from 1996. The effect of discharge of liquid radioactive waste "Sellafield" was found in the waters of the White Sea and the Arctic Ocean.²⁰²

Radioactive wastes are currently one of the major problems of nuclear energy, and the problem is international. There is a continuous discussion on how to respond to radioactive waste.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid. p. 126

¹⁹⁹ Gramberg, I., Laverov, N., Dodin, D. (2000) *Arktika na poroge tret'yego tysyacheletiya (resursnyy potentsial i problemy ekologii)* [Arctic on the threshold of the third millennium (resource potential and environmental issues)]. Saint-Petersburg: Nauka, p. 153

²⁰⁰ Ibid. p.153

²⁰¹ Belyaev, A. Problemy zakhroneniya radioaktivnykh otkhodov [the problem of radioactive waste disposal], available at http://abel-2.ru/downloads/2006_RAO.pdf, (accessed 10 March 2013).

²⁰² Problemy radiatsionnoy reabilitatsii arkticheskikh morey, sposoby i piti ikh resheniya [the problems of rehabilitation of the Arctic seas, methods and solutions], available at <http://www.rosnord.ru/resources/ecology/70-problemy-radiatsionnoj-reabilitatsii-arkticheskikh-morej-sposoby-i-puti-ikh-resheniya>, (accessed 11 March 2013)

4.6 The petroleum hydrocarbons

A major environmental problems associated with hydrocarbon pollution is production and transportation of oil and gas. The Arctic has one of the world's largest oil reserves, both onshore and offshore. Exploration and exploitation of deposits can become significant sources of oil pollution of the environment in the Arctic.²⁰³

The biggest threat to oil pollution comes from unregulated emissions, spills and leaks in the production and transportation of oil. Besides fishing vessels can cause numerous small spills. The examples of the massive oil spill in vast spaces: pipeline breaks in Usinsk (Russia) in 1994 and accident of Exxon Valdez tanker in 1989. The most of the oil spill is small or even insignificant. For example, as a result of 365 accidents in 1994 in the Norwegian offshore oil fields, the total volume of the oil spill was 55 tons. But it is rare and difficult to predict of major oil spill which cause the environmental disasters.²⁰⁴

Big rivers flow into the sea from the Russian Arctic, and pollution from river transportation can be considered as a major problem. The petroleum hydrocarbons enter the Barents Sea with effluents, wastewater, from the atmosphere, from the mouth of the White Sea, through the Kara Gate. The existing agreements fails to deal with the waste problem; however, the main problem now is the transfer petroleum hydrocarbons by Atlantic waters through the western border of the sea from the industrialized regions of Europe, the U.S. and oil-producing areas of active navigation.²⁰⁵

Arctic environmental risks associated with a field development, production and transportation of oil and gas has local and regional nature. The natural environment in the Arctic is more vulnerable to spills in warm climates, because oil in the cold and darkness falls slowly, and plant and animals need more time to recover.²⁰⁶

²⁰³ Arctic monitoring and evaluation (1998) *Zagryazneniye Arktiki: doklad o sostoyanii okruzhayushchey sredy Arktiki [Arctic pollution report on the state of the Arctic environment]*. Saint-Petersburg: AMAP, p. 146

²⁰⁴ Ibid. p. 149

²⁰⁵ Zagryazneniye neftyanymi uglevodorodami i pestitsidami [the contamination by petroleum hydrocarbons and pesticides], available at <http://www.arctic-online.ru/region/ecology/757.html>, (accessed 11 March 2013)

²⁰⁶ Arctic monitoring and evaluation (1998) *Zagryazneniye Arktiki: doklad o sostoyanii okruzhayushchey sredy Arktiki [Arctic pollution report on the state of the Arctic environment]*. Saint-Petersburg: AMAP, p. 157

Chapter 5. The international environmental cooperation in the Arctic

5.1 Environmental policy in the Russian Arctic

The intensive economic activity has caused the environmental problems in the Arctic. This calls for urgent and adequate strategic decisions.²⁰⁷

The environmental situation in many parts of Russian Arctic remained unfavorable in 90 years, and it is critical in some of them. Huge scale pollution has very negative consequences for environmental security in the Arctic, as well jeopardized the human health. The scenarios of many environmental scientists for the improvement of the environmental situation in the Arctic is extremely pessimistic, some of them believe that in 30-50 years, the country could lose all the natural resources and will not able to save at least part of the Arctic environment.²⁰⁸

For 90-years, the environmental issues have been very closed linked with security issues in general and the activities of the Federal Security Service in particular.²⁰⁹ In 1993 a team led by the famous scientists Alexei Yablokov provided a report to Russian government – “Facts and problems associated with the disposal radioactive waste in the seas in the Russian Federation”.²¹⁰

Because the problems associated with disposal in the various seas of radioactive waste, was largely closed off to the public, the appearance of the report caused a mixed reaction from politicians. But it alarmed environmentalists, who stated that nothing in the world can be more vicious than the current practice of disposal of radioactive waste in the seas and oceans of the countries using energy technologies.²¹¹

Why there was such a mixed reaction?

First, some have argued that a number of environmental studies are set up just to receive foreign grants, and that scientists consequently are biased;²¹²

Second the active developing of the environmental problems caused by the Russian armed forces, created the problems for the prestige of the country and difficulties to maintain

²⁰⁷ Morgunov, B. (2005) *Metodologiyab ucheta ekologicheskogo faktora v protsesse vyrabotki strategii ustoychivogo razvitiya zony Rossii* [Methodology of integrating environmental considerations into the process of developing a strategy for sustainable development of the Arctic zone of Russia]. Moskva: Synopsis. p. 4

²⁰⁸ Barsegov, Y. (2002) *Arktika – interesy Rossi i mezhdunarodnyye usloviya ikh realizatsii [the Arctic- Russia's interests and international conditions of their implementation]*. Moskva: Nauka, p. 224

²⁰⁹ Federal Security Service against the environmental spying, available at <http://rudocs.exdat.com/docs/index-15048.html?page=9>, (accessed 12 March 2013)

²¹⁰ Greshnevikov, A. (2002) *Zov Arktiki [Call of Arctic]*. Moskva: Zhizn' i mysl'. p. 18

²¹¹ Ibid. p. 18

²¹² Federal Security Service against the environmental spying, available at <http://rudocs.exdat.com/docs/index-15048.html?page=9>, (accessed 12 March 2013)

the military readiness. Grantors use the researches of Russian environmentalists to accuse Russia in environmental pollution.²¹³

It is difficult to say what is the truth and what is not. Whether, there may be selfish interests of grant makers (damage to Russia); whether there are selfish interests of local environmentalists (ready to do everything for money); whether there are selfish interests of Russian military (pollution), or whether the Russian government does not want to engage in nature protection.²¹⁴

But nevertheless, what was the ecological policy of Russia in the Arctic in 90-years?

The main objectives and approaches to the development of Arctic environmental policies have been developed by Goskomsever of the Russian Federation. Included was the management of renewable and non-renewable natural resources; the development and implementation of environmental standards in the North of Russia; the environmental impact assessment of all programs and projects of the Arctic; and the development of measures to improve the environment in areas with unfavorable ecological situation.²¹⁵ The main federal law under which the nature protection of the Arctic regulated is a law on “Environmental Protection of the Russian Federation”²¹⁶ in 1991.

5.2 Factors that hinder to environmental cooperation in the Arctic

According to Olav Stokke, the employee of Fridtjof Nansen Institute in Oslo, several factors restrain environmental cooperation in the Arctic:²¹⁷

The first group of factors relates to the problem of “joint action”, which has special significance for the Arctic, because of the presence in the region a number of unresolved border contentious issues. Any measures of environmental regulation requires certain costs from the industry, this creates the interests of enterprises to circumvent such measures. At the national level, the problem of providing for their implementation can be resolved to strengthen monitoring of the state. At the international level the implementation is usually faced with the desire of states to monitor and control exclusively their own means. States are reluctant to concede of part their sovereignty to international bodies, especially in a region such as Arctic.

²¹³ Ibid.

²¹⁴ Ibid.

²¹⁵ Barsegov, Y. (2002) *Arktika – interesy Rossi i mezhdunarodnyye usloviya ikh realizatsii [the Arctic- Russia's interests and international conditions of their implementation]*. Moskva: Nauka, p. 229

²¹⁶ *Ekologicheskoye pravo* (environmental law), available at <http://www.bibliotekar.ru/ecologicheskoye-pravo-3/25.htm>, (accessed 13 March 2013)

²¹⁷ See: (1990) *Mezhdunarodnoye ekologicheskoye sotrudnichestvo v Arktike* (svodnyy referat) [International environmental cooperation in the Arctic (combined abstract)]. Moscow: The Institute of Scientific Information On Social Science. p. 29

The second group of obstacles with regards to international cooperation is associated with a number of the unresolved jurisdictional borders in Arctic waters. As in international law, there is a link between the implementation of real rights and claims to sovereignty, states generally tend to avoid to enter into agreements for the joint management of resources in disputed areas.

Finally, environmental cooperation is also restrained by security factors. They are hindering factors because of the link between research and the development of environmental management. The scientific research in the Arctic to some extent been kept secret because of the value of the data for oceanography military navigation and communications in northern waters.

E. Nikitina, an employee of Scientific Institute in USSR, said that “unlike other regions in the world, there were no special arrangements for the regulation and coordination of environmental research. In the 1970s-1980s scientific cooperation in the region develop mainly on bilateral basis, but multilateral action taken only in the framework of universal international scientific organizations.”²¹⁸

Among the factors limiting the development of technical and scientific cooperation in the Arctic, E. Nikitina did point out the differences in the national political interests of the states involved, and particularly their military-political considerations.²¹⁹

The development of international cooperation in the Arctic and the formation of the regime of environmental protection in the region should be based on the concept of environmental protection security. This will require the development of common strategy for international environmental cooperation, acceptance of basic norms and principles of ecological behavior, the introduction of international monitoring of compliance, and establish responsibility in the case of breach. The formation of an international regime for the protection of the environment and scientific research in the Arctic depend on the activities of international non-regional mechanisms such as intergovernmental scientific organizations, which successfully combines national and universal interests.²²⁰

5.3 The international environmental agreements and researches in the Arctic

An important step of the environmental cooperation between the USSR and Norway was the governmental statement on 5 June, 1991.²²¹ The statement said: “*The parties*

²¹⁸ Ibid. p. 11

²¹⁹ Ibid. p. 12

²²⁰ Ibid. p. 15

²²¹ Sukharev, M. (2003) “*Rossia i Norvegija: istoriya dobrososedctva*” [Russia and Norway: the history of neighbourhood]. Murmansk: Pazori. p. 312

*underline the importance of bilateral cooperation in the field of environmental protection and will strengthen and enhance its contribution to the implementation of the specific measures that will reduce pollution and improve environment on both sides of the common border”.*²²²

A bilateral agreement on cooperation in the field of environmental protection was then signed by Norway and Russia in Kirkenes on 3 September, 1992. It was a continuation of pre-existing agreement between the Soviet Union and Norway in 1988.²²³

According to this agreement, Norway was very much concerned with solving environmental pollution that threatened the interests of nature and in the northern parts of Norway. Therefore the questions about reconstruction the combine “Pechenganickel” and about nuclear waste did receive close attention.²²⁴

On 23-27 August 1993, the scientific elite had a conference about protection of the polar regions from radioactivity. The conference welcomed the agreement on the organization of second Russian-Norwegian expedition to the Novaya Zemlya (it was conducted on 12-25 September, 1993); called for accelerated examination of the situation around the submarine “Komsomolets”; for improving the safety of Kola nuclear power plant, as well as the creation of environmentally friendly Russian-Norwegian-Finnish reserve.²²⁵

A meeting of the ministers of the environment from Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Finland, Sweden and IES were assembled in Bodø on 15 June, 1994. Representatives from the Netherlands, United States, AMAP Secretariat, CAFF (Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna), NEFCO (The Nordic Environment Financing Corporation) attended as observes. Russia was represented by the Minister of the Environment V. Danilov-Danilyan.²²⁶

The talks were based on the Declaration on the Environment Strategy (AEPS), adopted by the Ministers of Environment of the eight Arctic countries in Rovaniemi on 14 June, 1991; the joint statement of the Ministers of Environment in the Nordic countries and Russia on 3 September, 1992; at the Kirkenes Declaration, as well as the Declaration on Environment and Development in the Arctic, adopted in Nuuk (Greenland) on September 16, 1993²²⁷. The participants stressed the particular importance of Arctic ecosystem.²²⁸

²²² Ibid. p. 312

²²³ Sukharev, M. (1988) *”Rossiysko-norvezhskkiye otnosheniya v 20 veke”* [the Russian-Norwegian relations in the 20th century]. Murmansk. p. 280

²²⁴ Ibid. p. 280

²²⁵ Smirnov, A. (2003) *“Rossiysko-norvezhskkiye otnosheniya v Barentsevom-YevroArkticheskoy regione 90-gody XX veka”* [Russian-Norwegian relations in the Barents Euro-Arctic region 90 years of the XX century]. Moscow: Diplomatic Academy of the Russian Foreign Ministry. Dissertation. p. 120

²²⁶ Smirnov, A. (1998) *Murmanskiy koridor* (Murmansk corridor). Murmansk: Sever. p. 50

²²⁷ See: The Ministers of Denmark, Iceland, Sweden, Russia, Norway, Finland, Canada and the U.S. met in Nuuk (Greenland) about Arctic pollution on September 16, 1994. This is the second meeting organized by eight countries on this issue. The first was held in Rovaniemi in 1991. The result was a long-term strategy for

The analysis of numerous scientific papers and researches did suggest that the human impact on the nature of the north had reached a critical level. The basic sources of contamination were in western part of the Russian Arctic, in the area of mining works and near mineral deposits – nickel, oil, gas, tin.²²⁹

The researchers did show that the Barents Sea was the most polluted of the Arctic seas. A special agreement on cooperation in combating oil pollution in the Barents Sea was signed by the Norwegian Minister of the Environment T. Berntsen on May 1994.²³⁰

Also many experts thought that a serious problem is the problem of waste water. More than 40 percent of water is discharged untreated; the content of nickel exceeds the allowable level of 450 times, and copper up to 2000 times. The risk of radionuclide pollution, which generated by atomic fleet, a decommissioned nuclear submarines and Kola NPP are also a serious environmental problem.²³¹

According these issues it was established a special group of experts from the representatives of international environmental and financial institutions and it was adopted a special program for environmental protection of Barents region. The program consists of 7 areas: the marine environment, radioactivity, acidification and heavy metals, the biological diversity of species, the development of responsible of companies, health, environmental awareness and influence.²³²

The most important projects were to improve the quality of drinking water in the north-west of Russia and the conference on the environment in the Barents Region (was held on 7-8 June, 1994 in Apatity on the basis of the Kola Scientific Center, Russian Academy of Sciences.²³³

The main attention was paid to radioactivity. The issue of the safety of radioactive waste storage was discussed too. This question was initiated by the Norwegian environmental organization “Bellona” and the Murmansk Shipping Company. Norway became chairman of the project, and later the United States, France and the European Commission jointed too. On

monitoring and protection of the Arctic environment. In Nuuk Ministers reached the agreement on strengthening the monitoring of certain areas in the Arctic with a high concentration of heavy metals associated with industrial activities in Europe, Russia, Asia and North America. (1994) “*Arctic region: agreement on monitoring*” Environment Policy and Law, 24 № 1, p. 27

²²⁸ Ibid. p. 50

²²⁹ Ibid. p. 50

²³⁰ Ibid. p. 50

²³¹ Smirnov, A. (2003) “*Rossiysko-norvezhskiy otnocheniya v Barentsevom-YevroArkticheskom regione 90-gody XX veka*” [Russian-Norwegian relations in the Barents Euro-Arctic region 90 years of the XX century]. Moscow: Diplomatic Academy of the Russian Foreign Ministry. Dissertation. p. 131

²³² Ibid. p.132

²³³ Ibid. p.133

26 December, 1996 the Russian Foreign Ministry told the Norwegian Embassy in Moscow that Russia was ready to sign the decision. In addition, the following activities have been prescribed: ecomonitoring of Barents and White Seas and the study of environmentally harmful effects on fish, especially on marine salmon.²³⁴

Also, there were following environmental programs: “Priroda” and “The Interreg”. “Priroda” – the program which implemented under the leadership of the Norwegian Research Council. Until 1995, its activities were aimed at creating green technologies in collaboration between organizations and scientific institutions of Kirkenes and Kola Peninsula. Since 1995, the other parts of Norway, Murmansk and Arkhangelsk participated in the project too.²³⁵

The INTERREG is the largest EU Initiative. It supports the balanced development of the North Calotte, as economically, socially and environmentally. The INTERREG-Barents also covers Murmansk and Archangelsk region, except the North Calotte countries.²³⁶

NEFCO is an international financial institution established by the five Nordic countries. NEFCO finances the projects primarily in Russia, Ukraine, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova and Belarus, in order to generate positive environmental effects of interests to the Nordic region.²³⁷ In 1996 the Norwegian expert council received a list of 22 environmental projects for the Russian part of the Barents Region. This list was commissioned by NEFCO and opened the opportunity to investment of clean technologies.²³⁸

It should be also noted the programs “Cooperative Threat Reduction” and “The Arctic environmental cooperation in the military field”. The CTR agreement, often called the Nunn-Lugar program, was signed on June 17, 1992 and concerned mainly the financing disposal of strategic submarines. The program “The Arctic environmental cooperation in the military field”, which was attended by the U.S., Norway, Russia and joint them in 2003, the United Kingdom, was launched in 1995 and aimed to establish a dialogue in the field of military defense of the environment in the Arctic. The agreement was signed by the defense ministers of the three countries in Bergen on September 26, 1996.²³⁹

²³⁴ Ibid. p. 133

²³⁵ Sukharev, M. (1988) “*Rossiysko-norvezhskiyе otnosheniya v 20 veke*” [the Russian-Norwegian relations in the 20th century]. Murmansk. p. 281

²³⁶ Your window to the Barents Region, available at <http://www.barentsinfo.org/?DeptID=3570>, (accessed 17 March 2013)

²³⁷ Nordic Environment Finance Corporation, available at <http://www.nefco.org/>, (accessed 17 March 2013)

²³⁸ Sukharev, M. (1988) “*Rossiysko-norvezhskiyе otnosheniya v 20 veke*” [the Russian-Norwegian relations in the 20th century]. Murmansk. p. 281

²³⁹ Sarkisov, Antipov, Kalinin (2011) “Mezhdunarodnoye sotrudnichestvo pri likvidatsii ekologicheskogo naslediya kholodnoy voyny v arkticheskom regione rossii” [the international cooperation for the elimination of the environmental legacy of the Cold war in the Arctic regions of Russia], *Arktika: ekologiya i ekonomika*, № 3, p. 49

According to the agreement of the Government Commission of the United States and Russia, it was held an international symposium on Arctic pollution by various nuclear waste on 1-4 May, 1995. The symposium was organized by the Office of Naval Research of U.S. and conducted under the direction of Professor H. Livingston. The symposium was attended by researches from Russia, Canada, UK, Germany, USA, France, Norway, Japan and etc.²⁴⁰

The introductory presentations were made by R. Edison (Office of Naval Research, USA) – review of research within the general program on nuclear pollution of the Arctic, and by academician N. Laverov – the possible resources of contamination in the Russian Arctic. These reports made it possible to broad discussion of various aspects of the problem, including the effects of pollution in the North Atlantic.²⁴¹

There are also joint the Russian-Norwegian researches about contamination in Western Arctic Seas. The real threat of radiation from the North-West of Russia has caused a lot of public interest in the Northern Europe in 1990s, especially in the Nordic countries. Several international co-operation arrangements were established, the purpose of which was to reduce the threat at both the bilateral and multilateral level.²⁴²

The joint work of experts of Russia and Norway to study radioactive pollution in western Arctic seas begun in 1992. The study was initiated due to concerns about the possible consequences of dumping and disposal of radioactive waste in the Arctic Seas. It was formed the Norwegian-Russian Expert Group to coordinate the work and study of radioactive contamination of the northern territories. In 1992 the joint naval expedition was held to the study of general state of the radioactive contamination of the Kara and Barents seas. In 1993-1994 there were two joint expeditions to areas of radioactive waste disposal in the Kara Sea²⁴³. In September 1993, the members of the Murmansk Marine Biological Institute in cooperation with the Norwegian colleagues was made 14 benthic stations in the south-eastern and central parts of the shallow waters of the Kara Sea.²⁴⁴

A procedure for periodic radioactive survey of the dumped objects was successfully tested in the course of the Russian-Norwegian expeditions to Novaya Zemlya in 1992-1994.

²⁴⁰ Vozzhinskaya, V. (1996) “Radionuklidnoye zagryazneniye arktiki” [Radionuclides Pollution of the Arctic. An International meeting on the problems of nuclear pollution of the Arctic], *Okeanologiya*, 36, № 1, p. 152

²⁴¹ Ibid.

²⁴² Hønneland, G. (2003) *Russia and the West: environmental co-operation and conflict*. p.31

²⁴³ Nikitin, Shershakov, Tsaturov (2011) “The sovместnyye rossiysko-norvezhkiye issledovaniya radioaktivnogo zagryazneniya zapadnykh arkticheskikh morey” [the Joint Russian-Norwegian research about contamination of western arctic seas], *Arktika: ekologiya i ekonomika*, №2, p. 27

²⁴⁴ See: (1996) *Metodologiya i protsedura otsenki vozdeystviya morskoy neftegazovoy industrii na okruzhayaushchuyu sredu Arktiki* [Russian Academy of Sciences. Methodologies and assess the impact of offshore oil and gas industry in the Arctic environment]. Murmansk. p. 29

Russian ships participated in these expeditions too. Almost the same procedures with minor additions was used to evaluate the radiation situation in the region and bodies of three submarines due to accidents: “Komsomolets” in the Norwegian Sea in 1989, “Kursk” in 2000 and K-159 in the Barents Sea in 2003.²⁴⁵

A Norwegian Plan of Action for Nuclear Safety in areas adjacent to the borders of Norway came into force in 1995. Its objectives are to protect human health and environment from radioactive contamination and pollution from chemical weapons. The Plan of Action identifies four prioritised areas:²⁴⁶

- safety measures at nuclear facilities
- management, storage and disposal of radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel
- radioactive pollution in northern areas
- arms-related environmental hazards.

In the period 1995-1999, 343 million NOK was spent on the Plan, but many projects have not started or have been postponed. The priority was given to cooperation on security issues with the Kola nuclear power, research and assessment of pollution in the northern areas.²⁴⁷

Also the bilateral co-operation between Norway and Russia in the areas covered by the Plan of Action is mainly found in the following three levels:²⁴⁸

- at state level between the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Minatom;
- through environmental co-operation, the Norwegian Ministry of the Environment and Goskomekologiya being the main participating bodies;
- in the technical co-operation on nuclear safety between the Norwegian Radiation Protection Agency (NRPA) and Gosatomnadzor.

In 1994 Norway together with the US started discussions with RTP Atomflot and Murmansk Shipping Company about a joint project to enhance and increase the potential of low-level liquid radioactive waste (LLW) treatment plant at the RTP site. According to the data presented at the conference by scientists:

²⁴⁵ Apalin, V., Vasin, S., Grigoriev, A. And Sivintsev, Y. (2011) *Continuous radiation monitoring of the objects with spent nuclear fuel and radioactive waste dumped/sunken in the Arctic Seas*. National Research Center “Kurchatov Institute”. CEG Oslo.

²⁴⁶ Hønneland, G. (2003) *Russia and the West: environmental co-operation and conflict*. p.31

²⁴⁷ Ibid. p. 31

²⁴⁸ Ibid. p. 88

“At that time the plant treated ~1200 m³/ year of liquid waste from the nuclear icebreaker fleet. The project goal was to increase the capacity to 5000 m³/ year and also expand the treatment options to deal with two more types of liquid waste.”²⁴⁹ It includes high quality liquid waste salts coming from the Russian Northern fleet. The construction of this facility and a similar facility in the Far East of Russia will give to Russia the technology and capacity which it needed, so they will not started dumping LLW at sea again.²⁵⁰

The fisheries relations between the Soviet Union and Norway characterized by the fact that they have acquired a solid contractual legal status after the introduction of zones. From 1975 to 1984, it were signed nine agreements between the two countries, including six intergovernmental and three diagonal which created favorable conditions for the activation and development mutual relations. The cooperation was carried out in three directions in this period: fisheries, scientific and technical cooperation, and commercial activities.²⁵¹

The co-operation between Soviet/Russia and Norwegian scientists in the field of fish recourses of the Barents Sea dates back to the 1950s. Now it works within the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES). The Knipovich Scientific Polar Institute for Marine Fisheries and Oceanography (PINRO) in Murmansk, the Norwegian Institute of Marine Research in Bergen and the Norwegian Institute of Fisheries and Aquaculture in Tromsø are the main participants.²⁵²

Since 1983, the important form of co-operation among the scientists was the joint organization of symposia between PINRO and the Institute of Marine Research in Bergen to evaluate the main fish stocks in the Barents and Norwegian seas and explore their habitat.²⁵³

During a visit to Norway, the Soviet Prime Minister Ryzhkov in January 1988 and the Minister of Fisheries Kotlyar in August 1987 discussed about the further development and improvement of business co-operation in the interest of both countries. A mutual interest in deepening and developing contacts were expressed in the course of discussions with the Norwegian companies and enterprises.²⁵⁴

²⁴⁹ Sörlie, A., Wester, D., Czajkowski, C., Kozyreva, O. and Pichugin, S. (2001) *Norway, Russia and the USA in cooperation to improve the situation regarding radioactive waste in the northwest of Russia*. WM³ 01 Conference, Tucson, AZ.

²⁵⁰ Ibid.

²⁵¹ Lukashova, E. (1988) *Voprosy sotrudnichestva SSSR i Norvegii v oblasti rybnogo khozyaystva* [The state and prospects of the USSR-Norway fisheries relationships (1977-1987)] in *USSR – Norway fisheries cooperation. Collected papers*. p. 51

²⁵² Hønneland, G. (2003) *Russia and the West: environmental co-operation and conflict*. p.21

²⁵³ Lukashova, E. (1988) *Voprosy sotrudnichestva SSSR i Norvegii v oblasti rybnogo khozyaystva* [The state and prospects of the USSR-Norway fisheries relationships (1977-1987)] in *USSR – Norway fisheries cooperation. Collected papers*. p. 54

²⁵⁴ Ibid. p. 59

During the 1990s, the Russian-Norwegian co-operation in management of fisheries is accessed as a quite successful. A Permanent Committee under the Joint Fisheries Commission was established in 1993. Various experts from the two countries' fisheries administrations and research institutions have met on the Permanent Committee. Since 1994, the activities of the Permanent Committee can be divided into three main areas:²⁵⁵

- discussions on current issues related to fisheries management and enforcement practices in the two countries;
- the administrations of exchange of personnel and data;
- the execution of more comprehensive tasks assigned to it by the Joint Fisheries Commission.

The most important thing that the meetings of the Permanent Committee which included Norwegian and Russian fishery authorities help to discuss the domestic issues of current interest more deeply than using a simple correspondence. For example, the Russian authorities often ask for clarification of Norwegian rules and enforcement procedures followed by the Norwegian coast guard when dealing with the Russian fishermen. The current information on the national legislation of the parties is always on the agenda at the Committee meetings.²⁵⁶

²⁵⁵ Hønneland, G. (2004) *Russian Fisheries Management. The Precautionary Approach in theory and practice.* p. 145

²⁵⁶ Ibid. p. 148

Chapter VI. Conclusion

To sum up my thesis, it can be noted that within the field of scientific environmental cooperation, the good-neighborly relations between Norway and USSR/Russia have always maintained, despite of political disagreements throughout the history. The intensive political and scientific dialogue was always conducted. An important meeting place in Russian-Norwegian relations has been cooperation in the Arctic, where our countries are in direct contact. Also, the development of scientific relations in the Arctic is a priority for Russia and for Norway.

A significant place in the dialogue between Russia and Norway are the fisheries, the environment and nuclear radiation. Important joint projects are to improve the environment in the Russian regions, for example “in the recycling projects, cleaning of oil-contaminated soil, on the study on the harmonization of Russian and Norwegian rules and standards for the protection of the environment and safety in the production of hydrocarbons in the Barents Sea, to improve safety during loading and transport of oil, and etc.”²⁵⁷ Attention should be paid to the fact that Norway is making a significant contribution to ensure nuclear and radiation safety in the Russian North-West. Norway participates in the disposal of Russian submarines and radioactive components, organizes the storage of radioactive waste and helps to improve the safety of the Kola and Leningrad nuclear power plant.²⁵⁸

The transformation the USSR into Russia did not affect so much to our relations with Norway, because a strong basis was established – political, economic, international legal and cultural. A rich historical heritage takes a significant place in relations between Russia and Norway. This is a good-neighborliness and Pomor trade, which existed before revolution in Russia. The Soviet-Norwegian relations were not entirely smooth, because of the Cold War and Winter War.

Since 1986, in Soviet policy a special attention pays to the issues of international environmental cooperation which binds to the global security. An important breakthrough in politics came from Gorbachev’s Murmansk Initiatives, with special emphasis on environmental issues in October 1987.

G. Osherenko noted: “In the West Murmansk program has received a mixed reviews among both scholars and political leaders. Its position on arms control repeatedly

²⁵⁷ Den Russiske Ambassade i Oslo, available at <http://www.norway.mid.ru/ru/rn-politics.html>, (accessed 24 April 2013)

²⁵⁸ Ibid.

characterized as the old proposals in the new package, and environmental aspects have not attracted the attention.”²⁵⁹ But the Scandinavian countries responded enthusiastically to the proposal of environmental cooperation, and a number of agreements were eventually signed between Russia and Norway.

Gorbachev was the first head of state who put the problems of cooperation in the Arctic on the agenda on international relations. The State Commission for the Arctic, led by Y. Maslyukov, and Goskompriroda, were both created in Gorbachev period. He was well aware of the interdependence of environment, politic and economy, and recognized the need for the comprehensive approach to global environmental issues.

Questions have been raised about the sincerity of the Soviet leaders at this point. As well as G. Osherenko noted that “the representatives of the U.S. State Department and the Canadian Foreign Ministry believed that the Soviet Union raises the environmental issues only to disguise their real interest in arms reduction that favorable to the Soviet side. But at the same time, scientists both in the west and east are increasingly considering global environmental change and other environmental problems as a threat to national and international security, not less serious than nuclear arsenals of the opposing sides”.²⁶⁰

As we can see from the documents and signed agreements, the Soviet Union/Russia attached a great importance to protection of Arctic environment. In this field, the USSR/Russia proceeds from the recognition of the vital importance of this issue for all humanity. Taking effective measures to protect and improve the environment in the Arctic, the Soviet Union/Russia give importance to the expansion of comprehensive international cooperation in this area. The Soviet Union/Russia proceeds from the assumption that the most rational approach to the successful solution of the environmental problems in the Arctic can only be cooperation between the states.

As we can see, both the environmental questions and the security policy are highly political fields. Sometimes this fields go in different directions. In those cases, it must be an important political task to try to merge these interest.

In this paper the theory of securitization and transnationalism play a decisive importance. The securitization theory helped to bring the problem of protecting the Arctic environment to a new international level. With the end of the Cold War, the military

²⁵⁹(1990) Mezhdunarodnoye ekologicheskoye sotrudnichestvo v Arktike (svodnyy referat) [International environmental cooperation in the Arctic] (combined abstract). Moscow: The Institute of Scientific Information On Social Science. p. 24

²⁶⁰ Ibid. p. 29

agenda, which was the nature of the traditional discourse of security, began to lose its essential. It is appeared the other security issues, which cannot be ignored. The securitization process, produced by Gorbachev can be considered as successful; the audience adopted with the success his “Murmansk speech”. Finally, the international community drew the attention to the environmental problems in the Arctic.

Not only states, but also scientists, non-governmental organizations and associations participated in solving the environmental problems. The variety of participants, types of environmental and scientific cooperation, partnership between the scientific academies, talks about transnational cooperation between the states in solving environmental problems in the Arctic.

A significant cause for environmental worry is a nuclear activity of the Russian Northern Fleet in the Barents Region. A major air pollutants come from enterprises engaged in non-ferrous metallurgy and energy. The main sources of pollution of the marine environment are marine enterprises and organizations of the defense industry. The radioactive waste is unresolved question too. However, it should be noted that due to financial support from Norway, it is decreased emissions of heavy metals from “Severonickel Combine” and “Kovdor Combine”. Norway and Russia are engaged in offshore drilling oil in the Barents Sea. In the fishing industry, there are some concerns about the impact of seismic explosions on fish. The rivers, such as Yenisey and Ob are the main channels for river borne pollution into the Barents and Kara Seas.²⁶¹ The sunken Russian submarines are also pose a threat to the environment in the Barents Sea.

The BEAR and Arctic Council have been especially important in efforts to address protection of the Arctic environment. The cooperative processes, which carry out by these organizations can be divided into international and transnational levels. According to O. Stokke: “At the international level, regional initiatives seek to involve clusters of states in closer interaction and joint framing of problems and opportunities.<...> At the transnational level, sub-state region-builders strive to coordinate behavior and establish common terms of reference in adjacent territories separated by national borders.”²⁶²

It is important to highlight the following cooperative initiatives concerning the Arctic in the aftermath of the Cold War. Gorbachev’s Murmansk Initiatives (1987) initiated the Arctic Policy and drew attention to the environmental issues. A bilateral

²⁶¹ Stokke, O. (2000) “Sub-regional cooperation and protection of the Arctic marine environment: the Barents Sea” in Davor Vidas *Protecting the Polar Marine Environment*. p. 132

²⁶² Ibid. p. 126

Environmental Commission was the first policy responses in 1988. International Arctic Science Committee was established in 1990. This was followed by a Finnish initiative to establish the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy in 1991, “including a set of working groups that generated a considerable amount of programmatic activities, especially environmental monitoring and mapping of international cooperative mechanisms relevant to the northern environment.”²⁶³Next, the Arctic Council Initiative was established in 1996. The creation BEAR and Kirkenes Declaration were the strong diplomatic decisions which were taken in the North.

Due to the rising of environmental crisis in Arctic, the role of international scientific conventions for the protection of the Arctic environment is significant. The world understands that the integration and coordination of efforts between the countries creates an effective resistance to the destruction of Arctic environment. That is why the issue of environmental protection is the most important area between Russia and Norway in particular.

²⁶³ Ibid. p. 128

Literature

(1988) SSSR v bor'be za bezopasnost' i sotrudnichestvo v Yevrope, 1964-1987 [USSR in the struggle for security and cooperation in Europe, 1964-1987]. *Sbornik dokumentov*. Moskva mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya.

(1990) Mezhdunarodnoye ekologicheskoye sotrudnichestvo v Arktike [svodnyy referat] (International environmental cooperation in the Arctic) (combined abstract]. Moscow: The Institute of Scientific Information on Social Science.

(1994) "Arctic region: agreement on monitoring" Environment Policy and Law, 24 № 1.

(1996) *Metodologia i protsedura otsenki vozdeystviya morskoy neftegazovoy industrii na okruzhayaushchuyu sredu Arktiki* [Russian Academy of Sciences. Methodologies and assess the impact of offshore oil and gas industry in the Arctic environment]. Murmansk.

(2010) *Otvechaya na vyzov vremeni, vneshnyaya politika perestroyki: dokumental'nyye svidetel'stva po zapisyam besed M. Gorbacheva s zarubezhnymi deyatelyami i drugim materialam* [responding to recall of time, foreign policy of perestroika: documented by records of conversations of M. Gorbachev with foreign leaders and other materials]. Moskva: Ves' Mir.

Aleshkina, A.S. (2009) *Vneshnyaya politika Kanady v otnoshenii Rossii v kontse 20 – nachale 21 veka: problemy Arktiki* [Canada's foreign policy in relation to Russia in the late 20th – early 21st century: problems of the Arctic], Petrozavodsk State University, Dissertation.

Alimov, A. (2012) "O mezhdunarodnoy konferentsii "Arktika v uslovii mezhdunarodnykh izmeneniy"" [the international conference "The Arctic with international changes"], *Journal Obshchestvo. Sreda. Razvitiye (Terra Humana)*, № 2.

Apalin, V., Vasin, S., Grigoriev, A. And Sivintsev, Y. (2011) *Continuous radiation monitoring of the objects with spent nuclear fuel and radioactive waste dumped/sunken in the Arctic Seas*. National Research Center "Kurchatov Institute". CEG Oslo.

Arctic Boundaries, available at <http://www.uarctic.org/atlasmaplayer.aspx?m=642&amid=5955> (accessed 17 October 2012)

Arctic Council, available at http://bellona.ru/filearchive/fil_Arctic_council_RUS.pdf, (accessed 4 March 2013).

Arctic Council, available <http://www.arctic-council.org/index.php/en/about-us/history>, (accessed 19 February 2013).

Arctic monitoring and evaluation (1998) *Zagryazneniye Arktiki: doklad o sostoyanii okruzhayushchey sredy Arktiki [Arctic pollution report on the state of the Arctic environment]*. Saint-Petersburg: AMAP.

Arctic Universe. Analytical resource. available at <http://www.arcticuniverse.com/ru/finland.html>, (accessed 4 March, 2013).

Åtland, Kristian (2009) *The European Arctic in Soviet and Russian security policy, 1987-2007*. A dissertation for the degree of Philosophiae Doctor. University of Tromsø.

Buzan, B. (1998) *Security: a new framework for analysis*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Barsegov, Y. (2002) *Arktika – interesy Rossi i mezhdunarodnyye usloviya ikh realizatsii [the Arctic- Russia's interests and international conditions of their implementation]*. Moscow: Nauka.

Bartenev, V. (2011) “Sekyuritizatsiya sfery sodeystviya mezhdunarodnomu razvitiyu: analiz politicheskogo diskursa” [“Securitization of international development assistance: the analysis of political discourse”], *Vestnik mezhdunarodnykh organizatsiy* № 3(34).

Belyaev, A. Problemy zakhoroneniya radioaktivnykh otkhodov [the problem of radioactive waste disposal], available at http://abel-2.ru/downloads/2006_RAO.pdf, (accessed on 10 March, 2013).

Berkman, P., Lang, M, Walton, D., Young, O. (2011) *Science Diplomacy Antarctica, Science, and the Governance of International Spaces*. Smithsonian Institution Scholarly Press: Washington DC.

Bloom E. (1999) Establishment of the Arctic Council. - *The American Journal of International Law*, Vol. 93, №3.

Bones, S. (2010) Fieldwork: Polar Research and Norway's relations with the Soviet Union in Bones, S. and Mankova, P. (eds.) *Norway and Russia in the Arctic*. University of Tromsø, the publication series of the department of the history and religious studies, № 12.

Bones, S. Science in-between: Norway, the European Arctic and the USSR (in press).

Bulatov, V. (1987) "Sovetskiy soyuz i Norvegiya: sotrudnichestvo i konflikty v Arktike" [The Soviet Union and Norway: cooperation and conflict in the Arctic] in B. Goldin and Jens-Petter Nielsen (eds.) *Strakh i ozhidaniya. Rossiya i Norvegiya v XX veke*. Arkhangelsk: Pomor University Press.

Case-study, available at www.nntu.ru/RUS/otd_sl/metod_uprav/inov_met/keis.doc, (accessed on 23 April, 2012).

Declaration on Cooperation in the Barents Euro-Arctic region, available at http://www.lawrussia.ru/texts/legal_555/doc55a708x422.htm (accessed 29 January 2013).

Definition, "Globalization" <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Globalization>, (accessed 8 February 2013).

Definitions, "Globalization" <http://qed.princeton.edu/main/MG/Definitions>, (accessed 8 February 2013).

Den Russiske Ambassade i Oslo, available at <http://www.norway.mid.ru/ru/rn-politics.html>, (accessed on 24 April 2013).

Dr. Nayef R.F. Al-Rodhan (2006) Definitions of globalization: a comprehensive overview and a proposed definition, <http://www.sustainablehistory.com/articles/definitions-of-globalization.pdf>, (accessed 8 February 2013).

Ekologicheskoye pravo (environmental law), available at <http://www.bibliotekar.ru/ecologicheskoe-pravo-3/25.htm>, (accessed on 13 March 2013).

Espen Barth Eide "Barentsevo sotrudnichestvo – severnoye vozrozhdeniye" [The Barents cooperation – Northern Renaissance] available at http://www.norvegia.ru/News_and_events/happenings/The-northern-regions/Barents-cooperation---Northern-Renaissance/ (accessed 29 January 2013).

Evangelista, M. (1995) Transnational relations in the USSR and the Russia in Risse-Kappen, Thomas *Bringing transnational relations back in: non-state actors, domestic structures, and international institutions*. Cambridge University Press.

Federal Security Service against the environmental spying, available at <http://rudocs.exdat.com/docs/index-15048.html?page=9>, (accessed on 12 March 2013).

Gramberg, I., Laverov, N., Dodin, D. (2000) *Arktika na poroge tret'yego tysyacheletiya (resursnyy potentsial i problemy ekologii) [Arctic on the threshold of the third millennium (resource potential and environmental issues)]*. Saint-Petersburg: Nauka.

Greshnevikov, A. (2002) *Zov Arktiki [Call of Arctic]*. Moscow: Zhizn' i mysl'.

Gubel' atomnoy podvodnoy lodki "Komsomolets" [The death of a nuclear submarine "Komsomolets"]. available at <http://ria.ru/infografika/20090407/167344596-ig.html>, (accessed on 9 March 2013).

Hønneland, G. (2003) *Russia and the West: environmental co-operation and conflict*. London: Routledge.

Hønneland, G. (2004) *Russian Fisheries Management. The Precautionary Approach in theory and practice*. Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

Katastrofa na Chernobyl'skoy AES [The accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant], available at <http://o-chaes.ru/>, (accessed on 12 February 2013).

Katastrofy na atomnykh podvodnykh lodkakh [the disaster of nuclear submarines], available at <http://mypage.sbor.net/psv/SeaWolf/subcrash.htm> (accessed on 9 March 2013).

Keoheyn, Nye (2002) "Transnatsionalnyye otnosheniya i mirovaya politika" ["Transnational relations and worlds politic"] in Tsygankov *Teoriya mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniy [International Relation Theory]*. Moskva: Gardariki.

Kopengagenskaya shkola (sekuritizatsiya) [the Copenhagen School (securitization)], available at <http://www.securitylab.ru/blog/personal/avetjan/22855.php> (accessed on 2 October 2012).

Kulagin, V. (2012) "Globalnaya ili mirovaya bezopasnost?" ["Global or world security?"], *Zhurnal teorii mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniy i mirovoy politiki [Journal of international relations theory and world politics]*, 1 (28).

Lukashova, E. (1988) Voprosy sotrudnichestva SSSR i Norvegii v oblasti rybnogo khozyaystva [The state and prospects of the USSR-Norway fisheries relationships (1977-1987)] in *USSR – Norway fisheries cooperation. Collected papers*. Moskva: VNIRO.

Lukin, Y. (2010) *Velikiy peredel Arktiki [A great division of the Arctic]*. Arkhangelsk: Northern Arctic Federal University, Pravda Severa.

Makarov, V. (2000) Sistema transgranichnogo regional'nogo sotrudnichestva v barentsevom yevro-arkticheskom regione [the system of cross-border regional cooperation in the Barents Euro-Arctic region]. Moscow: Diplomatic Academy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Department of Foreign Policy and International relations. Dissertation.

Matthew Evangelista (1999) *Unarmed Forces. The Transnational Movement to End the Cold War*, Ithica and London.

Miller, M. (2008) Arctic Council, available at <http://marilijamihkel.weebly.com/uploads/2/2/1/5/2215937/uurimus.pdf>, (accessed 19 February 2013)

Morgunov, B. (2005) Metodologiya ucheta ekologicheskogo faktora v protsesse vyrabotki strategii ustoychivogo razvitiya arkticheskoy zony rossii [Methodology of integrating environmental considerations into the process of developing a strategy for sustainable development of the Arctic zone of Russia]. Moscow. Synopsis.

Muntean, M. (2007) *Osnovy teorii mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniy [Foundations of International relations]*, available at <http://www.twirpx.com/file/90415/>, (accessed on 2 October 2012)

Nikitin, Shershakov, Tsurov (2011) "The sovmetnyye rossiysko-norvezhkiye issledovaniya radioaktivnogo zagryazneniya zapadnykh arkticheskikh morey" [the Joint Russian-Norwegian research about contamination of western arctic seas], *Arktika: ekologiya i ekonomika*, №2.

Nilssen, A. (2001) *Sosedi na Kraynem Severe: Rossiya i Norvegiya. Ot pervykh kontaktov do Barentseva sotrudnichestva* [Neighbors in the Far North: Russia and Norway. From the first contact to the cooperation]. Murmansk: BookPublishers.

Nordic Environment Finance Corporation, available at <http://www.nefco.org/>, (accessed on 17 March, 2013).

Norvegiya i Rossiya nesut otvetstvennost' za razvitiye Arktiki [Norway and Russia are responsible for the Arctic's development], available at http://nord-news.ru/main_topic/?mtopicid=392, (accessed on 21 April 2012).

Ogorodov, S. (2008) “Vliyaniye izmeneniy klimata i ledovitosti arkticheskikh morey na dinamiku beregov Yevrazii” [“Effects of changing climate and sea ice extent on Eurasian arctic coastal dynamics”] *Journal Problemy Arktiki i Antarktiki*, №1 (78).

Osnovy gosudarstvennoy politiki rossiyskoy federatsii v arktike. [Principles of state policy of Russian Federation in the Arctic], available at <http://www.sci.aha.ru/econ/A111c.htm>, (accessed 12 April 2012).

Petsamo-Kirkenesskaya operatsiya [Petsamo-Kirkenes operation, Norway during the second World War], available at http://www.norge.ru/petsamo_kirkenes/ (accessed 22 January 2013).

Problemy radiatsionnoy reabilitatsii arkticheskikh morey, sposoby i puti ikh resheniya [the problems of rehabilitation of the Arctic seas, methods and solutions], available at <http://www.rosnord.ru/resources/ecology/70-problemy-radiatsionnoj-reabilitatsii-arkticheskikh-morej-sposoby-i-puti-ikh-resheniya>, (accessed on 11 March, 2013).

Proshlo 17 let so dnya avarii tankera “Exxon Valdez” na Alyaske [It has been 17 years since the tanker accident “Exxon Valdez” in Alaska], available at <http://www.pravda.ru/science/planet/environment/24-03-2006/79810-tanker-0/>, (accessed 6 March, 2013).

Repnevsky, A. (2005) *Zimnyaya voyna v politike Norvegii* [A Winter War in Norwegian Policy] in materials of the Sixth Annual Conference (14-16 April 2004), ed. Baryshnikov, V. available at http://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/History/Article/repn_zimv.php, accessed (25 February, 2013)

Risse-Kappen, Thomas (2001) Unarmed Forces: The Transnational Movement to End the Cold War by Matthew Evangelista *The International History Review*, Vol. 23, No. 1.

Risse-Kappen, Thomas (1995) *Bringing transnational relations back in: non-state actors, domestic structures, and international institutions*. Cambridge University Press.

Sarkisov, Antipov, Kalinin (2011) “Mezhdunarodnoye sotrudnichestvo pri likvidatsii ekologicheskogo naslediya kholodnoy voyny v arkticheskom regione rossii” [the international cooperation for the elimination of the environmental legacy of the Cold war in the Arctic regions of Russia], *Arktika: ekologiya i ekonomika*, № 3.

Semenova, V. Kachestvennyye metody: vvedeniye v gumanisticheskuyu sotsiologiyu: glossariy k knige [Qualitative methods: an introduction to humanistic sociology: a glossary for the book], available at <http://voluntary.ru/dictionary/588/word/keis-stadi> (accessed on 25 April 2012).

Shirina, D.A. (2005) “Mezhdunarodnoye sotrudnichestvo: k novomu myshleniyu v Arktike” [International cooperation to new thinking in the Arctic], *Sovremennaya Arktika opyt izucheniya i problem*, p. 7-33

Smirnov (2003) “*Rossiysko-norvezhskiye otnosheniya v Barentsevom-YevroArkticheskoy regione 90-gody XX veka*” [Russian-Norwegian relations in the Barents Euro-Arctic region 90 years of the XX century]. Moscow: Diplomatic Academy of the Russian Foreign Ministry. Dissertation.

Smirnov, A. (1998) *Murmanskiy koridor* (Murmansk corridor). Murmansk: Sever.

Sörli, A., Wester, D., Czajkowski, C., Kozyreva, O. and Pichugin, S. (2001) *Norway, Russia and the USA in cooperation to improve the situation regarding radioactive waste in the northwest of Russia*. WM’ 01 Conference, Tucson, AZ.

Sperling, Valerie (2001) Unarmed Forces: The Transnational Movement to End the Cold War (review) *Journal of Cold War studies*, Volume 3, Number 3, p. 100-102.

Stritzel, Holger (2007) “Towards a theory of securitization: Copenhagen and beyond”, *European Journal of International Relations* 13, p. 357-383

Stokke, O. (1994) *The Barents Region: Cooperation in the Arctic Europe*. London: Sage.

Stokke, O. (2000) “Sub-regional cooperation and protection of the Arctic marine environment: the Barents Sea” in Davor Vidas *Protecting the Polar Marine Environment*. Cambridge University Press.

Sukharev (2003) “*Rossia i Norvegiya: istoriya dobrososedctva* ” [Russia and Norway: the history of neighbourhood]. Murmansk: Pazori.

Sukharev, M. (1988) “*Rossiysko-norvezhskiye otnosheniya v 20 veke*” [the Russian-Norwegian relations in the 20th century]. Murmansk.

Teoriya sekyuritizatsii v mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniyakh [securitization theory in international relations], available at URL: <http://old.geopolitica.ru/Articles/1406/> (accessed on 17 October 2012).

Teoriya sekyuritizatsii v mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniyakh [securitization theory in international relations], available at <http://geopolitica.ru/Articles/1404/> (accessed on 2 October 2012).

Tsentr voyenno-politicheskikh issledovaniy [Center for military-political studies], available at

<http://www.eurasian-defence.ru/content/%D0%B0%D0%B5%D0%BF%D1%81>,
(accessed 19 February 2013).

Tsygankov, P. (2002). *Teoriya mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniy* [Theory of international relations]. Moskva: Gardariki.

Uchenyye predlozhili transnatsionalnuyu model arkticheskogo upravleniya v XXI veke [Scientists has proposed a transnational model of Arctic governance in the XXI century], available at <http://www.wpru.ru/?p=2422> (accessed 4 October 2012)

United Nations Environment Programme, GEO: Global Environment Outlook, available at <http://www.unep.org/geo/geo3/russian/397.htm>, (accessed 6 March 2013).

Vinokurova U. Circumpolar Civilization: a geocultural approach, available at <http://www.google.ru/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=circumpolar+civilization+definition&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CDEQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fartcticmuseum.com%2Fen%2Ffiles%2FVino>, (accessed 18 April 2013).

Volkov (1989) “Sotrudnichestvo v Arktike” [Cooperation in the Arctic], in *Istoricheskiye svyazi Russkogo Severa i Norvegii*. Arkhangelsk Press.

Vozzhinskaya, V. (1996) “Radionuklidnoye zagryazneniye arktiki” [Radionuclides Pollution of the Arctic. An International meeting on the problems of nuclear pollution of the Arctic], *Okeanologiya*, 36, № 1.

Williams, Michael (2003) “Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics” *International Studies Quarterly* 47, p 511-531.

Yevstigneyeva (2008) “Osobennosti sovremennogo razvitiya rossiysko-norvezhskikh otnosheniy (na primere vzaimodeystviya v Arktike)” [Features of the modern development of the Russian-Norwegian relations (for example, cooperation in the Arctic)]. Moscow: Diplomatic Academy of the Russian Foreign.

Your window to the Barents Region, available at <http://www.barentsinfo.org/?DeptID=3570>, (accessed 17 March 2013);

Zagryazneniye neftyanymi uglevodorodami i pestitsidami [the contamination by petroleum hydrocarbons and pesticides], available at <http://www.arctic-online.ru/region/ecology/757.html>, (accessed on 11 March, 2013).

Znamenitosti Rosii [Russian celebrities], available at <http://www.bankgorodov.ru/fame/index.php?fid=376> (accessed 22 January 2013).