

*D.Kalibekuly<sup>1</sup>, Y.S. Chukubayev<sup>1</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> *Al-Farabi Kazakh National University*

## REGIONAL SECURITY DYNAMICS IN NORTHERN EUROPE (ON THE EXAMPLE OF NORWAY) IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT CHANGES

### *Abstract*

The paper examines the dynamics of regional security in Norway as a part of Northern Europe. Being a political and geographical part of the Euro-Atlantic security system. Northern Europe, in its turn, is experiencing the impact of the confrontation between Russia and NATO. Norway's security policy analyzed from the perspective of a regional leader, as a NATO member country participating in the operations of the North Atlantic Alliance and as NATO's northern wing. Accordingly, the escalation of the conflict between Russia and the West pushes Norway to maintain internal political security, which concerns the issues of protecting territorial sovereignty and exclusive economic zones, and responsibilities within NATO. Russia's action in the east of Ukraine and in Crimea has led to a significant increase in the strategic security of Northern Europe and the Far North. The main strategic characteristics of the Alliance in the Arctic were analyzed.

**Key words:** Northern Europe, Norway, regional security, defense policy, North Atlantic Alliance, Arctic, Ukrainian crisis, strategic policy, international relations.

*Д. Қалибекұлы<sup>1</sup>, Ю. С. Чукубаев<sup>1</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> *Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті*

## СОҢҒЫ ӨЗГЕРІСТЕРГЕ БАЙЛАНЫСТЫ СОЛТҮСТІК ЕУРОПАДАҒЫ АЙМАҚТЫҚ ҚАУІПСІЗДІК ДИНАМИКАСЫ (НОРВЕГИЯ МЫСАЛЫНДА)

### *Аңдатпа*

Жұмыста Солтүстік Еуропаның бір бөлігі болып табылатын Норвегияның аймақтық қауіпсіздік динамикасы қарастырылған. Солтүстік Еуропа өз кезегінде, еуроатлантикалық қауіпсіздік жүйесінің саяси-географиялық бөлігі болғандықтан, Ресей мен НАТО арасындағы қарама-қайшылықтың әсерін бастан кешіріп отыр. Сондықтан, Норвегияның қауіпсіздік саясаты Солтүстік Атлантикалық Альянстың операцияларына қатысатын НАТО-ға мүше ел және НАТО-ның солтүстік қанаты ретінде аймақтық көшбасшы тұрғысынан талданды. Тиісінше, Ресей мен Батыс арасындағы жанжалдың шиеленісуі, Норвегияны аумақтық егемендік пен эксклюзивті экономикалық аймақтарды қорғауға және НАТО шеңберіндегі жауапкершілікке қатысты ішкі саяси қауіпсіздікті қамтамасыз етуге итермелейді. Ресейдің Шығыс Украинамен Қырымдағы әрекеті Солтүстік Еуропа мен Қиыр Солтүстіктің стратегиялық қауіпсіздікті бекітуге әкелді. Арктикадағы Солтүстік атлантикалық альянстың негізгі стратегиялық сипаттамалары талданды.

**Кілт сөздер:** Солтүстік Еуропа, Норвегия, аймақтық қауіпсіздік, қорғаныс саясаты, Солтүстік Атлантикалық Альянс, Арктика, Украина дағдарысы, стратегиялық саясат, халықаралық қатынастар.

*Д. Калибекулы<sup>1</sup>, Ю. С. Чукубаев<sup>1</sup>*

*<sup>1</sup> Казахский национальный университет им. Аль-Фараби*

## **ДИНАМИКА РЕГИОНАЛЬНОЙ БЕЗОПАСНОСТИ В СЕВЕРНОЙ ЕВРОПЕ (НА ПРИМЕРЕ НОРВЕГИИ) В СВЕТЕ ПОСЛЕДНИХ ИЗМЕНЕНИЙ**

### *Аннотация*

В работе рассматривается динамика региональной безопасности Норвегии, как часть Северной Европы. Северная Европа в свою очередь испытывает воздействие противостояния России и НАТО, оказавшись политико-географической частью евроатлантической системы безопасности. Политика безопасности Норвегии проанализирована в аспекте регионального лидера, как страна-член НАТО, участвующая в операциях Североатлантического альянса и как северный фланг НАТО. Соответственно, обострение конфликта между Россией и Западом подталкивает Норвегию вести внутривнутриполитическую безопасность, которая, касается вопросов защиты территориального суверенитета и исключительных экономических зон, и обязанности в рамках НАТО. Действие России на Востоке Украины и в Крыму привело к значительному усилению стратегической безопасности Северной Европы и Крайнего Севера. Проанализированы основные стратегические характеристики Североатлантического союза в Арктике.

**Ключевые слова:** Северная Европа, Норвегия, региональная безопасность, оборонная политика, Североатлантический альянс, Арктика, Украинский кризис, стратегическая политика, международные отношения.

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

Since the Ukrainian crisis, which split the Euro-Atlantic security system, relations between Russia and NATO have undergone a significant transformation in the spirit of the Cold War. The constructive dialogue on maintaining the collective security system of the 2000s was replaced by the thinking and logic of containment in the confrontation between the two regional subjects of international relations. Northern Europe, as a natural political and geographic part of the Euro-Atlantic security system, is also affected by the confrontation between Russia and NATO, which, of course, affects the dynamics of regional security.

The structure of the Euro-Atlantic security system is experiencing several difficulties in connection with the disagreement between the parties to adopt a common and compromise vision of European security. The spirit of strategic partnership and agreement that was achieved in the previous stages of cooperation between Russia and NATO / the West was undermined by various strategic aspirations of the participants of European security, where NATO sought to maintain the status quo, and Russia to geopolitical revisionism. Geopolitical turbulence could not but affect the dynamics of regional security, in particular Norway. The European regional security system began to be more military in nature, with a threat or demonstration of military force, which marked a strategic shift in the European security system, and the end of the principles of the "Founding Act of Russia and NATO": not the deployment of large conventional forces and nuclear weapons in the Eastern Europe. NATO forces are conducting a number of major conventional exercises, and the United States is modernizing its nuclear forces in Europe. Russia is taking similar actions. The withdrawal of the parties from the INF Treaty and the increased air and water patrolling spaces in Europe have become dangerous points of contact between Russia and NATO.

The region of Northern Europe and the Arctic has also become an object of military interaction between the opposing sides: NATO has stepped up military exercises in the Arctic. Because the Arctic region is seen as an important component in the military doctrines of Russia and NATO, and consequently, combat submarines are again sailing in the Arctic waters. These events reflect the regional dynamism in the context of the current strategic situation. The fact that the region of

Northern Europe and the Arctic plays a key role in determining the strategic dynamics in relations between Russia and NATO, also in the context of the politics of the countries of the region.

### **Key regional security aspects of Norway**

Norway has been a member of NATO since the founding of the North Atlantic Alliance. Norway's strategic position makes it - the Alliance member an important partner for the United States in maintaining an overall security strategy. Norway's security policy is based on multilateral relations format within the Alliance, and Norway is the only country in the region that does not adhere to a policy of neutrality, unlike Sweden and Finland. The security policy of Norway can be divided into two important aspects: first, it is intra-regional, where Norway actively promotes the idea of military integration of the Nordic countries within the framework of a regional organization (NORDEFECO) [1]. The second is Oslo's membership in NATO, and, accordingly, the implementation by Norway of special regional NATO missions, as the northernmost stronghold of the North Atlantic Alliance. [2].

In general, the Norwegian security cluster can be divided according to the following three main aspects:

- Norway as a regional leader or central element of the regional security structure (NORDEFECO);
- Norway as a NATO member country participating in the operations of the North Atlantic Alliance. (Norway was taking an active part in NATO operations in the Balkans and Afghanistan);
- Norway as NATO's northern wing.

The history of country and its experience are very significant for the North Atlantic Alliance, and plays an important role in shaping NATO's Arctic strategy. The Arctic is recognized as one of the most important regions for ensuring the strategic security of the Alliance member states, therefore the role of Norway here is indisputably important. [3].

Russia, as a regional participant in the Arctic, appears to be a key participant for Norway, and in its foreign policy strategy the Norwegian government recognizes the importance of cooperation with Russia at the regional level in the format of multifaceted cooperation: security, energy, ecology, socio-cultural development, etc. [4]. But, nevertheless, taking into account Norway's membership in NATO, Norwegian-Russian relations are closely dependent on the conjuncture of Russian-American relations. Russia has traditionally been and remains a key factor for Norway, which is taken into account when developing a national security strategy. This position is due to the fact that the Northern military fleet is based on the Kola Peninsula and most of the Russian arsenals of strategic nuclear weapons are concentrated there. Now, after the crisis around Ukraine and the degradation of the Euro-Atlantic security system, a spirit of rivalry prevails in Norwegian-Russian relations, where the military confrontation between the North Atlantic Alliance and Russia plays an important role. As it was noted above, Norway's membership in NATO and the country's geographic location will certainly have an impact on the regional security system. Norway is now again playing the role of NATO's northern flank, in the confrontation with Russia [5].

The definition of Norway's security policy is based on two pillars: an internal political definition of security, which primarily concerns the protection of territorial sovereignty and exclusive economic zones, and responsibilities within NATO. Norway's geographical position gives it a special meaning in the defense of NATO's northern flank; therefore it is one of the countries of the alliance that has its own specific tasks.

The strategic outline of Norway's military doctrine was first defined in the Norwegian government's foreign policy declaration of 4 February 2007. This document noted the following: "The protection of Norwegian interests in the North in the field of economy, environment and security should be considered a priority, and the interests themselves should be interconnected", "The government will seek international recognition of the Norwegian position on Spitsbergen, fish protection zones, oil and gas production and environmental protection. ". The Norwegian

government was tasked with “strengthening the Norwegian military presence and sovereignty in the North, including the continued preparedness of the Norwegian armed forces for environmental emergencies, as well as strengthening the capacity of the Coast Guard for monitoring natural resources and preparedness for emergencies” [6].

Another document that regulates the military policy of Norway in the Arctic is the Strategic Concept of the Armed Forces of Norway. This document reflects the threats that the Norwegian Armed Forces will have to face in the High North. The document reflects the following strategic objectives:

- Challenges to sovereignty in the exclusive economic zone (200-mile coastal zone).
- Potential attacks on marine biological resources, such as attacks on oil and gas platforms on the shelf.
- Technogenic disasters;
- Norway's commitment to alliance obligations in NATO [7].

The strategic guidelines of Norway above coincide with the general Arctic policy of NATO in this region of the planet. However, Norway has not yet independently formulated its national strategy towards Russia, but in fact, as noted above, Norwegian security policy is largely determined in the wake of NATO's overall defense strategy. The Ukrainian crisis could not but affect the dynamics of bilateral relations between Russia and Norway, where this resulted in the curtailment of military cooperation programs with Moscow, the return of Russia to the list of external threats to national security, an increase in the military budget of 2016 by 9.4%, plans to allocate additional NOK 30 billion over the next four years [9].

But, nevertheless, it is necessary to note the foreign policy component in the strategic policy of Norway in the High North: despite the statements of the Norwegian government on the protection of national sovereignty, the regional security strategy of Norway is largely determined by allied relations within NATO, and therefore the dynamics of Norwegian-Russian relations, so closely dependent on the Russian-American strategic dialogue. In the spring of 2014, Norway was one of the first NATO countries to announce a "freeze" of military cooperation programs with Russia for a period of at least a year. According to the Norwegian Minister of Defense, cooperation will be maintained only in areas such as search and rescue operations, maritime transport security, cooperation between the coast guard and border services. Norwegian experts have a negative but rather restrained assessment of the consequences of the Ukrainian crisis for the security of NATO's northern flank. The greatest concern is caused by the possibility of repeating the Crimean experience in the Baltic region in connection with the increased activity of the Baltic Fleet and incidents with the violation of the borders of Estonia, Finland and Sweden by Russian military aircraft. The situation in the Barents Sea is assessed as more stable, and the actions of the Russian aviation and navy are more predictable and not provoking [9].

During the Warsaw Summit, it was decided to triple the strength of the NATO response forces (up to 40 thousand people), create their strike force - especially high readiness forces, which are organized into small headquarters in the six eastern countries of the Alliance, capable of managing exercises and receiving reinforcements if necessary. Two more such headquarters are next in line [10].

The main decision taken in Warsaw was the previously announced further expansion of NATO's military presence on the Eastern flank - the deployment of four multinational reinforced battalions in each of the Baltic states and in Poland on a rotational basis and the establishment of military depots there in case of crisis reinforcements. The response to NATO's actions could be increased military activity by Russia, the conduct of large-scale exercises by the Russian military and sudden checks of troops in the western regions of the country. But, even without the deployment of four NATO battalions in the Baltic States and Poland, such activity would have been. This is the logic of the situation that we have after the Crimea and the Ukrainian events. With the help of the latest S-400 missile systems, Russia has created several “no-go zones”, which partially cover the territories and waters of NATO countries. Multilevel air defense systems created over Crimea, Kaliningrad region, Kamchatka and Syria [11].

The air defense system created in the Kaliningrad region covers a significant part of the Baltic countries, Poland, as well as the Baltic Sea. A similar zone in the North worries Norway because it could affect the relationship between European NATO countries and the United States.

### **Norway's defense policy in the Arctic**

The restoration of Russia's long-term military presence in the Arctic began in earnest already in the 2010s, having acquired an organizational form in 2014 with the formation of a separate area of the Joint Strategic Command "North", the core of which was the Northern Fleet of the Russian Navy. During the same period, active construction of new and renovation of some old military bases began. Work began in almost the entire Russian sector of the Arctic: on the islands of the archipelagos of Franz Josef Land, Novaya Zemlya, Severnaya Zemlya, Novosibirsk Islands, Wrangel Island, as well as on the mainland - from the Kola Peninsula to Chukotka [12].

At the same time, due to the deterioration of relations between Russia and NATO, largely (but still only partly) due to the events in Ukraine in 2014, the Western powers are also increasing their activity in the region. In 2015, the Arctic Challenge hosted the first major NATO air force exercise, the Arctic Challenge, with the participation of neutral partner states: Finland, Sweden and Switzerland. In the fall of 2018, Trident Juncture - 2018, the largest exercise since the collapse of the USSR, was held in Norway and surrounding waters. The purpose of the maneuvers was to test the combat capability of NATO's rapid reaction forces and the ability of participating countries to competently dispose of the support received from the allies. If the American leadership decides to radically update the icebreaker fleet (including the construction of nuclear icebreakers), this will dramatically simplify the process of creating and supporting bases on the same islands of the Canadian Arctic Archipelago, but even now, using mainly air supplies, the Alliance is able to deploy to In the Arctic, significant air force forces, many times larger than those that are currently available, have increased the level of permanent presence in the Arctic from tens to hundreds of combat and auxiliary aircraft. In terms of the naval forces, preparations for a possible build-up are already underway, and the basis for such a build-up may be, the 2nd Fleet of the US Navy, recreated in 2018, the operational area of which is the North Atlantic, including the Arctic. [3].

The strategic importance of Northern Europe and the High North has grown significantly since the Ukrainian crisis. The document of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly and its Political Committee "NATO and Security in the Arctic" dated 07.10.2017 indicates the following strategic characteristics of the region:

– The Arctic remains a vital area for Euro-Atlantic security. Five Arctic Council members from eight countries are also NATO members - Canada, Denmark, Iceland, Norway, and the United States. Alliance member countries have conflicting interests over Russia's geopolitical aspirations in the Arctic and the growing military presence in the region, but nevertheless have reached a general consensus on the importance of the region for NATO security. Moreover, while NATO does not formally play a significant role in relation to the Arctic region, at the Warsaw Summit in July 2016, the Alliance reaffirmed its readiness to improve security on all its borders, including in the North Atlantic. The Warsaw Summit Final Communiqué referred to NATO's commitment to strengthen its maritime position in the North Atlantic, as well as to raise the Alliance's "comprehensive situational awareness" in the region to deter and defend against any potential threats, including from sea, routes of communication and maritime approaches to NATO territory. This is also important for the Far North. Likewise, all Arctic states have issued national Arctic strategic documents reflecting increased interest in the region. Significant national investment is being made in ground surveillance, early warning, and ballistic missile defense - the geography of the region plays a key role in countering any emerging missile threat [13].

– The 2016 Warsaw Summit communiqué admits the evolving security challenges in the North Atlantic, especially in relation to NATO-Russia relations. The Alliance condemned "Russia's aggressive actions, including provocative military actions on the periphery of NATO territory", and

stressed the need for containment and the need to strengthen NATO's defenses. In Warsaw, NATO allies also agreed to raise the Alliance's awareness of the situation in the North Atlantic in response to Russia's military stance. It is important to note that the North Atlantic borders the Arctic; therefore, any change in the safety of the first is likely to affect the High North as well. Thus, it would be wise for NATO allies to raise awareness of the situation in the Arctic. This can and should be done without provocation, that is, without deploying military forces in the Far North.

– The report also indicates Russia's strategic behavior, which will certainly affect the security of the Arctic NATO states: Russia's violations of the territorial integrity of Ukraine, Georgia and the Republic of Moldova raise concerns about territorial conflicts between Russia and the rest of the Arctic states. In each of these cases, Russia supported separatist movements or incited conflict to challenge the borders of sovereign territory. This kind of Russian aggression increases regional instability and is fraught with the expansion of the conflict. Moscow, as the largest Arctic coastal state, recognizes the geostrategic importance of the Arctic and the vital energy resources of the Arctic, and is building up its military to defend what it considers Russia's territorial interests in the region. Russia's disregard for the territorial integrity of its peaceful neighbors cannot be ignored in the Far North.

– The main security challenge for the Alliance in the Arctic has been the build-up of Russian military and civilian emergency forces since 2008 as part of a broader military modernization program. Initially, this modernization was considered neutral by other Arctic states. First, because Russia has the longest coastline of any Arctic coastal state and it needs to invest in infrastructure to sustain and develop its energy research. In addition, due to the remoteness of the High North and its harsh climate, emergency assistance and search or rescue operations are often provided by military units. However, a certain build-up of Russian military power is clearly not related to the safety of shipping and commercial activities. For example, the deployment of long-range air and coastal defense assets along the coast, even to the east of Novaya Zemlya, cannot be attributed to the safety of navigation and reconnaissance. A possible explanation for Russia's efforts to strengthen its defenses in the region is that most of the Russian navy, the Northern Fleet, is based in the Arctic. Moscow is particularly worried about the sea-based nuclear deterrent deployed in the Arctic.

The main task of Norway's military duties in the peace period is to monitor the sea and airspace of NATO's northern flank, which includes part of the Arctic (primarily the Barents Sea) and the North Atlantic. But in the course of recent events, in the friction between Russia and NATO, the military tasks of Norway have increased significantly, the Norwegian military aircraft are intercepting Russian combat aircraft, and the Royal Air Force and Navy are monitoring Russian forces in the region. As noted above, NATO is central to the Norwegian security strategy, and at the diplomatic level, Oslo is actively using this organization to achieve its goals in the Arctic. At the foreign policy and bureaucratic level, it was Norway, along with the United States and Denmark, that was one of the main initiators of NATO's involvement in Arctic affairs. Oslo's official position is that the involvement of NATO is necessary because the countries of the region (both NATO member states and the Arctic Council) are not able to defend their economic and military-strategic interests in the Arctic on their own and, accordingly, these countries are not capable to create an appropriate military potential for the above purposes. In January 2009, this alliance even tried to put forward some semblance of its Arctic strategy. Later, however, under the influence of Canada, NATO refused to formulate a full-fledged strategy in the High North [14]. Noteworthy is the fact that the list of joint activities proposed by NATO in the Arctic almost completely coincides with the plans of Norway and other Nordic countries both at the national level and within the framework of NORDEFCO: monitoring the air and sea space, creating unified rescue units, conducting joint maneuvers, educational exchanges, protection of energy flows, environmental monitoring.

Speaking in Washington in June 2014, Norwegian Defense Minister I. E. Sereide said: “There is reason to think that changes in the European security landscape will last. NATO finds itself in a new situation in which we must reassess our understanding of Russia and its intentions. We must

breathe new life into NATO. We need a strong, effective, and credible alliance ... " [15]“The initiative to improve interoperability of forces is a good start. Exercises should be based on realistic scenarios. In maneuvers, we must learn to use the full range of our combat capabilities. Future exercises should provide mutual support and demonstration of deterrent potential, focus should be on interaction, ” said Norwegian Defense Minister at the meeting of the US Atlantic Council [16].

As temperature rises and the region experiences significant climatic changes, new economic, scientific, maritime and political opportunities are gradually militarizing the region and its potential as a new theater for strategic rivalry between the United States and Russia. The once closed areas, bound by eternal ice, now, due to the melting of glaciers, are becoming open for navigation and transport and economic exploitation due to the reduction of the ice shelf, the opening of commercial routes through the Arctic Ocean, which can shorten the travel time between Asia and Europe.

Russia has devoted significant resources to energy production and the militarization of the Arctic through the reactivation of military installations during the Cold War, the modernization of submarines and missiles, and the reorganization of its regional assets under a single command in the Northern Joint Strategic Command. Russia in general poses a significant threat to NATO. Still, given its limited resources, it would be a bad idea for the US to overreact and focus more on the Arctic, where its interests are limited and the interaction between the US and Russia is largely based on cooperation. Compared to Russia, which relies on Arctic resource extraction for 15-20 percent of its annual economy and expects the region to provide \$ 500 billion in annual GDP by 2030, or 30 percent of its current GDP, is the United States. strategic interests in the Arctic are minimal (less than one third of one percent of US GDP is in the Arctic). While Russia has a significant nuclear footprint on the Kola Peninsula and attaches great importance to maintaining its maritime nuclear deterrence in the Arctic, the United States does not deploy its nuclear weapons in the region or patrol them with any nuclear weapons, armed submarines [17].

Russia's recent efforts to develop the Arctic have moved into near dangerous areas of maritime rivalry. Western adversaries usefull sovereignty over ocean territory of the Russian navy ideal for the development and tactics of safe interventions and potentially untraceable capabilities. While many Soviet-era submarines and icebreakers ought to be decommissioned by the end of 2019, the Russian Navy is replacing them with new warships delivered in 2020. As the Russian military moves closer to Norway, the only other country with claims in the Barents Sea, Putin's intentions in the Arctic seem increasingly hostile. The 2010 “agreed demarcation line” between Russia and Norway no longer gives the West the same confidence it used to. In October 2019, the Barents Observer celebrated the launch and testing of submarine weapons in the Norwegian Sea, just a day after a peaceful meeting between the Russian and Norwegian military leaders. Two Russian Sierra-class nuclear-powered submarines sailed into the Norwegian Sea to begin deep diving exercises, as well as the development and testing of underwater weapons.

While Russian submarine exercises and weapon testing are troubling, especially in the backyard of Norway, cooperation has been the predominant model of US-Russian engagement in the Arctic since the end of the Cold War. It is important not to exaggerate Russia's aggression in the Arctic; Norwegian Prime Minister Erna Solberg said the Arctic does not pose a serious security problem today, and other Norwegian analysts said that they "do not consider a conflict likely". [18] The same cannot be said about Europe or the Indo-Pacific region, where US interests are much stronger. In practice, the change in the strategic goals of the United States and NATO, which would be required to match Russian capabilities and really compete with Moscow in the Arctic, is impossible. While Russia has twenty-two fully operational military icebreakers, the United States has only two. There is also no consensus within NATO as to whether the Arctic is an area of military concern; Canada, a coastal state of the Arctic Five, has repeatedly stated that it does not believe that NATO should play any role in Arctic affairs.

Aggressive rebalancing of Russia in the Arctic is also undesirable. There are many possible scenarios. To name just a few of it, in which a military confrontation could erupt - over resource competition, territorial disputes, and unauthorized passage along the Northern Sea Route, But the

most likely scenario that could provoke a military conflict and a rise of Russian military exercises is an increase of NATO's military presence. Considering Moscow's sensitivity to the strategic encirclement, the concerns that have spread to the Arctic and the increase of NATO operations are likely to exacerbate security dilemmas and increase the likelihood of misperceptions and miscalculations, undermining strategic stability in a rapidly changing region where there is currently no mechanism for dialogue on security issues.

### **Conclusion**

Thus, Norway will continue to remain in the wake of NATO's strategic policy, but, nevertheless, its policy will be limited to formal actions. The main line of confrontation between Russia and NATO will run mainly at the diplomatic level, which will be limited to the build-up, as well as military maneuvers, these actions include NATO exercises in the states bordering with Russia, as well as issues of strategic arms control. The Arctic will remain a place of relative cooperation and cooperation between regional actors in international relations. Despite some alarmist statements from both sides, there will be no nuclear confrontation between NATO and Russia, therefore even a military "confrontation" will be formal in nature, which is influenced by a number of factors.

### *References:*

1. <https://www.nordefco.org/the-basics-about-nordefco>.
2. *Norway and NATO* // <https://www.norway.no/en/missions/nato/norway-nato/>
3. V.N. Konyshov et al. / *National Interests: Priorities and Security*, 2017, vol. 13, ISS. 2, PP. 353–368.
4. *Norwegian Ministries. Norway's Arctic Strategy – between geopolitics and social development* // [https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/76dc3d09a93a460c8fe649390a722689/arctic-strategy\\_kort-versjon.pdf](https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/76dc3d09a93a460c8fe649390a722689/arctic-strategy_kort-versjon.pdf).
5. *Высокоширотное противостояние* // <https://russiancouncil.ru/analytics-and-comments/analytics/vysokoshirotnoe-protivostoyanie/>.
6. *The Soria Moria Declaration on International Policy*. Oslo: The Office of the Prime Minister, 2007. URL: [http://regjeringen.no/en/archive/Stoltenbergs-2nd-Government/Office-of-the-Prime-Minister/rapporter-og-planer/rapporter/2005/the-soria-moriadeclaration-on-internati.html?regj\\_oss=1&id=438515](http://regjeringen.no/en/archive/Stoltenbergs-2nd-Government/Office-of-the-Prime-Minister/rapporter-og-planer/rapporter/2005/the-soria-moriadeclaration-on-internati.html?regj_oss=1&id=438515)
7. *Capable Force. Strategic Concept for the Norwegian Armed Forces*. Oslo: The Norwegian Ministry of Defence, 2009. P. 22–24, 49–50. URL: [http://regjeringen.no/upload/FD/Dokumenter/Capable-force\\_strategicconcept.pdf](http://regjeringen.no/upload/FD/Dokumenter/Capable-force_strategicconcept.pdf).
8. *Søreide I. New long-term plan for the Armed Forces – a monumental political challenge*. URL: <https://regjeringen.no/en/aktuelt/new-long-termplan-for-the-armed-forces--a-monumental-political-challenge/id2471559>.
9. *The Soria Moria Declaration on International Policy*. Oslo: The Office of the Prime Minister, 2007. URL: [http://regjeringen.no/en/archive/Stoltenbergs-2nd-Government/Office-of-the-Prime-Minister/rapporter-og-planer/rapporter/2005/the-soria-moriadeclaration-on-internati.html?regj\\_oss=1&id=438515](http://regjeringen.no/en/archive/Stoltenbergs-2nd-Government/Office-of-the-Prime-Minister/rapporter-og-planer/rapporter/2005/the-soria-moriadeclaration-on-internati.html?regj_oss=1&id=438515).
10. *Warsaw Summit Communiqué* // [https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official\\_texts\\_133169.htm](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_133169.htm).
11. *Четвертый дивизион S-400 в Крыму zastupil na boevoe dezhurstvo vblizi granicy s Ukrainoj*// <https://tass.ru/armiya-i-opk/5850333>
12. *Strategiya razvitiya Arkticheskoy zony` Rossijskoj Federaczii i obespecheniya naczional`noj bezopasnosti na period do 2020 goda*// <http://static.government.ru/media/files/2RpSA3sctElhAGn4RN9dHrtzk0A3wZm8.pdf>.
13. *NATO and the Security in the Arctic* // <https://www.nato-pa.int/download-file?filename=%2Fsites%2Fdefault%2Ffiles%2F2017-11%2F2017%20->



[%20172%20PCTR%2017%20E%20rev.1%20fin%20-%20NATO%20AND%20SECURITY%20IN%20THE%20ARCTIC.pdf](#)

14. <https://library.fes.de/pdf-files/bueros/usa/06874.pdf>

15. "NATO in an Era of Global Competition" - A Norwegian perspective // <https://www.regjeringen.no/en/aktuelt/NATO-in-and-Area-of-Global-Competition/id764468/>

16. The Arctic is "not up for grabs," Norwegian ambassador says // <https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/new-atlanticist/the-arctic-is-not-up-for-grabs-norwegian-ambassador-says/>

17. The changing shape of Arctic security // <https://www.nato.int/docu/review/articles/2019/06/28/the-changing-shape-of-arctic-security/index.html>

18. Norvegiya ne verit v ugrozu so storony Rossii, zayavil prem'er// <https://ria.ru/20190409/1552528144.html>

ХҒТАР 11.25.91

<https://doi.org/10.51889/2021-1.1728-8940.15>

*Ж.С.Жаманқараев<sup>1</sup>, Ж.К.Симтиков<sup>1</sup>*

*<sup>1</sup> Абай атындағы Қазақ ұлттық педагогикалық университеті*

## **ҚАЗІРГІ КЕЗЕҢДЕГІ САЯСИ-ЭКОНОМИКАЛЫҚ САНКЦИЯЛАРДЫҢ МӘНІ МЕН МАЗМҰНЫ**

### *Аңдатпа*

Мақалада халықаралық саяси және экономикалық санкциялардың қазіргі аспектілері қарастырылады, әлемдік саясаттың қазіргі жағдайын ескере отырып, халықаралық санкциялар ұғымына авторлық анықтама беріледі, халықаралық санкцияларды талдау механизмі сипатталады. Ғылымда халықаралық санкциялар көбінесе егеменді мемлекетке, оның институттарына, ұлттық компанияларға немесе жеке азаматтарға бағытталған, олардың қызметін мәжбүрлеу, шектеу, тежеу немесе алдын-алу мақсатында біржақты немесе ұжымдық саяси, экономикалық немесе құқықтық шаралар кешенін білдіреді. Басқаша айтқанда, Санкциялар әскери емес және күшсіз мәжбүрлеу шараларын қамтиды. Халықаралық санкциялар рөлінің мұндай трансформациясы, ең алдымен, әлемдік экономиканың жаһандануының күшеюімен, жекелеген мемлекеттердің, сауда қауымдастықтары мен трансұлттық корпорациялардың әлемдік экономикалық процестерге тартылуын күшейтумен байланысты. Сонымен қатар, бұл БҰҰ рөлінің әлсіреуіне, осы ұйым қызметінің тиімділігінің төмендеуіне, қоғамның қабылдаған шешімдеріне деген сенімін жоғалтуға, сондай-ақ БҰҰ реформасы туралы ұзаққа созылған пікірталасқа байланысты. Халықаралық санкциялардың табиғатын талдай отырып, олардың қазіргі халықаралық саяси конъюктураға байланысты тез өзгеру қабілетін ерекше атап өткен жөн. Санкциялар әлемдік үстем державалардың мүдделерімен тікелей байланысты және олардың сыртқы саяси бағытының векторына байланысты өзгереді.

**Түйін сөздер:** саясаттану, әлемдік саясат, саяси ықпал, үстем держава, халықаралық санкциялар, саяси және экономикалық санкциялар, санкциялар, санкциялар стратегиясы.