

REVIEWS AND REPORTS

UDC [32.019.51(98):070(73)](045)

DOI: 10.17238/issn2221-2698.2018.33.178

Covering geopolitical problems in the context of the Arctic exploration in the American media discourse (based on *The New York Times* content analysis)*

© **Natalia S. AVDONINA**, Cand. Sci. (Pol.), Associate Professor

E-mail: natalia.avdonina1987@gmail.com

Northern (Arctic) Federal University named after M.V. Lomonosov, Arkhangelsk, Russia

© **Svetlana O. DOLGOBORODOVA**, postgraduate student

E-mail: dol21031967@yandex.ru

Saint Petersburg State University, Saint Petersburg, Russia

Abstract. The article is based on a review of the geopolitical problems of the Arctic region, represented in the contemporary American media discourse on the example of the newspaper «The New York Times». The paper was chosen because it is an example of traditional American journalism, which adheres to the principles of objectivity. As a result of the analysis, the following trend was found — throughout 2001-2005 years the newspaper actively presented two Arctic issues: the feasibility of oil drilling in Alaska and the problem of climate change in the Arctic. Since 2007, the arctic problematics on the pages of newspapers became relevant in the context of geopolitical issues, which was connected to the event of August 2, 2007, namely the setting of the Russian flag in the Arctic Ocean. Coverage of the Arctic issues was carried out in the context of competition, and later — international cooperation. In the period from 2011 to 2018, the focus of the American newspaper was pointed out to the climate change and resource development in the Arctic.

Keywords: *Arctic, media discourse, Arctic media discourse, geopolitical problems, American mass media, informational policy.*

Introduction

The Arctic territories in the geographical and meaningful space periodically attract the attention of local and world communities as an object of struggle, cooperation, and development. Until 1982, the Arctic was “divided” between five states: Russia, Canada, the USA, Norway, and Denmark. In 1982, the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea introduced other principles of delimitation: “the full sovereignty of the coastal state applies only to the 12-mile zone of territorial waters, to the airspace above it, to its bottom and subsoil. Also, a 200-mile exclusive economic zone is established. The bottom of the seas and oceans and the subsoil beneath them, not under anyone's jurisdiction, are declared the common heritage of mankind, that is, all states of the world have equal rights to develop their natural resources, and any of them has the right to submit to the UN and other specialized international organizations application for the development of marine shelf resources”¹. According to this clause, Iceland, Finland and Sweden got the right to apply for a presence in the Arctic. India, China, South Korea, Brazil, Germany, Japan de-

* For citation:

Avdonina N.S., Dolgoborodova S.O. Covering geopolitical problems in the context of the Arctic exploration in the American media discourse (based on *The New York Times* content analysis). *Arktika i Sever* [Arctic and North], 2018, no. 33, pp. 150–161. DOI: 10.17238/issn2221-2698.2018.33.178

¹ Barcic I.N. O pravovom statusu rossijskogo arkticheskogo sektora. [On the legal status of the Russian Arctic sector]. *Pravo i politika*. №12, 2000. URL: <http://geo.1september.ru/article.php?ID=200700102> (Accessed: 15 March 2018). [In Russian]

clared their readiness to develop deposits on the Arctic shelf². It is primarily due to the high resource potential of the region: in the Arctic, 13% of the world's oil reserves, 30% of natural gas and many minerals are concentrated.³

Such methods as the “hot war on the cold territory”, “the age of the Arctic” and the “battle for the Arctic” are used to describe the geopolitical situation around the Arctic. Apart from the fact that the Arctic is considered as a reservoir of deposits of natural resources, it is also defined as a possible transport route, which may form over time as a result of ice melting. In this context, it is necessary to note the term “Global Arctic” adopted by the official community, chosen by the Thematic Network on Geopolitics and Security in January 2014 in Copenhagen. The term was officially launched into circulation at the 2014 Arctic Circle Assembly.⁴

Russia is the largest of the Arctic countries, connected with the Arctic not only by geographical location but also by history and national interests. The modern Russian sector of the Arctic covers an area of about 9.46 million km², of which 6.8 million km² is in the water area and makes up 45% of the total area of the Arctic Ocean. Within the sector, the continental shelf of Russia is 6.19 million km² or 41% of the entire water area of the Arctic. Based on these data, it is possible to justify the reasons why Russia is actively defending its rights to develop and develop the Arctic space.

Mass media are an essential tool in covering the Arctic subjects and the formation of relevant public opinion. The problem of the development of the Arctic territories becomes topical on the news agenda of the world media and is a kind of indicator of international politics in the Arctic vector.

The purpose of the article is to consider the specifics of covering the topic of Arctic exploration in the American media selection on the example of The New York Times newspaper for 2001–2018. It was during this period that the most significant and relevant for the region of co-being took place. According to the observations of the researcher Yu.F. Lukin, the most modern studies of the Arctic space, the already established legal regime of the Arctic, key legislative acts for the development of the Arctic zone of both Russia and other countries are associated with these years. The period is also rich in international events relating to the status of the Arctic, in which the Russian Federation, the United States, and Canada were directly involved. These years are crucial to defining contemporary Arctic issues in an international media selection.

We give the definition of the concept of “media discourse”. Kozhemyakin E.A. characterizes media discourse as a semantic unit in which “there is a conversion of information into meanings (knowledge construction), transfer of knowledge from one level (for example, institutional) to an-

² Страны и регионы. [Countries and regions]. URL: <http://www.arctic-info.ru/encyclopedia/countries-and-regions/> (Accessed: 06 October 2018) [In Russian]

³ Trump B.D., Kadenic M., & Linkov I. A sustainable Arctic: Making hard decisions. *Arctic, Antarctic, and Alpine Research*, 50 (1), 2018.

⁴ Heininen L., & Finger M., The “Global Arctic” as a New Geopolitical Context and Method. *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, 33(2), 199–202 pp., 2017.

other (for example, everyday), confluence of various types of information (for example, political and entertainment, event and advertising) or the creation of special knowledge relating only to media reality” [1, Kozhemyakin, E.A., p. 16].

Thus, in this article, under the Arctic media discourse, we understand the interpretation in the public consciousness of information about the Arctic region, its development and development, and the empowerment of this phenomenon with the direct participation of the media.

Information policy of the United States regarding the development of the Arctic territories

The term “information policy” basically has the concept of “policy”, which A.S. Panarin describes as “a type of human practice, through which people influence the environment, their fate and change their status in society ... these are actions aimed at changing destinies” [2, Chevozerova G.V., p. 206]. Researcher G.V. Chevozerova believes that “information can also change its perceiving system. It is logical to assume that if the transfer of information is carried out as a political act, that is, for some purpose and for the sake of achieving the planned changes for the audience that perceives it, then we can say that the information policy is implemented in this way” [2, Chevozerova G. V., p. 206]. The scientist interprets the information policy as “the production of purposeful changes of objects, processes, phenomena using the transmitted information” [2, Chevozerova G.V., p. 206]. Prokhorov E.P. notes that the state information policy is based on the requirements of mass information security, including the reliability of information, its availability, the variety of channels for obtaining information and the positions it presents, and so on. “Information policy is an ideological and creative concept of the current problem-thematic lines, the direction of this media, the nature of the development of which is determined by the social position and embodied in a set of received program forms” [3, Prohorov E.P., p. 245].

Researcher of the Arctic Media Discourse Rowe E.V. notes that the information policy of the Arctic states is based on the Arctic strategies of the states [4, Rowe E., p. 4], therefore, for different subarctic countries, the interpretation in the media of various aspects of the problem of the development of the Arctic is typical. According to the researcher, points of contact for both the state Arctic and information policy are such interests as climate change, increasing the flow of people to the Arctic and the role of natural resources extracted in the Arctic region. Nevertheless, each state has developed its arctic course, which, undoubtedly, reflected on the Arctic media discourse of both a separate nation and the whole world. In this article, we will consider only the Arctic media discourse of the United States.

For the information policy of the United States regarding the development of the Arctic, attention to the environmental aspect is characteristic, and the United States, along with Denmark, is in favor of active international cooperation in the Arctic. Alana Rov notes that “in an interview with a senior official in the Arctic in 2011, the United States explained that the United States supported an open and transparent Arctic Council and included more stakeholders as permanent observers” [4, Rowe E., p. 5]. Lukin Yu.F. explains this by saying that America has no prospects for

expanding its Arctic territory, and calls this trend towards the internationalization of the Arctic key to the modern international community. In this context, there are options for manipulating the topic of environmental concern for the Arctic (and the course on environmental protection in the Arctic is very strong in the United States Arctic media discourse – Author's note) to discourage the expansion of possessions of circumpolar states [5, Lukin Yu.F., p. 123].

The information policy of the United States regarding the development of the Arctic, for example, repeatedly voiced the idea of the insolvency of the Arctic strategy of America. Rowe E. quotes the American tabloid Daily News, which notes with concern the lack of ability of the US Navy to operate independently in the Arctic Ocean and quotes Navy officials who claim that the United States is "the only Arctic nation without an Arctic strategy <... > we do not anticipate a military threat in the Arctic, but this does not mean that you will not need to work there"[4, Rowe E., p. 5]. Economic competition for limited natural resources is also seen as a driving force for a potential Arctic conflict.

The speech plane generally arctic media discourse saturated language means that express a negative assessment (stylistically reduced, and heat-injective slang vocabulary derivational neologisms, foreign language vocabulary, aggressive comparisons, and metaphors) and indirect means speech aggression (intertextuality, biased use of negative information, irony and language demagogic).

According to Rowe E., the Associated Press article, entitled "The New Cold War," pointed to Russia as the most aggressive, wishing to establish itself as the superpower of the new region. Russia's resurgence in the foreign policy arena as a more convincing "energy superpower" in the second presidency of Vladimir Putin (2004–2008), as well as the well-established cold war narratives, undoubtedly facilitate the formation of the "villain" image from Russia in the Arctic policy, says E. Rowe [4, Rowe E., p. 7]. On the example of the passage from the article "AP", the above-mentioned means of speech expressiveness manifest themselves: the aggressive comparison made in the headline — "the new cold war" — and the metaphor "the role of the villain" in relation to Russia.

Geopolitical issues in the context of the Arctic exploration in the publication "The New York Times" The American newspaper The New York Times is very actively involved in covering the development and transformation of the Arctic region. According to the data of the monitoring agency Lexis-Nexis, the search query "Arctic" in The New York Times for the period 2001–2018 results in 577 materials. On average, the publication annually produces about 70 materials affecting the Arctic region or its problems.

Resource development and ecology in the Arctic: topics in American Arctic media discourse

The themes of oil drilling and global warming are often updated in the newspaper The New York Times from 2001 to 2018. In 2000, the publication published its program material "This is not

oil against beauty in the Arctic”,⁵ where the authors consider the prospects of America in the Arctic. Here is a fragment of the text: “What is at stake here, according to the latest estimates of the United States Geological Survey, is 16 billion barrels of oil - this is an amount sufficient to replace all of our imports from Saudi Arabia for the next 30 years”⁶. The material can be described as a program since it defines two main themes for the whole further Arctic discourse of The New York Times: oil production and the protection of the Arctic environment.

It is worth noting the lack of a geopolitical component, including information on international cooperation in the Arctic region in the media cycle “The New York Times” in the early 2000s. At the same time, texts are published in which the image of Russia is represented as the image of a country actively exploring the Arctic, which is due to the historical context.

The primary vector of coverage of the Arctic in “The New York Times” is the study of the risks and benefits of oil production in the region, the prospects for Arctic research and development.

The only topic that almost all texts published in The New York Times in 2002 are about is the controversy over oil production in the Arctic and preserving the region as a national reserve: “Mining can damage the wild”, “New dispute about oil in Alaska”, “The Senate proceeds to the counting of votes on the issue of buoyancy in Alaska.” The dispute over Alaska pushed Republicans and Democrats: the first ones, at the time with President Bush, defended the idea of mining in order to reduce US dependence on imported oil; Democrats insisted on reducing not oil imports, but the development of technologies, in particular, reduce fuel consumption and also claimed that oil⁷.

In 2003, the newspaper continued to cover the disputes of politicians, scientists, and businesspeople over Arctic oil. The headings emphasize the topicality of the topic: “Depressed Alaska on the menu?”, “What is the price of drilling?”, “Grizzly look at the ground over oil”.

Another topic that is also important in analyzing the US Arctic discourse is the indigenous peoples of the north. In 2001, journalists covered the release of a film based on Inuit folklore^{8,9}. This problem also arises in the context of oil production in the Arctic. In a portrait essay on the 85-year-old Eskimo Inusik Nasaliku, the journalist smoothly turns to the problematic and writes: Compounds such as mercury and PCBs that are carried by wind and currents from the industrialized south and accumulate in the fatty tissues of arctic animals. People who eat such animals also suffer, and a high level of pollutants is found in breast milk of Eskimo women”¹⁰.

In November 2005, a “large-scale five-year plan for the selection of various federal benefit programs and the resolution of oil and natural gas drilling in the wilderness of Alaska” was ap-

⁵ It's Not Oil vs. Beauty in the Arctic. *The New York Times*. 2000. 9 October.

⁶ It's Not Oil vs. Beauty in the Arctic. *The New York Times*. 2000. 9 October.

⁷ Senate Moves To Showdown On Drilling In Alaska. *The New York Times*. 2002. 17 April.

⁸ Inuit - Indigenous people of North America

⁹ Returning Tundra's Rhythm to the Inuit, in Film. *The New York*. 2002. 30 March.

¹⁰ Eskimos Fret as Climate Shifts and Wildlife Changes. *The New York Times*. 2004. 6 September.

proved¹¹. In December, the publication reported that Democrats achieved a reduction of \$ 42 million in the budget for oil production in the Arctic.¹²

In 2005 - 2011 Arctic issues in *The New York Times* fade away, the publication addresses the topic of global warming. We can distinguish the following catchy behind-heads: “A catastrophe on the top of the world”, “The dangers of early spring”.

Since 2011, the problems of oil production, aggravated after the oil disaster in the Gulf of Mexico, have returned to the pages of the newspaper: Americans are in every way afraid of a repetition of the same anywhere, especially in the Arctic, which has so long defended as a protected area. BP, the worst oil spill in our history. <...> These dangers are only higher in the harsh and remote Arctic waters. Before we go to the ends of the earth in search of oil, we need more in-depth knowledge, better technologies to prevent emissions and clean up after accidents, and extensive experience in protecting the Arctic waters of Alaska, one of the last frontiers of our oceans, from death and aimless risk¹³.

Of the consequences of global warming, Americans are concerned, in particular, with a possible methane catastrophe: “The main concern is that as the climate changes, the ocean temperature may increase enough to destabilize many of these marine methane deposits, sending them to the atmosphere”¹⁴.

In 2015, the Arctic perspective in the publication changed its direction due to the policy of President Obama in the Arctic, who opposed drilling over a larger area of the American Arctic territory and for recognizing it as a nature reserve. However, such a decision was not made.

In 2016–2018 the publication also follows its standard arctic discourse, with the difference that the personality of Barack Obama is replaced by the figure of Donald Trump and the debate about oil production in Alaska flares up again.

Geopolitical issues in the context of the problem of Arctic development

Geopolitical problems or interests of other countries in the Arctic are not raised by journalists from *The New York Times* until 2007. At the beginning of the century, the Arctic is not considered as a zone of rivalry, but also about Russian-American or any international cooperation in this media also did not write.

It was only in 2004 that messages about other Arctic states began to appear in the Arctic discourse of the United States. In March 2004, the media wrote twice about the drifting Russian research camp, which was in trouble in the Arctic due to melting ice¹⁵. Americans write about Canadian military exercises in the Arctic in a different, already geopolitical way: “Not all of Canada’s considerable claims to the Arctic are internationally recognized. The United States, the European

¹¹ Senate Passes Budget With Benefit Cuts and Oil. *The New York Times*. 2005. 4 November.

¹² Congressional Leaders Agree to \$42 Billion in Budget Cuts. *The New York Times*. 2005. 19 December.

¹³ No to Arctic Drilling. *The New York Times*. 2011. 18 August.

¹⁴ Arctic Methane: Is Catastrophe Imminent? *The New York Times*. 2011. 20 December.

¹⁵ Rescue On for Russian Crew After Arctic Camp Collapses. *The New York Times*. 2004. 5 March.

Union, and Denmark either claim that the region's waterways are open to all or have made their claims in parts where climate change is expected to lead to increased access to the region's precious resources in the coming years"¹⁶ — It is the first material since 2001 when The New York Times journalists are raising geopolitical issues in the context of the Arctic.

In 2007, geopolitical issues were more active in the publication, with an emphasis on Russian policy. In this context, one can mention the "The New York Times" material, sacred to Chukotka and its economic stagnation.¹⁷

In August 2007, Russia became one of the leading topics in the international Arctic information discourse, the reason for which was the establishment of the Russian flag at the bottom of the Arctic Ocean. "A look at the future of wealth, the Russians set the flag on the Arctic bottom, under the polar cap" - with such a title in the publication came out the material the very next day after the flag was installed. Here is a fragment of the text: "The expedition, intensively covered by Russian news organizations and state-controlled television, combines adventures on the high seas with the well-established Russian traditions of polar exploration. But it was also a publicly delivered stunt <...> Mr. Chilingarov spoke as if he were the first on the moon. "If in a hundred or a thousand years someone descends to where we were, they will see the Russian flag. Our task is to remind the world that Russia is the great Arctic and scientific power"¹⁸. It is worth noting that the material represents two points of view: both Russian and American, and the Russian point of view is presented by journalists in more detail, quoting two Russian politicians at once: Sergey Lavrov and Vladimir Putin and scientist Artur Chilingarov. Journalists also celebrate the tradition of the northern Russian expeditions. However, the media is followed by more rigid material relating directly to geopolitics, the "Ice Cold War," for which the installation of the Russian flag at the North Pole was the information channel. In this text, journalists study the positions and claims on the Arctic not only in Russia but also in other states and ask the question "Will the rhetoric grow into extremely armed prey on the ice?"¹⁹. The material in the newspaper for the first time declared the interests of the United States in the Arctic, which previously were limited only to disputes about ecology and oil production.

For the American Arctic discourse, a contention also becomes characteristic: "We own only three ships intended for polar missions. <...> Russia, on the contrary, has a fleet of 18 icebreakers. We must have enough ships to maintain our presence"²⁰. Disputes about maritime borders, especially in the complex ice geography of the Arctic Ocean, require international solutions - this is the conclusion of journalists. It is the first analytical material on geopolitical topics in the context of the US Arctic discourse since 2001.

¹⁶ Canada Reinforces Its Disputed Claims in the Arctic. *The New York Times*. 2004. 29 August.

¹⁷ Where Russians Still Think Boldly. *The New York Times*. 2007. 22 April.

¹⁸ Eyeing Future Wealth, Russians Plant the Flag on the Arctic Seabed, Below the Polar Cap. *The New York Times*. 2003. 3 August.

¹⁹ Russians Plant the Flag on the Arctic Seabed, Below the Polar Cap. *The New York Times*. 2003. 3 August.

²⁰ An Ice-Cold War. *The New York Times* August. 2007. 8 August.

The installation of the Russian flag on the ocean floor revived the interest of not only journalists: Canada soon wanted to designate its sovereignty in the Arctic and a week later announced the opening of two military bases in the Arctic. "The first principle of Arctic sovereignty is to use it or lose it",²¹ — "The New York Times" quoted Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper.

Six months later, in February 2008, the installation of the Russian flag sounds again in the publication, but in a new context: the immersion project at the end of the 20th century. pondered by American scientists who collaborated with the Russians²². This further confirms the competitiveness of the Arctic information discourse: the publication is trying to figure out who is assigned the leadership in the Arctic technologies.

In 2007, the Arctic media discourse in the United States acquired a new trend, and a kind of "race" for the Arctic in the world is indeed taking place, as the primacy in technology development is being discussed.

The headlines of the Arctic materials in The New York Times are increasingly acquiring international issues: "The Tale of the Cold War" (about the role of the Arctic in the Cold War and the arms race), "5 countries are ready to talk, not to compete on the topic of the Arc-Tiki" , "Russian scientists deserving the study of the seabed" (on the results of Russian dives). In 2013, the newspaper published a material assessing the likelihood of the Cold War in the Arctic. "Preventing the Arctic Cold War" - the potential for a conflict of the scale of the Cold War is high, although the likelihood is low now, the author writes. The idea of the text is reduced to the absence of concrete actions by President Barack Obama, who "should hold an international meeting with President Putin and other leaders of the Arctic countries, to ensure that economic development is at the top of the world not only"²³. In contrast to 2007, the publication notes the peaceful nature of Putin's policies in the Arctic, since "the Russian economy depends on rich oil fields and natural gas"²⁴.

In the autumn of 2013, 8 publications were published in the publication related to the activities of Russia in the Arctic. The main information center was the detention of the Greenpeace ship by the Russian military and the call of the Dutch ambassador (Greenpeace is based in the Netherlands - author's note) to Moscow. This topic will be periodically updated in the media until April 2014. In 2015, tensions in relations between Russia and the West will affect the activities of the Arctic Council. "The Arctic Council is gathering in the shadow of tension because of Russia" - with the title "The New York Times" will publish material in which Russia will take a central place: "Russia's military activity in the Arctic and its extensive territorial claims to waters emphasize strategic priority, which for this region established Putin. Increased competition for natural resources increased the possibility of confrontation, and the annexation of the Crimea in March 2014 greatly strained relations with the other permanent members of the Council. <...> Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov, who attended the last meeting of the council in Sweden two years ago, refused

²¹ Canada Announces Plans for 2 New Bases in Its Far North. *The New York Times*. 2007. 11 August.

²² Final Russia's Claim Under Polar Ice Irks American. *The New York Times*. 2008. 9 February.

²³ Preventing An Arctic Cold War. *The New York Times*. 2013. 13 March.

²⁴ Preventing An Arctic Cold War. *The New York Times*. 2013. 13 March.

to attend this meeting. <...> Many suspected that his decision was made in retaliation for Canada's sharp criticism of the Kremlin's actions in Ukraine and a boycott of a meeting on Arctic issues in Russia"²⁵.

In 2015, President Barack Obama went on a trip to Alaska, which causes the appearance in the newspaper for the first time since 2001 of primary analytical material on the role of the United States in the Arctic. This text is incredibly important, since it's for the first time declared potential "rivals" (this is the word that the edition uses) of the US in the Arctic, which is headed by Russia (the text lists the main Russian bases of the Arctic, as well as icebreakers in exact numbers) as well as China, South Korea and Singapore. In this context, the publication recalled the cold war "when the United States and the Soviet Union clashed with each other in the Arctic and beyond." Thus, like the Russian Arctic discourse, the American aspect manifests itself in national development in the region: "When Russia introduced Sputnik into outer space, we sat with our hands in our pockets with great enthusiasm and said, "Good for Mother Russia," quotes Media expert²⁶.

International cooperation on the development of the Arctic in the context of geopolitical topics

In 2009, the pronounced competitiveness of the US Arctic discourse weakened. There is a noticeable trend towards international cooperation in the media: international agreements are highlighted, in particular, restrictions on fishing in the Arctic. International cooperation in the Arctic is viewed positively (for example, this is reflected in the heading "The Arctic Circle of Friends" in an article on international cooperation on warming in the Arctic²⁷).

Militaristic sentiments were asleep in the Arctic discourse, foreign prospects on the Northern Sea Route are lit neutral²⁸. It is worth noting that American targets in the Arctic are not particularly prominent. International cooperation, sometimes even being served in a historical context, is the main thing that reflects this period.

After 2007, the Russian Federation was forever entrenched in the informational discourse of the United States as an individual Arctic player. "The New York Times" after 2008 covers Russian activities in Artik in the context of international cooperation. In 2010, for example, the publication covered Russian-British cooperation in the Arctic (an agreement with the British oil giant BP) and through this topic, the release addresses Russian policy and its internal problems,²⁹ but covering them in 2010, the media does not allow widespread criticism of the authorities, although it assumes it. The main thing is that the media objectively represents the point of view of Russia itself, quoting Russian experts without their comments.

The US's misunderstanding was caused by the actions of Russia and Norway after the conclusion of the 2010 treaty. After 2010, journalists almost never returned to international coopera-

²⁵ Arctic Council Meets in Shadow of Tension on Russia. *The New York Times*. 2015. 25 April.

²⁶ U.S. Is Playing Catch-Up in Scramble for the Arctic. *The New York Times*. 2015. 30 August.

²⁷ An Arctic Circle of Friends. *The New York Times*. 2009. 28 March.

²⁸ Arctic Shortcut, Long a Dream, Beckons Shippers as Ice Thaws. *The New York Times*. 2009. 11 September.

²⁹ Russia Embraces Arctic Drilling. *The New York Times*. 2011. 16 February.

tion in the Arctic, in 2012 only one material was devoted to this topic. He relates to the role of China in the Arctic race: “It seems that everyone is trying to push into the melting Arctic space, including China, which has no Arctic territory”³⁰. In 2013, journalists continue the theme with the material “China is knocking on the Icelandic door”³¹, where the conclusions state the need for US cooperation with Iceland and Norway.

Thus, the Arctic discourse in *The New York Times* and its thematic diversity can be divided into several stages. For clarity and simplification of understanding, we present them in the table.

Table 1

Topics in the US Arctic Media Discourse

Period (years)	Leading topic	Specifics
2001–2006	Resource Development and Climate Change in the Arctic	Disputes about the benefits of resource development in Alaska for the US economy, as opposed to the environmental consequences of the region and the preservation of the American Arctic as a national reserve.
2007–2008	Geopolitical picture in the Arctic	Interpretation of the installation of the Russian flag at the bottom of the Arctic Ocean and the revival of international interest in the region, an analysis of the prospects for different states in the Arctic.
2009–2010	The international cooperation	Coverage of international cooperation in the Arctic, informing readers about various Arctic projects, assessment of the consequences of the Arctic partnership.
2011–2018	Climate change and resource development in the Arctic	The focus is on the melting of ice in the Arctic, an assessment of the effects of global warming, as well as the risks and benefits of resource development in Alaska.

Conclusion

In 2001–2005, in *The New York Times*, only two Arctic themes are actively heard: the suitability of oil drilling in Alaska (that is, in the US Arctic) and the problem of climate change in the Arctic. All other Arctic issues in *The New York Times*, for example, rare materials on the peoples of the Far North, are raised in the publication only in the context of these critical topics.

In 2006, the Arctic issues in the newspaper subsided in connection with the decision on the question of drilling oil in Alaska.

In 2007, on the contrary, the Arctic discourse came to life and acquired a geopolitical sound, which was caused by the installation of the Russian flag in the Arctic on August 2, 2007, at the bottom of the Arctic Ocean in the framework of the Russian expedition “Arctic-2007”. In connection with the ambiguous perception of this Russian gesture by Western politicians, the event creates informational grounds for the future geopolitical direction of the Arctic media discourse. The headlines of the Arctic materials in *The New York Times* gradually acquire international issues, the authors use various speech means to express aggression.

In 2007, claims of other states in the Arctic and the need to protect US sovereignty in the Arctic were widely publicized for the first time. It is worth noting that, judging by the content of

³⁰ China and the Northern Rivalry. *The New York Times*, 2012, 5 October.

³¹ China Knocks on Iceland's Door. *The New York Times*. 2013, 13 March.

the materials, the United States does not name its unequivocal Arctic allies - they write neutral questions about Canada's Canadian forces in the Arctic, although they pay attention to them, and the Arctic policy of Russia and Norway 2010), condemned for greed in matters of oil production. It can be said that Russia appears in the US discourse as an individual Arctic player. If the newspaper pays attention to the Arctic policy of other countries only occasionally, then the Russian Federation is mentioned in a swarm even in the headlines, which can be explained by the cautious attitude of the American public to the Russian policy as a whole.

The status of Russia as an individual Arctic player is emerging in the context of the coverage of the development of the Russian Arctic and comparison with the development of the same US region - thus, the competitiveness of the American information discourse is manifested. China is also emerging as an individual Arctic media player, but it is only an observer in the Arctic Council. However, Americans are devoting several materials to China's activities in the Arctic.

After 2007, the geopolitical aspect of the Arctic discourse in The New York Times will continue, the installation of the Russian flag in the Arctic was a turning point in the coverage of the Arctic. However, with the loss of acute relevance in the second decade of the 20th century. Americans are again addressing resource development issues in Alaska and climate change in the Arctic as the main Arctic topics.

References

1. Kozhemyakin Ye.A. Massovaya kommunikatsiya i mediadiskurs: k metodologii issledovaniya [Mass communication and media discourse: toward methodology]. *Nauchnye vedomosti. Seriya: Gumanitarnye nauki* [Belgorod State University Scientific Bulletin. Humanities Sciences], 2010, no. 12 (83), pp. 13–22.
2. Chevozerova G.V. Informatsionnaya politika SMI [Information policy in the mass media]. *VYeSTNIK VGU. Seriya: Filologiya. Zhurnalistika* [Scientific Journal of Proceedings of Voronezh State University. Series: Philology. Journalism], 2011, no. 1, pp. 206–213.
3. Prokhorov Ye.P. *Vvedenie v teoriyu zhurnalistiki* [Introduction to the theory of journalism]. Moscow, Aspekt-Press, 2002. 351 p. (In Russ.)
4. Rowe Ye. A dangerous space? Unpacking state and media discourses on the Arctic. Norwegian Institute of International Affairs. *Polar Geography*, 2012, pp. 1–12.
5. Lukin Yu.F. *Velikiy peredel Arktiki* [Great Re-Partition of the Arctic]. Arkhangelsk: NArFU Publ., 2010. 399 p. (In Russ.)
6. Posluns M., Hodgins B.W., Osborne S.L., Karram K., Coates K.S. *The Dundurn Arctic Culture and Sovereignty Library*. Dundurn: Dundurn Press Limited, 2014. 3128 p.
7. Flake L.E. *Contextualizing and disarming Russia's arctic security posture*. Center for Strategic Intelligence Research (CSIR). US National Intelligence University, Washington, DC, United States, 2017.
8. Trump B.D., Kadenic M., Linkov I. A sustainable Arctic: Making hard decisions. *Arctic, Antarctic, and Alpine Research*, 2018, no. 50 (1)
9. Heininen L., Finger M. The "Global Arctic" as a New Geopolitical Context and Method. *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, 2017, no. 33 (2), pp. 199–202.
10. Misje A.S. *Russian hegemony in the Arctic space? Contesting the popular geopolitical discourses*. California State University, Fullerton, ProQuest Dissertations Publ., 2012. 71 p.
11. Pincus R., Ali S.H. Have you been to "The Arctic"? Frame theory and the role of media coverage in shaping Arctic discourse. *Polar Geography*, 2016, no. 39 (2), pp. 83–97.
12. Bulatova E.I. Sredstva verbal'noj agressii kak instrument informacionnyh vojn (na primere Arkticheskogo mediadiskursa) [Means of verbal aggression as a tool of information wars (by the example of

- the arctic media discourse)]. *Filologicheskie nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki* [Philological Studies. Issues of Theory and Practice], 2016, no. 8, pp. 88–90.
13. Bykov A. YU. Sovremennye trendy mediarynka Soedinennyh Shtatov Ameriki [Actual trends of the USA media market]. *Zarubezhnaya zhurnalistika v 2011 godu: sb. statej* [Foreign Journalism in 2011: proceedings]. Ed. by A.S. Puyu, E.S. Georgiev. Saint Petersburg: SPBU, School of Journalism and Mass Communications Publ., 2012, pp. 13–21. (In Russ.)