

Federal State-Funded Educational Institution of Higher education
**RUSSIAN PRESIDENTIAL ACADEMY OF NATIONAL ECONOMY
AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

Manuscript copyright

Eduard Galimullin

**RUSSIAN AND U.S. GOVERNMENT POLICY IN THE ARCTIC:
A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS**

Specialty 23.00.02 – Political Institutions, Processes, and Technologies
(Political Science)

ABSTRACT
of the thesis for the PhD of Political degree

Moscow – 2021

Main results of E.Z. Galimullin's Dissertation

"Russian and U.S. public policies in the Arctic: a comparative analysis".

The relevance of the research topic

There is a growing interest in the Arctic, both from the directly bordering and from other states, particularly from Asia. There is no definitive understanding of the reasons for the changes and transformations taking place in the region in recent decades, but one of the main reasons for this interest, in our view, is the economic benefit from the possible large-scale extraction of hydrocarbons and other minerals beyond the Arctic Circle because of climate change, and the close to year-round navigation along Arctic Sea routes, shorter than traditional ones. In recent years the United States has been paying special attention to the Arctic region. Other subarctic states are also becoming increasingly active in their policies to develop the region.

In this regard, the development of the Arctic is one of the priorities of the Russian Federation's state policy. Approaches to the development of the North and the Arctic have changed, but the understanding of the strategic importance of the region remains permanent. Relying largely on the achievements of the Soviet period, the modern Arctic policy of the Russian Federation is undergoing significant changes - a consequence of the emergence of new challenges in the Arctic and the need to respond to them, which makes this dissertation research relevant. By now the legal framework of the state policy of the Russian Federation in the Arctic at the present stage has been formed. Its goals, objectives, priorities, and implementation mechanisms have been defined, institutions and structures responsible for the adoption and implementation of decisions have been appointed.

At the same time, the tasks of improving the effectiveness of Russia's Arctic policy, ensuring sustainable development of the Russian Arctic, including the improvement of socio-economic indicators and the effective realization of the available resource potential, remain unchanged. Russia's current chairmanship of the Arctic Council, the leading intergovernmental regional forum, also adds to the importance to this.

In the conceptual aspect, the relevance of the topic is conditioned by the presence of internal and foreign policy specifics of state policy implementation in the Arctic. It consists in a significant degree of influence of interdependence of political actors in the region on the effectiveness of state policy, as well as in mutual influence of measures and decisions taken by the states. In this connection it seems necessary to study the Russian and American experience of Arctic policy as the strongest and most active actors at present, between which, to a certain extent, the competition in this region is unfolding. It will help to understand the similarities, differences and essential characteristics of its development and implementation in each country. In the practical-political aspect the relevance is conditioned by the necessity of searching and approbation, considering national specifics, of effective mechanisms of management and decision-making on the development of the region. The comparative analysis considers the dependence of the form and content of state Arctic policy on both the specifics of historical time, and the socio-political space of Russia and the United States.

Despite the currently growing tensions in U.S.-Russian relations, an analysis of the experience of the U.S. government policy in the Arctic does not cease to be an urgent task. Among all Russia's neighboring states in the region, the United States occupies a special place by virtue of its strategic, economic and investment opportunities, acting as one of the most influential political actors in the region along with our country. Cooperation, albeit local, between the two states can have a positive impact on the implementation of Russia's state policy in the Arctic.

Scientific status of the issue

The problems of public policy, its formation and implementation, is one of the most important topics in political science. In this regard, when writing the dissertation, considerable attention was paid to the study of the works of such foreign scientists, who conceptually approached to the consideration of politics and public administration, namely: M. Weber, T. Dye, J. Anderson, B. Ripley and J. Franklin, G. Lasswell, L. Salamon, W. Wilson, S. Osborne, W. Oström and E. Oström, P. Dunleavy S. Huntington, C. Hood, J. Chandler, L. Metcalfe, and S. Richards, R.

Rhodes, J. Thorning, and also Russian political scientists and scholars - L. V. Smorgunov, A. I. Solovyov, A. Yu. Melville, A. A. Degtyarev, L. N. Timofeeva, A. V. Ponedelkov, O. A. Nesterchuk.

The works of O. Young, M. Byers, T. Koivurov, K. Hussein, D. Nord, M. Weissman, L. Heininen, H. Exner-Payrot, M. Tennberg, S. Knecht and K. Keil, J. Depledge and C. Dodds, A. Zagorski, L. Poval, L. Bezrukov, L. Poval, L. Bezrukov, C. Coates, C. Holroyd, D. Dorow, J. Capulla, H. Mikkola, N. Wegge describe existing conditions in the region for international cooperation on a global level, analyze the current Arctic governance, define the existing problems and challenges. All the above works are of obvious interest and are inextricably linked to the topic of public administration in the Arctic, including at the national level, since there is a strong dependence on the foreign policy context.

There is a separate, extensive range of research on the study of Russian and American Arctic strategies, both in independent consideration and in comparison, including in a historical perspective. These are the works of P. Gudev, V. Ivanter, V. Leksin, B. Porfiriev, E. Bloom, M. David, J. Fondel, L. Heininen, A. Sergunin, M. Laruelle, A. Pilyasov, V. Konyshchev, J. Staun, D. Trenin, Y. Lukin, T. Rotnam, S. Haycox, A. Petrov, V. Bortnikov, N. Pankevich, K. Mika, J. Solsky.

Some works by A. Sergunin, V. Konyshchev, A. Zagorskii, and D. Melnikov deal specifically with the military aspects of Russian and U.S. state Arctic policy, although militarization issues are addressed in most scholarly articles on the topic.

A significant place in the publications of researchers is occupied by a detailed analysis of Russia's socio-economic policy in the Arctic. The works of A. Vylegzhanina, V. Shchitinsky, M. Minina, N. Novikov, A. Tatarkin, V. Leksin, N. Volgin, B. Porfiriev, E. Korchak consider the general state and problems, including in their historical relationship, various stimulating mechanisms, the priorities of socio-economic development and the role of the state.

The works of T. Kiiski, T. Solakivi, M. Drevniak, E. Gai, F. Lazar, S. Kirchner, H. Solvang, Y. Bobrova, V. Gavrilov, D. Yumashev, N. Veretennikov, N. Zalivsky, E. Plisetsky, M. Kepa refer to the publications on researching various

aspects of the Northern Sea Route development, evaluating the economic feasibility of its use, analyzing the legal status and development prospects.

There are many works devoted to the study of the impact of Western sanctions against Russia, including those considering the impact of restrictive measures on the efficiency of public administration and on the energy industry of Russia. These are the works of D. Firthoft, I. Overland, M. Klinova, E. Sidorova, A. Konoplyanik, G. Ivanov, N. Andreassen, M. Morgunova, E. Telegina, N. Nazarova, R. Sidortsov, A. Petrov, M. Tsyachnyuk, A. Vatansever, A. Kontorovich.

The last group of works is devoted to the consideration of Russian-American relations in the Arctic. Several researchers analyze the history and current state of development of these relations - these include works by N. Bolkhovitinov, A. Vylegzhanin, A. Todorov, R. Pincus, S. Okun, A. Fenenko, A. Grinev, A. Petrov, I. Kurill, O. Terebov, which also examine specific cases and areas of cooperation.

A few dissertation studies touching on the topic of state administration of the Russian Arctic and concerning the consideration of international legal aspects of cooperation in the region have also been analyzed.

We note that while the topic of Russian and U.S. policy in the Arctic is generally well developed, there is a lack of detailed analysis of the American experience, which is mostly confined to strategic analysis. Consequently, specific opportunities for applying the American experience in Russian public policy are not considered, and only ways of cooperation are suggested. At the same time, the importance of applying successful foreign experience has been repeatedly noted, including by officials.

The object of study is the state policy of Russia and the United States in the Arctic.

The subject of study is the peculiarities of strategic, regulatory, and institutional components of the state Arctic policy of the two countries.

The purpose of the thesis research is to identify opportunities to improve Russian state policy in the Arctic based on a comparative analysis of Russian and U.S. policy in the region.

To achieve the purpose of the thesis it is necessary to solve the following tasks:

1. Analyze the basic concepts and results of models and methods of public policy development;
2. Characterize the current state of international cooperation in the Arctic and the specifics associated with the implementation of public policy in northern regions;
3. Examine the legal standards governing Arctic policy in Russia and the United States;
4. Reveal the main specifics of the formation and implementation of state policy of Russia and the United States in the Arctic in the field of socio-economic development;
5. Examine the experience of cooperation between Russia and the United States in the Arctic;
6. Conduct a comparative analysis of the common and special in the public administration of the Arctic regions of Russia and the USA;
7. Consider the possibility of adapting American experience in order to improve Russia's state policy in the Arctic and provide appropriate recommendations.

The hypothesis of the study is that the reviewed and analyzed experience of the U.S. Arctic policy can be applied to the improvement of the Russian Arctic policy. It seems that the use of these results is relevant precisely in those areas where Russian Arctic policy remains insufficiently effective: in the sphere of interaction between the authorities and business, state companies and scientific institutions, coordination of federal and regional authorities responsible for the development and implementation of Arctic policy, as well as in the issue of indigenous peoples' participation in the region's management.

The methodological basis of the dissertation research is a complex of analytical methods of political science, the emphasis in the application of which is placed on the systemic (comprehensive) study of the stated issue.

The specifics of this dissertation research predetermined the application of the comparativist approach, involving the comparison of Russian and American experience in various areas of public policy in the Arctic. By means of binary comparison it is possible to identify the common and special in the development of the region, to discover and consider effective practices and solutions.

The historical method has highlighted the main stages in the development of bilateral relations and identified trends in the evolution of bilateral relations in the Arctic.

The structural-functional method made it possible to consider the interaction between the structural elements of the state policy of Russia and the United States in the Arctic.

The method of "case-study" made it possible to study individual episodes of cooperation between the United States and Russia in the Arctic, reflecting certain features of bilateral relations.

Content analysis of the strategic and regulatory documents has helped to identify the direction of the policy changes in them.

SWOT-analysis has made it possible to summarize and summarize the strengths and weaknesses of Russian and U.S. public policies in the Arctic.

General scientific methods such as analysis, synthesis, inductive and deductive methods were also widely used in the study.

As a result of the conducted scientific research the following main results containing **scientific novelty** were obtained:

1. The specifics of the implementation of state policy and governance in the Arctic have been found and characterized: a) foreign policy (a unique model of coordinating the interests of border states, denoted by the term "complex interdependence"), b) domestic policy (special environmental, economic, infrastructure requirements). The author offers an author's vision of the development of the role of the state institution in the Arctic policy: strengthening its dominant position and reducing the opportunities for active participation of international and non-profit organizations in the

regional policy as a result of the increasing military-strategic and resource importance of the Arctic and the growing geopolitical competition;

2. The result of the content analysis of Russian and American doctrinal documents on state policy in the Arctic with the following conclusions: a) there are still institutional challenges in the development of the Russian Arctic, including the lack of criteria for inclusion of territories into the AZRF, non-transparent mechanism of this procedure, the lack of AZRF (Arctic Zone of the Russian Federation) status of an independent object of state management; b) U.S. public policy in the Arctic is predominantly a response to the rise of other states in the region and is largely dependent on the ruling administration, which sets priorities and allocates funding to achieve its goals;
3. The study of the problems of state management of the AZRF in the context of the international political situation in general and confrontational relations between Russia and the USA in particular, developed in the period from 2014 to 2021, revealed: a) the presence of fragmentation in addressing the socio-economic and spatial-territorial development of the Russian Arctic at the level of target-program planning; b) weak vertical coordination in the socio-economic planning of the American Arctic development, coupled with dependence of the political and territorial development of the Arctic in the Russian Federation. The results of the survey of Russian youth conducted by the author concerning their motivation to move for temporary or permanent residence to the regions of the AZRF showed the following: a) the issues of attracting young personnel to the Arctic are not fully elaborated; b) there are measurable quantitative factors that can facilitate the inflow of necessary specialists to the region (percentage ratios of factors that prevent and favor relocation, upper and lower wage limits);
4. The comparative and SWOT-analysis of the state policy of Russia and the USA in the Arctic revealed its strengths in both states: in Russia: a)

centralization and sufficient political will to actively implement state policy; b) rich experience in its implementation; in the USA: a) high level of expert and analytical support of Arctic policy; b) publicity of ministries and departments in the Arctic; c) established practice of interaction with indigenous communities; and weaknesses: in Russia: a) insufficient coordination between the center and the regions; b) narrowed space for non-state actors to participate in the development and implementation of state Arctic policy; c) large energy players lobbying their interests; d) low level of expert and analytical support for Arctic policy; in the USA: a) the federal center lacks the necessary political will to systematically and consistently implement state policy in the Arctic; b) there is a strong opposition in government structures to the development and implementation of Arctic policy. Correcting these deficiencies, particularly in Russia, in our opinion, will significantly improve public policy in the ASRF.

The empirical basis of the study is represented by the international agreements that make up the current Arctic governance regime; documents of the Russian Federation that regulate the country's Arctic policy; documents that define the strategy and national interests of the United States in the Arctic; materials and data from Internet resources, websites and portals related to the topic of the thesis research; official speeches, interviews, comments by politicians and public figures of the Russian Federation and the USA; and also - the results of the study. The sample size was 100 people aged 18 to 33 years living outside the Arctic region.

The provisions of the dissertation submitted for the defense:

1. It is established that the challenges of modernity dictate new requirements, under which public administration and public policy are inevitably adjusted, finding its conceptual expression both in the theories of researchers and in practice. Modern accents are made in the direction of increasing the number of participants, the politicization of societies, the

increasing role of transnational corporations. The content of the concepts is enriched due to the emergence of new strong actors - TNCs, which have a significant impact on the policies of individual states and world politics. However, as the dissertator argues, the ongoing pandemic will probably strengthen the role of states in the regulation of socio-economic processes. Thus, modern public policy needs a new conceptual expression;

2. State policy and public administration in the Arctic has its own unique specifics: both foreign policy (a unique model of coordination of interests of border states, characterized by the term "complex interdependence") and domestic policy (special environmental, economic, infrastructure requirements). Legislative provision of state policy in the Northern regions should consider and reflect all these influences, thus forming the forms and methods of state management of the region. The Arctic region continues to act as a region of peace and cooperation, not fully reflecting the processes in international politics, including confrontational ones. However, because of the increasing strategic significance of the Arctic and growing geopolitical competition, the role of the dominant political institution in the region may be reassumed by the state. As a result, the emphasis on national and energy security in the doctrinal documents of the major Arctic countries will significantly reduce the opportunities for active participation of international and non-profit organizations in regional politics;
3. Despite the formation of the conceptual and regulatory framework of Russia's state policy in the Arctic, as well as its inclusion in the system of federal strategic planning, there are still institutional challenges in the development of the AZRF. They include the absence of a federal law regulating the borders and the very concept of the Arctic zone of Russia, the lack of the AZRF status of an independent object of state management. The underfunding of development programs, lack of updating of regional strategies of socio-economic development and lack of coordination in the

system of strategic planning remain serious problems. U.S. government policy in the Arctic is mainly a response to the strengthening of other states in the region. Like the general policy agenda, it is highly dependent on the ruling administration, which sets priorities and allocates funding to achieve the set goals. The current U.S. Administration (President D. Biden) is likely to continue a confrontational policy toward Russia in response to the country's increasing presence in high latitudes, including military;

4. At present, the issues concerning the socio-economic development of the Russian Arctic are addressed at the level of program-targeted planning in a fragmented and unsystematic way. The fact that the constituent entities of the entity administratively belong to different federal districts and different macro-regions also complicates the implementation of a coordinated state policy regarding the region. It is necessary to holistically and systematically improve public administration in the ASRF, which should apply the principle of public-private partnership with special emphasis on the development and implementation of innovative solutions in the socio-economic sphere (telemedicine, the use of radio-controlled vehicles to deliver goods to hard-to-reach areas), the involvement of the private sector in social service provision, and the active involvement of regional authorities and municipalities in studying the available Russian and foreign experience of state. The government authorities of the Russian Federation need to decide which instruments of territorial development to apply in the Arctic, given that the Territories of Advanced Development (TADs) of the Far East have proved ineffective. In the United States, there is weak vertical coordination in socio-economic planning, coupled with the dependence of the political agenda on the ruling administration, which does not contribute to a coherent public policy in the region. The uneasy relationship between Washington and the state of Alaska includes several types of federalism, and socioeconomic issues are addressed by regional authorities outside the "Arctic" context;

5. 5. The Russian Federation and the United States have more common goals regarding the Arctic than contradictions. Both countries have a positive historical record of cooperation and mutual problem-solving. The Bering Strait region is the immediate, material basis for this cooperation, and the institutional cooperation is provided by the coast guard services of the two countries. At the same time there are a few contradictions, primarily concerning the status of the Northern Sea Route (NSR) and some other sea straits. It is necessary to develop cooperation in the Bering Strait region, transfer this experience to other areas of cooperation, strengthen cooperation in science, involve experts in the discussion of problems and exchange experience. Cooperation, even if local, between the two states will undoubtedly have a positive impact on the implementation of Russia's state policy in the Arctic and increase its effectiveness;
6. U.S. government policy in the Arctic is mainly a response to the strengthening of other states in the region, including Russia. In the United States, the federal center does not have sufficient political will to strengthen the country's Arctic position, and there is strong opposition in the power structures to the promotion of some decisions, for example - the ratification of the 1982 Convention on the Law of the Sea. At the same time, there is a high level of expert and analytical support of the Arctic policy in the USA, there is an extensive network of research centers and independent research organizations. Publicity of the activities of ministries and departments in the Arctic, publication of their own visions and plans of measures in the region, in our opinion, reduces possible public tension regarding the transparency of state policy and makes the content of this policy available to a wide range of stakeholders, including in the sphere of public administration itself. And, therefore, it also makes possible the active participation of all stakeholders in the Arctic policy. As for the Arctic policy of the Russian Federation, the study found that it remains quite centralized, for many reasons, including many of an objective nature,

which suppresses the initiative of regional and municipal authorities, as well as the private sector. In Russia, in contrast to the United States, the federal center has sufficient political will to actively implement state policy in the Arctic, there is a wealth of experience in its implementation, which, however, needs to be rethought in modern conditions. At the same time, it is obvious that for many reasons (human, economic) the state and the federal center cannot cope with the task of such scale alone. We characterize the coordination between the center and the regions as weak, which is caused by the regions' expectation of a "plan of action" from Moscow and dependence in terms of decision-making. The high strategic importance and significant presence of power ministries and agencies in the Arctic also narrows the space for non-state actors to participate. At the same time, major energy players actively lobby their own interests, often going against the interests of the regions and the long-term plans of the state for the socio-economic development of the Arctic. The thesis describes the level of expert and analytical support for Russia's Arctic policy as insufficient, although in recent years there have been positive changes in this direction, such as the establishment and development of the Arctic Development Project Office, which operates according to the "think tank" model;

7. It has been established that the results of the analysis of the U.S. Arctic policy experience can and should be used in the process of improving the state Arctic policy of Russia. It is not only a question of borrowing, considering national specifics, successful practices - a detailed consideration, including unsuccessful solutions, ineffective mechanisms and approaches will allow to avoid similar mistakes in Russia.

The theoretical significance of the study lies in the addition of political science knowledge in the field of comparative political analysis of the state policy of Russia and the United States in the Arctic.

The study provides a characteristic of the current state of cooperation between Russia and the United States in the Arctic the socio-economic situation in the AZRF and Alaska. On this basis, it provides evidence for the necessity of cooperation between both states, shows the possibility of expanding joint activities of Russia and the United States in the Arctic, as well as the use of the American Arctic experience to improve Russian state Arctic policy.

The provisions and conclusions set out in the thesis can be used by representatives of the Russian and foreign scientific community engaged in the study of Russian and U.S. state policy in the Arctic region. It is possible to use the results obtained in the interaction between the scientific and expert community and public authorities in the issues of improving the effectiveness of Russia's state policy in the Arctic.

The materials of the study can also be used in the educational process in preparing courses of lectures on comparative political science and in the development of other educational and methodological materials.

The dissertation consists of an introduction, 3 chapters divided into 7 paragraphs, conclusion, bibliography, appendices.

The main provisions and conclusions of the study are reflected in seven publications of the author in Russian and English (including co-authorship), of which three were published in scientific journals recommended by VAK under the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Russian Federation and two were published in journals included in the SCOPUS database (I and II quarters):

1. Shapovalova, D., Galimullin, E., Grushevenko, E. (2020) Russian Arctic offshore petroleum governance: The effects of western sanctions and outlook for northern development. *Energy policy*, 146, 1-8 pp. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2020.111753> (SCOPUS I KB.);
2. Galimullin, E., Matveenko, Y. (2019). The ongoing formation of Russia's Arctic policy: a new stage? In L. Heininen & H. Exner-Pirot, *Arctic Yearbook* 2019, 305-322 pp. URL: <https://arcticyearbook.com/arctic->

[yearbook/2019/2019-scholarly-papers/318-the-ongoing-formation-of-russia-s-arctic-policy-a-new-stage](#));

3. Galimullin, E.Z. China and the "Eastern Vector" of Russian Arctic Policy // Asia and Africa Today. - 2020. - №2. - C. 57-63. <https://doi.org/10.31857/S032150750008474-3> (BAK);
4. Galimullin, E., Benedik, I. Prospects of the Northern Sea Route in the context of Russian-American relations // International Processes. - 2019. - Vol. 17. - № 4 (59). - 115-134 c. <https://doi.org/10.17994/IT.2019.17.4.59.7> (WAC/SCOPUS Q2);
5. Galimullin, E.Z., Matveenkov, Y.I. Russia and the USA in the Arctic region: rivalry or strategic partnership? // PolitBook. - 2017. - 1. - pp. 64-81. <https://doi.org/10.24412/FgQnfcEjzSc> (WAC);
6. Galimullin, E.Z. Migration attitudes and mechanisms to attract young people to the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation // The Arctic and the North. - 2019. - № 36. - P. 96-109. <https://doi.org/10.17238/issn2221-2698.2019.36.96> (RSCI);
7. Galimullin, E.Z. Socio-economic development of the subjects of the "Arctic zone of the Russian Federation" in the context of sustainable development of the region / Proceedings of the II International Scientific-Practical Conference, Irkutsk, 19-21 November 2018 // FSBIU VPO "IGU". - C. 269-273

The results of the work were also discussed during the author's reports at international scientific and practical conferences in 2018-2020 in Russia and abroad.

The author developed and tested while teaching practice the training course "The Arctic region in the modern system of international relations", consisting of 2 lectures and 3 seminars.

