

A Critical Research of the Dispute Matters through the Planetary Politics Perspective: The Arctic Case

Adnan Dal¹, Ebru Caymaz²

Review-Research Paper

Abstract

The concept of the global commons has paved a resilience-based approach to vulnerable regions. At the nexus of geopolitics and economics, the atmosphere, Antarctica, the High Seas, and outer space are in crisis due to the negative effects of climate change. Therefore, this research questions the current anthropocentric approach to international relations. It attaches importance to a systematic process of reconstruction, especially against the states and institutions that cannot provide a solution to the ecological crises. In this reformation process, planetary politics has been dominant in the international relations literature. Planetary politics arguments can be adapted into the Arctic international relations literature, which argues that the existing international institutions and politics as insufficient in the region, where ecological change is destructive. Besides, the concept of planetary politics over the Arctic region raises similar arguments, especially when considering studies associated with the green theory. It is a well-established fact that the green theory emerged as a solution-providing paradigm in the Arctic international relations literature. Accordingly, by adopting the planetary politics perspective and a critical vantage point, this research tries to outline how the environmental and developmental issues and disputes are settled in the Arctic.

Keywords

Arctic,
Global Commons,
Green Theory,
Planetary Politics

Article Info

Received
19.09.2023
Accepted
18.10.2023

Gezegensel Siyaset Perspektifi Üzerinden Anlaşmazlık Konularının Eleştirel Bir Araştırması: Arktik Meselesi

Derleme-Araştırma Makalesi

Öz

Küresel müşterekler kavramı, hassas bölgelere dirençlilik temelli bir yaklaşımın yolunu açmıştır. Jeopolitik ve ekonominin kesiştiği noktada atmosfer, Antarktika, açık denizler ve uzay, iklim değişikliğinin olumsuz etkileri nedeniyle krizde. Bu nedenle, bu araştırma uluslararası ilişkilere yönelik mevcut insan merkezli yaklaşımı sorgulamaktadır. Özellikle son yıllarda yaşadığımız ekolojik krizlere çözüm üretemeyen devlet ve kurumlara karşı sistemli bir yeniden yapılanma sürecine önem verilmektedir. Bu yeniden yapılanma sürecinde gezegensel siyaset, sistemik bir değişim önerisiyle uluslararası ilişkiler literatürüne hakim olmuştur. Ekolojik değişimin yıkıcı olduğu Arktik bölgesinde mevcut uluslararası kurum ve politikaların yetersiz olduğunu düşünen Arktik uluslararası ilişkiler literatürü de gezegensel siyaset argümanlarına uyarlanabilir. Ayrıca Arktik bölgesi üzerindeki gezegensel siyaset düşüncesi de, özellikle yeşil teori ile ilgili çalışmalar göz önüne alındığında, benzer argümanlara sahiptir. Yeşil teorisinin Arktik uluslararası ilişkiler literatüründe çözüm sağlayıcı bir paradigma olarak ortaya çıktığı bilinmektedir. Buna göre, gezegensel siyaset perspektifini benimseyen bu araştırma, çevre ve kalkınma sorunlarının ve bunlarla bağlantılı ihtilaf konularının Arktik'te nasıl çözümlendiğini özetlemeye çalışmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler

Arktik,
Küresel Müşterekler,
Yeşil Teori,
Gezegensel Siyaset

Makale Hakkında

Gönderim Tarihi:
19.09.2023
Kabul Tarihi
18.10.2023

¹ Asst. Prof., Hatay Mustafa Kemal University, adnan.dal@mku.edu.tr, 0000-0002-3633-9044.

² Assoc. Prof., Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, ebru.caymaz@comu.edu.tr, 0000 0002 9119 7659.

Introduction

As a prominent region that is listed among the global commons, the dispute matters about the Arctic are often examined under eight titles; territorial disputes, maritime disputes, Beaufort Sea dispute, disputes regarding the extension of the continental shelf, disputes regarding alternative shipping routes, environmental protection, protecting the rights of the indigenous peoples, and international security. However, the central dispute matter in the Arctic region can be asserted as the continental shelf problem that exists throughout the region (Byers, 2013: 6). Being home to powerful states such as the United States (US) and Russia, the continental shelf disputes have become even more complex considering the power competition or transition in the Arctic.

Although there are many studies examining the dispute matters in the region, the current studies usually provide analyses within the framework of the realist theory. In today's world, where actors are diversified due to globalization, it is possible to address the dispute matters in terms of many different variables that occur between powerful Arctic actors. The multinational Arctic region holds great potential in terms of both natural resources and maritime trade routes, which have caused many disputes in the past. While geopolitical changes, increasing demand for energy resources, migration, and transportation needs have become the major factors of change within the Arctic, several social-ecological regimes deal with a wide variety of stressors concurrently. Therefore, analyzing the dispute matters in the context of pure realism has caused current analyses to be limited in scope. Accordingly, from a wider point of view, this research interrogates the anthropocentric approach to international relations. By adopting the planetary politics perspective, this research tries to outline how the environmental and development issues and their associated dispute matters are being settled in the Arctic. The next session explains the concept of the global commons and its interconnected relations to the region.

1. The Concept of the Global Commons

The global commons, as an environmental term, is defined as the Earth's limited natural resources that lie beyond national jurisdictions (Dauvergne, 2012: 3). The term refers to international and supranational resource domains with common-pool resources. Unlike global public goods, these resource domains are subject to problems of overuse, congestion, and degradation (Ostrom, 1990: 280).

There are several essential differences between governing the common resources and resources of the global commons (Stern, 2011: 213). First of all, many resources of the global commons are non-renewable and not immediately observable. Secondly, externalities between the uses of global resources and local resources are significantly different in terms of costs, benefits, and interests. Moreover, the dynamics of the global commons' resource pools are less easily understood and the unintended consequences of resource degradation can be unforeseen (Hardin, 1968: 1243; Kanie, 2007: 67). For instance, carbon dioxide emissions heavily affect the atmosphere and lead to climate change but its associated effects on sea ice also offer economic opportunities that cause a paradox in terms of development. Therefore, ensuring sustainable use of global commons' resource pools has become one of the priorities of the United Nations (UN) as well (2015: 1).

Since the global commons are often referred to as the "common heritage of mankind" (Baslar, 1998: 3) and the effects of human-induced climate change now clearly be seen in glaciers, sea ice, and thawing of permafrost, mitigation of climate change has become one of the major goals at a planetary level with a special emphasis on the Arctic in Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Reports. Founded by the UN in 1988, the IPCC guides all stakeholders by supplying them with the latest scientific data against the negative effects of climate change. The Paris Agreement has further reinforced the environmental governance of the global commons. Since the term resilience is highly interconnected to the management and governance of resources as well as the people of the Arctic, enhancing the resilience of the Arctic Ocean has been added to the UN agenda (2015: 1). The next section discusses the environmental and development issues within the Arctic from a planetary politics perspective.

2. Planetary Politics: A Resolution or An Exaggeration?

According to several scientific studies, the world is not only faced with ecological crises such as changing weather conditions, rising temperatures, rising water levels, and the decimation of biodiversity; it is also facing a generalizing crisis of the Earth system. As a result, while scientists stress the importance and urgency of a fundamental shift to halt the destruction and safeguard the environment, discussions about how social sciences should be constructed in the context of this reality have begun. The ecological crisis, which started to intensify after the 1970s, turned into one of the problems that occupied global politics in the 1990s. As a result of several socio-ecological developments—such as the deepening of the ecological crisis in the 1990s, the end of the Cold War, the neoliberal world order and the globalization of capital, and the emergence of new social movements—the structure of the IR discipline has changed (Erçandırılı, 2014: 495).

In the last few years, humanity has witnessed the downfall of human civilization as a result of pandemics and climate change. Furthermore, the idea of ‘globalization’, a totalizing and capitalist-centric concept that homogenizes the entire planet into a territory to conquer, is no longer capable of providing a sufficient explanation for the events occurring on the planet (Mould, 2023: 1). As Elias and Moraru (2015: 11) assert, a ‘planetary turn’ is timely to indicate. Thus, a shift in the languages of IR discipline is highly needed to fundamentally criticize the current conceptions of globalization, which are growing more problematic and connected with colonial, hegemonic, and capitalist discourses, in order to move toward an emancipatory planetary ontology (Mould, 2023: 2). In this context, the term ‘planetary’, has already vigorously mobilized (Clark and Szerszynski, 2020: 13).

Scientific debates have already declared that humanity is living in a new geological era, where the biosphere is changing radically through its activities (Vaughan, 2016: 1). Some scientists have called it the ‘Anthropocene’ (Crutzen and Steffen, 2003: 251-257). The Anthropocene concept is used to illustrate how the Earth's potential for self-renewal has been drastically reduced and how it has entered a difficult-to-reverse process (Crutzen and Steffen, 2003: 251-257). In the social sciences literature, it emphasizes the necessity of many physical, cultural, and social changes. However, the concept has been widely criticized for being anthropocentric, since the social reality is not only limited to humans. The social reality consists of more than one type, subject, and object. Non-human lives, relationships, and ecological cycles have contributed to the production of civilization in certain times and places. Thus, the agency of non-humans also ought to be evaluated. This counter-argument comes particularly from post-humanists and planetary politics scholars.

Currently, the traditional IR and international politics -driven by a Cartesian assumption that distinctly separates humans and nature- have been criticized by proponents of planetary politics (Burke et al., 2016: 12). They refer to an ontological shift that combines both humanity and nature and evaluates them as an indistinguishable whole. A shift is needed since planetary politics entails decolonizing the anthropocentrism of capitalist culture in order to create a term for the entire world as if all life was, is, and always will be of equal importance (Manners, 2023: 4). Litfin (2003: 481), defines planetary politics as planetary relations of causality, which can only be comprehended and treated as a whole. In addition, she asserts that characterizing the Earth holistically as a self-regulating system is a key component of planetary politics (Litfin, 2009: 198). Moreover, as a new phenomenon, planetary politics requires considering a situation holistically in which every win is a win for everyone and every defeat is a loss for everyone (Manners, 2023). Thus, anthropocentric, eurocentric, and ethnocentric understandings of the Globe must be rejected since they are symptoms of the issue according to planetary politics (Manners, 2023, p. 8). At this point, Burke et al. (2016: 499) perceive the Anthropocene as responsible for the rapid reduction of biodiversity, and its implications on the biosphere. Now that the literature of the Anthropocene devotes a special focus to climate change because we have reached a record level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, a structural change is required.

The perspective of planetary politics over the Arctic region introduces that structural change, especially considering studies associated with green theory. It is known that green theory—which is not state-centric, emphasizes the correlation between society and nature, and tries to overcome the problems underlying environmental problems with its unique ontological structure—emerged as a solution-providing paradigm in the Arctic IR literature in the 1990s (Dyer, 2018). Green politics, which tries to find solutions to the threats to climate change and the biosphere in general through a

socio-ecological correlation, has emerged as an ethical counterargument to the human-centric systemic structure. It examines how social relations affect nature and focuses on the environmental problems caused by the neoliberal policies adopted in the 1970s. In this context, it can be deduced that the relationship between society and nature is being evaluated for the first time in international relations.

In parallel with the demand for a structural change by planetary politics, green theory scholars seek a fundamental, paradigmatic transformation. First of all, the security areas that are being examined by green theorists are not limited to the individual and society, in addition to these, the state, humanity, and even the planet Earth itself are also considered as subjects. Herein, it should be clearly stated that the aspect that makes the security understanding of the green theory differs from other theories since it deals with the concept of security in an ecocentric way, rather than in an anthropocentric way. The need for a global-scale political revolution is emphasized rather than renovating the existing institutions. According to Eckersley (1992), one of the notions of green theory, *ecocentrism*, is the refusal of the anthropocentric worldview that positions moral value solely on humans in favor of one that positions independent value on ecosystems and all living beings. On the other hand, the '*limits to growth*' argument concerning the nature of the environmental catastrophe, according to Dobson (1990), is a second essential component of green politics. Proponents of '*limits to growth*' try to indicate that the rising economic and population growth of human societies causes some intercorrelated crises (Meadows et al., 1972). In other words, green thinking argues that the existing environmental disaster is caused by the rising economic growth that has occurred over the last two centuries (Paterson, 2005). Thus, many scholars criticize the necessity of ecological modernization and rising economic growth within the Anthropocene.

At this point, an oxymoron between economic growth and sustainable development objections arises. The content of sustainable development itself has remained ambiguous. At first, it was a political strategy for global environmental and resource management, ecological modernization, and an attempt to reconcile environmental and developmental issues. Yet, it has failed because of the lack of necessary socio-economic actors to implement its strategy. Considering the cyclical relationship between climate change and fossil fuel consumption, there is a crucial point to be noted here in connection with the Arctic paradox. Increased fossil fuel consumption in the Arctic region means that the sustainable development goals also reinforce and intensify the existing ecological destruction. As an essential instance, Russia has significantly advanced its investments to enhance its infrastructure within the Arctic territory in recent years. In addition to opening up new oil and gas pipelines, Russia has been building new icebreakers, as well as enhancing railway infrastructure to connect Siberia to the Arctic. Besides, the Russian Ministry of Arctic Development has further announced new megaprojects (Jordan, 2021: 1; Trutnev, 2021: 2). Moreover, aside from China, Russia also works together with several countries such as Italy and Türkiye (i.e. Arctic LNG-2 Project). All of these international mega-development projects have aroused environmental concerns while Turkish ship builders are increasingly involved in the projects of the Northern Sea Route surprisingly (Bronder, 2021: 1). In addition to economic sanctions against Russia due to the Russia-Ukraine conflict, their ability to bid the lowest offers puts forward Turkish shipyards as salient alternatives for future large-scale projects.

Herein, we may accept that sustainable development generally presupposes growth is compatible as long as the environmental issues are being successfully addressed. Yet, evaluations come from the motto of planetary politics offer a more holistic perspective than current political analyses. The next session critically examines the dispute matters in the region based on the planetary politics background.

3. A Critical Examination of the Disputes in the Arctic Region

In the 20th century, due to the negative effects of global warming on sea ice, the Arctic has become more accessible. In addition to the discovery of the fossil fuel potential of the region, increasing numbers of maritime transportation, establishing strategic bases, mining, seafood diversity, and conducting scientific activities cause a struggle for political and legal sovereignty in the region (Dal, 2020: 287). Herein, owing to its special emphasis on the interconnectivity of society, ethics, justice, and nature, green theory may open alternative channels for dialogue via its unique ontological structure that tries to overcome the underlying environmental problems by assisting the solution process of the apparent ones. Since green theory redefines climate change in terms of economic

competition while asserting that as a result of indifference to cooperation, green theory scholars examine the role of the economic, political, and cultural variables in their environmental conflict analyses (Denis 2021; Dyer, 2017; Dryzek, 1997).

Byers (2013: xviii) has conducted one of the most comprehensive studies examining the disputes within the Arctic. He discusses the international legal situation in the Arctic under eight titles: terrestrial disputes, maritime disputes, Beaufort Sea dispute, disputes regarding the extension of the continental shelf, disputes regarding alternative routes, environmental protection, indigenous peoples, and security. And yet, the effects of global warming on the legal situation are excluded from the scope of his study. Therefore, the planetary politics perspective can present even a broader perspective for dispute settlement in the Arctic.

In order to enhance the governance process among the Arctic nations the Arctic Council was established as a “*high-level forum*” in 1996. Although the Council is not a formal organization established by an international treaty, it is significant in terms of being a principal intergovernmental venue for environmental protection. Since the Council consists of scientific institutions, a network of regulators, media, and non-governmental organizations alongside governments its effective working groups can conduct multi-dimensional projects. During the Swedish Chairmanship of the Arctic Council (2011-2013), in line with the necessity of establishing a common ground for the unification of resilience efforts, the resilience concept has been emphasized as a priority and the Arctic Resilience Action Framework (ARAF) was developed in May 2017. Furthermore, *The Arctic Scientific Cooperation Agreement* can be perceived as a milestone reaffirming the essential role of science which provides a framework for propelling the efforts of scholars studying cutting-edge issues. In order to ensure continuous collaboration among scientific and diplomatic communities under the umbrella of the Agreement, official meetings have been conducted to evaluate and discuss common Arctic issues. The main aim of the Agreement can be summarized as ensuring a holistic; international, inclusive, and interdisciplinary science cooperation process. Composed of international institutions and northern residents working in research as well as operational and local observing, Sustaining Arctic Observing Networks (SAON) can be given as a prominent example of how the green theory perspective reconstructs existing institutions. As a legacy of the International Polar Year (IPY), SAON was founded in 2007 upon the request from the Arctic Council Ministers to cooperate and coordinate an Arctic Observing Network that addresses identified societal needs mentioned in the Salekhard Declaration (SAON-IG, 2007: 1).

Being adopted in 1982 as an incorporative body of treaties, customs, and international agreements to maintain order, the UNCLOS provides the legal basis for negotiating sovereignty-related issues in the Arctic Ocean. It is stated that no state can claim sovereignty in the High Seas and that the High Seas will be open to every state, whether it has a coast or not. What freedoms the High Seas will bring for each state are listed in six articles. On the other hand, the Convention provides the possibility for littoral states to expand their continental shelf as long as they advocate their claims with solid scientific proof (Caymaz and Büyüksağnak, 2021: 80). In addition, the Convention is also criticized since its implementation relies on national legislation of the Parties and they need to set certain provisions as their priorities within national legislation. Albeit its support for national autonomy, some states such as Canada and Russia have preferred different priorities as well. Furthermore, seabed mining regimes and profit sharing are also heavily criticized. Besides, the Convention does not offer an effective framework for border disputes since not all states have become parties to the Convention.

Rothwell (2008: 272) further criticizes Article 76 of the UNCLOS as one of the major drawbacks. While the definitions and terms used in Article 76 are referred to as unclear or ambiguous, the status of ice in international law and the assertion of maritime jurisdiction over ice-covered waters have been ignored in the Convention. As a result, the major dispute matter revolves around expanding the continental shelf. While unilateral or bilateral agreements of states are sufficient to determine the section up to 200 miles related to the continental shelves of the states, this is not sufficient for 200 miles beyond; they have to apply to the Commission established under UNCLOS. If the area claimed by a state before the Commission is accepted as its natural extension, then the borders agreed by the Commission and the state become binding on the state (Matz-Lück, 2009: 236). Due to bilateral disputes between Russia-Norway, US-Canada, Denmark-Canada, and Russia-Denmark, it is possible

to see that every political player is clustered around the UN Convention on Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) over time. Denmark, which started to expand its sovereignty over Greenland in 1916, applied to the United Nations on 14 December 2014 to expand the continental shelf, like other littoral states and claimed an area of 895,000 square kilometers (Honneland, 2017: 61). In 2007, the Danish government took its place in the struggle for sovereignty in the Arctic to prove that the Lomonosov Mountain Ridge is an extension of Denmark. Canada has also applied to expand its continental shelf while Russia planted a flag on the bottom of the sea (McDorman and Schofield, 2015: 207).

Another major dispute matter is based on maritime routes in the Arctic. While Russia has sovereignty over the Northern Sea Route (NSR), the legal status of the Northwest Passage (NWP) is controversial. Canada claims that the NWP belongs to its internal waters while the US objects to that claim and alleges that the passage is within international waters. Therefore, natural resources in the disputed areas cause disagreements (Migeed, 2022: 35).

The other major dispute matter arises from the freedom of navigation. Russia has not allowed the US to enter its exclusive economic zone in the Arctic Ocean for research since 1998. After ratifying UNCLOS on 12 March 1997, Russia took advantage of the sovereign rights it offered to the littoral states according to the 1st and 2nd paragraphs of Article 246 of the Convention. Although the 3rd paragraph constitutes an obstacle for unjustified refusals, Russia is hesitant to allow other states to conduct even scientific activities. Russia also does not present a justified reason for this situation while Article 77 of UNCLOS creates a relevant contradiction. Paragraph 2 of Article 77 accepts all permits and approvals regarding the continental shelf within the sovereignty of the littoral state. It does not seem appropriate in terms of international law for the US to engage in the specified activities unless it has the approval of Russia. In the dispute regarding the determination of the Bering Sea borderline, negotiations were held in 1976 to determine the line, but due to the differences in the method used, a disputed area of 15,000 nautical miles emerged. In 1990, it was possible to sign an agreement between the two states. Although this agreement was not approved by the Duma, there was no de facto development contrary to this agreement (Gül, 2014: 3).

And yet, as an exemplary actor for dispute settlement, Norway presents high dedication to the settlement of disputes through bilateral agreements. For example, in addition to the bilateral agreements with Russia on the legal maritime border in 1957, 2007, 2010, and 2011, Norway signed agreements with Denmark on the continental shelf and fisheries border in 1995 and 2006, and with Iceland on fishing and continental shelf in 1980 and 1981 (McDorman and Schofield, 2015: 207). Upon the agreement signed with Russia on the delimitation of maritime areas in 2010, Norway has undertaken an important mission in the transition to the cooperation process, especially in the Barents Sea, where there are significant hydrocarbon energy reserves (Honneland, 2017: 61).

Although the COVID-19 pandemic halted scientific projects pertaining to the Arctic, even Russia maintained its scientific collaboration with its international partners, especially through the Arctic Council. As a successful working group within the Council, the Sustainable Development Working Group (SDWG) proceeds with its scientific research on sustainable development with an essential focus on environmental, social, as well as economic issues including the human dimension. Being one of the most active members of the SDWG, Russia submitted seven projects in 2020 despite the challenges related to the pandemic. Constructed as joint international scientific projects in diverse fields, these projects can be enlisted as ‘Digitalization of the Linguistic and Cultural Heritage of the Indigenous Peoples; The Arctic: Territory, Environment and Culture’, ‘the Arctic Demography Index (AIM)’, ‘Sustainable Financing in the Arctic’, ‘Arctic Hydrogen Energy Applications and Demonstrations (AHEAD)’, ‘Biosecurity in the Arctic’, and ‘Gas Hydrates and Their Role in the Sustainable Development and Climatic Transformation of the Arctic’ (Lavelle, 2021: 4).

In addition to existing dispute matters, newly emerging economic activities in the region are perceived both as an economic opportunity and a potential threat to security that would accelerate regional militarization between NATO and Russia in return. In the past, owing to the unusual degree of scientific cooperation and collaboration among the Arctic actors, the region was highlighted as a unique isolated area marked by geopolitical stability (Saxena, 2020). However, often referred to “Arctic exceptionalism”, that stability condition has been disrupted due to Russia’s revival of militarization strategy along the NSR and NATO’s enlargement in return. In addition to a high number of economic sanctions, Russia’s Arctic Council Chairmanship was protested by the other Arctic states

(Rehman, 2022: 1) which significantly impeded mega infrastructure projects and sustainable development in the Arctic. The Arctic science diplomacy process has also been disrupted since the other Arctic states have paused their participation in the projects conducted by the Arctic Council. As a result, the region is no longer isolated from the global geopolitical shifts which further means that its position as a global common is also threatened.

On the other hand, Arctic science diplomacy managed to offer an alternative channel for communication between Russia and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in the past. The first formal dialogue initiated between Russia and NATO was on 'Environmental Security in the Arctic Ocean' in 2010 (Berkman and Vylegzhanin, 2012: 1). Thereafter, hosted by Cambridge University, the Russia-NATO dialogue expands to seventeen nations involving eight Arctic states as well as representatives of indigenous communities and an interdisciplinary mixture of scientists. In order to establish the balance between mutual interests and nations regarding the Arctic High Seas, representatives from Russia, the US, Norway, Canada, Finland, Iceland, Greenland, the UK, Germany, France, and China contributed to the ambassadorial panels in 2015 and 2016 (Reykjavik University, 2016: 1).

Conclusion

In this study, the dispute matters are examined from the perspective of planetary politics, which presents a unique framework by synthesizing the traditions of both problem-solving and critical theories. It is obvious that only a state-oriented international politics or distinctive Cartesian philosophical assumption will be insufficient against global threats such as climate change. However, the validity of the assessments on planetary politics seems to depend more on whether analysts and political decision-makers can transcend the prevailing paradigm of the traditional anthropocentric perspective in the face of global threats. Accordingly, based upon multidisciplinary dimensions for the resolution of disputes among security actors, this study is conducted to address the need for a more in-depth understanding of the Arctic region as a global common.

Developing the Polar Code in 2014 and still working to enhance the legal framework of it indicates that the legal involvement of the UN in the Arctic will further continue. Grounded on environmental concerns, the Polar Code introduces applicable solutions for ship owners while navigating through ice-covered waters, unpredictable harsh weather conditions, and dark periods in the Arctic. In order to minimize the ecological footprint, it also prescribes limits on oil, sewage, and chemical discharge, as well as suitable ship designs for preventing accidents. Therefore, from a planetary politics point of view, the UNCLOS comes forward as the prominent legal structure that provides efficient solutions for the most of dispute matters.

While the contradictory articles of the UNCLOS lead to disputes between states, aside from the littoral states, it is highly significant that the international community to develop policies which assist Arctic science diplomacy and prioritize measures that will increase the socio-economic conditions and human development levels of indigenous peoples and communities living in the region, rather than being a commercial and economic center of profit offered by the rich energy resources and new maritime transportation/trade routes that have emerged due to global warming. Since climate change poses a global risk to the environment and enemy states have managed to continue scientific communication in all other conflicts within the 21st century, even in the Cold War period, international scientific communities may become the essential key to improving at least scientific communication in the Arctic. They have made several calls to resume collaborations with Russian scholars. Norway's Chairmanship of the Arctic Council promises a high potential to establish a common ground in the Arctic considering the previous experiences of Norway as a dispute settler.

It is also recommended that the use of diplomatic mediators such as Türkiye and India may become an alternative channel for establishing dialogue and resolving disputes. It is envisioned that the Russia-Ukraine conflict will not be resolved in the near future. Therefore, by adopting a planetary politics perspective, diplomatic mediators may help to assist Arctic states in transforming that hot conflict into a frozen one.

References

- Baslar, K. (1998). *The Concept of the Common Heritage of Mankind in International Law*, The Hague-Boston-London, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Berkman, P. A. and Vylegzhanin, A. N. (2012). *Environmental Security in the Arctic Ocean*. Springer.
- Bronder, P. L. (2021). Turkish Yard Wins Bid to Build Nuclear Icebreaker Dock, June 13. <https://thebarentsobserver.com/en/industry-and-energy/2021/06/turkish-yard-wins-bid-build-nuclear-icebreaker-dock> (Accessed on 20.08.2023).
- Byers. M. (2013). *International Law and the Arctic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dal, A. (2020). Kuzeydeki Asırlık Çatışma: Arktik Bölgesi'ndeki Çıkarlar Algılaması ve Egemenlik Tartışmaları Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 30(2).
- Caymaz, E., Büyüksağnak, Y. B. (2021). An Analysis from the English School Perspective on conflict issues in the Arctic Region of the Russian Federation and the United States, *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 18 (1).
- Dauvergne, P. (2012). *Handbook of Global Environmental Politics*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Dryzek, J. S. (1997). *The Politics of the Earth: Environmental Discourses*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dyer, Hugh C. (2017) *Green Theory In McGlinchey, S., Walters, R. and Scheinpflug, C., (eds) International Relations Theory*. pp. 84-90. England: E-International Relations Publishing.
- Dyer, Hugh C. (2018). *Introducing Green Theory in International Relations*. <https://www.e-ir.info/2018/01/07/green-theory-in-international-relations/> (Accessed on 22.08.2023).
- Erçandırılı, Y. (2014). "Yeşil Teori" in *Uluslararası İlişkiler Teorileri*, Ramazan Gözen (ed.): 493-514. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Gül, T. (2014). "Arktikte'ki Rusya: Sorun ve İşbirliği Arasındaki Gel-Git", *Bilgesam Analiz*, No.1167.
- Hardin, G. (1968). "The Tragedy of the Commons". *Science*. 162 (3859): 1243–1248.
- Honneland, G. (2017). *Arctic Euphoria and International High North Politics*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jordan, J. (2021). *Russia's Coercive Diplomacy in the Arctic*, The Arctic Institute, <https://www.thearcticinstitute.org/russia-coercive-diplomacy-arctic/> (Accessed on 21.08.2023).
- Kanie, N. (2007). "Governance with Multilateral Environmental Agreements: A healthy or ill-equipped fragmentation?" *Global Environmental Governance: Perspectives on the Current Debate*, Walter Hoffmann and Lydia Swart (eds.), 67-86. New York: Center for UN Reform Education.
- Lavelle, K. C. (2021). Regime, climate, and region in transition: Russian participation in the Arctic Council. *Problems of Post-Communism*. Vol. 69, Issue 4-5.
- Matz-Lück, N. (2009). *Planting the Flag in Arctic Waters: Russia's Claim to the North Pole*, *Göttingen Journal of Public International Law*, 2009, <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1416682>. Accessed on 22.08.2023.
- McDorman, T. L. and C. Schofield. (2015). *Maritime Limits and Boundaries in the Arctic Ocean: Agreements and Disputes*. L. C. Jensen ve G. Honneland (Editörler). *Handbook of the Politics of the Arctic*. Edward Elgar Publishing. (207-226)
- Migeed, R. R. (2022). *Ending the Game of Environmental Politics in the Arctic: How the Arctic States Can Achieve Dispute Resolution Using Existing Legal Frameworks*. *Ocean & Coastal L. J.*, 35.
- Ostrom, Elinor (1990). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Rehman, M. (2022). *Changing contours of Arctic politics and the prospects for cooperation between Russia and China*. The Arctic Institute. URL: <https://www.thearcticinstitute.org/changing-contours-arctic-politics-prospects-cooperation-russia-china/> (Accessed on 20.08.2023).

- Reykjavik University (2016). Arctic high seas, ambassadorial panel on building common interests in the Arctic Ocean. URL: <https://en.ru.is/news/building-common-interests-in-the-arctic-ocean-1> (Accessed on 22.08.2023).
- Rothwell, R. D. (2018). Arctic Ocean Shipping: Navigation, Security and Sovereignty in the North American Arctic. Leiden: Brill.
- SAON_IG (Sustained Arctic Observing Networks Initiating Group) (2007). The SAON process Annex 4. URL: https://www.arcticobserving.org/images/pdf/Workshops/2nd_edmonton/saon_ig.pdf (Accessed on 20.08.2023).
- Stern, P. C. (2011). "Design principles for global commons: natural resources and emerging technologies". International Journal of the Commons. 5 (2): 213.
- The UN (2015). The 2030 Agenda for sustainable development. URL: <https://sdgs.un.org/goals>
- Trutnev, Y. (2021). Yuri Trutnev Held a Meeting of the State Commission for the Development of the Arctic, <https://minvr.gov.ru/press-center/news/yuriy-trutnev-provyel-zasedanie-gosudarstvennoy-komissii-po-voprosam-razvitiya-arktiki-32076/> (Accessed on 20.08.2023).
- Vaughan, A. (2016). Human impact has pushed Earth into the Anthropocene, scientists say. The Guardian. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2016/jan/07/human-impact-has-pushed-earth-into-the-anthropocene-scientists-say>. Accessed on 22.08.2023.